Models Reviewed for Implementation in Virginia's Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program

The source of information provided in this report is:

Catalog of School Reform Models
August 1999
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S. W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204-3297
503/275-9500

Disclaimers:

1. Recommendation of instructional models and methods with a proven track record is not intended as a guarantee that the program will be successful as implemented in a particular school. School divisions are permitted to choose instructional methods or models that are not recommended so long as they meet the Board's criteria.
2. Some of the instructional models have an associated textbook that may not be on the list of instructional materials reviewed or recommended as part of the state textbook adoption process. Recommendation of a model or instructional method should not be interpreted as endorsement of the associated textbook materials. Before adopting any model with associated materials, the school should determine whether there is sufficient SOL correlation for the grade level or course where the method will be used.
3. Products and services on the list may not be available in all areas of the commonwealth. School divisions are responsible for negotiating contracts with vendors for products or services.

Entire School Reform Models

Accelerated Schools

IN BRIEF

Developer	Henry Levin, Stanford University
Year Established	1986
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	More than 1,000
Level	Primarily K-8
Primary Goal	To bring children in at-risk situations at least to grade level by the end of sixth grade
Main Features	*Gifted-and-talented instruction for all students through "powerful learning" *Participatory process for whole school transformation *Three guiding principles (unity of purpose, empowerment plus responsibility, and building on strengths)
Results	Improvements in student achievement in many accelerated schools, based on evidence drawn from small-scale evaluations and case studies (large-scale study now underway)
Impact on Instruction	Adapt instructional practices usually reserved for gifted-and-talented children for all students
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Governance structure that empowers the whole school community to make key decisions based on the Inquiry Process
Impact on Schedule	Depends on collective decisions of staff
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	No
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learner	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parent and community involvement is built into participatory governance structure
Technology	Depends on collective decisions of staff
Materials	Training materials, Accelerated School Resource Guide

Origin/Scope
The Accelerated Schools approach, developed by Henry Levin of Stanford University, was first implemented in 1986 in two San Francisco Bay Area elementary schools. The Accelerated Schools Project has now reached over 1,000 accelerated schools in 40 states.

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

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

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

For more information, contact:
Claudette Sprague
National Center for the Accelerated Schools Project
Stanford University
CERAS 109
Stanford, California 94305-3084
Phone: 650-725-1676
Fax: 650-725-6140
E-mail: hf.cys@forsythe.standford.edu
Web site: www.stanford.edu/cgi-bin/leland/group/ASP

ATLAS Communities

IN BRIEF

Developer	Coalition of Essential Schools, Education Development Center, Project Zero, School Development Program
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	57 (12 pathways)
Level	PreK-12
Primary Goal	To develop preK-12 pathways organized around a common framework to improve learning outcomes for all students
Main Features	*PreK-12 pathways *Development of coherent K-12 educational programs for every student *Authentic curriculum, instruction, and assessment *Whole-faculty study groups *School/pathway planning and management teams
Results	Consistent improvement on standardized tests and statewide performance assessments in pathways that have worked with ATLAS for at least three years
Impact on Instruction	Teachers focus on active inquiry and are attuned to students' individual strengths and limitations
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Each preK-12 pathway has a pathway coordinator supported by the district (0.5-1.0 FTE depending on the number and size of schools in the pathway)
Impact on Schedule	Within schools, teachers meet in study groups; across pathway schools, teachers need time to plan together
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	No
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	No
Parental Involvement	Parent and community involvement is integral to the ATLAS approach; many schools have family centers
Technology	No special technology required
Materials	All ATLAS materials provided

Origin/Scope
ATLAS Communities was formed in 1992 as a partnership of four leading educational organizations: Education Development Center, the Coalition of Essential Schools, Project Zero, and the School Development Program. There are 57 ATLAS schools in seven states.

General Description
ATLAS Communities is a design for educational reform linking elementary, middle, and high schools as partners in creating a pathway of teaching and learning from kindergarten through grade 12. Its goal is to create a coherent educational program for each student and to help all students develop the habits of mind, heart, and work they will need as informed citizens and productive workers in the 21st century. Thus, ATLAS goes beyond basic literacies, enabling students to develop an understanding of important concepts, to reason, to solve real-world problems, and to cherish others and their environments.

ATLAS addresses dimensions of education that cut across the grade span, across the curriculum, and across the many different constituencies involved in education. In ATLAS Communities educators, students, their families, civic leaders, business people, and cultural institutions all become deeply invested in the learning process.

For the last five years, ATLAS Communities has been working with pathways of schools in districts across the country to:

Improve learning outcomes for all students (Teaching and Learning);
Evaluate student work through a variety of standard and innovative assessment tools (Assessment);
Engage teachers in serious and sustained professional development (Professional Development);
Involve families and other members of the community in the education of their children (Learning Community); and
Reorganize the internal structures and decision-making processes within schools and districts to support all of the above (Management and Decision-Making).

These are the key elements of the ATLAS Communities framework. Instead of focusing on selected elements, ATLAS believes that all of the parts must be connected to the whole. In order for school change to be sustained, these elements must be fully integrated.

For more information, contact:
ATLAS Communities
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158-1060
Web site: www.edc.org/ATLAS/

Community for Learning

IN BRIEF

Developer	Margaret C. Wang, Temple University
Year Established	1990
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	53
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	To achieve social and academic success for students by linking schools with community institutions
Main Features	*Collaboration with homes, libraries, museums, and other places where students can learn *Coordinated health and human services delivery component *Site-specific implementation design *Adaptive Learning Environments Model of instruction
Results	Student achievement in program schools has improved faster than in district schools and control schools
Impact on Instruction	Teams of regular teachers and specialists work together in the classroom, providing individual and small-group instruction for regular and special students; individualized learning plans are developed for all students
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Program facilitator; teacher teams
Impact on Schedule	Flexible use of time for instructional teaming and planning (block scheduling)
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parental involvement is an essential component of the design
Technology	No specially designed equipment required
Materials	No specially designed materials required

Origin/Scope
The Community for Learning program (CFL) was developed in 1990 by Margaret C. Wang, Executive Director of the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE). It has been implemented in 53 urban and rural schools in the mid-Atlantic region and across the country. The classroom instruction component, Adaptive Learning Environments Model, was developed under the aegis of the National Follow Through Project and has been implemented in over 200 schools in 22 states.

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

The emphasis on collaboration extends into the classroom itself, where regular teachers and specialists (such as special education teachers, Title I teachers, and school psychologists) work in teams to meet the diverse academic and social needs of all children. The instructional component of Community for Learning is called the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM), an inclusive approach to meeting the learning needs of individual students in regular classes, including students with special needs. As the title suggests, ALEM teachers adapt instruction for each student, using a variety of instructional strategies and grouping patterns (e.g., whole class, small groups, individuals). Students are taught to take responsibility for planning and monitoring their own progress. Learning tasks are divided into small units and evaluated frequently by the teacher, who modifies learning plans and instructional strategies on an ongoing basis. Students progress at their own pace, advancing when ready and
taking extra time when necessary. Individualized attention is provided for those who are not progressing well and for those who are exceptionally talented and ready for advanced lessons in given subjects.

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

For more information, contact:
Frederick McCoy
Laboratory for Student Success
Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091
Phone: 800-892-5550
Fax: 215-204-5130
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.edu
Web site: http://www.temple.edu/LSS

Co-NECT

IN BRIEF

Developer	BBN Corporation
Year Established	1992
# of Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	58
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	To improve achievement in core subjects
Main Features	*Design-based assistance for comprehensive K-12 school reform *Customized on-line/on-site training and personal support *National "critical friends" program *Leadership processes for whole-school technology integration
Results	Overall improvement in test scores relative to district trends
Impact on Instruction	Emphasis on authentic problems and practical applications
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Organization of school into small learning communities ("clusters"); full-time facilitator preferred
Impact on Schedule	Flexible block scheduling; common planning time for teachers
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	No
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Encouraged
Technology	Significant investment required; schools need computers and Internet access for teachers (at least) in order to make the most of the products and services available on-line (Co-NECT does not provide equipment)
Materials	Provided, both print and on-line

Origin/Scope
Co-NECT was founded in 1992 by members of the Educational Technologies Group at BBN Corporation. By January 1998 there were 58 schools in eight states.

General Description
Co-NECT helps schools work through a structured process of comprehensive school reform. The primary purpose is to boost academic achievement for all students in core subject areas including mathematics, reading, writing, science, and the social sciences. The design is based on a set of five benchmarks derived from best practices in some of the most effective schools in the United States. The benchmarks include:

*high expectations for all students and schoolwide accountability for results;
*schoolwide emphasis on practical application of academic knowledge to authentic problems;
*use of assessments that measure actual student and school performance;
*organization of the school into small learning communities (known as "clusters"); and
sensible use of the best available technology for everyone.

Co-NECT provides a combination of on-site and on-line assistance aimed at helping each participating school implement these design benchmarks within a period of three years.

Schools that work with Co-NECT need to have computers in every classroom and on every teacher's desk and Internet access for teachers in order to make the most of the products and services available on-line. These computers are connected by a schoolwide local area network (LAN), with shared file storage, printers, and direct, high-speed access to the Internet. Some Co-NECT schools also have extensive video production and broadcast facilities.

The Co-NECT Exchange, the organization's Web site, delivers specialized professional training for teachers and leaders and supports the growth of a collaborative professional community among participating schools. The exchange offers a rich and growing array of tools, tele-collaborative projects and other curriculum resources, discussion areas, on-line training modules, and membership utilities. The site has been field-tested over a period of three years with thousands of teachers around the United States, and is undergoing continuous development.

Other offerings include Co-NECT Critical Friends (a national school visitation and quality review program) and an annual technology conference.

For more information, contact:
Heather Corbitt
Co-NECT Schools
1770 Massachusetts Avenue, #301
Cambridge, MA 02140
Phone: 617-995-3100 or 877-726-6328 (toll free)
Fax: 617-955-3103
E-mail: info@co-nect.net
Web site: http://www.co-nect.net

Core Knowledge

IN BRIEF

Developer	E. D. Hirsch, Jr.
Year Established	1986
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	700+
Level	K-8
Primary Goal	To help students establish a strong foundation of core knowledge for higher levels of learning
Main Features	*Sequential program of specific grade-by-grade topics for core subjects *Rest of curriculum (approximately half) left for schools to design
Results	Single school quantitative and qualitative data demonstrate improved student achievement and equity -- specifically for students in lower performing schools
Impact on Instruction	Instructional methods (to teach core topics) are designed by individual teachers/schools
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Minimal
Impact on Schedule	Minimal
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Schools are expected to involve parents in planning and resource development
Technology	None required
Materials	Detailed material provided

Origin/Scope
The Core Knowledge Foundation is an independent, non-profit, non-partisan organization founded in 1986 by E. D. Hirsch, Jr. The foundation's essential program, a core curriculum titled the Core Knowledge Sequence, was first implemented in 1990. By January 1998, it was being used in more than 700 schools in 42 states.

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

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

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

Parental involvement and consensus building contribute to the success of the Core Knowledge Sequence. Parents and community members are invited to be involved in obtaining resources, planning activities, and developing a schoolwide plan. The schoolwide plan integrates the Core Knowledge content with district and state requirements and assessment instruments. Additionally, parents and teachers are encouraged to cooperate in planning learning goals and lesson plans.

For more information, contact:
Constance Jones
Director of School Programs
Core Knowledge Foundation
801 East High Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Phone: 804-977-7550
Fax: 804-977-0021
E-mail: jonescore@aol.com
Web site: http://www.coreknowledge.org

Direct Instruction

IN BRIEF

Developer	Siegfried Englemann
Year Established	1968
# Schools Served (Jan. 1968)	150
Level	K-6
Primary Goal	To improve academic performance so that by fifth grade, students are at least a year and a half beyond grade level
Main Features	*Field-tested reading, language arts, and math curricula *Highly scripted instructional strategies *Extensive training
Results	Numerous large- and small-scale evaluations have found significant positive effects on student achievement in reading, language arts, and/or mathematics
Impact on Instruction	To facilitate cross-class grouping, schools must coordinate schedules so that all teachers at a particular grade level teach major subjects at the same time
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Some teachers may be asked to serve as peer coaches
Impact on Schedule	To facilitate cross-class grouping, schools must coordinate schedules so that all teachers at a particular grade level teach major subjects at the same time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Not emphasized
Technology	None required
Materials	Detailed materials provided by publisher

Origin/Scope
Direct Instruction has evolved from a theory of instruction developed by Siegfried Engelmann of the University of Oregon. Englemann's early works focused on beginning reading, language, and math and were published by Science Research Associates in 1968 under the trade name DISTAR (Direct Instruction System for Teaching And Remediation). Over the past three decades, the original curricula have been revised and new ones developed through sixth grade (plus remedial programs and science programs for higher grades). These curricula have been incorporated into the comprehensive school reform model known as the Direct Instruction Model, which has been implemented in some 150 schools nationwide. Direct Instruction curricular materials have been used in hundreds more schools.

General Description
Englemann's theory of instruction is that learning can be greatly accelerated in any endeavor if instructional presentations are clear, rule out likely misinterpretations, and facilitate generalizations. He and his associates have developed over 50 instructional programs based on this theory. Each program is shaped through field tryouts; student errors are carefully evaluated and lessons revised prior to publication. The lessons are carefully scripted and tightly sequenced.

The comprehensive Direct Instruction Model incorporates teacher development and organizational components needed to optimize use of these programs. Through substantial training and in-class coaching, teachers in the lower grades learn to present highly interactive lessons to small groups. Students make frequent oral responses, and teachers monitor and correct errors immediately. Students are placed at appropriate instructional levels based on performance, so those who learn rapidly are not held back and those who need additional assistance receive it. The model calls for inclusion of students with special needs except in the most extreme cases.

Although the Direct Instruction Model incorporates curricula for all areas, its reading, language arts, and math curricula can be implemented separately.

For more information, contact:
Linda Vinson
615-771-5027
linda_vinson@mcgraw-hill.com

Edison Project

IN BRIEF

Developer	Chris Whittle and the Edison Project Design Team
Year established	1991
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	25
Level	K-12
Primary goal	To create innovative schools that operate at current public school spending levels and provide all students with an academically excellent education rooted in democratic values
Main Features	*Contracts with school districts or charter schools *Schools within schools *Challenging curriculum (traditional and non-traditional approaches) *Instruction tailored to meet individual students' needs *Emphasis on computer technology
Results	Some Edison schools are outperforming control schools in reading; high rates of parent and student satisfaction
Impact on Instruction	Edison designs 75% of schools' curricula; schools use the Success for All reading program and the University of Chicago math program
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Edison is responsible for implementing the educational programs and the management systems (this includes hiring staff)
Impact on Schedule	Longer school day and year; Edison may use a different daily schedule than other district schools
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parent Advisory Board; families meet with teachers quarterly; social services provided on-site
Technology	Edison equips each school with technology, including a computer for every teacher and student
Materials	Broad range of curriculum materials provided as part of the design

Origin/Scope
The Edison Project was founded by Chris Whittle in 1991. The first Edison partnership schools opened in the summer of 1995 in Sherman, Texas; Wichita, Kansas; Mount Clemens, Michigan; and Boston, Massachusetts. The Edison Project now (as of January 1998) has 25 partnership schools in eight states.

General Description
The Edison Project is a privately sponsored effort to create innovative schools that operate at current public school spending levels and that provide all students, regardless of economic or social circumstances, with an education that is rooted in democratic values, that is academically excellent, and that prepares them for productive lives.

The Edison Project establishes partnership schools either in contract with the local school district or as part of a charter school initiative. In the schools it contracts with, the Edison Project is responsible for implementing the educational program, technology plans, and management systems. It is also accountable to the communities it serves for the performance of the schools. In Edison partnership schools, authority must be as decentralized as possible, and each decision-making unit must be accountable for results.

The Edison Project intends to enable high school graduates to perform college-level work. It also strives to foster in every student an appreciation of the arts, a commitment to health and fitness, an understanding of right and wrong, and a desire to participate responsibly in a democratic society.

The design is composed of ten integral parts:

1. Schools Organized for Every Student's Success: smaller schools within schools;
2. Better Use of Time: longer school day and year;
3. Rich and Challenging Curriculum: world class standards; education in humanities and arts, mathematics and science, ethics, practical skills, and health and fitness (Edison uses the University of Chicago School Mathematics Program and the Success for All reading program);
4. Teaching Methods That Motivate: multiple instruction techniques;
5. Careful Assessment That Provides Real Accountability: tied to standards; multiple assessment tools;
6. A Professional Environment for Teachers: a portable computer for every teacher; extensive professional development;
7. Technology for an Information Age: a computer in every student's home; highly equipped schools;
8. New Partnership with Parents: regular communication between teachers and parents;
9. Schools Tailored to Your Community: curriculum tailored to meet local needs; and
10. Backed by a System That Serves: support, guidance, and resources from the Edison national headquarters.

For more information, contact:
The Edison Project
521 Fifth Avenue, 16th Floor
New York, NY 10175
Phone: 212-309-1600
Fax: 212-309-1604
E-mail: geninfo@newyork.edisonproject.com
Web site: http://www.edisonschools.com

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB)

IN BRIEF

Developer	Outward Bound, USA
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	47
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	To promote high achievement for all students
Main features	*Challenging learning expeditions that involve authentic projects and fieldwork *High expectations for all students *Shared decision-making *Regular review of student achievement and level of implementation
Results	Nine of ten third-year ELOB schools have shown significant improvement on standardized tests
Impact on Instruction	Interdisciplinary projects; frequent journeys out of the classroom for fieldwork
Impact on Organizational Staffing	At least three hours of team planning time for teachers weekly; 15-20 days of professional development per teacher per year
Impact on Schedule	Requires large, flexible blocks of time for in-depth investigation in school and in the field; students stay with same the teacher for more than one year
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	No
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-Language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Many opportunities for parents and community to be involved in students' learning expeditions
Technology	None required
Materials	Provided

Origin/Scope
Formed in 1992, Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB) is based on the principles of Outward Bound, which educator Kurt Hahn founded in 1941. There are 47 ELOB schools in 13 states as of January 1998

General Description
Expeditionary Learning focuses teaching and learning toward enabling all students to meet rigorous academic standards and character goals. Curriculum, instruction, assessment, school culture, and school structures are organized around producing high quality student work in learning expeditions ¾ long term, in-depth investigations of themes or topics that engage students in the classroom and in the wider world through authentic projects, fieldwork, and service.

Learning expeditions are designed with clear learning goals that are aligned with district and state standards. Ongoing assessment is woven throughout each learning expedition, pushing students to higher levels of performance.

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

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

For more information, contact
Greg Farrell
Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound
122 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: 617-576-1260
Fax: 617-576-1340
E-mail: meg_campbell@elob.ci.net
Web site: http://www.elob.org

High Schools That Work

IN BRIEF

Developer	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), Atlanta, GA
Year Established	1987
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	Over 700
Level	9-12
Primary Goal	To increase the achievement of career-bound students by blending the content of traditional college prep studies with quality vocational and technical studies
Main Features	*Upgraded academic core *Common planning time for teachers to integrate instruction *Higher standards/expectations
Results	Sites participating in 1994 and 1996 assessments showed significant improvement in reading and math scores and widened the gap in achievement scores between career-bound students at HSTW sites and vocational students nationally
Impact on Instruction	Sites are expected to end low-level courses for all students and increase the use of engaging instructional strategies
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Sites align with middle schools and post-secondary institutions; more teachers work together
Impact on Schedule	Use of larger blocks of instructional time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	No
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	No specialized practices noted
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parents are expected to help their children select a schedule that reflects HSTW principles
Technology	No specific technology required
Materials	Specific materials are suggested to guide schools in making changes

Origin/Scope
High Schools That Work (HSTW) is an initiative of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)-State Vocational Education Consortium that began in 1987. More than 700 schools in 21 states are members of the HSTW network.

General Description
High Schools That Work is a whole-school, research-and-assessment-based reform effort that offers a framework of goals and key practices for improving the academic, technical, and intellectual achievement of career-bound high school students. It provides intensive technical assistance, focused staff development, and a nationally recognized yardstick for measuring program effectiveness. HSTW promotes a changed school environment as a context for implementing 10 key practices: high expectations; challenging vocational studies; increasing access to academic studies; a program of study that includes four years of English, three of math, and three of science; work-based learning; collaboration among academic and vocational teachers; students actively engaged; an individualized advising system; extra help; and keeping score (using assessment and evaluation data to foster continuous improvement). HSTW sets high expectations, identifies a recommended curriculum to meet the expectations, and sets student performance goals benchmarked to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Three main ideas lay the foundation of HSTW: (1) academic and vocational teachers, principals, and counselors work together to establish unity of vision, a common process for reorganizing the school, and a plan for doing so; (2) teachers and school leaders are empowered to accomplish their goals when they share expertise and learn from each other; and (3) assessment, evaluation, and feedback should drive the process and implementation of reform. The HSTW framework builds support and collaboration among school and district leaders, teachers, students and families for raising expectations for a more challenging and meaningful high school program of study. SREB and its partners assist high schools in customizing the HSTW framework into action plans for creating more personalized learning environments leading to improved student motivation and performance.

For more information, contact:
Gene Bottoms, Senior Vice President
Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30318-5790
Phone: 404-875-9211
Fax: 404-872-1477
E-mail: gene.bottoms@sreb.org
Web site: http://www.sreb.org

High/Scope

IN BRIEF

Developer	David P. Weikert
Year Established	1970
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	100
Level	K-3
Primary Goal	To provide children with effective, developmentally sound learning experiences in all curriculum areas and to be sensitive to their backgrounds, strengths, and interests
Main features	*Small group instruction *Active learning *Learning centers *Observational and portfolio assessment * Manipulative materials *Technology integration
Results	Students in the program often have significantly higher scores on standardized achievement tests
Impact on Instruction	See main features
Impact on Organizational Staffing	None
Impact on Schedule	None
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Program actively encourages parent and community involvement in workshops, in classrooms, and in other ways
Technology	4-6 computer stations and appropriate software (list provided by the developer) recommended for each classroom
Materials	Teacher guides, video tapes, student assessment, CDs and records

Origin/Scope
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation was founded in 1970 by David P. Weikart (then of Ypsilanti Public Schools) as a not-for-profit educational research, training, and program development organization. In its first year, High/Scope's K-3 program was active in 10 schools in six states. As of January 1998, more than 100 schools across the country have adopted the High/Scope elementary approach.

General Description
Built on the principles and practices of active learning, the High/Scope approach to education encompasses all aspects of children's development and involves teachers and parents in supporting children's emerging intellectual, physical, social, and emotional skills and abilities.

The curriculum, which has its roots in High/Scope's validated preschool program, provides guidelines for creating a classroom learning environment that includes designated activity areas furnished with materials, supplies, and equipment. The daily schedule provides children with opportunities to work with a variety of manipulative materials, formulate practical problems, and make thoughtful efforts to solve them.

A group of K-3 learning goals called key experiences is defined in the curriculum. The key experiences in language and literacy, mathematics, science, music, and movement provide a framework for sequenced instructional activities, daily teacher planning, and assessment of individuals and groups.

High/Scope views learning as a social experience involving reciprocal interactions between children and adults, and it offers children many experiences that require cooperative work and the use of effective communications skills.

The curriculum's plan-do-review process provides an organizational framework for children's work in the activity areas and allows children to generate learning initiatives. In the daily plan-do-review sequence, children choose, organize, and evaluate learning activities and share the results of their experiences with their peers. The child-initiated activities of the plan-do-review process provide teachers with insight into children's interests and levels of development while also helping children develop a sense of responsibility and empowerment that contributes to their lifelong competence and self-esteem.

For more information, contact:
Charles Wallgren
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48198
Phone: 734-485-2000
Fax: 734-485-0704
E-mail: info@highscope.org
Web site: www.highscope.org

Modern Red Schoolhouse

IN BRIEF

Developer	Hudson Institute
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	43
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	To combine the rigor and values of the little red schoolhouse with the latest classroom innovations
Main Features	*Challenging curriculum *Emphasis on character *Integral role of technology *High standards for all *Individual education compact for each student
Results	Test scores of students in MRSh elementary schools have increased at multiple sites
Impact on Instruction	Teachers vary time and teaching approaches to ensure that all students pass "watershed assessments" in order to advance from primary to intermediate to upper divisions
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Technology specialist must be added to the staff
Impact on Schedule	Teachers may need to reschedule their day to accommodate interdisciplinary lessons and long-term projects
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parents agree to help take responsibility for student performance through Individual Education Compacts; community helps define character development component
Technology	Sophisticated computer technology is required
Materials	Provided

Origin/Scope
Modern Red Schoolhouse (MRSh) was developed in 1992 by the Hudson Institute, a private, non-profit research organization. There are 43 MRSh schools in 11 states.

General Description
MRSh works in partnership with schools throughout the country to reinvent the virtues of the little red schoolhouse in a modern context.

At an MRSh school, students master a rigorous curriculum, develop character, and promote the principles of democratic government. These elements of the traditional red schoolhouse are then combined with innovative teaching methodologies and student groupings, flexibility in organizing instruction and deploying resources, and advanced technology as a learning and instructional management tool.

The core principle of MRSh is that all students can and will reach high academic standards. Mastery of subject matter is the only acceptable goal, regardless of a child's background, learning style, or pace. Because students learn at different rates and in different ways, instructional methodologies and time spent on lessons vary. This way, students progress through the curriculum in the ways that are best suited to their individual strengths and abilities.

MRSh strives to help all students achieve high standards through the construction of a standards-driven curriculum; traditional and performance-based assessments; effective organizational patterns and professional-development programs; and effective community-involvement strategies.

The primary tool for monitoring continuing progress is the Individual Education Compact, an agreement negotiated by the students, parents, and teacher. This "educational road map" establishes measurable goals, details parent and teacher responsibility for helping the student achieve, and lists services the school, parents, or community should provide.

For more information, contact:
Karen White
Production Manager
Modern Red Schoolhouse
208 23rd Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: 615-320-8804
Fax: 615-320-5366
E-mail: kwhite@mrsh.org
Web site: http://www.mrsh.org

Onward to Excellence

IN BRIEF

Developer	Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	Over 1000
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	To help schools build capacity through shared leadership for continuous improvement in schools
Main Features	*School leadership teams *Two-year improvement process *School profiles (data on student achievement) *Effective practices research *Curriculum mapping
Results	Improved student achievement at high implementation schools
Impact on Instruction	Depends on decisions of leadership team and school community
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Leadership team composed of principal, teachers, and (sometimes) parents, students, or district representatives
Impact on Schedule	Depends on decisions of leadership team and school community
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	No
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learner	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parents often serve on leadership teams; input of parents and community members sought for key decisions
Technology	Depends on decisions of leadership team and school community
Materials	Material provided to guide schools through the process

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Roots & Wings

IN BRIEF

Developer	Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers from Johns Hopkins University
Year Established	1993
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	747 schools use Success for All; over 200 of these have added Roots & Wings components
Level	PreK-6
Primary Goal	To guarantee that every child will progress successfully through elementary school
Main Features	*Research-based curricula *One-to-one tutoring *Family support team *Cooperative learning *On-site facilitator *Building advisory team
Results	Students in Roots & Wings schools have outperformed students in control schools
Impact on Instruction	Combination of prescribed curriculum with teacher-developed instruction in the areas of literacy, math, and social and scientific problem-solving
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Family support team; full-time facilitator; building advisory committee; one-to-one tutoring
Impact on Schedule	Schedule may need to be adjusted to incorporate curricular requirements
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes (reading, math, science, social studies)
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Family support team works to increase strong school-home connections
Technology	None required
Materials	Provided (as part of the cost of design)

Origin/Scope
Roots & Wings, created in 1993 by Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers at Johns Hopkins University, is a comprehensive, whole-school reform model designed to place a high floor under the basic skills achievement of all students while building problem solving skills, creativity, and critical thinking. As of January 1998, Success for All, the reading component of Roots & Wings, is operating in 747 schools in 40 states. Over 200 of these schools have added the math, science, and social studies components that constitute Roots & Wings.

General Description
The purpose of Roots & Wings is to create well-structured curricular and instructional approaches for all elementary subjects, pre-kindergarten to grade 6, based on well-evaluated components and well-researched principles of instruction, assessment, classroom management, motivation, and professional development.

Roots & Wings builds on the Success for All program, initiated in 1987, which provides research-based curricula for students in pre-kindergarten through grade six in reading, writing, and language arts; one-to-one tutoring for primary grade students struggling in reading; and extensive family support services (see description of Success for All). To these, Roots & Wings adds MathWings, a practical, constructivist approach to mathematics for grades 1-5, and WorldLab, an integrated approach to social studies and science emphasizing simulations and group investigations for grades 1-5.

Roots refers to strategies that every child needs in order to meet world-class standards and to have good language skills, reading skills, and health. It involves early intervention for at-risk children, research-based curricula with extensive training support, one-to-one tutoring, integrated health and social services, and family support. Wings refers to a curriculum and instruction strategy designed to let children soar. Each school has a full-time facilitator to help implement the program, a Family Support Team to foster community and parent involvement, and a Building Advisory Team to evaluate the entire school climate and advise the principal on general direction and goals.

For more information contact:
Roots & Wings
200 West Towsontown Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21204-5200
Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-324-4444
E-mail: sfa@successforall.net
Web site: http://www.successforall.net

School Development Program

IN BRIEF

Developer	James Comer, Yale University
Year Established	1968
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	721
Level	Primarily K-6, but also some middle and high schools
Primary Goal	To mobilize entire community of adult caretakers to support students' holistic development to bring about academic success
Main Features	*Three teams (school planning and management team, student and staff support team, parent team) *Three operations(comprehensive school plan, staff development plan, monitoring and assessment) *Three guiding principles (no-fault, consensus, collaboration)
Results	Student achievement in many Comer schools has risen significantly, often outpacing district-wide achievement or achievement in control schools
Impact on Instruction	Goals and outcomes are developed through the comprehensive school plan process
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Representative teams provide input into the decision-making process; decisions are made through collaboration and consensus
Impact on Schedule	Depends on decisions of teams
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Generally not, although a literacy program has been developed and piloted
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parent team; parents serve on school planning and management team; in general, parental involvement is central to the program
Technology	Depends on decisions of teams
Materials	Training manual with materials; 14-segment video series

Origin/Scope
The School Development Program, founded by child psychiatrist James Comer of Yale University, was first implemented in 1968 in the two lowest achieving schools in New Haven, Connecticut. As of January 1998, 541 elementary schools, 107 middle schools, and 73 high schools were using the School Development Program, also known as the Comer Process.

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

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

Mechanisms

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

Operations

- Comprehensive School Plan: gives direction to the school improvement process; covers academics, school climate, staff development, public relations, and other areas.
- Staff Development Plan: focuses teacher training on needs related to the goals and priorities specified in the comprehensive plan.
- Monitoring and Assessment: generates data on implementation and results; allows teams to modify the school's approach where necessary.

Guiding Principles

- No-Fault Approach to Problem-Solving: lets teams analyze and solve problems without recrimination.
- Consensus Decision Making: promotes dialogue and common understanding.
- Collaboration: enables both the principal and the teams to have a say in the management of the school.

For more information, contact:
Beverly Crowther
School Development Program
53 College Street
New Haven, CT 06510
Phone: 203-737-4008
Fax: 203-737-4001
E-mail: beverly.crowther@yale.edu
Web site: http://info.med.yale.edu/comer

Success for All

IN BRIEF

Developer	Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers from Johns Hopkins University
Year Established	1987
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	747
Level	PreK-6
Primary Goal	Ensuring that all children learn to read
Main Features	*Schoolwide reading curriculum *Cooperative learning *Grouping by reading level (reviewed by assessment every 8 weeks) *Tutoring for students in need of extra assistance *Family support team
Results	Students in Success for All schools have consistently outperformed students in control schools on reading tests; effects have been even more pronounced for students in the bottom quartile
Impact on Instruction	Prescribed curriculum and cooperative learning in reading classes; other subjects not affected (see Roots & Wings for a description of other curricular components that can be added)
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Building advisory committee; full-time facilitator; family support team; tutors
Impact on Schedule	Daily 90-minute reading periods; tutoring
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	Yes (reading)
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Family support team works to increase parental involvement
Technology	None required
Materials	Detailed materials provided

Origin/Scope
Success for All was founded by Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers from Johns Hopkins University. It was first implemented in a single elementary school in Baltimore in 1987. The following year it expanded to six schools (five in Baltimore and one in Philadelphia). By January 1998, it had grown to 747 schools in 40 states.

General Description
Success for All restructures elementary schools (usually high poverty Title I schools) to ensure that every child learns to read in the early grades. The idea is to prevent reading problems from appearing in the first place and to intervene swiftly and intensively if problems do appear.

Success for All prescribes specific curricula and instructional strategies for teaching reading, including shared story reading, listening comprehension, vocabulary building, sound blending exercises, and writing activities. Teachers are provided with detailed materials for use in the classroom. Students often work cooperatively, reading to each other and discussing story content and structure. From second through sixth grade, students use basals or novels (but not workbooks). All students are required to spend 20 minutes at home each evening reading books of their choice.

Students are grouped according to reading level for one 90-minute reading period per day. The rest of the day they are assigned to regular age-grouped grades. Every eight weeks, teachers assess student progress using formal measures of reading comprehension as well as observation and judgment. The assessments determine changes in the composition of the reading groups and help identify students in need of extra assistance. Those students receive one-on-one tutoring for 20 minutes per day at times other than regular reading or math periods. First graders get priority for tutoring. Tutors are generally certified teachers, although well-qualified paraprofessionals may tutor children with less severe reading problems.

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

For more information, contact:
Success for All
200 West Towsontown Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21204-5200
Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-324-4444
E-mail: sfa@successforall.net
Web site: http://www.successforall.net

Reading/Language Arts Models

Breakthrough to Literacy

IN BRIEF

Developer	Carolyn Brown and Jerry Zimmermann, University of Iowa
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	Over 1,850
Level	K-2
Primary Goal	To teach connection of oral language to print
Main Features	*Daily story reading *Interactive computer software *Print materials to integrate computer curriculum *Children progress at their own pace
Results	Breakthrough students in several districts have scored higher on standardized reading tests than students in control groups have
Impact on Instruction	Suggested routine for 10-15 minutes of reading interaction and 15-20 minutes on the computer (in reading classes only)
Impact on Organizational Staffing	None
Impact on Schedule	None
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	In the developmental stages
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parents are asked to read to their child and listen to the child "read" to them every night
Technology	Computer software is provided; 2-3 computers and 1 printer per classroom are necessary
Materials	Provided

Origin/Scope
Breakthrough to Literacy was founded by Carolyn Brown and Jerry Zimmermann in 1981 at the University of Iowa. Since its initial implementation in Dallas public schools in 1994, Breakthrough (previously called Foundations in Reading) has been adopted in over 1,100 schools in 19 states, serving over 25,000 children.

General Description
Breakthrough to Literacy focuses on teaching pre-kindergarten through second grade students to relate oral language and pictures to print. The program provides each child, at his or her level of language/literacy development, stories and access to direct and explicit instruction for phonemic awareness. This is achieved through the use of "big books," pupil books, and computer modules.

The typical Breakthrough classroom focuses on one big book per week (10-15 minutes per day). The book is read to the children every day with a different objective. On Monday, for example, the objective is introduction. The teacher introduces the author and illustrator and reads the book to the students. They discuss what they liked or disliked about it and then the teacher reads it again. On Tuesday, the objective is review. The teacher asks the children to recall what they learned the previous day and to role play based on the story's characters. Wednesday, integration is the focus. The children are asked to relate what they've learned to something in their own lives; and so on through Friday.

Children also spend 15-20 minutes per day at the computer making connections between what they have "read" and what they see on the computer screen, and vice versa. When the teacher chooses a new big book, the children have already seen those words on the computer several times. This combination of literature-based instruction and instructional technology is intended to help the children develop better phonemic awareness, enhance their vocabulary development, and promote an understanding of sound-symbol relationships. Children progress through the program at their own pace due to daily one-on-one sessions with teachers and computers.

The program does not end in the classroom, however. Parents are urged to read to their children and have stories "read" to them every night.

For more information, contact:
Henry Layne
The Wright Group
19201 120th Avenue NE
Bothell, WA 98011
Phone: 800-523-2371, ext. 3433
Fax: 425-486-7704

Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition
(CIRC)

IN BRIEF

Developer	Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University
Year Established	1986
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	About 1,000
Level	2-8
Primary Goal	To improve reading and writing skills
Main Features	*Story-related activities in teams *Direct instruction in reading comprehension *Integrated language arts/writing
Results	Improved reading and writing achievement
Impact on Instruction	Increased cooperative learning practices; focus on literature and basals; focus on higher-order learning
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Reorganizes classroom for student teamwork; requires no extra staffing
Impact on Schedule	Longer reading periods are encouraged
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes, through Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (BCIRC)
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Encouraged but not required
Technology	Schools apply existing technology
Materials	Teachers' manuals; curriculum materials matched to basals and novels

Origin/Scope
Research and development on cooperative learning began at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of schools in 1970. Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) was developed in collaboration with schools during 1986-88 to provide elementary schools with a full comprehensive reading and writing curriculum based on research on cooperative learning and research on effective reading and writing practices. CIRC is now used in grades 2-8. Development of materials and processes has continued based on use of the program in schools. Program developers include Robert Slavin, Robert Stevens, Nancy Madden, and Anna Marie Farnish.

In 1987, research and development of Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (BCIRC), the program's Spanish adaptation, was begun.

General Description
CIRC provides curricula and instructional practices for teaching reading and writing. The practices include use of reading groups, students working in teams, story-related activities, partner reading, story grammar and story-related writing, words-out-loud exercises, word meaning exercises, story retell, partner checking, regular assessment, direct instruction in reading comprehension, independent reading, and integrated writing and language arts. CIRC includes curriculum materials to be used in these processes.

For more information, contact:
Dorothy Sauer
CIRC Program
Center for Social Organization of Schools
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore MD 21218
Phone: 1-800-548-4998
Fax: 410-516-6671
Web site: http://www.successforall.com

Dr. Margarita Calderon
BCIRC Program
CRESPAR/SFA Regional Center
1816 Larry Hinson
El Paso, TX 79936
Phone: 915-595-5971
Fax: 915-595-6747
e-mail: MeCalde@aol.com or mcalderon@csos.jhu.edu

First Steps™

IN BRIEF

Developer	State Education Department of Western Australia
Year Established	1989
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	Over 191 districts in the USA
Level	K-10
Primary Goal	To provide teachers with the tools to link assessment, teaching, and learning and to maximize each child's growth in language and literacy
Main Features	*Developmental Continua in reading, spelling, writing, and oral language *Direct links to developmentally appropriate teaching strategies and learning activities
Results	Several studies have shown improvement in the reading abilities of First Steps students
Impact on Instruction	Whole class, small group, and individual instruction
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Whole school participation recommended; First Steps tutor recommended to provide ongoing schoolwide support
Impact on Schedule	None
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Parents support student growth in literacy through information provided in Parents as Partners booklets and workshops
Technology	None required
Materials	Teacher resource material; training materials provided for First Steps tutors

Origin/Scope
First Steps was developed in 1989 by the Education Department of Western Australia. It has been available in the United States since 1995 under the management of Heinemann USA. It is currently in use by over 600 schools in Australia, as well as in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, Canada, and throughout the English-speaking world. In the United States, over 191 school districts are using First Steps.

General Description
First Steps is a literacy resource that supports schools in helping children in kindergarten through tenth grade make progress in their language and literacy development. Specifically, First Steps concentrates on reading, writing, spelling, and oral language development. Three components form the core of First Steps:

- School development, which is incorporated into all First Steps training sessions to ensure that the whole staff can make informed, collaborative choices in response to student need;

- Professional development and ongoing support that emphasize the importance of theoretical understandings combined with sound practice; and

- Curriculum materials that consist of the Developmental Continua (a diagnostic framework that maps out the stages of language and literacy development) and resource books that complement the continua and provide teachers with additional developmentally appropriate activities.

Using the First Steps Developmental Continua, teachers, schools, and districts assess students' understandings and skills, select activities that link directly to assessment, and report student progress systematically and accurately to parents, school boards, and state departments of education.

Thus, First Steps serves both as a practical teaching resource and as a vehicle for accountability. It gives educators strategies for logically linking instructional activities to assessment. It enables all education stakeholders, including parents, to monitor the progress of children's language and literacy development. It provides continuity of assessment and teaching from year to year. And it creates a common language for teachers, principals, parents, and children regarding learning, assessment, and reporting. In addition, First Steps professional development models are customized to meet the individual needs of the schools and districts that implement them.

For more information, contact:
Dennis Jackson or Kevlynn Annandale
361 Hanover Street
Portsmouth, NH 03801
Phone: 800-541-2086 (Jackson, ext.118, Annandale, ext.135)
Fax: 800-354-2004
E-mail: firststeps@heinemann.com
First Steps Web: http://www.heinemann.com/firststeps

National Writing Project

IN BRIEF

Developer	James Gray, University of California, Berkeley
Year Established	1974
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	160 sites
Level	K-16
Primary Goal	To improve the teaching of writing
Main Features	*Teachers-teaching-teachers model of professional development *Local and national networks of exemplary practitioners *Professional development programs designed collaboratively with schools and districts to reflect local needs *Writing promoted as a tool for learning across the curriculum
Results	In two studies, NWP students (including English-language learners) have had higher grades, writing assessment scores, and/or college placement rates than students in control groups
Impact on Instruction	Provides strategies for linking instruction, curriculum, standards, and assessment in the teaching of writing
Impact on Organizational Staffing	None required
Impact on Schedule	None required
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Professional development programs can be designed with parent engagement components
Technology	Professional development programs can be designed with technology components
Materials	None required

Origin/Scope
The National Writing Project (NWP) began in 1974 at the University of California, Berkeley where its founder, James Gray, established a program for K-16 teachers called the Bay Area Writing Project. The NWP has now been replicated at 160 sites in 46 states and Puerto Rico.

General Description
The NWP has three major goals: (a) to improve the teaching of writing at all grade levels, (b) to improve professional development programs for teachers, and (c) to improve the professional standing of classroom teachers. Writing Project sites are typically housed in universities and serve multiple schools and school districts. Local sites accomplish these goals by supporting a K-16 network of exemplary teachers of writing who are able to work with schools around their professional development needs.

In practice, each local site identifies and recruits exemplary teachers for an annual invitational institute on its campus. Most often held in the summer, this intensive institute convenes teachers to demonstrate and examine their approaches to teaching writing; consider strategies for using writing as a tool in all subject areas; learn about how to teach writing by writing themselves; study theory and research underpinning best practices in the teaching of writing; and prepare themselves to lead professional development programs in the schools during the academic year.

Writing project workshops in the schools, then, are characterized first by the fact that they are taught by credible teachers, the graduates of the invitational institutes. Second, these workshops are tailored to the needs of the contracting school or district. The local project works in concert with the school faculty to design full professional development programs with sessions matched to the school, teacher, and student context. Programs are conducted in a series, rather than as one-shot events, so that teachers can receive support as they make changes in their practices. Third, writing project programs can be designed to include features like peer coaching or to work with regular school support structures like school improvement committees or grade level teams.

National Writing Project sites also provide an array of other programs to serve individual teachers and schools, such as open enrollment summer institutes, teacher research groups, assessment workshops, emergent literacy programs, a series on writing across the curriculum, support for new teachers, writing and reading conferences, young writer's programs, seminars and study groups, and parent workshops. Program offerings at local sites typically reflect the needs and interests of teachers in their service areas.

For more information, contact:
Richard Sterling
Executive Director
National Writing Project
5511 Tolman Hall, #1670
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
Phone: 510-642-0963
Fax: 510-642-4545
E-mail: nwp@socrates.berkeley.edu
Web site: http://www-gse.berkeley.edu/Research/NWP/nwp.html

Reading Recovery

IN BRIEF

Developer	Marie Clay
Year Established	1984 (United States)
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	9,815
Level	First grade
Primary Goal	To bring first grade students who are having difficulty learning to read and write to the average level of their class as quickly as possible (12-20 weeks)
Main Features	*One-to-one tutoring program *Individualized instruction *Specially trained teachers
Results	83% of the children who receive a complete program achieve the program goal
Impact on Instruction	No necessary impact on regular reading classroom instruction, though number of low-performing students is reduced
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Opportunity for highly focused professional development
Impact on Schedule	30-minute pull-out lessons; Reading Recovery teachers are expected to work at least one-half of each day in Reading Recovery
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Daily reading and reconstruction of a cut-up sentence written by the students; occasional observation of lessons
Technology	Minimal requirements: completion of scanable reporting forms to follow students' progress
Materials	Little books, writing materials, easel, magnetic letters, markers, erasable board, reporting forms; one-way mirror at training site

Origin/Scope
Reading Recovery was developed by New Zealand educator and psychologist Marie M. Clay. The program came to the United States via Ohio State University in 1984. In the 1996-97 school year a total of 9,815 U.S. schools were using Reading Recovery in 48 states plus the District of Columbia and Department of Defense Dependent Schools (DoDDS).

General Description
Reading Recovery is an intensive early intervention literacy program. First-grade children who score in the lowest 20 percent of their class (based on individual measures of assessment and teacher judgment) are eligible to participate. Their regular classroom instruction is supplemented with daily one-to-one, 30-minute lessons for 12-20 weeks with a specially trained teacher.

Reading Recovery lessons provide children with individualized instruction that focuses on their strengths, experience with books and stories, accelerated learning expectations, and strategies that help them become independent learners. Each day, Reading Recovery teachers record the details of every lesson they provide. Instruction continues until participants can read at or above the class average and can demonstrate the use of independent reading and writing strategies. The student is then "discontinued," thus providing the opportunity for another child to enter Reading Recovery.

Typically, Reading Recovery teachers spend a half-day teaching Reading Recovery lessons and a half-day in other instructional activities. Each Reading Recovery teacher is expected to serve at least eight children over the course of one academic year.

For more information, contact:
Jean F. Bussell, Executive Director
Reading Recovery Council of North America
1929 Kenny Road, Suite 100
Columbus, OH 43210-1069
Phone: 614-292-1795
Fax: 614-292-4404
E-mail: bussell.4@osu.edu

Mathematics Models

Connected Mathematics Project

IN BRIEF

Developer	Connected Mathematics Project, based at Michigan State University
Year Established	1991
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	Approximately 2,200 schools
Level	6-8
Primary Goal	To help teachers and students develop deep and long- lasting mathematical understanding, reasoning, and skills
Main Features	"Investigations," or explorations of rich problems that embody important mathematical concepts *Connections among ideas *Emphasis on inquiry *Multi-dimensional assessment package
Results	CMP participants significantly outperformed comparison students on problem solving and proportional reasoning measures; eighth-grade CMP students significantly outperformed non-CMP counterparts on the ITBS
Impact on Instruction	See Main Features; also requires use of graphing calculators
Impact on Organizational Staffing	None
Impact on Schedule	Designed for average class periods; however, periods of 60+ minutes are desirable
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Schools are encouraged to use Getting to Know CMP to acquaint parents with CMP materials and ideas for helping their children
Technology	Scientific calculator for grade 6; graphing calculator for grades 7 and 8; computers optional
Materials	Complete student books; teacher books with assessments and black-line masters, and a Getting to Know CMP book

Origin/Scope
The Connected Mathematics Project (CMP), headquartered at Michigan State University, was funded from 1991-1997 by the National Science Foundation. Project directors are Glenda Lappan, William Fitzgerald, and Elizabeth Phillips of Michigan State University; James Fey of the University of Maryland; and Susan Friel of the University of North Carolina. CMP is currently implemented in about 2,200 schools in all 50 states plus Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico.

General Description
CMP is a mathematics curriculum for middle school students that is designed to foster knowledge and skill in using the vocabulary, forms of representation, materials, tools, techniques, and intellectual methods of the discipline of mathematics. CMP is intended to enable students to define and solve problems with reason, insight, inventiveness, and technical proficiency. The development of CMP has focused on the tight alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The overall project goal is to enable all students to reason and communicate proficiently in mathematics.

CMP development has been guided by five instructional themes:

- ***Mathematical Investigations:*** The curriculum is organized around "big ideas" in mathematics - clusters of important, related mathematical concepts, processes, ways of thinking, skills, and problem-solving strategies - that are studied in depth with the development of deep understanding as a goal.
- ***Reasoning:*** Students grow in their ability to reason effectively with information represented in pictorial, graphic, numeric, symbolic, and verbal forms, and to move flexibly among these representations.
- ***Teaching for Understanding***: Instruction emphasizes inquiry and discovery of mathematical ideas through investigation of rich problem situations.
- ***Connections***: The curriculum emphasizes significant connections among various mathematical topics and problems in other school subjects. The curriculum offers an opportunity to revisit and deepen understanding of ideas over time.
- ***Technology***: Selection of mathematical goals and teaching approaches reflects the information processing capabilities of calculators and computers and the fundamental changes these tools are making in the way people learn and apply their knowledge.

During grades six through eight, CMP students develop knowledge and skill within five mathematical strands: number, geometry and measurement, probability, statistics, and algebra. Outcomes are specified for each of these areas by the end of eighth grade.

CMP is a problem-centered curriculum. It is organized into units that address mathematical ideas through a series of "investigations." Each investigation contains problems for teachers and students to explore. As students explore a series of connected problems, they develop deep understandings of important mathematical concepts embedded within the problems.

For more information, contact:
Elizabeth Phillips
Connected Mathematics Project
A715 Wells Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
Phone: 517-432-2870
Fax: 517-432-2872
E-mail: cmp@math.msu.edu
Web site: http://www.mth.msu.edu/cmp

Core-Plus Mathematics Project/Contemporary

Mathematics in Context

IN BRIEF

Developer	Core-Plus Mathematics Project
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (Nov. 1998)	200
Level	High school, accelerated 8th grade
Primary Goal	To teach powerful mathematics for all students
Main Features	*Integrated, connected strands *mathematical modeling and problem solving *core topics accessible to all students *collaborative group investigations *multi-dimensional assessment
Results	CPMP students have outperformed comparison groups on standardized tests of quantitative thinking and NAEP items; more students take more mathematics
Impact on Instruction	Materials promote active learning, active teaching, and assessment; graphics calculators are used as tools for exploration
Impact on Organizational Staffing	All teachers are encouraged to start teaching CPMP at Course 1 and move up a course each year
Impact on Schedule	Common planning periods for staff teaching same course (encouraged); works well in block schedules and traditional two-semester schedules
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Encouraged early in adoption process
Technology	Graphics calculators
Materials	Calculator software, linkage strips for space-shape study, basic school supplies

Origin/Scope
Research and development for Contemporary Mathematics in Context (CMIC) was funded by a series of grants from the National Science Foundation to the Core-Plus Mathematics Project (CPMP), directed by Christian Hirsch of Western Michigan University, Arthur Coxford of the University of Michigan, James Fey of the University of Maryland, and Harold Schoen of the University of Iowa. Each course goes through a three-year research and development process. Courses 1, 2, and 3 have been published by Everyday Learning Corporation, and Course 4 was available in the summer of 2000. CMIC materials are currently being used in about 200 schools.

General Description
CMIC is a four-year integrated mathematical sciences curriculum for high schools: a three-year sequence for all students, plus a fourth-year course continuing the preparation of students for college mathematics. Its goal is to prepare students for success in college, careers, and daily life in contemporary society. CMIC content and pedagogy are based on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards. The curriculum builds on the theme of mathematics as sense-making. Through investigations of real-life contexts, students develop a rich understanding of important mathematics that makes sense to them and, in turn, enables them to make sense out of new situations and problems.

CMIC courses share the following mathematical and instructional features:

- ***Multiple connected strands***: Each year of the curriculum features four strands - algebra and functions, statistics and probability, geometry and trigonometry, and discrete mathematics.
- ***Mathematical modeling***: The curriculum emphasizes mathematical modeling, including data collection, representation, interpretation, prediction, and simulation.
- ***Access***: The curriculum is designed so that topics are accessible to all students, with methods for accommodating differences in student performance.
- ***Graphics calculators***: This technology allows for multiple representations - numerical, graphical, and symbolic and a focus on goals in which mathematical thinking is central.
- ***Active learning***: CMIC offers rich problem situations that involve students in investigating, conjecturing, verifying, applying, evaluating, and communicating mathematical ideas.
- ***Multi-dimensional assessment***: Student progress is assessed through both curriculum-embedded and supplementary assessment procedures.

For more information, contact:
Marcia Weller Weinhold, Outreach Coordinator
Core-Plus Mathematics Project
4408 Everett Tower
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
Phone: 616-387-4562
Fax: 616-387-4546
E-mail: cpmp@wmich.edu
Web site: http://www.wmich.edu/math-stat/cpmp

Interactive Mathematics Program

IN BRIEF

Developer	Diane Resek and Dan Fendel (San Francisco State University); Sherry Fraser and Lynne Alper (University of California, Berkeley)
Year Established	1989
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	243
Level	9-12
Primary Goal	To make higher level mathematics accessible to more kinds of students
Main Features	*Integrated core curriculum that replaces the traditional mathematics sequence *Focus on developing student understanding
Results	SAT scores comparable to those of traditional students; high scores in probability, statistics, problem-solving, and quantitative reasoning; higher overall GPAs and more math taken
Impact on Instruction	Hands-on experiences; open-ended projects; cooperative learning; written and oral communication emphasized; manipulatives, models, and graphing calculators
Impact on Organizational Staffing	Starts with at least two teachers who must share planning time
Impact on Schedule	None
Students Served	
Title I	Yes
English-language learners	Yes
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Many assignments require family involvement
Technology	Daily use of graphing calculators
Materials	Textbooks, teacher resource materials, manipulatives

Origin/Scope
The Interactive Mathematics Program (IMP) began in 1989. Directed by Diane Resek and Dan Fendel, mathematics professors at San Francisco State University, along with Sherry Fraser and Lynne Alper, mathematics teachers at the University of California, Berkeley, the program was originally piloted in three schools in California. It has since expanded to 243 schools across 21 states, and is currently being implemented in French-speaking Canada.

General Description
IMP is a four-year high school core mathematics curriculum intended to replace the traditional Algebra 1/Geometry/Algebra 2/Trig/PreCalculus sequence. It consists of 20 units, 5 per year, which are integrated and problem-centered. The content goes beyond what is traditionally taught in high school mathematics by offering units covering probability, statistics, discrete mathematics, and matrix algebra. It focuses on developing student understanding by using investigations, hands-on experiences, group learning, and open-ended projects. The idea is to make high-level mathematics more accessible to students with varied backgrounds and abilities. Other important features of the program include an emphasis on written and oral communication, daily use of graphing calculators, and a wide variety of assessment tools.

For more information, contact:
Janice Bussey
IMP Outreach Coordinator
2420 Van Layden Way
Modesto, CA 95356
Phone: 888-628-4467
Fax: 209-575-2750
E-mail: jbimp@telis.org

University of Chicago School Mathematics Project

IN BRIEF

Developer	University of Chicago School Mathematics Project
Year Established	1983
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	Approximately 4 million students
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	To improve the performance and participation levels of the vast majority of students K-12
Main Features	K-12 mathematics curriculum use of applications, readings, problem solving, and technology to lay groundwork for depth and breadth of mathematics understanding
Results	K-6 students do as well on computation and better in areas such as data and fractions; secondary students score as well on traditional tests and higher on problem solving and applications
Impact on Instruction	Prescribed curriculum
Impact on Organizational Staffing	None
Impact on Schedule	None
Students Served	
Title I	No
English-language learners	No
Urban	Yes
Rural	Yes
Parental Involvement	Home Links: materials for parents of elementary students that promote review and enrichment
Technology	Calculators or graphing calculators (depending on the grade) and/or computers must be available for students' use
Materials	Wide range of materials for grades K-12

Origin/Scope
The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project, founded in 1983 by an organization of the same name, offers a complete mathematics curriculum and materials for teachers for grades K-12. It is now being used by approximately four million students throughout the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and abroad.

General Description
The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project (UCSMP) seeks to improve mathematics education for the vast majority of students in grades K-12. The project began by researching the teaching of mathematics through real life applications, including the examination of mathematics curricula taught in other countries. UCSMP has gone on to develop innovative materials for the teaching of mathematics as well as teacher training programs. It continues to engage in extensive evaluations of its own work. UCSMP develops its materials with several key goals in mind: to update mathematics curricula, to upgrade student achievement, and to increase the number of students continuing their mathematics education beyond algebra and geometry.

The project has three major components: elementary, secondary, and resource development. UCSMP materials, including textbooks, teacher resource kits, and workbooks, are published by the Everyday Learning Corporation and Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley. Translations of foreign textbooks and evaluation reports are published by the project, by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), and by the American Mathematical Society.

UCSMP's K-6 curriculum helps children make the transition from intuition and concrete operations to abstractions and symbol processing skills. In the early stages of this curriculum, the program emphasizes playful, verbal interactions and manipulative activities. This helps create a mathematics-rich atmosphere in the classroom and helps lay the groundwork for a greater breadth and depth of mathematical understanding. The curriculum in UCSMP's secondary texts (grades 6-12) stresses the use of applications, readings, problem solving, and technology. Both the elementary and secondary components of UCSMP actively involve teachers in the writing of their materials.

For more information, contact:
Carol Siegel
UCSMP
University of Chicago
5835 South Kimbark
Chicago, IL 60637
Phone: 773-702-1130
Fax: 773-702-0248
e-mail: ucsmp@cicero.uchicago.edu