Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing below Grade Level:

A Resource for Supporting and Evaluating Teachers

The following table identifies major categories of research-based practices for teaching students performing below grade level (Column 1), including general instructional practices; reading, writing and mathematics instructional strategies; formative assessment strategies; and teacher collaboration practices.

In addition, it provides specific examples (though not exhaustive) of research-based best practices in teaching students performing below grade level (Column 2) and how teacher evaluators can identify evidence of these practices in classroom observation, teacher conferences or other sources of evidence (Column 3). The citations and references provided in Column 4 have complete bibliographic information at the end of the document.

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	**Specific Examples**	**Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation**	**Citations/ References**
GENERAL INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES			
Academic Engaged Time	• Use of predictable routines and signals that have been taught and practiced by students so that instructional time is maximized ☐ Posted agenda ☐ White board configuration ☐ Hand signals or clapping patterns ☐ Line-up procedures ☐ Transition procedures ☐ Materials distribution and collection ☐ Music cues ☐ Code words ☐ Practicing routines (beginning of the school year or when introducing a new procedure)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Echevarria & Short, 2000; Peregoy & Boyle, 2008; The Education Trust, 2005)
Curriculum, Instruction and Assessments Linked	• Teachers use standards and assessments to monitor their teaching. • In courses that have no external standards and assessments, teachers may create them (e.g., SLOs) to ensure that students are	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan	(Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2010, n.d.; The Education Trust, 2005)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
to Content Standards	getting the instruction they need.	• Pre-conference • Post-conference	
Universal Design in Learning (UDL) Principles: 1. **WHAT:** Present content in multiple ways 2. **HOW:** Allow students to express what they know in multiple ways 3. **WHY:** Capture and maintain student interest and motivation	• Teacher may use visuals, short video clips, role play, discussion, debate, etc., to support a textual reading • Teacher may use manipulatives, graphics, symbols, animation, modeling, etc., to present mathematics content • Teacher uses multiple methods to check for understanding and allow students to demonstrate their learning, including: ☐ Thumbs Up, Thumbs Down ☐ Self-Assessment activities ☐ Think (Write) Pair Share ☐ Use of leveled sentence frames ☐ Responses to leveled questions ☐ Quick drawing or sketching ☐ Response cards ☐ Example/Non-example ☐ Posters/comic strips ☐ Reading response journals ☐ Oral presentations or demonstrations • Teacher builds in opportunities for student choice, connects objectives to real-world situations, and eliminates learning distractions (e.g., noise levels when students are reading, overload of sensory stimulation)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(CAST, 2011) http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlguidelines/downloads
Response to Intervention (RtI) Principles: 1. **Primary prevention:** high	• Teacher teaches the core curriculum using research-based instructional strategies to help students access grade-level content (see the remainder of the document for examples of these strategies) • Teacher uses instructional practices that are culturally and linguistically responsive	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-	(National Center on Response to Intervention, 2010) http://www.rti4success.org/

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
quality core instruction that meets the needs of most (80%) students 2. **Secondary prevention** for the remaining 20%, including evidence-based intervention in small groups 3. **Tertiary prevention** and individualized intervention(s) of increased intensity for students (2-7%) who show minimal response to secondary prevention	• Teacher engages in once-a-year universal screening to determine students' current level of performance • Teacher conducts Progress Monitoring at regular intervals to determine if students are responding to intervention • Teachers collaboratively engage in data-based decision making to inform instruction within the classroom and allow movement within the multi-level system (e.g., use of formative and benchmark assessments focused on specific Common Core State Standards and discrete skills) • Teacher provides differentiated learning activities (e.g., mixed instructional grouping, use of learning centers, peer tutoring) to address individual needs • Teacher makes accommodations to ensure all students have access to the instructional program (e.g., use of Assistive Technology [see below], strategies for helping English learners and non-readers access grade-level content and text [see below and see ELL document]) • Teacher identifies interventions, as needed, to address behavior problems that prevent students from demonstrating the academic skills they possess (e.g., use of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports [see below]) • In **Tier 2**, evidence-based interventions are well defined in terms of duration, frequency, and length of sessions, and the interventions demonstrate fidelity to research-based models [see below] • In **Tier 3**, teachers provide intensive and individual support to remediate existing problems and prevent more severe problems [see Students with Disabilities document]	conference • School-wide data analysis • Observation of collaborative teams • Observation of collaboration between general education and special education teachers	
Use of Assistive Technology (AT) as needed	• Examples include (but are not limited to): ☐ Abbreviation expanders ☐ Alternative keyboards ☐ Audio books and publications	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-	(Great Schools Inc., 2012) http://www.greatschools.org/articles/?topics=188&language=EN

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
	☐ Electronic math work sheets ☐ Freeform database software ☐ Graphic organizers and outlining ☐ Information/data managers ☐ Optical character recognition ☐ Paper-based computer pen ☐ Personal FM listening systems ☐ Portable word processors ☐ Proofreading programs ☐ Speech-recognition programs ☐ Speech synthesizers/screen readers ☐ Talking calculators ☐ Talking spell checkers and electronic dictionaries ☐ Variable-speed digital recorders ☐ Word-prediction programs	conference • Post-conference • Observation of collaboration between general education and special education teachers	
Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)	• Teacher implements school-wide behavioral expectations, including the use or teaching of: ☐ rules ☐ routines ☐ prosocial behaviors ☐ environment arrangement to prevent the development and occurrence of problem behavior ☐ instruction to prevent initial occurrences of behavior the school would like to target for change ☐ data to make decisions and solve problems ☐ universal screening and regular monitoring of student behavior and performance • Teacher teaches, models, provides opportunities for student practice of, observes and recognizes examples of appropriate student behavior, including: ☐ Respect Yourself, Respect Others, and Respect Property	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference • School-wide behavioral plan	(OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2009) www.pbis.org

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
	☐ Be Safe, Be Responsible, Be Respectful ☐ Respect Relationships and Respect Responsibilities • **Tier 2:** Teacher provides specialized small group interventions for students with at-risk behavior • **Tier 3:** Tertiary Level (Individual) – teacher provides or collaborates with specialists who provide specialized, individualized systems for students at high risk for dangerous or highly disruptive behavior or those behaviors that impede learning or result in social exclusion		
TEACHING STUDENTS BELOW GRADE LEVEL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS			
Addressing Gaps in the Code: • Phonemic/Phono-logical awareness • Alphabetic knowledge **CCSS Foundational Skills 1, 2**[1]	• Systematic instruction and practice in orally identifying and producing sounds, and sorting words based on beginning, middle, and ending sounds ☐ Rhyming ☐ Onset/rime blending ☐ Onset/rime segmentation ☐ Phoneme blending ☐ Phoneme segmentation ☐ Phoneme substitution, addition, deletion • Systematic instruction and practice to recognize all 52 letters of the alphabet (upper- and lower-case)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Adams, 1990; Adams, Foorman, Lundberg, & Beeler, 1998; Ehri, et al., 2001; Juel, 1988; National Reading Panel, 2000)
Addressing Gaps in the Code: • Phonics and decoding • Multisyllabic decoding	• Focused instruction of phonics/ decoding with immediate practice in text (including consonants, short/long vowels, consonant blends and digraphs, diphthongs, silent consonants, and syllabication) • Picture Sorts by sound • Use of software to reinforce sound/spelling relationships	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-	(Adams, 1990, 2011; Blachman, et al., 2004; Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, Mehta, & Schatschneider, 1998; Lesaux & Siegel, 2003; National Reading Panel, 2000; O'Connor, Fulmer,

[1] CCSS – Common Core State Standards. Foundational Skills are not ends in themselves, but are necessary prerequisites to effective text comprehension.

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
CCSS Foundational Skills 3	• Regular assessment to determine which sound/spelling relationships have been mastered • Multisyllabic decoding instruction: □ BEST—Break apart the word, Examine each part (prefix, suffix, root, syllables), Say each part, Try the whole word in context (5-10 minutes per day at most) □ Word Analysis Chart used in instruction	conference	Harty, & Bell, 2005)
Addressing Gaps in the Code: • Code-switching/ contrastive analysis **CCR Anchor Standards[2] for Speaking and Listening, 6** **CCR Anchor Standards for Language, 1, 3, 6** **CCR Anchor Standards for Writing, 4**	• Provide explicit instruction and practice in code-switching or contrastive analysis between: • Casual writing and formal writing • First and second languages • Dialects and standard English □ "Accurate assessment requires that we separate dialect influence from decoding error in Standard English" (R. Wheeler, Cartwright, & Swords, 2012, p. 418) • General and technical (domain-specific) language (e.g., plane, equal)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Laufer & Girsai, 2008; Turner, 2009; R. Wheeler, et al., 2012; R. S. Wheeler, 2006, 2008)
Oral Reading Fluency (accuracy, rate, expression) and Word Recognition	• Explicit instruction in high-frequency irregular sight words • Constant Time Delay (sight word practice with 3-second delay to promote word recall) • Use of Word Walls	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-	(Rasinski, 2003; Wexler, Vaughn, Edmonds, & Reutebuch, 2008) (O'Connor, 2006)

[2] CCR Anchor Standards – College and Career Readiness Standards (K-12) from the Common Core State Standards

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
(automaticity) • Link the Teaching of Oral Reading Fluency to proven Word Recognition and Comprehen-sion Strategies **CCSS Foundational Skills 3, 4**	• Practice games to increase automaticity (e.g., I have ____; who has ____?) • Pattern and predictable books • Partner reading • Unison reading • Choral reading • Phrased Text Lessons (for modeling and practicing reading with expression and phrasing) • Limited use of repeated reading	conference • Post-conference	
Vocabulary • Explicit and Systematic Vocabulary Instruction • Regular opportunities to practice and apply new vocabulary • Word learning strategies taught • Wide reading of fiction/non-fiction • Morphemic analysis **CCR Anchor Standards for Language, 4, 5, 6**	• Teacher has pre-selected high-utility domain-specific and general vocabulary words for instructional focus • Use of Word Knowledge Rating Chart or Anticipation Guide to pre-assess student understanding • Links between new words and previously-learned words or concepts • Clear, student-friendly definitions and examples • Use of visuals, short video clips, or graphics • Opportunities to check for understanding during vocabulary instruction • Regular opportunities to practice new words in context • Meanings of Latin and Greek roots, prefixes and suffixes • Structural and morphemic analysis of words • Use of student-friendly dictionaries • Appropriate use of context clues • Academic word families • Multiple meaning words • Use of graphic organizers • Examples/non-examples (Frayer model) • Word Walls • Personal dictionaries	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Beck, McKeown, & Kucan, 2002; Feldman & Kinsella, 2005; Hairrell, et al., 2011; Harmon, Hedrick, & Wood, 2005; Kinsella, 2003; Marzano, 2004; Stahl & Nagy, 2006)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
	• Vocabulary games for review • I have _____. Who has _____? • Picture This • Non-linguistic representations (sketches, motions) to represent newly acquired vocabulary		
Reading Comprehension Support • Scaffolding of complex text • Leveled texts on same topic • Repeated reading for different purposes • Direct instruction of key words and concepts, with student practice • Exploration of subtopics involving more complex texts **CCSS Anchor Standards for Reading, 1-11**	• Scaffolding of complex text "1. Select a topic about which your students need to learn. If the students are below grade level, begin with shorter, simpler texts. 2. Teach the key words and concepts directly, engaging students in using and discussing them to be sure they are well-anchored. 3. As the students learn the core vocabulary and basic concepts of the domain, they will become ready to explore its subtopics (more complex texts!)" (Adams, 2011, p. 93) ☐ Use of visual displays, realia, and actions to support comprehension of complex text ☐ Graphic organizers ☐ Clustering, webbing, mapping ☐ Venn diagrams, compare/ contrast matrices ☐ Branching (e.g., family tree) ☐ KWL charts ☐ Thinking maps ☐ Flow charts ☐ Storyboards or timelines ☐ Cause/effect relationships (e.g., Fishbone) ☐ T-charts ☐ Somebody Wanted But So ☐ Semantic maps ☐ Sense charts or 5 W charts ☐ Mnemonic devices ☐ Computer-assisted instruction • Instruction and student practice in leveled texts along these	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(ACT, 2006; Adams, 2011; Bowers, Fitts, Quirk, & Jung, 2010; Gajria, Jitendra, Sood, & Sacks, 2007)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
	dimensions of complexity: ☐ "Relationships (interactions among ideas or characters) ☐ Richness (amount and sophistication of information conveyed through data or literary devices) ☐ Structure (how the text is organized and how it progresses) ☐ Style (author's tone and use of language) ☐ Vocabulary (author's word choice) ☐ Purpose (author's intent in writing the text)" (ACT, 2006, p. 14) • Leveled texts, leveled questions, leveled response frames • Teacher read-aloud before independent reading • Partner reading • Teacher-guided discussion of text		
Reading Comprehension Support through Syntactical and Semantic Analysis • The teaching of language structures to develop comprehension of complex text **CCR Anchor Standards for Language, Standards 1-6**	• Comparative analysis of oral and written language ☐ Analysis of sentences to determine propositions ☐ Teaching of relevant parts of speech and their function in context ☐ Opportunities to play linguistic and conceptual categorization games	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(ACT, 2006; Adams, 2011)
Teaching of Reading/ Listening Comprehension and	• Explicit instruction in, and opportunities to practice, comprehension and self-regulation strategies while reading complex text, including:	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan	(Block & Duffy, 2008; Block, Parris, Reed, Whiteley, & Cleveland, 2009; Block, Parris,

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
Metacognitive Strategies • The teaching and practice of comprehension and metacognitive strategies (including cognitive strategy instruction) **CCR Anchor Standards for Reading, 1-11** **CCR Anchor Standards for Speaking and Listening, 1-3**	☐ Metacognition ☐ Monitoring ☐ Questioning ☐ Predicting / verifying predictions ☐ Inferring ☐ Summarizing ☐ Synthesizing ☐ Using text cues ☐ Visualizing/imaging ☐ Clarifying (fix-it strategies) ☐ Evaluating	• Pre-conference • Post-conference	& Whiteley, 2008; Boulware-Gooden, Carreker, Thornhill, & Joshi, 2007; Cubukcu, 2008; Duffy & et al., 1988; Edmonds, et al., 2009; Eilers & Pinkley, 2006; Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, & Mueller, 2001; Gunning, 2010; Hare & et al., 1989; Jitendra, Hoppes, & Xin, 2000; Johnson & von Hoff Johnson, 1986; Klingner, Vaughn, & Boardman, 2007; Kratzer & Teplin, 2005; Mills, 2009; Moats, 2001; National Reading Panel, 2000; Paris, Lipson, & Wixson, 1983; Pressley, 2006; Swanson, Edmonds, Hairrell, Vaughn, & Simmons, 2011; Teplin, 2008; Wexler, et al., 2008)
Opportunities for peer interaction around academic tasks and texts	• Cooperative group activities using purposeful grouping arrangements and structured tasks around comprehending text • Development of instructional arrangements where students work together to plan, draft, revise, and edit their compositions.	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Frey, Fisher, & Everlove, 2009; Klingner & Vaughn, 1999; Perin, 2007)
Writing Processes **CCR Anchor Standards for**	• Opportunities for students to discuss and verbalize their ideas before writing • Brainstorming, pre-writing and planning opportunities • Extended and frequent opportunities to produce writing drafts	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-	(Davidson & Koppenhaver, 1993; Fisher & Frey, 2008; Gunning, 2010; Ivey & Fisher, 2006; Kinsella, 2005; Perin,

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
Writing, 5, 6	• Instruction and practice in revising to improve specific parts of the writing craft (e.g., organizational structure, word choice, sentence variety, integration of evidence) • Instruction and practice in peer editing and self-assessment • Opportunities to publish and present writing to authentic audiences • Targeted instruction to individuals or small groups based on analysis of student writing/data • Teacher modeling of all steps in the writing process • Backwards graphic organizers • Balance between writing short, bounded texts and longer process pieces • Targeted questions to help students edit and revise their work • Use of editing checklists for student self-assessment ☐ S (Spelling) ☐ C (Capitalization) ☐ O (Order of words) ☐ P (Punctuation) ☐ E (Express complete thought)	conference • Post-conference	2007; Spandel & Stiggins, 1990; Vaughn & Bos, 2011)
Teaching of Analytic Writing and Presentation Skills • Writing for different purposes: to inform, explain, or persuade • Writing for different audiences	• Explicit cognitive strategy instruction in writing • Instruction and opportunities to practice incorporating the 6 Traits of Writing (ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency, conventions) within a writing process model • Use of mentor texts, real-world models, anchor papers and rubrics to provide clear and high expectations for student writing • STOP: Suspend judgment, Take a side, Organize ideas, Plan as you write • DARE: Develop a topic sentence, Add supporting details, Reject an argument for the other side, End with a conclusion • Instruction in summarizing a text: 1. Delete unnecessary material (practice with existing paragraphs)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Coe, Hanita, Nishioka, & Smiley, 2011; Culham, 2003; Davidson & Koppenhaver, 1993; Dixon, Carnine, & Kame'enui, 1993; Fisher & Frey, 2008; Graham, MacArthur, & Fitzgerald, 2007; Harris & Graham, 1992; Ivey & Fisher, 2006; Langer, 2001; Perin, 2007; Raphael & Englert, 1990; Spandel & Stiggins, 1990; Stein, 1994)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
CCR Anchor Standards for Writing, 1-3, 11 **CCR Anchor Standards for Speaking and Listening, 4-6**	2. Delete redundant material (practice with existing paragraphs) 3. Compose a word to replace a list of items 4. Compose a word to replace the individual parts of an action 5. Select a topic sentence 6. Invent a topic sentence if one is not available • Teachers set clear and specific goals for what students are to accomplish with their writing product. 1. What is the purpose of the assignment? 2. What are the characteristics of the final product? 3. Define each part of the product, give an example, and ask students to give examples. 4. Provide prewriting opportunities • Teach text structure (e.g., compare/contrast, problem/solution)		
Development of Writing Fluency and Stamina **CCR Anchor Standards for Writing, 10**	• Daily opportunities for students to write for different purposes □ Journals □ Reading response logs □ Quick Writes □ Exit slips □ Process pieces □ Writing explanations in math and science □ Writing for web publication □ Responding to writing prompts • Integration of longer writing tasks (process writing) over extended periods and short writing tasks (completed in one sitting) • Integration of student-selected writing tasks and topics with teacher-provided prompts and genres • Emphasis on fluency rather than correctness in the early phases of working with struggling writers • Individual oral and written feedback to students that encourages effort and growth	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Johannessen & McCann, 2009; Kinsella, 2005)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
Research/Synthesis in Writing **CCR Anchor Standards in Writing, 7-9**	• Teacher modeling and guided practice in gathering and synthesizing information from multiple sources to inform or persuade an audience • Teacher modeling and guided practice in using textual evidence to support a written argument	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Graham & Harris, 2005; Perin, 2007)
TEACHING STUDENTS BELOW GRADE LEVEL IN MATHEMATICS			
1. Visual and Graphic Depictions of Problems **CCSS Standards for Mathematical Practice, 4 (Model) and 5 (Use appropriate tools)**	• Teacher presentation of graphic depictions of problem-solving sets with multiple examples • Student practice using their own graphic organizers with guidance from teacher on which visuals to select and why • Initial use of manipulatives with a transfer from concrete to abstract	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Butler, Miller, Crehan, Babbitt, & Pierce, 2003; Gersten, et al., 2009; Witzel, Mercer, & Miller, 2003)
2. Systematic and Explicit Instruction	• Highly explicit models of steps, procedures, and/or questions to ask when solving problems • Vocabulary and strategy instruction in mathematics, with teacher modeling, student practice (with teacher guidance) followed by student restating of their learning for the day	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Baker, Gersten, & Lee, 2002; Gersten, et al., 2009; Kroesbergen & van Luit, 2003)
3. Student Think Alouds and Metacognition in Math **CCSS Standards for**	• Teachers teach students to ask themselves the following questions: □ "1. Do I understand the meaning of the words in this problem? What is the question? (problem translation, linguistic knowledge)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference	(Cardelle-Elawar, 1992, 1995; Carpenter, Fennema, Franke, Levi, & Empson, 1999; Gersten, et al., 2009)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
Mathematical Practice, 1 (Solve problems) and 2 (Reason)	☐ 2. Do I have all the information needed to solve the problem? What type of information do I need? (problem integration, schematic knowledge) ☐ 3. Do I know how to organize the information to solve the problem? Which steps should I take? What do I do first? (planning, strategic knowledge) ☐ 4. How should I calculate the solution? With which operations do I have difficulty? (problem execution, arithmetic knowledge)" (Cardelle-Elawar, 1995, p. 85) • Students explain their thinking and strategy for how they solved a problem	• Post-conference	
4. Peer-Assisted Learning Activities **CCSS Standards for Mathematical Practice, 3 (Critique)**	• Instruction and practice in using peer-assisted learning interventions, particularly for computation work	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Baker, et al., 2002; Gersten, et al., 2009; Kroesbergen & van Luit, 2003)
5. Use of Formative Assessment Data **CCSS Standards for Mathematical Practice, 4 (Model) and 6 (Use precision)**	• Teachers receive computer information on student performance and recommended next steps • Teachers not only use formative assessment data but share the information with students regarding the number of types of problems students should complete in a given amount of time or focus on next • Formative assessment occurs every 1-4 weeks within and between instructional units and affects student engagement and achievement	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference • School-wide data analysis • Observation of collaborative teams	(Baker, et al., 2002; William, 2007)

DRAFT

Research-Based Practices for Teaching Students Performing Below Grade Level	Specific Examples	Data Sources: e.g, Classroom Observation	Citations/ References
6. Automaticity / Skill Efficiency **CCSS Standards for Mathematical Practice, 6 (Use precision)**	• "Teaching is rapidly paced • Modeling by the teacher with many teacher-directed, product type of questions • Smooth transitions from demonstration to substantial amounts of error-free practice. • The teacher plays a central role in organizing, pacing, and presenting information to meet well-defined learning goals" (Hiebert & Grouws, 2007, p. 1)	• Classroom Observation • Lesson Plan • Pre-conference • Post-conference	(Brophy & Good, 1986; Hiebert & Grouws, 2007)
TEACHER PROFESSIONAL AND COLLABORATIVE PRACTICES			
Teacher Collaboration in Lesson Planning and Lesson Analysis	• Teachers collaborate to ensure that course content is consistent no matter who is teaching ☐ Lesson Study ☐ Consultancy ☐ Micro-lab ☐ Video analysis ☐ Peer observation of classroom instruction	• School-wide data analysis • Observation of collaborative teams	(Chokshi, Ertle, Fernandez, & Yoshida, 2001; Lewis, 2003; The Education Trust, 2005) http://www.nsrfharmony.org/
Use of Common Assessments linked to CCSS and/or SLOs	• Teachers create and/or analyze assessments used across a grade level or course to determine student mastery of CCSS, achievement of SLOs, or to identify students in need of intervention, remediation, acceleration or enrichment • Teachers collaboratively engage in data-based decision making to inform instruction within the classroom and allow movement within the multi-level system (e.g., use of formative and benchmark assessments focused on specific Common Core State Standards and discrete skills) ☐ Collaborative analysis of student work ☐ Academic conference ☐ Data-driven dialogue	• School-wide data analysis • Observation of collaborative teams	(Bailey & Heritage, 2008; Love, 2002; Popham, 2008) http://www.nsrfharmony.org/

DRAFT

References

ACT. (2006). Reading between the lines: What the ACT reveals about college readiness in reading. Retrieved from www.act.org

Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Adams, M. J. (2011). *Reading, language, and the mind*. Paper presented at the NYSED Network Team Institute, Albany, NY.

Adams, M. J., Foorman, B. R., Lundberg, I., & Beeler, T. (1998). *Phonemic awareness in young children*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H Brookes Publishing.

Bailey, A. L., & Heritage, M. (2008). *Formative assessment for literacy grades k-6: Building reading and academic language skills across the curriculum*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Baker, S., Gersten, R., & Lee, D.-S. (2002). A synthesis of empirical research on teaching mathematics to low- achieving students. *Elementary School Journal, 103*(1), 51-73. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1002308

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Blachman, B. A., Schatschneider, C., Fletcher, J. M., Francis, D. J., Clonan, S. M., Shaywitz, B. A., et al. (2004). Effects of intensive reading remediation for second and third Graders and a 1-year follow-up. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(3), 444-461. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/journals doi:10.1037/0022-0663.96.3.444

Block, C. C., & Duffy, G. G. (2008). Research on teaching comprehension: Where we've been and where we're going. In C. C. Block & S. R. Parris (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (Second ed., pp. 19-37). New York: The Guilford Press.

Block, C. C., Parris, S. R., Reed, K. L., Whiteley, C. S., & Cleveland, M. D. (2009). Instructional approaches that significantly increase reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*(2), 262-281.

Block, C. C., Parris, S. R., & Whiteley, C. S. (2008). CPMs: A kinesthetic comprehension strategy. *Reading Teacher, 61*(6), 460-470.

Boulware-Gooden, R., Carreker, S., Thornhill, A., & Joshi, R. M. (2007). Instruction of metacognitive strategies enhances reading comprehension and vocabulary achievement of third-grade students. *Reading Teacher, 61*(1), 70-77.

Bowers, E., Fitts, S., Quirk, M., & Jung, W. (2010). Effective strategies for developing academic English: Professional development and teacher practices. *Bilingual Research Journal, 33*(1), 95-110. Retrieved from http://www.informaworld.com, doi:10.1080/15235881003733407

DRAFT

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillan Publication Co.

Butler, F. M., Miller, S. P., Crehan, K., Babbitt, B., & Pierce, T. (2003). Fraction instruction for students with mathematics disabilities: Comparing two teaching sequences. *Learning Disabilities: Research & Practice, 18*(2), 99-111.

Cardelle-Elawar, M. (1992). Effects of teaching metacognitive skills to students with low mathematics ability. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 8*(2), 109-121.

Cardelle-Elawar, M. (1995). Effects of metacognitive instruction on low achievers in mathematics problems. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(1), 81-95.

Carpenter, T. P., Fennema, E., Franke, M. L., Levi, L., & Empson, S. B. (1999). *Children's mathematics: Cognitively Guided Instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

CAST. (2011). Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 2.0. Wakefield, MA: CAST. Retrieved from http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlguidelines/downloads.

Chokshi, S., Ertle, B., Fernandez, C., & Yoshida, M. (2001). Lesson study protocol. Retrieved from Lesson Study Research Group, Teachers College: http://www.tc.edu/lessonstudy/doc/Lesson_Study_Protocol.pdf

Coe, M., Hanita, M., Nishioka, V., & Smiley, R. (2011). *An investigation of the impact of the 6+1 Trait Writing model on grade 5 student writing achievement (NCEE 2012–4010)* Retrieved from http://edlabs.ed.gov

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2010). *New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy*. Albany, NY: New York State Education Department.

Common Core State Standards Initiative. (n.d.). *New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for Mathematics*. Albany, NY: New York State Education Department.

Cubukcu, F. (2008). Enhancing vocabulary development and reading comprehension through metacognitive strategies. *Issues in Educational Research, 18*(1), 1-11.

Culham, R. (2003). *The 6 + 1 traits of writing: The complete guide (grades 3 and up)*. New York: Scholastic.

Davidson, J., & Koppenhaver, D. (1993). *Adolescent literacy: What works and why* (Second ed.). New York: Garland Publishing.

DRAFT

Dixon, R. C., Carnine, D., & Kame'enui, E. (1993). Tools for teaching diverse learners: Using scaffolding to teach writing. *Educational Leadership, 51*(3), 100-101.

Duffy, G. G., & et al. (1988). Modeling mental processes helps poor readers become strategic readers. *Reading Teacher, 41*(8), 762-767.

Echevarria, J., & Short, D. J. (2000). *Using multiple perspectives in observations of diverse classrooms: The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). ED441334*. Paper presented at the the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Edmonds, M. S., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Reutebuch, C., Cable, A., Tackett, K. K., et al. (2009). A synthesis of reading interventions and effects on reading comprehension outcomes for older struggling readers. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(1), 262-300. Retrieved from http://rer.sagepub.com/content/79/1/262, doi:10.3102/0034654308325998

Ehri, L. C., Nunes, S. R., Willows, D. M., Schuster, B. V., Yaghoub-Zadeh, Z., & Shanahan, T. (2001). Phonemic awareness instruction helps children learn to read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's meta-analysis. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(3), 250-287. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/748111

Eilers, L. H., & Pinkley, C. (2006). Metacognitive strategies help students to comprehend all text. *Reading Improvement, 43*(1), 13-29. Retrieved from http://www.projectinnovation.biz/TOC_Reading_March_2006.pdf

Feldman, K., & Kinsella, K. (2005). Narrowing the language gap: The case for explicit vocabulary instruction. New York: Scholastic Professional Paper.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Comprehension instruction in action: The secondary classroom. In C. C. Block & S. R. Parris (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (Second ed., pp. 258-270). New York: The Guilford Press.

Foorman, B. R., Francis, D. J., Fletcher, J. M., Mehta, P., & Schatschneider, C. (1998). The role of instruction in learning to read: Preventing reading failure in at-risk children. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(1), 37-55.

Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Everlove, S. (2009). *Productive group work: How to engage students, build teamwork, and promote understanding*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Gajria, M., Jitendra, A. K., Sood, S., & Sacks, G. (2007). Improving comprehension of expository text in students with LD: A research synthesis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40*(3), 210-225. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/proedcw/jld/2007/00000040/00000003/art00003

DRAFT

Gersten, R., Chard, D. J., Jayanthi, M., Baker, S. K., Morphy, P., & Flojo, J. (2009). Mathematics instruction for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of instructional components. *Review of Educational Research, 79*(3), 1202-1242. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0034654309334431

Graham, S., & Harris, K. H. (2005). Improving the writing performance of young struggling writers: Theoretical and programmatic research from the Center on Accelerating Student Learning. *Journal of Special Education, 39*, 19-33.

Graham, S., MacArthur, C. A., & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Best practices in writing instruction* New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Great Schools Inc. (2012). Assistive technology. Retrieved May 17, 2012, from http://www.greatschools.org/articles/?topics=188&language=EN

Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. L. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(1), 79-126.

Gunning, T. G. (2010). *Assessing and correcting reading and writing difficulties* (Fourth ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hairrell, A., Simmons, D., Swanson, E., Edmonds, M., Vaughn, S., & Rupley, W. H. (2011). Translating vocabulary research to social studies instruction: Before, during, and after text-reading strategies. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 46*(4), 204-210. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1053451210389606

Hare, V. C., & et al. (1989). Text effects on main idea comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24*(1), 72-88. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/748011

Harmon, J. M., Hedrick, W. B., & Wood, K. D. (2005). Research on vocabulary instruction in the content areas: Implications for struggling readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 21*(3), 261-280. Retrieved from http://www.journalsonline.tandf.co.uk/openurl.asp?genre=article&id=doi:10.1080/10573560590949377

Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (1992). *Helping young writers master the craft: Strategy instruction and self-regulation in the writing process*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Hiebert, J., & Grouws, D. A. (2007). Effective teaching for the development of skill and conceptual understanding of number: What is most effective? *NCTM Research Brief,* 1-3. Retrieved from http://www.nctm.org/clipsandbriefs.aspx

Ivey, G., & Fisher, D. (2006). *Creating literacy-rich schools for adolescents*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

DRAFT

Jitendra, A. K., Hoppes, M. K., & Xin, Y. P. (2000). Enhancing main idea comprehension for students with learning problems: The role of a summarization strategy and self-monitoring instruction. *Journal of Special Education, 34*(3), 127-139. Retrieved from doi:10.1177/002246690003400302

Johannessen, L. R., & McCann, T. M. (2009). Adolescents who struggle with literacy. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer & P. Smagorinsky (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 65-79). New York: The Guilford Press.

Johnson, D. D., & von Hoff Johnson, B. (1986). Highlighting vocabulary in inferential comprehension instruction. *Journal of Reading, 29*(7), 622-625. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40029689

Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 417-447.

Kinsella, K. (2003, November 12). *Vocabulary preparation vs. vocabulary decoration: Strategies to responsibly prepare students for the vocabulary demands of challenging curricula.* Paper presented at the Conference sponsored by Californians Together, Alhambra, CA.

Kinsella, K. (2005, January 8). *Academic writing scaffolds for linguistically diverse 4-12 classrooms.* Paper presented at the conference sponsored by Pearson Prentice Hall, Los Angeles.

Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1999). Promoting reading comprehension, content learning, and English acquisition through Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR). *Reading Teacher, 52*(7), 738-747. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20204676

Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. (2007). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties. What works for special-needs learners*. New York: Guilford Press.

Kratzer, C. C., & Teplin, A. S. (2005). *Teaching reading/writing to struggling high school students: Applications from balanced literacy instruction and adolescent motivation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Montreal, Quebec.

Kroesbergen, E. H., & van Luit, J. E. H. (2003). Mathematics interventions for children with special educational needs: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education, 24*(2), 97-114. Retrieved from doi:10.1177/07419325030240020501

Langer, J. A. (2001). Beating the odds: Teaching middle and high school students to read and write well. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 837-880.

Laufer, B., & Girsai, N. (2008). Form-focused instruction in second language vocabulary learning: A case for contrastive analysis and translation. *Applied Linguistics, 29*(4), 694-716. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/amn018

DRAFT

Lesaux, N. K., & Siegel, L. S. (2003). The development of reading in children who speak English as a second language. *Developmental Psychology, 39*(6), 1005-1019. Retrieved from http://content.apa.org/journals/dev/39/6/1005

Lewis, C. (2003). The essential elements of lesson study. *Lesson Study: Crafting Learning Together, 4*(3), 1-5.

Love, N. (2002). *Using data/getting results: A practical guide for school improvement in mathematics and science*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.

Marzano, R. J. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement: Research on what works in schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Mills, K. A. (2009). Floating on a sea of talk: Reading comprehension through speaking and listening. *Reading Teacher, 63*(4), 325-329. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1598/RT.63.4.8

Moats, L. C. (2001). When older students can't read. *Educational Leadership, 58*(6), 36-40.

National Center on Response to Intervention (Ed.). (2010). *Essential components of RtI -- A closer look at Response to Intervention*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved from http://www.nysrti.org/docs/RtiEssentialComponents_0520101.pdf.

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*.

O'Connor, R. E. (2006). *Teaching word recognition: Effective strategies for students with learning difficulties*. New York: Guilford Press.

O'Connor, R. E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of reading intervention in kindergarten through third grade: Changes in teaching and student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(5), 440-455. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/proedcw/jld

OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. (2009). Positive behavioral interventions and supports: Effective schoolwide interventions Retrieved June 12, 2012, from www.pbis.org

Paris, S. G., Lipson, M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 8*(3), 293-316.

Peregoy, S., & Boyle, O. (2008). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

DRAFT

Perin, D. (2007). Best practices in teaching writing to adolescents. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 242-264). New York: The Guilford Press.

Popham, W. J. (2008). *Transformative assessment.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Pressley, M. (2006). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching* (Third ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Raphael, T. E., & Englert, C. S. (1990). Writing and reading: Partners in constructive meaning. *Reading Teacher, 43,* 388-400.

Rasinski, T. V. (2003). *The fluent reader: Oral reading strategies for building word recognition, fluency, and comprehension*. New York: Scholastic Professional Books.

Spandel, V., & Stiggins, R. J. (1990). *Creating writers: Linking assessment and writing instruction*. New York: Longman.

Stahl, S. A., & Nagy, W. E. (2006). *Teaching word meanings*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stein, M. C. (1994). Effective writing instruction for diverse learners. *School Psychology Review, 23*(3), 392.

Swanson, E., Edmonds, M. S., Hairrell, A., Vaughn, S., & Simmons, D. C. (2011). Applying a cohesive set of comprehension strategies to content-area instruction. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 46*(5), 266-272. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1053451210395385

Teplin, A. S. (2008). *Open-door thinking: Metacognition in reading comprehension instruction.* Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

The Education Trust. (2005). *Gaining traction, gaining ground: How some high schools accelerate learning for struggling students.* Retrieved from http://www2.edtrust.org/

Turner, K. H. (2009). Flipping the switch: Code-switching from text speak to standard English. *English Journal, 98*(5), 60-65. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/journals/ej/issues/v98-5

Vaughn, S., & Bos, C. S. (2011). *Strategies for teaching students with learning and behavior problems* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Wexler, J., Vaughn, S., Edmonds, M., & Reutebuch, C. K. (2008). A synthesis of fluency interventions for secondary struggling readers. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 21*(4), 317-347. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11145-007-9085-7

Wheeler, R., Cartwright, K. B., & Swords, R. (2012). Factoring AAVE into reading assessment and instruction. *Reading Teacher, 65*(6), 416-425. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01063

DRAFT

Wheeler, R. S. (2006). "What do we do about student grammar--all those missing -'ed's' and -'s's'?" Using comparison and contrast to teach Standard English in dialectally diverse classrooms. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 5*(1), 16-33. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/EJ843817.pdf

Wheeler, R. S. (2008). Becoming adept at code-switching. *Educational Leadership, 65*(7), 54-58. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org

William, D. (2007). What does research say the benefits of formative assessment are? *NCTM Research Brief*, 1-3. Retrieved from http://www.nctm.org/clipsandbriefs.aspx

Witzel, B. S., Mercer, C. D., & Miller, M. D. (2003). Teaching algebra to students with learning difficulties: An investigation of an explicit instruction model. *Learning Disabilities: Research & Practice, 18*(2), 121-131.

DRAFT