



## TEACHERS21

# Audit of the Dedham Public Schools K-12 ELA Program

## Final Report

Respectfully submitted on June 12, 2016 by the Teachers21 audit team:

Jennifer Antonucci, Director of Professional Development  
David Castelline, Staff consultant  
Greg Hurray, ELA consultant  
Marc Kerble, Curriculum & Instruction consultant

## Table of Contents

<b>Overview</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Purpose and Scope of the Inquiry.....	1
Process .....	1
Limits of the Study.....	3
Hallmarks of an Effective ELA Program.....	3
<i>What does an effective, high performing ELA program look like?</i> .....	3
<i>Observable Indicators</i> .....	4
<b>Findings</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Overall Impressions.....	5
Issues and Challenges .....	7
<i>Curriculum</i> .....	7
<i>Pedagogy</i> .....	8
<i>Rigor</i> .....	9
<i>Accountability</i> .....	10
<i>Infrastructure</i> .....	10
<i>Work Environment / Climate</i> .....	11
<i>Belief System</i> .....	11
<i>Professional Development</i> .....	12
<b>Three Year Vision</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Five Major Tasks .....	13
<b>Recommendations: Enacting Major Tasks</b> .....	<b>14</b>
Steps to Completing Major Task I: Coordinate the Elementary ELA Program.....	14
Steps to Completing Major Task II: Increase Academic Rigor at All Levels .....	17
Steps to Completing Major Task III: Foster a ‘Growth Mindset’ Culture among the Staff.....	19
Steps to Completing Major Task IV: Emphasize Autonomy and Independence among the Students	21
Steps to Completing Major Task V: Strengthen Programs Supporting High Needs Students in K-8..	23
<b>Final Thoughts</b> .....	<b>24</b>
Appendix A: Sources.....	ii
Appendix B: ELA ELEMENTS - Focus Areas and Questions .....	vi
Appendix C: Classroom Observation Tools .....	xi
<i>Elementary Observation Tool</i> .....	xi
<i>Secondary Observation Tool</i> .....	xii
Appendix D: Interview Questions.....	xiv
<i>Teacher Interview Questions</i> .....	xiv
<i>Principal/Administrator Interview Questions</i> .....	xv
Appendix E: 2015 MCAS Writing Scores.....	xvi
Appendix F: Three Year Implementation Timeline .....	xviii
Appendix G: Envisioning ELA Program 2019.....	xxi

## Overview

In March, 2016, Superintendent Welch hired Teachers21 to conduct an audit of the PreK-12 English Language Arts Program of the Dedham Public Schools. This report comprises the scope of our inquiry, the process we used, our findings, and our recommendations.

## Purpose and Scope of the Inquiry

The purpose of the audit, as described by Superintendent Welch, is to examine the ELA program, PreK-12, for strengths and areas of need, and to make recommendations that will lead to an improvement in student performance, achievement, and growth. To do this, we proposed to examine eight aspects of the ELA program and identify strengths and gaps in each of these areas. The areas we examined are as follows:

- Curriculum
- Pedagogy
- Academic Rigor / Expectations
- Accountability (data collection, progress monitoring)
- Infrastructure (including organizational plan, personnel roles, and schedule)
- Professional Work Environment / Climate
- Belief System / Attitude of Professional Staff
- Professional Development

For each of these focus areas, we developed a set of subtopics and questions. For example, under Curriculum, we examined the following subtopics: Balance, Organization, Outcomes, Deep Goals, Fidelity, Differentiation and asked questions such as *Is the curriculum horizontally balanced (comprising a wide range of genres, topics and themes) and vertically progressive (each step building upon previous steps)? Is there a clearly articulated scope and sequence? Does the curriculum emphasize deep goals: inferential thinking, critical thinking, evidence-based writing, positive habits of mind (effort, creativity, collaboration, problem solving, autonomy)? Is the curriculum sufficiently differentiated to meet the needs of diverse learners? Are there alternative pathways to successful learning?* (For the complete list of questions and subtopics, please see Appendix B.)

## Process

To conduct the audit, we collected information using five different methods:

1. classroom observations;
2. interviews of teachers, specialists, principals and program directors;
3. examination of district- and school-based curriculum documents and improvement plans;

4. examination of student work, including writing samples from a variety of grades; and,
5. an analysis of performance data from the state Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Over the course of eight weeks, we observed a number of classrooms and interviewed a variety of teachers, specialists and administrators, including the ECEC principal, the assistant principals of Dedham Middle School and Dedham High School, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment, the Director of Special Education, and the English Department Chairperson for grades 6-12. The following chart captures the extent of our observations and interviews:

### Early Childhood Observations & Interviews\*

School/ Principal	Observations		Interviews			
	Teachers (K)	Teachers (preK)	Teachers	Reading Specialists	SPED Teachers	Principal
ECEC Paul Sullivan	8	3	7 K 2 PreK	0	1	1

### Elementary Observations & Interviews\*

School/ Principal	Observations		Interviews			
	Teachers (3 - 5)	Teachers (1 - 2)	Teachers	Reading Specialists/ Librarians	SPED Teachers	Principal
Avery Clare Sullivan	14	10	9	2 RS 1 Lib	4	1
Greenlodge Joe Russo	5	3	8	2 RS	0	1
Oakdale Holli Armstrong	9	6	15	2 RS	3	1
Riverdale Ed Paris	5	4	10	2 RS 1 Lib	4	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>8 RS 2 Lib</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>

### Middle School Observations & Interviews\*

School/ Principal	Observations			Interviews			
	6th	7th	8th	Teachers	Reading Teachers	SPED Staff	Principal
Dedham Middle	9	5	4	6	4	5	1 <i>Margo Fraczek, AP</i>

### High School Observations & Interviews\*

School/ Principal	Observations		Interviews			
	9th	10th	Teachers	Literacy Specialists	SPED Staff	Principal
Dedham High Ron McCarthy	4	5	10	6 <i>dept. chairs in group</i>	0	1 <i>Jim Forrest, AP</i>

## District Leadership Interviews\*

Name	Role/Title
Michael Welch	Superintendent of Schools
Cynthia Kelly	Assistant Superintendent
Elizabeth O'Connell	Director of Special Education
Elizabeth Sawyer	English Department Chairperson, Grades 6-12

*\*The observation templates and the interview questions we used for teachers and administrators can be found in the Appendix C & D.*

Prior to beginning this work, we met with Superintendent Welch and the entire Administrative Leadership Team to outline our goals and methods. We emphasized that our purpose was not to evaluate or criticize individual teachers, schools or programs, but to collect data and information to inform recommendations for strengthening the ELA program over the next three years. We stressed that we wanted our work to be collaborative and transparent, and invited building principals and program directors to join us on all classroom visits and interviews. Principals and directors did join us on the vast majority of classroom observations and were present for some of the interviews. Dedham teachers and administrators were universally welcoming, cooperative, and interested in helping us conduct the audit.

## Limits of the Study

Given the brief time line for completing the audit, we acknowledge that our information may be incomplete in some respects and, as a result, some of our assumptions may be incorrect. *For example, to what extent might the writing instruction we saw during classroom observations have been influenced by the proximity of the upcoming PARCC exams?* To the extent possible, we have endeavored to be accurate, thorough, and thoughtful in all aspects of our work by triangulating data from multiple sources and through multiple lenses. Had time allowed, we would have preferred to observe every classroom in the district and spent even more time interviewing teachers and examining student work.

## Hallmarks of an Effective ELA Program

### What does an effective, high performing ELA program look like?

We do not subscribe to the notion that there is only a single iteration of a successful English Language Arts Program. On the contrary, success comes in many forms. However, we do believe that successful programs have in common a number of key characteristics, identified in white papers and statements of principle published by major literacy organizations, institutions, and research bodies such as the *International Literacy Association*, the *National Council of Teachers of English*, the *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*, the *Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education*, the *National Assessment of Educational Progress*, the *National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (National Reading Panel)*, the *Alliance for Excellent Education (Reading Next)*, the *National Institute for*

*Literacy (National Early Literacy Panel), and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education (RAND Reading Study Group), among others. (For a full listing of sources and resources, see Appendix A.)*

In our estimation, the hallmarks of an effective English Language Arts program include

- a powerful curriculum that both challenges students and differentiates instruction, providing a variety of pathways to successful learning by all students; such a curriculum emphasizes explicit comprehension instruction, intensive writing, oral language, diverse texts, and extended time for literacy; such a curriculum develops students' skills and strategies progressively and cumulatively through the years;
- student-centered pedagogy that emphasizes 'active learning,' the construction of knowledge and meaning ('learning by doing'), and immersion in authentic texts and tasks; such a pedagogy engages and inspires students by creating intrinsically motivating and relevant challenges and numerous choices for both gaining and demonstrating knowledge;
- challenging (and clearly articulated) expectations that emphasize deep learning goals: inferential thinking, critical thinking (analysis, interpretation, evaluation), evidence-based writing, positive habits of mind (effort, creativity, collaboration, problem solving, autonomy), and the acquisition of meaningful knowledge and experience;
- a system-wide emphasis on moving all students toward autonomy as decision makers, independence as learners and thinkers, and confidence as problem solvers able to work individually and collaboratively across disciplines;
- on-going formative and summative assessment procedures to monitor students' progress and measure the effectiveness of instructional programs and interventions;
- a 'growth mindset' culture among the staff that values continuous learning, professional development, and systematic examination of best practices;
- a belief system among the staff that reflects a deep commitment to 1) ensuring success for every student; 2) teacher self-efficacy (a belief that teachers *can* positively impact the learning of all students); 3) ownership of responsibility for all students in one's class; 4) ownership of the curriculum; and 5) collaboration with colleagues.

### Observable Indicators

Given these conditions, one would expect to see

- students displaying enthusiasm and excitement for learning, a willingness to take intellectual and academic risks, a genuine sense of inquiry, a love of reading and writing, an ability to think critically and creatively, independent decision making,

confidence in their ability to perform challenging tasks, and pride in their work;

- students demonstrating proficiency on identified benchmarks at all grade levels, a high rate of growth as measured by the DESE Student Growth Percentile and teacher-created assessments, and a discernible and measurable readiness for college and career challenges.

## Findings

### Overall Impressions

The Dedham Public Schools is clearly a wonderful learning environment for students. Everywhere we went, we found a dedicated staff that cares about the social, emotional, and intellectual wellbeing of the young people in their charge. Each of the seven schools we visited projected a nurturing environment in which students are treated with love, respect, and attention to individual strengths and needs. In every school the climate reflected genuinely strong relationships with students, collaboration and collegiality among the staff, and focused, respectful leadership by administrators and program directors. This is the cornerstone of a strong school system.

The Dedham Public Schools is clearly well resourced with respect to technology, staffing, supplies, and materials. In almost every building, we saw abundant resources to support the work of teachers. Technology that supports teaching and learning is readily available. *The ratio of reading specialists to students is quite favorable.* The libraries are well resourced; most elementary classrooms we visited have adequate availability to leveled texts and independent libraries as well as digital texts and programs such as *Reading A-Z, Lexia, RazKids, and NewsEla*. The exception might be the Early Childhood Education Center, where there was no reading specialist, technology was not abundantly available, and classroom libraries appear to need upgrading.

At every level we found extensive documentation laying out program goals, standards, units of study, and instructional procedures, though the majority of documents at the elementary and middle school levels need to be updated to reflect current Massachusetts Curriculum Framework Standards (adopted July, 2010). Much of the documentation, in order to be completely useful to teachers and administrators, needs to be augmented with grade-level benchmarks, specific outcomes for all units of study, pacing guides, pathways for diverse learners, and common assessments to measure student learning. The documentation at the high school – a clear explanation of core values and learning expectations, common rubrics for academic performance in all disciplines, updated course descriptions for English, and an action-oriented school improvement plan – reflects a well-coordinated effort to improve instruction and boost student achievement. On a system-wide level, the district's establishment of three long-term committees – Curriculum, Assessment, and Professional Development – and the time devoted to them during the summer and throughout the school year - speak volumes about the district's commitment to improved student performance and

empowerment of the teaching staff. All of our recommendations, it should be noted, are in service to the good work that is already taking place in these committees.

In every school we saw some examples of excellent instruction: teachers engaging students in high-level challenges that required complex thinking and frequent collaboration with peers. That said, academic achievement, as measured by MCAS scores, varies by level. As can be seen in the following chart comparing the percentage of Dedham students that scored in the Proficient or higher category to the percentage of students statewide scoring Proficient or higher in 2015, Dedham students generally outperformed the state.

Grade	% of Dedham students scoring Proficient or Advanced	% of students statewide scoring Proficient or Advanced
4	71%	60%
5	58%	53%
6	71%	71%
7	73%	70%
8	87%	80%
10	94%	91%

However, in grades 7 and 10 there was a relatively small differential (three percentage points) and in grade 6, none at all. The state population, it should be noted, has a significantly higher percentage of high needs student than the district (state low income = 26.3%; Dedham = 16.8% according to the 2015 District Report Card). The data suggests a positive performance trend: the longer one is a student in the Dedham Public Schools, the better one performs. One would hope to see steady improvement in each grade for each cohort group, though that is not the case.

The other dimension captured by MCAS performance – *growth* compared to ‘academic peers’ – shows strength at some levels but inconsistency overall.

Grade	Median SGP Dedham	Median SGP state
4	45	50
5	61	50
6	39.5	50
7	37	50
8	50	50
10	35	51

While grade 5 scored 11 points higher than the state average and grade 8 scored at the state average, grades 4, 6, 7 and 10 scored significantly below the state average.

In all grades except grade 10, MCAS results for 2014 and 2015 show a significant gap in terms of *achievement* (% of students performing in the proficient or advanced performance band) and *growth* (% of students achieving moderate to strong growth in each grade) between special education students and non-special education students. In grade 10, the gap between all high needs students (low income, ELL, and students with disabilities) and non-high needs students



diminishes considerably. The gap between high needs students and non-high needs students resulted in a “Level 2” designation for all schools in the district except the high school. Dedham High School received a “Level 1” designation; only 36 % of high schools in the state achieved that designation.

Another important indicator of student achievement – writing performance as measured by MCAS composition scores in grades 4, 7, and 10 – is low compared to scores of surrounding districts, including districts selected by the DESE as having similar demographics, *and lower than the state average in those grades*. In grade 10, for example, writing scores on average were lower than those of students in Lexington, Newton, Wellesley, Brookline, Wayland, Needham, Natick, Arlington, Framingham, Waltham, Watertown, Norwood, Amesbury, Somerville, and Cambridge. SAT writing scores in 2015 were also significantly below scores of neighboring high schools. (Please see Appendix E for the MCAS composition scores for grades 4, 7, and 10.)

## Issues and Challenges

In our visits and in our interviews with teachers and administrators, several issues or impediments to improved student performance emerged. In some cases, the issue is specific to the elementary, middle, or high school level; in other cases, the issue has to do with a district-wide plan or program. Here are the major issues as we see them:

### Curriculum

1. A lack of a coherent approach to reading and writing instruction in the elementary and middle grades.
  - i. *Treasures*, the major reading program used in elementary classrooms, is inadequate in a number of respects, including its approach to phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency instruction. Recognizing this, many elementary teachers augment or even replace this program with chapter books, articles, and materials of their own making. This has resulted in a haphazard, inconsistent approach to instruction within and across schools. Assessment instruments – to measure phonics knowledge and fluency, for example – are wholly lacking. Differentiation of instruction is limited. The program does not stress Independent Reading. Teachers in many classrooms are experimenting – sometimes surreptitiously – with different ways of organizing instruction, including balanced literacy models such as the Daily Five or Reading Workshop. In some classrooms, teachers have abandoned *Treasures* and are teaching guided reading, without prerequisite training.
  - ii. There appears to be a great degree of overlap – and lack of distinction between – Reading class and English class in grades 6 and 7. We could discern no distinct, coordinated model for teaching text management (note taking and annotation), explicit comprehension strategies, and literature appreciation. Common Core standards being

addressed seemed largely limited to standards 1-3, having to do with reading for understanding and using textual evidence to support interpretation.

- iii. Five writing programs – *Treasures*, *Lucy Calkins*, *Empowering Writers*, *Six Traits*, *Empower* (Bonnie Singer) – appear to have been introduced to the staff in the past several years. This has led to confusion, a lack of consistency around philosophy, language, and assessment practices, and great variability around volume of writing and expected outcomes. Teachers at the middle school have noted that students arriving from the four elementary schools come with different skills and experiences as writers.
- iv. Writing at the middle school varies from teacher to teacher, despite an attempt to use a common rubric. We noticed inconsistency around the number of assignments, types of writing, expectations around revision, assessment, feedback to students, and metacognitive strategies to promote student growth. A consistent philosophy – and concomitant outcomes – was not in evidence. An insufficient number of full-length compositions – as opposed to brief open response tasks – appears to be an issue in a number of classrooms.
- v. The time allocated for genuine reading and writing tasks – exclusive of ancillary language arts activities such as spelling, grammar, vocabulary, and handwriting practice – is insufficient in grades K-5.

## Pedagogy

2. Instruction is largely teacher-driven rather than student-centered.
  - i. In many classrooms at all levels, students are frequently completing tasks assigned to them but not actively constructing knowledge through investigation, collaborative problem solving, and interactive discussion. In our visits to numerous classrooms, we observed a relatively narrow repertoire of ‘active learning’ / ‘accountable talk’ instructional strategies such as cooperative learning jigsaws, collaborative close reading, small group discussions, literature circles, writing groups, Socratic Circles, and debates, especially in grades 6-12. The teacher-student talk ratio in many classrooms was high, confirming a lack of constructivist ‘learn by doing’ activities. Students were willing to comply with assignments, but were not by and large engaged in thoughtful tasks such as synthesizing information from multiple sources, analyzing and evaluating it, and applying it creatively in a new situation.
  - ii. The Gradual Release of Responsibility model (highlighted by National Reading Panel) was not widely in evidence; with some frequency, teachers were teaching primarily to the whole class.
3. Instruction at all levels is relatively undifferentiated.

- i. At all three levels – elementary, middle and high school – there are leveled classrooms to which students have been assigned, but differentiation *within* classrooms – through choice, challenge activities, and varying text levels – was not widely in evidence.
- ii. Tier II instruction (extra time on task, intense targeted instruction, ‘double dosing,’) driven by thoughtful assessment practices, was not in evidence.

## Rigor

- 4. Expectations for student work are lower than they should be in many classrooms.
  - i. Writing at grades 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 is not consistently reflective of the highest level of work students are capable of producing. (*These are the grades the scope of our inquiry allowed us to examine most carefully. Writing in grades K-4 bears more scrutiny, but also seems inadequate in many respects.*)
  - ii. Student outcomes and expectations – including writing exemplars - are not clearly articulated at each grade level. A lack of identifiable benchmarks and criteria for achieving them – such as common assessments and agreed upon anchor papers – means that accountability from class to class and from grade to grade is not consistent.
  - iii. At elementary and middle school levels, much of the emphasis is on shorter paragraph-length assignments such as ‘open response’ tasks – suggesting a focus on test preparation rather than full-length compositions in all genres that emphasize voice, authorship, creativity, and student control of ideas and revisions.
  - iv. Many of the reading and writing tasks we observed at the elementary and middle school levels (such as ‘fact vs. opinion’ and ‘pronoun identification’ worksheets) focused on discrete skills that seemed disconnected from a larger set of more important strategies and learning objectives. Many of these lessons seemed canned – that is, lifted right out of a workbook without a sense of how they fit into the larger unit of study. An over-reliance on worksheets seemed to come at the expense of authentic tasks (for example, close reading of primary texts) that emphasize deep goals such as critical thinking, analyzing and interpreting, problem solving, comparing, contextualizing, evaluating, and applying new knowledge to new circumstances. In our classroom observations we saw relatively few students struggling with challenging texts, annotating texts, arguing over texts, or actively and independently engaging with demanding textual challenges.
  - v. Insufficient time is devoted to reading and writing instruction in kindergarten and elementary classes; insufficient time is devoted to writing instruction in middle school.
- 5. Many students seem unenthusiastic and unengaged, *compliant* rather than excited about learning.

- i. The emphasis in many classrooms seemed to be on completing assigned work rather than on moving students to autonomous, independent activities focusing on research, inquiry, and self-expression. A number of lessons seemed overly scaffolded, removing the opportunity for students to think critically and creatively.
6. Tracking of students at an early age leads to lowered expectations for students that are not at the highest level.
    - i. At the beginning of first grade, students are assigned to the Learning Center, the Reading Specialist or the classroom teacher for reading instruction, based on their performance in kindergarten. This pattern continues throughout the elementary grades. At the end of grade 5, students are assigned to an 'Advanced' class or a 'Standard' class in middle school for ELA. This pattern continues through grade 8. In grade 9, students are assigned to Honors, College Prep 1, or College Prep 2. It is our contention, based on classroom observations and interviews with teachers, that this early leveling of students 1) stigmatizes a large number of students at an early age and 2) creates a ceiling of lowered expectations in the minds of teachers for all but highest-level students.

### Accountability

7. Lack of system-wide data collection, assessment, and progress monitoring system.
  - i. This inhibits the ability of teachers and administrators to track students' progress over time and measure the effectiveness of programs and interventions. Data on student performance that is passed on to teachers by handing over a folder with handwritten charts cannot be easily sorted and analyzed.

### Infrastructure

8. lack of centralized decision-making authority to plan, guide, and implement a consistent, coherent ELA program in K-5 classrooms.
  - i. As currently configured, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment position has too many responsibilities to take day-to-day control of the literacy program in grades pre-K through 5. A diffusion of decision-making responsibility has contributed to the inconsistencies in the program.
9. uncertainty over the role of the elementary reading specialists.
  - i. In their current role, elementary reading specialists spend most of their time working directly with underperforming students outside of the classroom. This prevents them from spending significant blocks of time coaching teachers and delivering professional development. Working with underperforming non-IEP

students largely removes responsibility for student success from the classroom teacher.

- ii. Reading specialists do not currently service kindergarten students or support kindergarten teachers.

10. lack of opportunity in the schedule for grade-level teachers and specialists to collaborate weekly to plan and implement Tier II intervention.

- i. The current schedule in each of the seven schools does not allow for weekly collaboration or PLC (Professional Learning Community) time. This prevents grade-level teachers and specialists from collaborating to improve student performance, develop common assessments, analyze data, and plan effective Tier II intervention.

### Work Environment / Climate

11. As noted previously, lack of collaborative planning time in the schedule precludes the development of common assessments and the opportunity to examine student work together.

- i. Without weekly collaboration time built into the schedule, teachers and specialists must meet haphazardly on their own time, resulting in inefficiency and isolated approaches to lesson planning and curriculum development.

### Belief System

12. As noted previously, we strongly suspect that the implementation of a tracking / leveling system in the early grades contributes implicitly to lowered expectations among the staff for a significant group of students.

13. The use of a 'wrap around' language arts program in the lower grades deprives teachers of a sense of ownership of the curriculum.

- i. A teacher's guide with scripted lessons contributes to the lack of empowerment and incentive to become a better teacher of reading and writing in the lower grades.

14. Sending 'below benchmark' students out of the classroom for reading instruction (which is delivered by special educators and reading specialists) removes primary responsibility for reading progress and achievement by those students from the classroom teacher; working primarily with grade-level students obviates the need to become a more skilled reading instructor.

- i. The classroom teacher continues to teach reading during the rest of the day (in science and social studies) leading to a lack of consistency in language, teaching strategies and overall approach for those students who leave during reading block.

## Professional Development

### 15. A lack of sustained focus on ELA professional development has contributed to the inconsistencies of the current program.

- i. Teachers at all levels, but particularly at the elementary level, expressed a strong interest in sustained professional development to become better teachers of reading and writing.
- ii. A lack of a central plan for three to five years of sustained ELA professional development precludes the opportunity for reading specialists, who are already in place in grades 1-7, to build capacity among the staff in a coordinated, effective way.

## Three Year Vision

We started by envisioning the ELA program three years from now, with all 'Issues and Challenges' addressed. In that vision we see

- ✓ **A teaching staff invigorated, empowered, and excited** about their own professional development, deeply involved in *writing, implementing, and revising curriculum; learning about evidence-based best practices* for motivating and engaging all students; and *collaborating with their peers* every week to share lessons, examine student work, and analyze student performance data.
- ✓ **A well-coordinated reading model in place in all five elementary schools**, underpinned by well-articulated teaching practices, grade-level benchmarks with criteria, rubrics and exemplars, and six common units of study per grade emphasizing challenging tasks that reflect current Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards. Classroom teachers take primary responsibility for instructing all students in their classrooms supported by special educators and literacy specialists. Literacy specialists spend 50% of their time providing direct support to students and 50% of their time providing on-going professional development to classroom teachers by modeling best practices through co-teaching. Teachers self-select from a menu of 'best practice' options those practices they would like to work on with the help of the literacy specialist. Students spend 90-120 minutes per day engaged in genuine and meaningful reading tasks.
- ✓ **A well-articulated writing program in place in all elementary schools and the middle school**, a program that emphasizes *authorship, voice, richness of language, writing fluency*, and *practice with all modes and genres* including narrative, informational, and

argument writing as well as poetry. This model emphasizes fully developed compositions for authentic audiences and purposes, moves student writers to assert control over idea development, revisions and word choice, and encourages metacognitive awareness and commitment to quality through the use of end-of-year portfolios.

- ✓ **Students excited about learning and optimistic about their academic progress.** Students in the elementary and middle years are in *heterogeneous* classes that are highly differentiated. They are learning from their teachers and through collaboration with peers, many of whom present positive models of behavior, thinking, persistence, creativity, and inquisitiveness. Because classes are mixed, students experience no stigmatization from inflexible groupings and give every indication of having limitless expectations for themselves; nor are teachers' attitudes implicitly shaped by previous labels. Students are consistently motivated by engaging activities that require them to interact with authentic texts, synthesize information from multiple sources, collaborate with peers, and independently construct meaning with relatively little help from instructors. Very often they are asked to apply newly acquired knowledge to new situations, including real-life problems and project-based challenges that require out-of-the-box thinking.
  
- ✓ **Students in all grades working to a very high level of achievement,** guided by teachers who have developed the curriculum, shared with them exemplars of excellent work, and modeled for them multiple pathways to get there.

(See Appendix F for a robust Three Year Implementation Timeline and Appendix G for additional detail in Envisioning 2019.)

### Five Major Tasks

To reach full implementation of this vision, we have divided the recommendations into five major tasks, which cut across the eight 'topics' or 'areas of focus' listed on page one. These sets of recommendations or 'major tasks' are

- I. COORDINATE THE ELEMENTARY ELA PROGRAM;
- II. INCREASE ACADEMIC RIGOR AT ALL LEVELS;
- III. FOSTER A 'GROWTH MINDSET' CULTURE AMONG THE STAFF;
- IV. EMPHASIZE AUTONOMY AND INDEPENDENCE AMONG THE STUDENTS;
- V. STRENGTHEN PROGRAMS SUPPORTING HIGH NEEDS STUDENTS IN K-8

## Recommendations: Enacting Major Tasks

### Steps to Completing Major Task I: Coordinate the Elementary ELA Program

#### STEP I [Create a K-5 ELA Coordinator Position.](#)

- This individual will have decision making authority to plan, implement, and oversee all components of the ELA program in grades K-5. This individual will be responsible for planning and delivering professional development in support of the English Language Arts program and will directly supervise the K-5 literacy specialists.

#### STEP II [Create a District Data Specialist position.](#)

- This individual will facilitate the collection and dissemination of data between schools and central staff; this person will help principals and literacy specialists monitor the progress of all students and evaluate the effectiveness of intervention plans and programs.
- With the purchase of a user-friendly data application such as *TestWiz*, the District Data Specialist will be able to facilitate the inputting of local data by teachers and comparison of multiple data points over time for all disciplines at both the elementary and secondary levels.

#### STEP III [Transform the K-5 Reading Teacher position to a K-5 Literacy Specialist position.](#)

- This individual will devote a substantial amount of time to *professional development coaching* in and beyond the classroom covering all four dimensions of English Language Arts: Reading, Writing, Speaking/Listening, and Language. This individual will also take charge of building-based assessments (data collection and analysis) and manage literacy resources. Each elementary school – including the Early Childhood Education Center – will be serviced by one or more literacy specialists.
- Begin formal training of the literacy specialists around 1) teaching writing; 2) coaching classroom teachers through co-teaching and modeling; and 3) assessment & data management.

#### STEP IV [Identify / select a balanced literacy reading program.](#) Choose among

- 1) *Calkins' Units of Study for Teaching Reading K-5*;
- 2) *Fountas & Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning*; and



3) blended approach: Units of Study from DESE MCU, ILA Bridges, EngageNY

STEP V [Identify / select a systematic phonics program for grades K-3.](#) Choose among

- 1) *Wilson Foundations*
- 2) *Project Read*
- 3) *Fountas & Pinnell Phonics Program*

STEP VI [Identify / select a systematic writing program for grades K-5.](#) Choose among

- 1) *Calkins' Units of Study in Opinion/Argument, Information, and Narrative Writing K-5;*
- 2) *Empowering Writers*
- 3) *Fountas & Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning;*

STEP VII [Reorganize delivery of reading instruction services, grades 1-5, from 'Pull Out' to 'Push In' program.](#)

- Classroom teacher will assume primary responsibility for instruction of all students, including those on an IEP and those performing below benchmark. Special education teachers, Literacy Specialists, and, to the extent possible, ELL teachers, will support students primarily *within the classroom setting*. Classroom teachers will differentiate instruction using Balanced Literacy components, including guided reading.
- Special education teachers, ELL teachers, and literacy specialists will work with the classroom teacher to 1) strengthen Tier I instruction for all students; 2) develop Tier II instruction to supplement – not supplant - Tier I instruction; and 3) augment Tier III instruction for those needing intense individualized support.
- Develop a designated, targeted resource for supporting differentiated small group reading instruction in K-3 classrooms. For example, hire and train 10 part-time (20 hours per week) *Literacy Aides* to work in all five elementary schools.
- Increase the amount of time students engage in *genuine reading tasks* (not seatwork or worksheets) to the following levels:

**IN CLASS (DAILY)**

GRADE	TIME (in minutes)	DETAIL
K	90	including intervention and phonemic awareness
1	110	including intervention and phonics
2	110	including intervention and phonics

<b>GRADE</b>	<b>TIME (in minutes)</b>	<b>DETAIL</b>
<b>3</b>	90-95	including intervention and phonics plus Social Studies and Science reading
<b>4</b>	90-95	including intervention plus Social Studies and Science reading
<b>5</b>	90-95	including intervention plus Social Studies and Science reading

**AT HOME INDEPENDENT READING (WEEKLY)**

<b>GRADE</b>	<b>TIME (in minutes)</b>	<b>DETAIL</b>
<b>K-1</b>	90-100	Parent or child reading
<b>2-5</b>	150	Beyond homework

## Steps to Completing Major Task II: Increase Academic Rigor at All Levels

STEP I Develop clear benchmarks, performance criteria, and exemplars of excellent work at each grade level for reading and writing while updating curriculum documents to conform to current Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards.

- At each grade, begin reading compositions collectively to calibrate expectations, match student work to appropriate targets.
- At high school, identify excellent composition work by examining outside sources, including exemplars from other high schools; establish clear grade-level exemplars and use universally for all students regardless of course level.
- In elementary grades, define beginning, mid-year and end-of year reading benchmarks and criteria for meeting them using either *Teachers' College* or *Fountas & Pinnell levels*.
- In all grades, use cognitive complexity scale (*Hess's Cognitive Rigor Matrix* or *NAEP Cognitive Targets* rubric) to identify / measure difficulty level of all major unit assignments.

STEP II Create a 6-8 ELA Coordinator position.

- This individual will plan, implement, and oversee all components of the ELA program in grades 6-8. This individual will be responsible for planning and delivering professional development in support of the English Language Arts program and will directly supervise the 6-8 English teachers and literacy specialists.
- Alternatively, transform the 6-12 English Department Chairperson position to a strictly administrative role without teaching responsibilities. Presently this position encompasses too many responsibilities to effectively influence the 6-8 program. (Other nearby districts have a Unit B ELA Coordinator to supervise and evaluate middle school English teachers and specialists.)

STEP III Clarify / strengthen the curriculum in grades 6, 7, 8.

- Clearly define the products expected at the end of grades 6, 7, and 8: a minimum of 8 full-length compositions each year in grades 6 and 7 split between the English and Reading teacher, and 6 full-length compositions in grade 8; should include, over three-year period, all genres, with two critical essays per grade.

- Delineate specific skills and strategies to be taught in the Reading Course for grades 6 & 7. Emphasize intense focus on text management/note taking, summarization, inferential thinking, text structure, vocabulary, and evidence-based analysis.
- In both English and Reading courses, incorporate frequent use of authentic texts and complex tasks addressing all 10 Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards in daily reading and literature instruction.

STEP IV Transform Middle School Reading Teacher position to a Literacy Specialist position.

- This individual will incorporate writing instruction into the Reading Course in grades 6 and 7; oversee progress monitoring for grades 6, 7, and 8; facilitate the transition of students from elementary to middle school; and work with the 6-8 ELA Coordinator to deliver high quality professional development and coaching.

STEP V Eliminate tracking / leveling of students in grade 6, 7, 8.

- Teach all students in a heterogeneous environment with universally high expectations.
- Differentiate instruction by creating multiple pathways for students to progress to clearly articulated benchmarks, including small group reading with varying text levels via book club and literature circle formats; use portfolio assessment to individualize writing instruction.
- Use 'Active learning' / Engagement strategies such as collaborative close reading, partner work, and cooperative learning formats that invite co-teaching opportunities and strategic support by Special Education and ELL staff.

STEP VI Continue and expand Instructional Rounds across the district to improve instruction.

- Administrators and teachers visit specific grade-level classes to observe instruction relative to school's self-identified 'Problem of Practice.'
- Across the district, administrators and teachers develop common understanding of 'best practices' and effective teaching.

## Steps to Completing Major Task III: Foster a 'Growth Mindset' Culture among the Staff

- STEP I [Empower elementary and middle school teachers to take ownership of the curriculum and full responsibility for instructing all students in their class.](#)
- Emphasize instruction - within balanced literacy framework – that relies first and foremost on the skill of the teacher to dynamically assess and instruct all students regardless of skill level or IEP (*“Good teachers, effective teachers, matter much more than particular curriculum materials, pedagogical approaches, or ‘proven programs’.” Allington et al.*);
  - Train teachers (using literacy specialists and other resources) through sustained professional development to become skilled teachers of reading and writing focusing on deep goals (*“Investing in effective teaching is the most ‘research-based’ strategy available.” National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement 2002*).
- STEP II [Continue to value teacher input on professional development decisions through the collective work of the district-wide Professional Development Committee.](#)
- Emphasize a *three-year plan of sustained professional development* work focused on teaching reading and writing in a heterogeneous environment.
- STEP III [Invest heavily in Summer Curriculum Development by teachers.](#)
- Invite teachers at every level (K-12) to work under the aegis of the curriculum coordinators and directors to write, revise and share units of study. In so doing, teachers will learn the principles of effective curriculum design, take ownership of the curriculum, and build a sense of collaboration with colleagues.
- STEP IV [Develop ‘Collaboration Time’ at each grade to allow teachers to plan and share lessons, examine student work, and analyze assessment data together.](#)
- Change the schedule in each building to develop common planning time that does not supplant contractual preparation time.
- STEP V [As a staff, or as individual departments, read a text that speaks to issues of mission, values, and teacher efficacy.](#)
- Begin with Mindset: The New Psychology of Success, by Carol Dweck, or Teaching with Poverty in Mind, by Eric Jensen, both of which examine teacher belief systems and teachers’ ability to positively influence the lives of students.
- STEP VI [Establish a writing community of Dedham teachers to encourage self expression and to honor teachers’ voices.](#)

- Meet bi-weekly to share own drafts of poetry, fiction, drama, blogs, and professional articles about teaching.
- Publish ***Dedham Voices - A Magazine of Teacher Writing*** - twice yearly and distribute to the community

## Steps to Completing Major Task IV: Emphasize Autonomy and Independence among the Students

STEP I [Shift responsibility for learning – and demonstrating learning - from teachers to students.](#)

- Establish ‘Growth Mindset’ in students; make clear that students will have to *present evidence* two to four times per year to demonstrate what they have learned.
- Develop formal portfolio assessment system in grades K-12. Include
  - Goals
  - Evidence to demonstrate learning
  - Metacognitive reflections (in writing) to highlight accomplishments, growth, progress over time.

STEP II [Focus professional development at all levels \(elementary, middle, high school\) on Differentiated Instruction \(student choice, challenge, alternate pathways to both gain and demonstrate learning\) to attain Deep Goals \(complex thinking, problem solving, evidence-based reasoning, creativity\).](#)

- Adopt Tomlinson/McTighe framework (*‘backward planning’* and *‘differentiated instruction’*) for construction of all units and lessons.
- Employ teaching models that incorporate *Gradual Release of Responsibility* theory into daily lessons, stressing explicit instruction, guided practice and independent application.
- Develop *tiered instruction* model in grades 6-8 that allows students to demonstrate mastery of critical vocabulary and grammar skills and move to next level regardless of grade.
- Incorporate multiple opportunities for student-controlled decision making in reading (book clubs, literature circles) and writing (topic selection, idea development, revisions, and presentation).

STEP III [Incorporate expectation of movement from explicit instruction to independent application into all yearlong curriculum maps \(grades 4-12\).](#)

- *Explicit instruction* during first novel unit leads to *independent application* of analytical skills by end of year in book club / literature circle format.
- Writing assignments move from *explicit instruction* early in year to *independent application* by end of year.

STEP IV [Train staff at all levels to use 'Active Learning' / Accountable Talk' strategies to emphasize student-centered learning.](#)

- Increase student-to-teacher talk ratio.
- Emphasize *construction – rather than absorption* – of knowledge.
- Develop mindset that honors social interaction and dialectical engagement: challenging the ideas of others / learning through the exchange of opposing ideas.
- Implement a high volume of interesting, intrinsically motivating activities - including project-based learning, reading of primary source texts, and writing to real audiences for genuine purposes - to engage all students.

STEP V [Develop an Independent Project Task in grades 5-12.](#)

- Each student must complete *independent research* on topic of own choosing appropriate to grade-level expectations.
- Graded on process notebook, creativity, effort, commitment to quality, originality, and final written and oral presentation.

STEP VI [Strengthen Independent Reading Program in grades 1-5.](#)

- Emphasize reading large volume of self-selected texts at 'just right' (independent) level in addition to teacher-directed guided reading texts at instructional level.
- Build in accountability (daily reading log, parent involvement) and incentives (book talks, sharing opportunities) to encourage lifelong reading habit.



## Steps to Completing Major Task V: Strengthen Programs Supporting High Needs Students in K-8

STEP I [Develop study group to formulate RTI \(Response to Intervention\) / MTSS \(Multi-Tiered System of Supports\) to provide evidence-based support for students who need extra time and more intense targeted instruction.](#)

- Strengthen Tier I instruction (all students) including procedures for differentiation; define all outcomes and targets clearly. In grade 5, for example, identify all writing products, rubrics for responding to them and exemplars of proficient work for each genre.
- Define Tier II intervention: purpose, goals, criteria for eligibility and exit, procedures for implementation in each building (generally regarded as “small-group instruction that relies on evidence-based interventions that specify the instructional procedures, duration, and frequency of instruction” (NCRTI).
- Support leadership team at each school to incorporate Tier II intervention plan into School Improvement Plan.
- For grades K-5, investigate schools in surrounding communities that add three to five additional RTI blocks per grade per week to regular Tier I instruction along with weekly collaboration meetings to plan intervention.
- For grades 6-8, investigate WIN program at Clarke Middle School, Lexington, and STRETCH plan at Pollard Middle School, Needham.

STEP II [Create District Data Specialist Position to facilitate universal screening and monitoring procedures for all students and close monitoring of students receiving intervention support.](#)

- Monitor all students’ progress; identify students needing extra support.
- Document and evaluate strategies employed by Child Study Team to determine eligibility for Special Education evaluation.

STEP III [Develop a plan at each school to create weekly collaboration time for each grade-level team.](#)

- Principal or director oversees; includes literacy specialist, ELL teachers, and Special Education teachers.

- Analyze assessment data; decide groupings and plans for intervention; monitor all students' progress.
- Share effective lessons / examine student work.

STEP IV [Provide professional development training to help staff coordinate full integration of Special Education and ELL staffs into classroom settings.](#)

- Preview material in advance.
- Co-present lessons / share responsibility for students in class as part of 'Push-In' model.

STEP V [Expand number of co-taught classrooms.](#)

- Mix of Special Education and general education students;
- Shared responsibility by general education teacher and special education teacher for all students.

## Final Thoughts

All of these recommendations are based on the projection of a three-year roll out. For each of these 'major tasks' to be implemented, building principals and administrative leaders must play the leading role; they are the drivers and managers who are ultimately responsible for enriching the lives of Dedham's students. Each set of recommendations can be implemented in isolation; none is dependent on any other for its success or effectiveness.

# Appendices

---

Appendix A: Sources

Appendix B: ELA Elements

Appendix C: Classroom Observation Tools

Appendix D: Interview Questions

Appendix E: MCAS Writing Scores

Appendix F: Three Year Implementation Timeline

Appendix G: Envisioning 2019

## Appendix A: Sources

- Allington, R. (2005). *What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research-Based Programs*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Allington, R., Cunningham, P. (1999). *Classrooms That Work. They Can All Read and Write*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Atwell, N. (1987). In the Middle. *Writing, Reading, and Learning with Adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Beck, I., McKeown, M., Kucan, L. (2013) *Bringing Words to Life. Robust Vocabulary Instruction (Second Edition)*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Belanoff, P., Dickson, M. (1991). *Portfolios – Process and Product*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Boushey, G., Moser, J. (2009). *The Café Book. Engaging All Students in Daily Literacy Assessment & Instruction*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Brown, D., Knowles, T. (2014). *What Every Middle School Teacher Should Know*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Buehl, D. (2011). *Developing Readers in the Academic Disciplines*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Calkins, L. (1986). *The Art of Teaching Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. (2001). *The Art of Teaching Reading*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Cherry-Paul, S., Johansen, D. (2014). *Teaching Interpretation Using Text-Based Evidence to Construct Meaning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. (1993). *Reading Recovery. A Guidebook for Teachers in Training*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Cowen, J. (2004). *A Balanced Approach to Beginning Reading Instruction. A Synthesis of Six Major U. S. Research Studies*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Culham, R. (2010). *Traits of Writing. The Complete Guide for Middle School*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Daniels, H. *Literature Circles. Voice and Choice in the Student-Centered Classroom*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Dixon-Krauss, L. (1996). *Vygotsky in the Classroom. Mediated literacy Instruction in the Classroom*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Dufour, R., DuFour, R. Eaker, R., Many, T. (2006). *Learning by Doing. A Handbook for Professional*

*Learning Communities at Work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

Duke, N., Pearson, D. (2002) *Effective Practices for Developing Reading Comprehension. (What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction. Third Edition)*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Dweck, C. (2006). *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York, NY: Ballantine.

Fountas, I., Su Pinnell, G. (2011). *The Continuum of Literacy Learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fullan, Michael. (1991). *The New Meaning of Educational Change (Second Edition)*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Gallagher, K. (2011). *Deeper Reading. Comprehending Challenging Texts, 4-12*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Gallagher, K. (2011). *Write Like This. Teaching Real-World Writing Through Modeling & Mentor Texts*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Graves, D. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and Children at Work*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Guthrie, J., Humenick, L. M. (2004). *Motivating Students to Read: Evidence for Classroom Practices That Increase Reading Motivation and Achievement*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Guthrie, J., Wigfield, A., et al. (2004). *Increasing Reading Comprehension and Engagement Through Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96, 403–423.

Harvey, S., Goudvis, A. (2007). *Strategies That Work. Teaching Comprehension for Understanding and Engagement*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Hattie, J. *Visible Learning for Teachers*. (2012). New York, NY: Routledge.

Holdaway, D. (1979) *The Foundations of Literacy*. New York, NY: Ashton Scholastic.

Holt, L. (1993). *Cooperative Learning in Action*. Columbus, OH. National Middle School Association.

Howell, R., Patton, S., Deiotte, M. (2008). *Understanding Response to Intervention. A Practical Guide to Systematic Implementation*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.

International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English Joint Task Force on Assessment. (2010). *Standards for the Assessment of Reading and Writing*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

International Reading Association. (2000). *Excellent Reading Teachers: A Position Statement of the International Reading Association*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

International Reading Association. (2007). *Teaching Reading Well. A Synthesis of the International Reading Association's Research on Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

International Reading Association. (2012). *Adolescent Literacy: A Position Statement of the International Reading Association*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

International Reading Association. (2012). *Literacy Implementation Guidance for the ELA Common Core State Standards*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Jensen, E. (2009). *Teaching with Poverty in Mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lattier, H. (2003). *Thinking Through Genre. Units of Study in the Reading and Writing Workshop, 4-12*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.

Love, N. (2009). *Using Data to Improve Learning for All*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Marzano R., Pickering D., Pollock Jane (2001). *Classroom Instruction That Works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R., Kendall, J. (2007). *The New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Second Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2011). *Guiding Principles for English Language Arts and Literacy Programs in Massachusetts*. Malden, MA: Massachusetts Curriculum Framework for English Language Arts and Literacy.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction* (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Palincsar, A., Brown, A. (1984). *Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension-Fostering and Comprehension-Monitoring Activities*. Champaign-Urbana, IL: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois

Pearson, P. D., Gallagher, M. (1983). *The Instruction of Reading Comprehension*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Pimentel, S. et al. (2007) *Teaching Reading Well. A Synthesis of the International Reading Association's Research on Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pressley, M. (2002) *Metacognition and Self-Regulated Comprehension. (What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction. Third Edition)*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Rasinski, T. (2003). *The Fluent Reader. Oral Reading Strategies for Building Word Recognition, Fluency, and Comprehension*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

- Rief, L. (1992). *Seeking Diversity. Language Arts with Adolescents*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rissman, L. M., Miller, D. H., & Torgesen, J. K. (2009). *Adolescent literacy walk-through for principals: A guide for instructional leaders*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Shanahan, T. (2005). *The National Reading Panel Report: Practical Advice for Teachers*. Champaign-Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.
- Sloan, G. (2003). *The Child as Critic. Developing Literacy through Literature, K-8*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Snow, C., Biancarosa, G. (2004). *Reading Next—A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. New York, NY: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Snow, C., Sweet, A. (2003) *Rethinking Reading Comprehension*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Stahl, N., Stahl, R., VanSickle, R. (2009). *Cooperative Learning in the Social Studies Classroom. Second Edition*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Strickland, S., Ganske, K., Monroe, J. (2002). *Supporting Struggling Readers and Writers. Strategies for classroom Intervention 3-6*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Tomlinson, C., Imbeau, M. (2010). *Leading and Managing A Differentiated Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Writing Study Group of the NCTE Executive Committee. (2004). *NCTE Beliefs about the Teaching of Writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Tomlinson, C., McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating Differentiated Instruction and Understanding by Design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

## Appendix B: ELA ELEMENTS - Focus Areas and Questions

ELEMENT: CURRICULUM	
ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<b>BALANCE</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the curriculum <u>horizontally balanced</u> (comprising a wide range of genres, topics and themes) and <u>vertically progressive</u> (each step building upon previous steps)?</li> <li>2. Is there a clearly articulated <u>scope and sequence</u>?</li> <li>3. Does the framework for teaching reading, writing, speaking and listening reflect the recommendations of the <i>National Reading Panel</i> (2000), the <i>RAND</i> report (2002) and the <i>National Early Literacy Panel</i> report (2008)?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clearly articulated scope and sequence</li> <li>• articulation of key outcomes</li> </ul>
<b>ORGANIZATION</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Does the framework for organizing the curriculum represent practices endorsed by the ILA (<i>International Literacy Association</i>) and the NCTE (<i>National Council of Teachers of English</i>)?</li> <li>5. Are there specific <u>units of study</u> at each grade? Are they organized by theme, genre, topic, strategy, skill?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of common assessments</li> <li>• curriculum maps</li> </ul>
<b>OUTCOMES</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Are there clearly articulated outcomes, products, experiences and common assessments at each grade?</li> <li>7. Do the outcomes reflect current <i>Massachusetts ELA Curriculum Frameworks</i> targets and standards?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• unit &amp; lesson planning structures</li> </ul>
<b>DEEP GOALS</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Does the curriculum emphasize <u>deep goals</u>: inferential thinking, critical thinking, evidence-based writing, positive habits of mind (effort, creativity, collaboration, problem solving, autonomy)?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• commonly developed differentiated units of study</li> </ul>
<b>FIDELITY</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>9. Is the articulated curriculum taught consistently by all teachers in each grade, including Special Education and ELL teachers?</li> </ol>	
<b>DIFFERENTIATION</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Is the curriculum sufficiently differentiated to meet the needs of diverse learners? Are there alternative pathways to successful learning?</li> <li>11. Do UDL (<i>Universal Design for Learning</i>) principles underlie the approach to curriculum development and the design of specific units of instruction?</li> <li>12. Are there Tier II opportunities for targeted instruction and extra time on task (i.e.: extra reading support / interventions for general education students)?</li> </ol>	
<b>Look for ...</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• scope &amp; sequence</li> <li>• curriculum maps</li> <li>• units of study</li> <li>• common assessments</li> <li>• benchmark documents (ex: reading trajectory)</li> <li>• Tier II Intervention Plan (beginning in K)</li> <li>• specific writing products</li> </ul>	



ELEMENT: PEDAGOGY	
ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS	POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS
<p><b>PHILOSOPHY</b></p> <p>1. Is there a clearly articulated unifying philosophy or statement of principles underlying the approach to instruction? (i.e., <i>Constructivism? Mastery Learning? Apprenticeship? The Classroom as Studio?</i>)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional Development on               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best Practices</li> <li>• Differentiation</li> <li>• Engagement Strategies</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>BEST PRACTICES</b></p> <p>2. Does the system actively promote a range of Research Based Instructional Practices for teaching literacy as identified by the ILA, NCTE, Marzano, Hattie, et al.?)</p> <p>3. Do teachers consistently employ a <u>range of research-based practices</u> that lead to engagement and achievement, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explicit instruction / modeling with mentor texts</li> <li>• Small Group Mediated Learning</li> <li>• Accountable Talk (Socratic circles, literature circles, partner reading, debates, small group discussions, performances, and collaborative presentations)</li> <li>• Gradual Release of Responsibility strategies</li> <li>• Cooperative Learning strategies (jigsaw, CSL, etc.)</li> <li>• Motivation / Engagement strategies</li> <li>• Cognitive strategies ('Active Reading')</li> <li>• Authorship / Apprenticeship strategies (writing)</li> </ul> <p>4. What s the ratio of teacher-to-student-talk in class?</p> <p>5. Do teachers consistently incorporate pedagogical strategies suggested by the DESE and MA Curriculum Frameworks, including the use of text-based evidence to support interpretations, close reading of texts, evidence-based analytical writing, and comparison of both fiction and nonfiction texts?</p> <p>6. Is there an emphasis on students constructing knowledge rather than absorbing knowledge (i.e., learning by doing)?</p> <p>7. Is there an emphasis on students gaining independence and autonomy rather than following a path of compliance?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Instructional Rounds</li> <li>• Interdisciplinary Common Expectations for key skills:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Text management</li> <li>• Inferential thinking</li> <li>• Analytical Writing</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Development of key documents</li> </ul>
<p><b>DIFFERENTIATION</b></p> <p>8. Is differentiated instruction embedded into core instruction at all grade levels? (multiple opportunities for choice, challenge, extra support, alternative pathways)?</p> <p>9. Does classroom instruction comprise a balance of whole-group, small-group, and individual learning experiences?</p> <p>10. Is there a balance between heterogeneous and homogeneous groupings? Do classroom teachers emphasize flexible groupings over fixed groupings?</p> <p>11. Is there support for students who need extra time on task and targeted instruction? Are there opportunities for advanced students to complete above-grade-level work?</p>	
<p><b>COORDINATION WITH SUPPORT SERVICES</b></p> <p>12. Is there consistent collaboration between classroom teachers and special education and ELL teachers? (i.e. coordinated planning, previewing of upcoming material, co-teaching)</p> <p>13. Do classroom teachers apply research-based SEL (Social Emotional Learning) practices (behavior management, Jessica Minahan techniques) to create a safe, risk-free learning environment for anxious and emotionally distressed students?</p> <p>14. Do classroom teachers apply SEI (Sheltered English Immersion) principles (i.e., language goals, multiple communication modalities, etc.) to support ELL students?</p>	

**ELEMENT: RIGOR/EXPECATIONS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT****ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS****POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS**

## EXPECTATIONS

1. Are there appropriately high clearly defined performance standards and benchmarks that reflect Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards - and other national standards - at all grade levels (F&P reading targets, Teachers' College reading and writing benchmarks)?
2. Are there exemplars that illustrate the standards at each grade level?
3. Are there collections of student work (portfolios) at each grade that are used to measure performance over time?
4. Do teachers use cognitive complexity tools & 'student work protocols' to measure rigor of student tasks (i.e. Hess's Cognitive Rigor Matrix, NAEP cognitive complexity scale)?

- Development of anchor papers and exemplars for each grade
- Development of clearly defined reading outcomes and benchmarks

## PERFORMANCE

5. Is detailed information about student performance – district-wide and per grade and class – shared with teachers?

## CONSISTENCY

6. Are performance standards consistent for all classes within a given grade? Are all teachers teaching to the same standard?
7. Do teachers within a grade from different schools regularly evaluate and compare student work?

## Look for ...

- Clearly articulated benchmarks that reflect national standards such as Mass. Frameworks and Teachers' College standards and benchmarks
- Exemplars and work samples at each grade
- Student work that matches defined standards

**ELEMENT: DATA COLLECTION, PROGRESS MONITORING, AND REPORTING****ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS****POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS**

## PERFORMANCE

1. Is detailed information about student performance – district-wide and per grade and class – shared with teachers?
2. Does the performance data represent multiple lenses, sources, and data points?

- Build collection and reporting systems

## PROGRESS MONITORING

3. Is there a plan in place to monitor the progress of all students at each grade over time and to identify students in need of extra support?
4. Does performance data flow to central staff and back to building administrators and teachers so that students' progress can be monitored at both the district and school level?
5. Are there data-driven plans to study the effectiveness of specific interventions and instructional programs?
6. Are common assessments used in each grade to measure student performance relative to identified benchmarks?

## REPORTING

7. Is the reporting system at the elementary level standards based, reflecting clearly agreed upon benchmarks?
8. Is the reporting system at the secondary level standards based, reflecting clearly agreed upon benchmarks?

## Look for ...

- data spreadsheets
- common assessments & related data
- access to data by teachers
- standardized tests in addition to MCAS
- standards-based reporting system to parents
- reading benchmarks
- writing rubrics
- PLC / collaborative time to interpret data

<b>ELEMENT: WORK ENVIRONMENT/CLIMATE</b>	
<b>ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS</b>	<b>POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS</b>
<p><b>COLLABORATION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do teachers in each building experience a spirit of collaboration with grade-level and school-wide colleagues (i.e., a sense of teamwork, everyone working toward a common purpose)?</li> <li>2. Do teachers at each grade - in and across schools – share lessons and compare results?</li> <li>3. Do classroom teachers and special educators and ELL teachers work closely together (i.e., meet, plan, co-teach and otherwise share responsibility for all students in the class)?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop PLC concept and time</li> <li>• Set growth and performance targets collectively</li> <li>• Build collaborative environment</li> </ul>
<p><b>CLIMATE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Do teachers individually and collectively foster a climate that rewards inquiry, intellectual risk taking, experimentation, and creativity?</li> <li>5. Do teachers <i>facilitate independent learning</i> through research projects, project-based learning, opportunities for creative self-expression, independent reading, authorship and public performances?</li> </ol>	
<p>Look for ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLC or collaboration times</li> <li>• Digital platform for sharing lessons</li> <li>• Project-based learning, research projects and public performances before a live audience</li> </ul>	

<b>ELEMENT: BELIEF SYSTEM/EXPECTATIONS</b>	
<b>ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS</b>	<b>POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS</b>
<p><b>SELF EFFICACY</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do teachers share a deep-seated belief that their mission is to ensure success for <i>every</i> student? Do they take personal responsibility for the success of every student in their class?</li> <li>2. Do teachers believe in their own efficacy – that they <i>can</i> improve things and have a huge impact on every student?</li> <li>3. Do teachers have a deep-seated passion for reading, writing, storytelling?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Read Jensen together</li> <li>• Read G. Canada together</li> </ul>
<p><b>EXPECTATIONS</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Do teachers hold all students to the highest standards even as they differentiate the pathways to success?</li> <li>5. Do teachers share with students what good work look like?</li> <li>6. Do students set goals for their own achievement?</li> </ol>	
<p>Look for ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student work portfolios</li> <li>• Common assessments</li> <li>• Exemplars</li> <li>• Writing over time</li> <li>• Goal setting for students facilitated by teachers</li> <li>• Teachers identifying and monitoring the progress of neediest students</li> </ul>	

<b>ELEMENT: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b>	
<b>ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS</b>	<b>POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS</b>
<p><b>ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is professional development delivered within the school system’s schedule? Is time assigned on a regular basis for professional development activities?</li> <li>2. Is professional development for ELA staff planned on a yearly basis? Is the PD organized into series of activities that allow teachers to earn PDPs?</li> <li>3. Are there opportunities for teachers to attend conferences?</li> <li>4. Does the district employ a <u>grant writer</u> to seek out opportunities for new programs, training, and professional development?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a three-year Professional Development Plan</li> <li>• Grant writer to secure professional development money</li> </ul>
<p><b>MINDSET</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Does the system foster a ‘<u>growth mindset</u>’ <u>mentality</u>?</li> <li>6. Do teachers commonly participate in activities in which they <u>reflect upon their growth</u> and <u>set goals</u> for future learning?</li> </ol>	
<p>Look for ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly professional development time built into calendar</li> <li>• Extended PD times (Early Release Days)</li> <li>• PD planned out across district a year in advance with input from staff</li> <li>• Ways to collectively examine practices (ex: instructional rounds, peer to peer visits)</li> <li>• Literacy specialists delivering professional development to ELA staff</li> <li>• Attendance by teachers and administrators at conference</li> </ul>	

<b>ELEMENT: INFRASTRUCTURE</b>	
<b>ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS</b>	<b>POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS</b>
<p><b>ORGANIZATION / PERSONNEL</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At each level – elementary and secondary – is there a <u>coordinator</u> or <u>program director</u> with authority to design and implement the ELA curriculum in all schools?</li> <li>2. Are there <u>specialists</u> in each building to facilitate the implementation of the ELA program in each school (i.e., <u>literacy specialists</u> with both instructional and coaching responsibilities as well as trained <u>literacy aides</u> to work in classrooms)?</li> <li>3. Is there a district-wide <u>data specialist</u> to collect and disseminate data to administrators and teachers and create reports for central staff?</li> </ol>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addition of key personnel</li> <li>• Change in role reading specialists</li> <li>• Incorporation of RTI structures as needed</li> <li>• Defining of time on task expectations for literacy</li> </ul>
<p><b>SCHEDULE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Does the schedule permit <u>weekly collaboration</u> at each grade and in each discipline?</li> <li>5. Does the schedule include regular opportunities for <u>classroom teachers and special educators</u> to co-plan?</li> <li>6. Is there adequate <u>time on learning</u> built into the schedule of each school?</li> <li>7. Is there adequate <u>time on learning in effect</u> at each school (actual number of minutes spent on reading and writing each day regardless of what schedule says)</li> </ol>	
<p><b>RESOURCES</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Are there adequate resources in place to support best practices and meet the needs of diverse learners?</li> </ol>	
<p>Look for ...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Director / Coordinator</u> at each level (K-5, 6-12) to direct and supervise ELA program with clear lines of decision-making authority over curriculum and instruction</li> <li>• <u>District-wide data specialist</u> to collect and disseminate performance data</li> <li>• <u>Schedule</u> that permits / encourages weekly collaboration meeting at each grade and in each discipline</li> <li>• <u>Adequate time on learning</u> (both scheduled and practiced)</li> <li>• <u>Tier II and III structures</u> – such as scheduled time for RTI – to support all students</li> <li>• <u>Coordination between classroom teachers and Special Ed teachers</u>, such as collaboratively developed plans, uniform professional development, scheduled meeting times, and co-teaching practices</li> </ul>	

## Appendix C: Classroom Observation Tools

### Elementary Observation Tool

GRADE \_\_\_\_\_ CLASSROOM \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>CURRICULUM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum map / scope &amp; sequence; Units of study</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Phonemic awareness training (grades K-2)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Phonics program (for example: <i>Foundations</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Spelling program (for example: <i>Foundations</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Fluency training (for example: <i>Read Naturally</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Vocabulary program (for example: <i>Text Talk</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Comprehension strategies taught explicitly (i.e., <i>Reciprocal Teaching</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Text management (grades 3-5): note taking strategies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Independent Reading program</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Literature study: Fiction; Nonfiction; Poetry; Drama (all grades)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Writing assignments (with explicit instruction) for narrative, informational, argument, descriptive/imaginative, and poetry</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Writing – reading connection (taught together)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Grammar &amp; conventions (explicit training focused on syntax)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>CONSISTENCY ACROSS GRADE</b></li> </ul> <p>RESOURCES (leveled library, indep. books, technology in classroom)</p>	
<p><b>PEDAGOGY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>PLANNING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o How is planning done (lesson planning template)?</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>ASSESSMENT PLAN</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o to determine independent level, instructional level, phonics knowledge, fluency (WCPM); comprehension (normed test); writing; common assessments (gr. 4-5); and to monitor progress</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>LEARNING OUTCOMES ARTICULATED</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Content goal articulated; Language goal articulated</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>BENCHMARKS</b> to measure progress and performance (i.e., <i>F&amp;P, DRA</i>)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>GRR MODEL / STRATEGIES for reading and writing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Each student working at 3 levels: independent (<i>independent reading</i>), instructional (<i>guided reading</i>) and challenge level (<i>read aloud / listening</i>)</li> <li>o Explicit instruction (skill taught)</li> <li>o Guided Practice (skill learned/practiced with mediation/scaffolding)</li> <li>o Independent Application (in new setting)</li> <li>o Writing workshop w explicit instruction, process, conferencing</li> <li>o Emphasis on authorship, choice, independence</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>ACTIVE LEARNING / STUDENT-CENTERED LEARNING</b> (learn by doing / constructing knowledge)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Accountable talk strategies; small group interactions; partner reading; literature circles; collaborative close reading; cooperative learning (jigsaw, rotations); Socratic Circles; debates; Readers’ Theater; presentations</li> <li>o Ratio of teacher-to-student talk</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>DIFFERENTIATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Leveled instruction (flexible groupings); Choice; Challenge</li> <li>o Metacognition: goal setting, reflection, progress monitoring</li> <li>o Tiered instruction (i.e., skills ladder / advance at own rate)</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>SCAFFOLDING / MEDIATED INSTRUCTION</b></li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Supportive <u>teacher–student interactions</u>; effective <u>feedback</u></li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>ENGAGEMENT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All students participating</li> <li>○ <u>Intrinsic</u> as well as <u>extrinsic</u> motivation</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>TIER II INSTRUCTION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ School-wide plan in place? extra time, targeted instruction?</li> <li>○ K-1 intervention for reading, writing support?</li> <li>○ Coordinated w/ classroom instruction? PLC time to collaborate?</li> </ul>	
<p><b>RIGOR / EXPECTATIONS/ STUDENT WORK</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>EMPHASIS ON HIGH QUALITY WORK</b> for all students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Work reflects established <u>benchmarks, standards</u></li> <li>○ <u>Cognitive complexity scale</u> used to measure rigor (<i>Hess, NAEP</i>)</li> <li>○ <u>Volume of writing</u>: writing portfolios</li> <li>○ <u>Volume of reading</u>: independent reading book logs / progress charts</li> <li>○ <u>Communication of expectations</u>: rubrics; exemplars; sharing of results; self-identification of growth, performance; classroom visits by parents</li> </ul> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>EMPHASIS ON GROWTH MINDSET</b>: validation of effort &amp; progress</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>EMPHASIS ON DEEP GOALS</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Inferential thinking</u>; <u>Critical Thinking</u>; <u>Evidence-based writing</u>; <u>Positive habits of mind</u> (effort, creativity, collaboration, problem solving, autonomy)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>COORDINATION W/ SPED, ELL, LIT SPECIALIST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Regularly scheduled meetings to plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Shared responsibility /co-teaching</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Previewing as well as reviewing of key skills</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lit specialist or aides working in classroom</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately mediated support vs. enabling action</li> </ul>	

OTHER:

## Secondary Observation Tool

GRADE \_\_\_\_\_ CLASSROOM \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>CURRICULUM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum map / scope &amp; sequence; Units of study</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Comprehensive Literature Study</u>: Fiction; Nonfiction; Poetry; Drama</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Writing assignments</u> (with explicit instruction) for <u>narrative, informational, argument, descriptive/imaginative, and poetry</u></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Spelling program</u> or plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Vocabulary program</u> or plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Comprehension instruction</u>: cognitive strategies, inferential thinking</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Text management</u>: note taking strategies</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Writing – reading connection</u> (taught together)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <u>Grammar &amp; conventions</u> (emphasis on syntax)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>CONSISTENCY ACROSS GRADE</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>RESOURCES</b> (books, technology in classroom)</li> </ul>	
<p><b>PEDAGOGY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>PLANNING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How is planning done (lesson planning template)?</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>ASSESSMENT PLAN</b> to determine <u>fluency</u> (WCPM); <u>comprehension</u> (normed test); <u>writing</u>; <u>end-of-unit</u> and/or common assessments; and to <u>monitor progress</u></li> </ul>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>LEARNING OUTCOMES ARTICULATED</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <u>Content goal articulated</u>; <u>Language goal articulated</u></li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>BENCHMARKS</b> to measure progress and performance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>GRR MODEL / STRATEGIES for reading and writing</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Explicit instruction (skill taught)</li> <li>o Guided Practice (skill learned/practiced with mediation/scaffolding)</li> <li>o Independent Application (in new setting)</li> <li>o <u>Writing workshop</u> w explicit instruction, process, conferencing</li> <li>o Emphasis on <u>authorship</u>, <u>choice</u>, <u>independence</u></li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>ACTIVE LEARNING / STUDENT-CENTERED LEARNING</b> <b>(learn by doing / constructing knowledge)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Accountable talk strategies; small group interactions; partner reading; book clubs; collaborative close reading; Socratic Circles; debates; Readers' Theater; presentations; writing groups</li> <li>o Ratio of <u>teacher-to-student talk</u></li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>DIFFERENTIATION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Leveled instruction (flexible grouping); Choice; Challenge</li> <li>o Metacognition: goal setting, reflection, progress monitoring</li> <li>o Tiered instruction (i.e., grammar 'test out'; skills ladder)</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>SCAFFOLDING / MEDIATED INSTRUCTION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Supportive <u>teacher-student interactions</u>; effective <u>feedback</u></li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>ENGAGEMENT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o All students participating</li> <li>o <u>Intrinsic</u> as well as <u>extrinsic</u> motivation</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>TIER II INSTRUCTION</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o School-wide plan in place? Extra time, targeted instruction?</li> <li>o Coordinated w/ classroom instruction &amp; assessments?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>RIGOR / EXPECTATIONS/ STUDENT WORK</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>EMPHASIS ON HIGH QUALITY WORK</b> for all students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Work reflects established <u>benchmarks, standards</u></li> <li>o <u>Cognitive complexity scale</u> used to measure rigor? (<i>Hess, NAEP</i>)</li> <li>o <u>Volume of writing</u>: writing portfolios</li> <li>o <u>Volume of reading</u>: independent reading book logs / progress charts</li> <li>o <u>Communication of expectations</u>: rubrics; exemplars; sharing of results relative to goals; self-identification of growth, performance; end-of-term letter to parents: summarize / preview</li> </ul> </li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>EMPHASIS ON GROWTH MINDSET</b>: validation of effort &amp; progress</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>EMPHASIS ON DEEP GOALS</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <u>Inferential thinking</u>; <u>Critical Thinking</u>; <u>Evidence-based writing</u>; <u>Positive habits of mind</u> (effort, creativity, collaboration, problem solving, autonomy)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>COORDINATION W/ SPED, ELL, LIT SPECIALIST</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Regularly scheduled meetings to plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Shared responsibility /co-teaching</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Previewing as well as reviewing of key skills</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Lit specialist or aide working in classroom</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately mediated support vs. enabling actions</li> </ul>	

OTHER:

## Appendix D: Interview Questions

### Teacher Interview Questions

**Teacher Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Grade:** \_\_\_\_\_

**School:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of Interview:** \_\_\_\_\_

1. (Curriculum) What do you use for guidance in preparing lessons? Units? (Is there a set curriculum map that you follow? Are there specific units that you teach?)
2. (Curriculum) What do you use to plan your year in reading and writing?
3. (Curriculum) Is there a set template that you use to plan lessons?
4. (Pedagogy) How do you organize instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners (at different levels of performance)?
5. (Pedagogy) How are students grouped for instruction? How often do you meet with the most struggling/most independent students per week?
6. (Infrastructure) What supports do you have for struggling learners? For advanced learners?
7. (Infrastructure) How much time do you (actually) teach reading every day? Writing?
8. (Data/Expectations) How do you monitor progress of students in reading? In writing? (Are there benchmarks that students are expected to reach? Are there exemplars and rubrics to measure writing?)
9. (Climate/Environment) How do you collaborate with grade level colleagues?
10. (Climate/Environment) How do you collaborate with SPED staff? ELL staff? Reading Specialist? Librarian?
11. (Climate/Environment) What are your deepest goals for students in reading? In writing?
12. (Professional Development) How do you continue to grow as a professional, learn new skills, learn about best practice, continue to grow as a professional in reading and writing instruction?
13. (Beliefs) How do you measure your success as a teacher?
14. (Open category) What would need to be in place to improve the performance/increasing the learning of your students?



## Principal/Administrator Interview Questions

**Administrator Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Role/School:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of Interview:** \_\_\_\_\_

### Curriculum:

1. Do you see consistency in the curriculum across each grade level? (HORIZONTAL)
2. Do you see a cumulative approach VERTICALLY through the grades? (e.g. a progression of skills being developed?)
3. Do your teachers have sufficient curriculum in hand to ...
4. (f/u: How big of a problem is it? How much of an issue is it for you and what would you want to see in place to improve the consistency?)

### Rigor:

1. Is the curriculum sufficiently rigorous?
2. Are the teachers' expectations of students high enough?
3. Do you feel like the work that students are doing on a day to day basis is sufficiently rigorous? (f/u: Do students regularly engage in critical thinking, creative thinking, collaborative inquiry?)

### Pedagogy:

1. Do you feel like your teachers are instructing in such a way that they are meeting the range of readers (diverse learners)?
2. Are the classroom teachers taking ownership of students who are above/below grade level? (Press for %)

### Assessment:

1. How do we know students are making progress and are teachers using the same measures, tools, criteria? Whose responsibility is it to monitor the progress of students? Is there a structure in place that facilitates the progress monitoring of all students?
2. Is it effective? How is it used? What's the fidelity?
3. How are teachers assessing and monitoring progress of their students? (Is there in place a school wide monitoring plan?)
4. How do you as principal know/monitor the progress of the 400 students in your building? Is there a plan/structure in place?

### Infrastructure:

1. Is there an expectation for the amount of time teachers spend teaching reading/writing every day? Is the time scheduled in large blocks? Do you think it is a sufficient amount of time?
2. Is there guidance or expectations for how often teachers meet with most struggling readers/writers per week?
3. Who makes the schedule? How are they created?
4. Is there an intervention plan in place for struggling readers/writers? At what grade level does this begin? *Are there criteria to identify students for intervention? Are there exit criteria?*

### Climate/Work Environment

1. How well coordinated are special education services with classroom instruction?
2. Is there time in teacher schedules for grade level meetings?
3. Is there scheduled time for classroom teachers, special ed teachers, ELL, reading specialists to meet during the week?
4. How well coordinated are special ed services?
5. (f/u: Do learning center teachers preview new skills and content with IEP students in advance? Do special ed staff co-teach in the classroom?)

### Professional development

1. How do you promote professional growth and development of your staff around their work? How do you organize professional development? How do you promote professional growth among your staff?
2. How do your teachers continue to learn new skills, learn about best practice, continue to grow as professionals in reading and writing instruction?

### Open Category:

1. What would need to be in place to improve the performance/increasing the learning of your students?

## Appendix E: 2015 MCAS Writing Scores

### Grade 4 MCAS Composition Scores 2015

Grade 4 2015 MCAS Composition Scores	Subject	Tested	WP1	WP2	Total Composition (20)
Wellesley	ELA	403	7.86	7.21	15.07
Lexington	ELA	548	7.76	7.11	14.87
Dover	ELA	93	7.43	7.08	14.51
Arlington	ELA	447	7.46	6.95	14.41
Medfield	ELA	196	7.28	6.97	14.25
Canton	ELA	257	7.29	6.89	14.18
Hudson (DART)	ELA	218	7.36	6.81	14.17
Brookline	ELA	500	7.35	6.8	14.15
Needham	ELA	404	7.2	6.75	13.95
Wrentham	ELA	134	7.14	6.78	13.92
Amesbury (DART)	ELA	163	7.05	6.72	13.77
Holliston	ELA	197	7.07	6.64	13.71
Cambridge	ELA	439	6.97	6.52	13.49
Waltham	ELA	366	6.86	6.49	13.35
<b>State Totals</b>	ELA	<b>23501</b>	<b>6.79</b>	<b>6.41</b>	<b>13.2</b>
Salem	ELA	358	6.68	6.44	13.12
Northampton (DART)	ELA	202	6.81	6.31	13.12
<b>Dedham</b>	ELA	<b>208</b>	<b>6.67</b>	<b>6.44</b>	<b>13.11</b>
Medford	ELA	353	6.45	6.14	12.59
Somerville	ELA	300	6.39	6.14	12.53

### Grade 7 MCAS Composition Scores 2015

Grade 4 2015 MCAS Composition Scores	Subject	Tested	WP1	WP2	Total Composition (20)
Wellesley	ELA	403	7.86	7.21	15.07
Lexington	ELA	548	7.76	7.11	14.87
Dover	ELA	93	7.43	7.08	14.51
Arlington	ELA	447	7.46	6.95	14.41
Medfield	ELA	196	7.28	6.97	14.25
Canton	ELA	257	7.29	6.89	14.18
Hudson (DART)	ELA	218	7.36	6.81	14.17
Brookline	ELA	500	7.35	6.8	14.15
Needham	ELA	404	7.2	6.75	13.95
Wrentham	ELA	134	7.14	6.78	13.92
Amesbury (DART)	ELA	163	7.05	6.72	13.77
Holliston	ELA	197	7.07	6.64	13.71
Cambridge	ELA	439	6.97	6.52	13.49
Waltham	ELA	366	6.86	6.49	13.35
<b>State Totals</b>	ELA	<b>23501</b>	<b>6.79</b>	<b>6.41</b>	<b>13.2</b>
Salem	ELA	358	6.68	6.44	13.12
Northampton (DART)	ELA	202	6.81	6.31	13.12
<b>Dedham</b>	ELA	<b>208</b>	<b>6.67</b>	<b>6.44</b>	<b>13.11</b>
Medford	ELA	353	6.45	6.14	12.59
Somerville	ELA	300	6.39	6.14	12.53

## Grade 10 MCAS Composition Scores 2015

Grade 10 MCAS 2015 Composition	Subject	Tested	WP1	WP2	Total Compositiion (20)
Lexington	ELA	513	8.11	7.58	15.69
Brookline	ELA	453	8.06	7.53	15.59
Needham	ELA	403	8.05	7.53	15.58
Wellesley	ELA	357	7.97	7.49	15.46
Falmouth (DART)*	ELA	233	8.08	7.44	15.52
Newton	ELA	949	7.9	7.49	15.39
Bedford	ELA	224	7.87	7.47	15.34
Wayland	ELA	198	7.87	7.47	15.34
Waltham	ELA	352	7.91	7.38	15.29
Arlington	ELA	281	7.82	7.41	15.23
Medford	ELA	300	7.8	7.41	15.21
Belmont	ELA	307	7.79	7.38	15.17
Natick	ELA	362	7.7	7.39	15.09
Hudson (DART)	ELA	158	7.83	7.22	15.05
Amesbury (DART)	ELA	155	7.75	7.28	15.03
Northampton (DART)	ELA	223	7.66	7.31	14.97
Somerville	ELA	302	7.81	7.16	14.97
Framingham	ELA	516	7.6	7.25	14.85
Amherst-Pelham (DART)	ELA	227	7.46	7.22	14.68
<b>State Totals</b>	<b>ELA</b>	<b>68882</b>	<b>7.48</b>	<b>7.13</b>	<b>14.61</b>
Norwood (DART)	ELA	243	7.49	7.12	14.61
Watertown (DART)	ELA	172	7.45	7.06	14.51
Cambridge	ELA	446	7.44	7.02	14.46
<b>Dedham</b>	<b>ELA</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>7.27</b>	<b>7.14</b>	<b>14.41</b>
Beverly (DART)	ELA	329	7.3	6.99	14.29
Mashpee (DART)	ELA	110	7.17	6.91	14.08

## Appendix F: Three Year Implementation Timeline

YEAR 1	DISTRICT	ELEMENTARY	MIDDLE	HIGH SCHOOL
TASK I: K-5 COORDINATE ELA PROGRAM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a K-5 ELA Coordinator Position</li> <li>Create a District Data Specialist position.</li> <li>Transform the K-5 Reading Teacher position to a K-5 Literacy Specialist position.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify / select a balanced literacy reading program.</li> <li>Identify / select a systematic phonics program for grades K-3</li> <li>Identify / select a systematic writing program for grades K-5</li> </ul>		
TASK II: INCREASE RIGOR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create a 6-8 ELA Coordinator position;</li> <li>Continue / expand <i>Instructional Rounds</i> across the district to improve instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop clear benchmarks, performance criteria, and exemplars of excellent work at each grade level for reading and writing while updating curriculum documents to conform to current Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop clear benchmarks, performance criteria, and exemplars of excellent work at each grade level for reading and writing while updating curriculum documents to conform to current Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards.</li> <li>Clarify / strengthen the curriculum in grades 6, 7, 8.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop clear benchmarks, performance criteria, and exemplars of excellent work at each grade level for reading and writing while updating curriculum documents to conform to current Massachusetts Curriculum Framework standards.</li> </ul>
TASK III: FOSTER GROWTH MINDSET		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to value teacher input on professional development decisions through the collective work of the district-wide Professional Development Committee.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to value teacher input on professional development decisions through the collective work of the district-wide Professional Development Committee.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue to value teacher input on professional development decisions through the collective work of the district-wide Professional Development Committee.</li> </ul>
TASK IV: EMPHASIZE AUTONOMY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shift responsibility for learning – and <i>demonstrating</i> learning - from teachers to students.</li> <li>Incorporate expectation of movement from <i>explicit instruction</i> to <i>independent application</i> into all yearlong curriculum maps (grades 4-12).</li> <li>Strengthen Independent Reading Program in grades 1-5.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shift responsibility for learning – and <i>demonstrating</i> learning - from teachers to students.</li> <li>Incorporate expectation of movement from <i>explicit instruction</i> to <i>independent application</i> into all yearlong curriculum maps (grades 4-12).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shift responsibility for learning – and <i>demonstrating</i> learning - from teachers to students.</li> <li>Incorporate expectation of movement from <i>explicit instruction</i> to <i>independent application</i> into all yearlong curriculum maps (grades 4-12).</li> </ul>
TASK V: STRENGTHEN HIGH NEEDS SUPPORT K-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop study group to formulate RTI (Response to Intervention) / MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) to provide evidence-based support for students who need extra time and more intense targeted instruction.</li> </ul>			

<b>YEAR 2</b>	<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>ELEMENTARY</b>	<b>MIDDLE</b>	<b>HIGH SCHOOL</b>
TASK I: K-5 COORDINATE ELA PROGRAM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reorganize delivery of reading instruction services, grades 1-5, from 'Pull Out' to 'Push In' program.</li> <li>Hire / create 10 part-time literacy aide positions to facilitate in-class differentiated reading.</li> </ul>		
TASK II: INCREASE RIGOR			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transform Middle School Reading Teacher position to a Literacy Specialist position.</li> <li>Eliminate tracking / leveling of students in grade 6, 7, 8</li> </ul>	
TASK III: FOSTER GROWTH MINDSET		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empower elementary teachers to take ownership of the curriculum and full responsibility for instructing all students in their class.</li> <li>Invest heavily in Summer Curriculum Development by teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empower middle school teachers to take ownership of the curriculum and full responsibility for instructing all students in their class.</li> <li>Invest heavily in Summer Curriculum Development by teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empower elementary and middle school teachers to take ownership of the curriculum and full responsibility for instructing all students in their class.</li> <li>Invest heavily in Summer Curriculum Development by teachers</li> </ul>
TASK IV: EMPHASIZE AUTONOMY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus professional development at all levels (elementary, middle, high school) on <i>Differentiated Instruction</i> (student choice, challenge, alternate pathways to both gain and demonstrate learning) to attain <i>Deep Goals</i> (complex thinking, problem solving, evidence-based reasoning, creativity).</li> <li>Train staff at all levels to use 'Active Learning' / Accountable Talk' strategies to emphasize student-centered learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus professional development at all levels (elementary, middle, high school) on <i>Differentiated Instruction</i> (student choice, challenge, alternate pathways to both gain and demonstrate learning) to attain <i>Deep Goals</i> (complex thinking, problem solving, evidence-based reasoning, creativity).</li> <li>Train staff at all levels to use 'Active Learning' / Accountable Talk' strategies to emphasize student-centered learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focus professional development at all levels (elementary, middle, high school) on <i>Differentiated Instruction</i> (student choice, challenge, alternate pathways to both gain and demonstrate learning) to attain <i>Deep Goals</i> (complex thinking, problem solving, evidence-based reasoning, creativity).</li> <li>Train staff at all levels to use 'Active Learning' / Accountable Talk' strategies to emphasize student-centered learning.</li> </ul>
TASK V: STRENGTHEN HIGH NEEDS SUPPORT K-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Year I of Tier II Intervention Plan in selected grades.</li> <li>Develop a plan at each school to create <i>weekly</i> collaboration time for each grade-level team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide professional development training to help staff coordinate full integration of Special Education and ELL staffs into classroom settings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide professional development training to help staff coordinate full integration of Special Education and ELL staffs into classroom settings.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide professional development training to help staff coordinate full integration of Special Education and ELL staffs into classroom settings.</li> </ul>

<b>YEAR 3</b>	<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>ELEMENTARY</b>	<b>MIDDLE</b>	<b>HIGH SCHOOL</b>
TASK I: K-5 COORDINATE ELA PROGRAM				
TASK II: INCREASE RIGOR				
TASK III: FOSTER GROWTH MINDSET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a writing community of Dedham teachers to encourage self-expression and to honor teachers' voices</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a staff, or as individual departments, read a text that speaks to issues of mission, values, and teacher efficacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a staff, or as individual departments, read a text that speaks to issues of mission, values, and teacher efficacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a staff, or as individual departments, read a text that speaks to issues of mission, values, and teacher efficacy</li> </ul>
TASK IV: EMPHASIZE AUTONOMY		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop an Independent Project Task in grades 5-12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop an Independent Project Task in grades 5-12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop an Independent Project Task in grades 5-12</li> </ul>
TASK V: STRENGTHEN HIGH NEEDS SUPPORT K-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement Year I of Tier II Intervention Plan in all grades.</li> <li>Implement a plan at each school to create <i>weekly</i> collaboration time for each grade-level team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand number of co-taught classrooms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand number of co-taught classrooms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand number of co-taught classrooms.</li> </ul>

Appendix G: Envisioning ELA Program 2019

Envisioning September 2019

	Curriculum	Pedagogy	Rigor	Accountability	Infrastructure	Work Environment / Climate	Belief System	Professional Development
DISTRICT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ K-12 Scope &amp; Sequence                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ aligned w/ MA CCSS</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ K-12 Statement of Guiding Principles:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Deep goals</li> <li>✓ Reading</li> <li>✓ Writing</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ K-12 Statement of Guiding Principles:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Philosophy</li> <li>✓ Research</li> <li>✓ Best Practices</li> <li>✓ Movement toward Autonomy</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ K-12 Statement of Guiding Principles:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Criteria</li> <li>✓ Benchmarks</li> <li>✓ Exemplars</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Data Specialist</li> <li>✓ K-8 Student Performance Spreadsheets to monitor progress</li> <li>✓ TestWiz available to teachers to analyze – and contribute to – data pool</li> <li>✓ Standardized Reading Test in addition to MCAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ K-5 ELA Coordinator</li> <li>✓ K-5 Literacy Specialists (8) fully trained to provide high quality in-class and district-wide professional development</li> <li>✓ K-5 Literacy Aides (10)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Collaboration time 1 x week</li> <li>✓ Summer Curriculum Development</li> <li>✓ Sped /Gen ED Taskforce to coordinate, co-teach,</li> <li>✓ Teachers Writing Group</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ District Study Group reporting out on Teacher Efficacy:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Jensen</li> <li>✓ C. Dweck</li> <li>✓ G. Canada</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Year 3 of 3 year plan: Differentiating Instruction to Promote Deep Goals</li> <li>✓ Year 2: In Search of Voice: Moving students toward Autonomy; units of study; active reading</li> <li>✓ Year 1: Deep Goals: goals &amp; strategies for teaching reading / writing; units of study; active learning principles</li> <li>✓ CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE assesses progress / reports to Superintendent</li> </ul>
ECEC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <i>Foundations</i> Phonemic Awareness</li> <li>✓ Writing goals, exemplars</li> <li>✓ Extended Literacy block</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ January benchmarks in place</li> <li>✓ Intervention for some students</li> <li>✓ Full end-of-year criteria</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Literacy Specialist in K</li> <li>✓ Literacy Aides in K</li> </ul>			
ELEMENTARY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ BALANCED LITERACY MODEL FOR READING:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ <i>Foundations</i> Phonics Program</li> <li>✓ Read Naturally fluency support</li> <li>✓ Interactive Read Aloud</li> <li>✓ Guided Reading (comprehension)</li> <li>✓ Text Talk (vocabulary)</li> <li>✓ Six Units of Study per Grade</li> <li>✓ CCSS tasks component</li> <li>✓ LLI Leveled Literacy Intervention</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ CALKINS UNITS OF STUDY / AUTHORSHIP MODEL FOR WRITING                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Six Traits rubric</li> <li>✓ Publishing focus</li> <li>✓ Portfolio Assessment</li> <li>✓ High volume of writing: 6 publishable pieces per year</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ COMMITMENT TO DEEP GOALS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Daily Five or GRR / Workshop Management System</li> <li>✓ Active Learning Strategies ('Learn by Doing')</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Heterogeneous Classes</li> <li>✓ Teacher responsible for all reading &amp; writing instruction</li> <li>✓ Support staff pushes in</li> <li>✓ articulated reading &amp; writing benchmarks &amp; exemplars</li> <li>✓ High expectations for all students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Articulated Gradient of Benchmarks                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Criteria</li> <li>✓ January Benchmarks</li> <li>✓ Exemplars</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Teacher-Created Common Assessments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Literacy specialist role: 50% students; 50% PD coaching in classrooms to build capacity</li> <li>✓ Literacy aides support teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Weekly collaboration meeting w specialists led by principal</li> <li>✓ Coordination w/ Sped staff: co-planning, previewing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Empowerment of Staff:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Ownership of Curriculum</li> <li>✓ Ownership of all students</li> <li>✓ Commitment to progress/ achievement for 100% of students</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Study group read: Jensen, Dweck</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Curriculum Development</li> <li>2. Active Learning</li> <li>3. Effective Reading Instruction</li> <li>4. Effective Writing Instruction</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ INSTRUCTIONAL ROUNDS: inter-and intra-school peer visits</li> </ul>

	Curriculum	Pedagogy	Rigor	Accountability	Infrastructure	Work Environment / Climate	Belief System	Professional Development
MIDDLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ CURRICULUM MAP / PACING GUIDE OUTLINING UNITS OF STUDY AND MAJOR WRITING TASKS               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Deep goals, authentic tasks</li> <li>✓ Definable outcomes</li> <li>✓ Move from explicit instruction to independent application</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ STATEMENT OF GOALS AND PRINCIPLES FOR TEACHING WRITING               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Six Traits rubric</li> <li>✓ Publishing focus</li> <li>✓ Portfolio Assessment</li> <li>✓ High volume of writing: 6 publishable pieces per year</li> <li>✓ Focus on authorship, voice, creativity, independence as well expository forms</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ READING COURSE IN 7 &amp; 8 DEFINES OUTCOMES               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Engage w authentic texts</li> <li>✓ Text management / annotation</li> <li>✓ Research-based cognitive strategies</li> <li>✓ Inferential thinking</li> <li>✓ Critical thinking (analysis, interpretation, evaluation)</li> <li>✓ Close reading activities</li> <li>✓ Multiple text comparisons</li> <li>✓ How vs. what a an author says</li> <li>✓ Vocabulary</li> <li>✓ Differentiated Tier II Intervention for below benchmark students taught by Reading Teacher</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ ACTIVE LEARNING / ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES in effect in all classrooms</li> <li>✓ DIFFERENTIATED TEACHING &amp; LEARNING BUILT INTO ALL UNITS               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Choice</li> <li>✓ Challenge</li> <li>✓ Alternate paths to gain and demonstrate knowledge</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ DIFFERENTIATED TEACHING &amp; LEARNING BUILT INTO READING COURSE IN 7 &amp; 8               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Choice</li> <li>✓ Challenge</li> <li>✓ Multiple text levels</li> <li>✓ Alternate paths to gain and demonstrate knowledge</li> <li>✓ Students challenged at independent, instructional, and challenge level</li> <li>✓ CCSS complex tasks (close reading)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Heterogeneous Classes</li> <li>✓ High expectations for all students</li> <li>✓ articulated reading &amp; writing benchmarks &amp; exemplars</li> <li>✓ Large volume of independent reading</li> <li>✓ Large volume of quality writing tasks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Teacher-Created Common Assessments and protocols for comparing results</li> <li>✓ articulated reading &amp; writing benchmarks &amp; exemplars</li> <li>✓ common rubric for writing in all ELA classes</li> <li>✓ Standardized Reading Test in addition to MCAS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ 6-8 COORDINATOR               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ supervises</li> <li>✓ evaluates</li> <li>✓ coordinates curriculum</li> <li>✓ plans / executes professional development</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Literacy Specialist role (formerly Reading Teacher)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Reading instruction</li> <li>✓ Writing instruction shared w/ ENG. Teacher (reduce essay load from 120 to 60)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ WEEKLY COLLABORATION MEETING w 6-8 coordinator               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Examine writing together</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Summer Curriculum Development to refine units</li> <li>✓ Sped /Gen ED Taskforce to coordinate, co-teach,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Empowerment of Staff:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Ownership of Curriculum</li> <li>✓ Ownership of all students</li> <li>✓ Commitment to progress/ achievement for 100% of students</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Study group read: Jensen, Dweck</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Curriculum Development</li> <li>2. Active Learning</li> <li>3. Effective Reading Instruction</li> <li>4. Effective Writing Instruction</li> <li>5. Differentiated Instruction</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ INSTRUCTIONAL ROUNDS: inter-and intra-school peer visits</li> </ul>
HIGH SCHOOL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ REFINED SIX TRAITS WRITING RUBRIC &amp; feedback               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Genre-specific indicators</li> <li>✓ Written &amp; oral comments</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ REFINED GOALS AND PRINCIPLES FOR TEACHING WRITING               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Six Traits rubric</li> <li>✓ Publishing focus / authentic tasks</li> <li>✓ Portfolio Assessment</li> <li>✓ High volume of writing: 6 publishable pieces per year</li> <li>✓ Focus on authorship, voice, creativity, independence as well expository forms</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ ACTIVE LEARNING / ENGAGEMENT STRATEGIES in effect in all classrooms: high student –teacher talk ratio</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ REDUCE # OF CP2 CLASSES / INCREASE % OF STUDENTS IN CP1, HONORS, AP</li> <li>✓ DEFINE QUALITY WRITING PER GRADE for all students regardless of level               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Exemplars for each genre</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ REGULAR / FREQUENT MEETING TO CALIBRATE EXPECTATIONS &amp; CRITERIA for all students regardless of level               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Exemplars for each genre</li> <li>✓ Compare to other schools</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ WRITING ASSESSMENT IN SEPT. PER GRADE TO GAUGE INDEPENDENT PERFORMANCE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ DEPT CHAIR ROLE REDEFINED: grades 9-12               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ supervises</li> <li>✓ evaluates</li> <li>✓ coordinates curriculum</li> <li>✓ plans / executes professional development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ WEEKLY COLLABORATION MEETING w 9-12 coordinator               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Examine writing together</li> </ul> </li> <li>✓ Summer Curriculum Development to refine courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Study group read: Jensen, Dweck</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Curriculum Development</li> <li>2. Active Learning</li> <li>3. Determining grade-level standard for writing in each genre</li> <li>4. Four-year portfolio presentation and assessment</li> </ol> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ INSTRUCTIONAL ROUNDS: inter-and intra-school peer visits</li> </ul>