

# WORKSHOP GUIDE FOR OLAC MODULE: *Learning Supports*

## OVERVIEW

**Note to Facilitators:** The workshop guide is set up in a flexible way to enable its use as an individual learning activity, an online learning experience, or a traditional face-to-face professional development session (or series of sessions). It is also possible to mix and match assignments to create a blended learning experience. The inclusion of objectives and evaluation rubrics also enables an individual, school district, or agency to submit the course materials to a university to determine whether or not this guide might serve as a credit-bearing learning experience. The amount of material included in the guide would translate to 1-semester-hour of credit in many universities that give credit for participation.

**Description:** The workshop draws on material provided in the module titled, “Learning Supports”—a learning resource developed and disseminated by the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council (OLAC) through its website (<http://www.ohioleadership.org/>). The narrative, videos, and charts comprising this workshop explain how educators can use the Ohio Improvement Process (OIP) with its connected set of TBTs, BLTs, and DLT to plan, implement, and evaluate core instructional practices and interventions that attend to the needs of diverse learners. This guide provides an overview of support frameworks and intervention strategies such as co-teaching, flexible grouping, and teaching for metacognition.

**Goals:** The overarching goal of the workshop described in this guide is to enable educators to use the OIP to engage in continuous improvement positioned to promote equitable, inclusive, high-quality, and responsive education for all learners. A subsidiary goal is to promote awareness of educational frameworks and intervention strategies that promote high levels of learning among students with diverse needs. The learning objectives that provide specification for the overarching goal come from three sets of relevant standards: the second edition of *Ohio’s Leadership Development Framework* (BASA, 2013), the Ohio Standards for Principals, and the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) Building Level Standards. Relevant objectives from each of the three sets of standards are keyed to the experiences listed in the Learning Experiences Matrix below.

**Evaluations of Learning:** The module includes a pre- and post-assessment that can be used at the beginning and end of the workshop to evaluate changes in the degree to which participants understand the content that the workshop presents. Rubrics keyed to learning objectives can be used to assess performance of the four activities described in the guide.



Objectives <sup>1</sup>	Individual Activity	On-line Small Group Activity	Face-to-Face Group Activity	Evaluation Method
<p><b>Activity #2: Supporting Teachers' Learning of an Effective Instructional Practice</b></p> <p>Based on what you learned from reading the material in the module and what you know about the teachers in your school, what is your assessment (albeit informal) of the extent to which the teachers, in general, use the following practices in an effective manner: (1) co-teaching, (2) differentiating instruction, (3) flexible grouping, (4) structuring the classroom for student success, (5) teaching for metacognition, (6) flexible grouping and (7) providing opportunities for enrichment and acceleration? What evidence supports your informal assessment? Which of these practices do you believe would have the greatest impact on the learning of the students enrolled in your school? Why? In your role as principal or teacher-leader, what <i>systematic</i> processes might you use in order to help the teachers in your school learn more about how to use the practice you identified as the one with the greatest potential impact?</p>				
<p><a href="#">Activity #3 Objectives</a></p>	<p>Read activity prompt #3 and submit a list of video resources that respond to the question asked in the prompt.</p>	<p>Read activity prompt #3 and post to a discussion board, blog, or wiki a list of video resources that respond to the question asked in the prompt.</p>	<p>Read activity prompt #3 and then make note of video resources that you know about or discover by searching the internet. Using your notes, share the resources you found with others in a small group.</p>	<p><a href="#">LS Rubric #3</a></p>
<p><b>Activity #3: Finding Useful Professional Development Resources</b></p> <p>Teachers often appreciate learning about effective practices by seeing those practices demonstrated or described in videos and webinars. For this reason, various organizations, such as the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council, the Center for Applied Special Technology, the What Works Clearinghouse, and the IRIS Center develop videos and webinars on practices that are effective for supporting students' learning. Pick an instructional framework (e.g., UDL, CRP, RTI) or an instructional practice (e.g., co-teaching, flexible grouping, teaching for metacognition, acceleration). Then visit the websites of these organizations or others to identify videos and webinars that might help teachers at your school learn about the framework or practice you selected. Write down the web addresses (URL) for five videos or webinar related to the instructional framework or practice you selected. Provide a rating of the quality and usefulness of the video or webinar (e.g., high, medium, low) and its level of relevance to the teachers at your school. Also provide a brief rationale explaining why you think the video or webinar is of high, medium or low quality, usefulness, and relevance. You can record the information, if you would like, using the matrix below.</p>				
<p><b>Video/Webinar Name</b></p>	<p><b>URL</b></p>	<p><b>Quality Rating (H,M,L)/Rationale</b></p>	<p><b>Usefulness Rating (H,M,L)//Rationale</b></p>	<p><b>Relevance Rating/ (H,M,L)/Rationale</b></p>

Objectives <sup>1</sup>	Individual Activity	On-line Small Group Activity	Face-to-Face Group Activity	Evaluation Method
<a href="#">Activity #4 Objectives</a>	Read activity prompt #4. Describe the professional development activity (e.g., the audience for whom it is designed, the sequence of steps to be used in conducting it, the amount of time it will take, and so on) and then answer the questions included in the activity prompt.	Read activity prompt #4. In a small group (using a wiki, blog, or discussion board) create a professional development activity to address the specifications included in the prompt. Describe the professional development activity (e.g., the audience for whom it is designed, the sequence of steps to be used in conducting it, the amount of time it will take, and so on). Then discuss the benefits and challenges associated with using the PD activity with staff at your school.	Read activity prompt #4. In a small group create a professional development activity to address the specifications included in the prompt. Describe the professional development activity (e.g., the audience for whom it is designed, the sequence of steps to be used in conducting it, the amount of time it will take, and so on). Then share your activity with the group as a whole, engaging other participants in a discussion of the possible benefits and challenges associated with using the PD activity with staff at their schools.	<a href="#">LS Rubric #4</a>
<p><b>Activity #4: Learning about Cultural Difference</b>            Develop a professional development activity for your school (or for a TBT at your school), perhaps one in which staff members discuss with one another the cultural values, norms, and practices that influenced their upbringing, experiences, and self-definitions or perhaps one that addresses culture differences in some other way. Why do you think the activity would be helpful for increasing the cultural sensitivity of staff at your school? If you actually were to use this activity with the staff at your school, what challenges do you anticipate?</p>				

## **OBJECTIVES**

### **ALL OBJECTIVES<sup>2</sup>**

#### ***OLAC Essential Practices (Building Leadership Team)***

OLAC 3.1: Ensure that the established district curriculum is the curriculum used by all teachers in the school, and ensure instruction is aligned with the big ideas and essential questions embedded in the curriculum.

OLAC 3.4: Ensure the delivery of high-quality instruction on a school-wide basis that is based on research-based practices, engages students, incorporates culturally responsive practices, and relies on ongoing assessment and progress monitoring to inform instruction.

OLAC 3.5: Require the systemic implementation and ongoing evaluation of prevention/intervention strategies as part of the building's instructional program to ensure that all students meet performance targets.

OLAC 5.7: Provide for extensive job-embedded professional development aligned with building-level strategies/action steps for improving for instruction and achievement.

OLAC 6.2: Keep the purpose of ensuring the success of every student central to all decisions.

#### ***Ohio Principal Standards***

OPS 2.1: Principals ensure that the instructional content that is taught is aligned with the Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district.

OPS 2.2: Principals ensure instructional practices are effective and meet the needs of all students.

OPS 2.3: Principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.

OPS 2.6: Principals support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.

OPS 3.4: Principals institute procedures and practices to support staff and students and establish an environment that is conducive to learning.

OPS 5.4: Principals establish expectations for the use of culturally-responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.

#### ***ELCC (Building Level Standards)***

ELCC 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

ELCC 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

---

<sup>2</sup> Specific standards are identified using a coding system whereby the first portion of the standard label is an abbreviation for the source of the standards (Ohio Leadership Advisory Council, Ohio Principals Standards, Educational Leadership Constituent Council) and the second portion includes a number representing the general area or domain in which the standard is located, a period, and then the specific number of the standard in that area or domain.

ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

ELCC 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

ELCC 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

### **Activity #1 Objectives:**

#### ***OLAC Essential Practices (Building Leadership Team Practices)***

OLAC 3.1: Ensure that the established district curriculum is the curriculum used by all teachers in the school, and ensure instruction is aligned with the big ideas and essential questions embedded in the curriculum.

OLAC 3.4: Ensure the delivery of high-quality instruction on a school-wide basis that is based on research-based practices, engages students, incorporates culturally responsive practices, and relies on ongoing assessment and progress monitoring to inform instruction.

OLAC 3.5: Require the systemic implementation and ongoing evaluation of prevention/intervention strategies as part of the building's instructional program to ensure that all students meet performance targets.

#### ***Ohio Principal Standards***

OPS 2.1: Principals ensure that the instructional content that is taught is aligned with the Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district.

OPS 2.2: Principals ensure instructional practices are effective and meet the needs of all students.

OPS 2.3: Principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.

#### ***ELCC (Building Level Standards)***

ELCC 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement.

ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

ELCC 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

### **Activity #2 Objectives:**

#### ***OLAC Essential Practices (Building Leadership Team Practices)***

OLAC 3.4: Ensure the delivery of high-quality instruction on a school-wide basis that is based on research-based practices, engages students, incorporates culturally responsive practices, and relies on ongoing assessment and progress monitoring to inform instruction.

OLAC 3.5: Require the systemic implementation and ongoing evaluation of prevention/intervention strategies as part of the building's instructional program to ensure that all students meet performance targets.

OLAC 5.7: Provide for extensive job-embedded professional development aligned with building-level strategies/action steps for improving instruction and achievement.

***Ohio Principal Standards***

OPS 2.2: Principals ensure instructional practices are effective and meet the needs of all students.

OPS 2.3: Principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.

OPS 2.6: Principals support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.

OPS 3.4: Principals institute procedures and practices to support staff and students and establish an environment that is conducive to learning.

***ELCC***

ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students.

ELCC 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.

ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

**Activity #3 Objectives:**

***OLAC Essential Practices***

OLAC 3.4: Ensure the delivery of high-quality instruction on a school-wide basis that is based on research-based practices, engages students, incorporates culturally responsive practices, and relies on ongoing assessment and progress monitoring to inform instruction.

OLAC 3.5: Require the systemic implementation and ongoing evaluation of prevention/intervention strategies as part of the building's instructional program to ensure that all students meet performance targets.

OLAC 5.7: Provide for extensive job-embedded professional development aligned with building-level strategies/action steps for improving instruction and achievement.

***Ohio Principal Standards***

OPS 2.2: Principals ensure instructional practices are effective and meet the needs of all students.

OPS 2.3: Principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.

OPS 2.6: Principals support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.

***ELCC***

ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

#### **Activity #4 Objectives:**

##### ***OLAC Essential Practices***

OLAC 5.7: Provide for extensive job-embedded professional development aligned with building-level strategies/action steps for improving instruction and achievement.

OLAC 6.2: Keep the purpose of ensuring the success of every student central to all decisions.

##### ***Ohio Principal Standards***

OPS 2.6: Principals support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional development.

OPS 5.4: Principals establish expectations for the use of culturally-responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.

##### ***ELCC***

ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.

ELCC 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.

ELCC 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

## OBJECTIVES

Objective <sup>3</sup>	Major Concept(s)
<b><i>OLAC Essential Practices (Building Leadership Team)</i></b>	
OLAC 3.1: Ensure that the established district curriculum is the curriculum used by all teachers in the school, and ensure instruction is aligned with the big ideas and essential questions embedded in the curriculum.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; ensure implementation, monitoring, and evaluation
OLAC 3.4: Ensure the delivery of high-quality instruction on a school-wide basis that is based on research-based practices, engages students, incorporates culturally responsive practices, and relies on ongoing assessment and progress monitoring to inform instruction.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; ensure implementation, monitoring, and evaluation
OLAC 3.5: Require the systemic implementation and ongoing evaluation of prevention/intervention strategies as part of the building's instructional program to ensure that all students meet performance targets.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness
OLAC 5.7: Provide for extensive job-embedded professional development aligned with building-level strategies/action steps for improving for instruction and achievement.	Provide high-quality PD; cultivate instructional effectiveness
OLAC 6.2: Keep the purpose of ensuring the success of every student central to all decisions.	Maintain focus
<b><i>Ohio Principals Standards</i></b>	
OPS 2.1: Principals ensure that the instructional content that is taught is aligned with the Ohio academic content standards and curriculum priorities in the school and district.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; maintain focus
OPS 2.2: Principals ensure instructional practices are effective and meet the needs of all students.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; ensure implementation, monitoring, and evaluation
OPS 2.3: Principals advocate for high levels of learning for all students, including students identified as gifted, students with disabilities and at-risk students.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness
OPS 2.6: Principals support staff in planning and implementing research-based professional	Provide high-quality PD

<sup>3</sup> Specific standards are identified using a coding system whereby the first portion of the standard label is an abbreviation for the source of the standards (Ohio Leadership Advisory Council, Ohio Principals Standards, Educational Leadership Constituent Council) and the second portion includes a number representing the general area or domain in which the standard is located, a period, and then the specific number of the standard in that area or domain.

Objective <sup>3</sup>	Major Concept(s)
development.	
OPS 3.4: Principals institute procedures and practices to support staff and students and establish an environment that is conducive to learning.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; ensure implementation, monitoring, and evaluation; support educator teams; manage structures and resources, including time
OPS 5.4: Principals establish expectations for the use of culturally responsive practices that acknowledge and value diversity.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; connect to the community
<b><i>ELCC Standards</i></b>	
ELCC 1.3: Candidates understand and can promote continual and sustainable school improvement environment with high expectations for students.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; ensure implementation, monitoring, and evaluation
ELCC 2.1: Candidates understand and can sustain a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning through collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning	Foster culture of inquiry; support educator teams
ELCC 2.2: Candidates understand and can create and evaluate a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and instructional school program.	Cultivate instructional effectiveness; use data effectively
ELCC 2.3: Candidates understand and can develop and supervise the instructional and leadership capacity of school staff.	Distribute leadership; provide high-quality PD
ELCC 5.3: Candidates understand and can safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the school.	Maintain focus; connect to the community
ELCC 5.5: Candidates understand and can promote social justice within the school to ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.	Maintain focus; connect to the community

## READING LIST

- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2013). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hall, T. E., Meyer, A. D., & Rose, D. H. (Eds.). (2012). *Universal design for learning in the classroom: Practical applications*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tomlinson, C. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

### References Cited in the Module

- Alston, J.A. (2004). The many faces of American schooling: Effective schools research and border-crossing in the 21st century. *American Secondary Education*, 32(2), 79-93.
- Arthur-Kelly, M., Sigafos, Green, V., Mathisen, B., Arthur-Kelly, R. (2009). Issues in the use of visual supports to promote communication in individuals with autism spectrum disorders. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 31(18), 1474-1486.
- Au, K. (2009). Culturally responsive instruction: What is it, and how can we incorporate it in the classroom. *Reading Today*, 27(3), 30-31.
- Austin, J. L., Lee, M. G., Thibeault, M. D., Carr, J. E., & Bailey, J. S. (2002). Effects of guided notes on university students' responding and recall of information. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 11(4), 243-254.
- Bastos, F.M.C. (2006). Border crossing dialogues: Engaging art education students in cultural research. *Art Education*, 59(4), 20-24.
- Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. *Remedial and Special Education*, 10(2), 17-22.
- Brophy, J. E. (1983). Classroom organization and management. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 264-285.
- Buckeye Association of School Administrators. (2013). *A report of the work of the Ohio Leadership Advisory Council from 2007 to 2013: Identifying and implementing essential leadership practices needed by superintendents, district leadership teams, building*

- leadership teams, and teacher-based teams to make and sustain improvements in district-wide instructional practice and student learning.* Columbus, OH: Author.
- Buron, K., & Curtis, M. (2003). *The incredible 5-point scale: Assisting students with autism spectrum disorders in understanding social interactions and controlling their emotional responses.* Shawnee Mission, KS: AAPC.
- Carpenter, L. (2002). The travel card. In B. S. Myles & D. Adreon (Eds.), *Asperger Syndrome and adolescence: Practical solutions for school success.* (pp 92-96). Shawnee Mission, KS: AAPC.
- Case, L.P., Harris, K.R. & Graham, S. (1992). Improving the mathematical problem-solving of students with learning disabilities: Self-regulated strategy development. *The Journal of Special Education, 26*(1), 1-19.
- Castle, S., Deniz, C. B., & Tortora, M. (2005). Flexible grouping and student learning in a high-needs school. *Education and Urban Society, 37*(2), 139-150.
- Colangelo, N., Assouline S.G., & Gross M.U.M. (2004). *A nation deceived: How schools hold back America's brightest students* (Volume 1). Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa.
- Curry, M.W. (2008). Critical friends groups: The possibilities and limitations embedded in teacher professional communities aimed at instructional improvement and school reform. *Teachers College Record, 110*(4), 733-774.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). *The right to learn: A blueprint for creating schools that work.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, D. (2002). Toward democratic education: The importance of culturally responsive leadership in 21st century schools. *Trotter Review, 14*(1), 5-16.
- Desoete, A., Roeyers, H., & Buysse, A. (2001). Metacognition and mathematical problem-solving in grade 3. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*(5), 435-449.
- Flavell, J.H. (1976), Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), *The nature of intelligence* (pp. 231-236). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Ford, D. (2010). Culturally responsive classrooms: Affirming culturally different gifted students. *Gifted Child Today, 33*(1), 50-53.
- Ford, M.P. (2005). *Differentiation through flexible grouping: Successfully reaching all readers.* Naperville, IL: Learning Points.

- Fredericks, J., Blumenfield, P., & Paris, A. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of Educational Research, 74*(1), 59-109.
- Friend, M., Reising, M., & Cook, L. (1993). Co-teaching: An overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and considerations for the future. *Preventing School Failure, 37*(4), 6-10.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Glass, G.V. (2008). *Fertilizers, pills & magnetic strips: The fate of public education in America*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- González, N., Moll, L., & Amanti, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practice in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gregg, L. (2010). Response to intervention joins data teams. In Ventura, S., et al., *Data teams: The big picture - Looking at data teams through a collaborative lens*. Englewood, CO: Lead + Learn Press.
- Hall, P., & Simeral, A. (2008). *Building teachers' capacity for success: A collaborative approach for coaches and school leaders*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hang, Q., & Rabren, K. (2009). An examination of co-teaching: Perspectives and efficacy indicators. *Remedial and Special Education, 30*(5), 259-268.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning; A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Haycock, K. (2008). *Core problems: Out-of-field teaching persists in key academic courses, especially in America's high-poverty and high-minority schools*. Press release retrieved May 15, 2009 from <http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Press+Room/CoreProblems.htm>.
- Hord, S. (1997). Professional learning communities: What are they and why are they important? *Issues About Change, 6*(1). Retrieved May 28, 2010 from <http://www.sedl.org/change/issues/issues61.html>.
- Junod, R. E. V., DuPaul, G. J., Jutendra, A. K., Volpe, R. J., & Clearly, K. S. (2006). Classroom observations of students with and without ADHD: Differences across types of engagement. *Journal of School Psychology, 44*(2), 87-104.
- Kamps, D. M., Barbeta, P. M., Leonard, B. R., & Delquadri, J. C. (1994). Classwide peer tutoring: An integration strategy to improve reading skills and promote peer interactions among students with autism and general education peers. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 27*(1), 49-61.

- Kansas State Department of Education (2012). Kansas multi-tier system of support. Retrieved from [www.kansasmtss.org/](http://www.kansasmtss.org/).
- Keefe, B., & Moore, V. (2004). The challenge of co-teaching in inclusive classrooms at the high school level and what the teachers told us. *American Secondary Education, 32*(3), 77-88.
- Lambert, M.C., Cartledge, G., Lo, Y., & Heward, W.L. (2006). Effects of response cards on disruptive behavior and academic responding during math lessons by fourth-grade urban students. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 8*(2), 88-99.
- Layng, T.V.J., Twyman, J.S., & Stikeleather, G. (2003). Headsprout Early Reading: Reliably teaching children to read. *Behavioral Technology Today, 3*, 7-20.
- Many, J. E., Dewberry, D., Taylor, D. L., & Coady, K. (2009). Profiles of three preservice ESOL teachers' development of instructional scaffolding. *Reading Psychology, 30*(2), 148-174.
- Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T., Graetz, J., Gardizi, W., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., & McDuffie, K. (2005). Case study in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures, and challenges. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 40*(5), 260-270.
- National Center on Response to Intervention (2010). *Essential components of RTI - A closer look at response to intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention.
- National Center on Universal Design for Learning (2010). *UDL guidelines-Version 1.0: Research evidence*. Wakefield, MA: CAST, Inc. Retrieved May 25, 2010 from <http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/udlguidelines/research>.
- Oakes, J. (2005). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality* (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- O'Brien, C. (2007). Using collaborative reading groups to accommodate diverse learning and behavior needs in the general education classroom. *Beyond Behavior, 16*(3), 7-15.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2008). *21st century skills, education & competitiveness: A resource and policy guide*. Retrieved May 22, 2009 from [http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/documents/21st\\_century\\_skills\\_education\\_and\\_competitiveness\\_guide.pdf](http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/documents/21st_century_skills_education_and_competitiveness_guide.pdf).
- Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Accountability in action: A blueprint for learning organizations*. (2nd ed.) Englewood, CO: Lead + Learn Press.
- Reis, S. M., Burns, D. E. & Renzulli, J. S. (1992). *Curriculum compacting: The complete guide to modifying the regular curriculum for high ability students*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

- Saez, E., Kopczuk, W., & Song, J. (2010). Earnings inequality and mobility in the United States: Evidence from social security data since 1937. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(1), 91-128.
- Sarason, S. B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scheurich, J.J. (1998). Highly successful and loving public elementary schools populated mainly by low-SES children of color. *Urban Education*, 33(4), 451-491.
- Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stecker, P. M., & Fuchs, S. (2000). Effecting superior achievement using curriculum-based measurement: The importance of individual progress monitoring. *Learning Disabilities: Research & Practice*, 15(3), 128-134.
- Stichter, J.P., Lewis, T. J., Whittaker, T. A., Richter, M., Johnson, N.W., & Trussell, R. P. (2009). Assessing teacher use of opportunities to respond and effective classroom management strategies: Comparisons among high- and low-risk elementary schools. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(2), 68-81.
- Sutherland, K. S., Alder, N., & Gunter, P. L. (2003). The effects of varying rates of opportunities to respond to academic requests on the behavior of students with EBD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 11(4), 239-248.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (1995). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed ability classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- US Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *The condition of education 2009* (NCES 2009-081). Retrieved from: <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=16>
- University of Kansas. (2005). *Special connections*. Retrieved from: <http://www.specialconnections.ku.edu/cgi-bin/cgiwrap/speconn/main.php?cate=instruction&ion=main&sucsection=udl/graphic#examples>.
- Vaughn, B., & Horner, R. (1995). Effects of concrete versus verbal choice systems on problem behavior. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*, 11(2), 89-92.
- Van Bourgondien, M.E., Reichle, N.C., & Schopler, E. (2003). Effects of a model treatment approach on adults with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 33(2), 131-140.
- Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (2010). Tier 3 interventions for students with significant reading problems. *Theory into Practice*, 49, 305-314.

*What is school-wide positive behavioral interventions & supports?* (May 4, 2009). OSEP Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports at [www.PBIS.org](http://www.PBIS.org).

Wong, H., & Wong, R. (January, 2001). *The miracle of teachers*. Teachers.net Gazette, 2(1). Retrieved June 15, 2009 from <http://teachers.net/gazette/JAN01/wong.html>.

Zwart, R.C., Wubbels, T., Bergen, T.C.M., & Bolhuis, S. (2007). Experienced teacher learning within the context of reciprocal peer coaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13(2), 165-187.

## RUBRICS

### LS RUBRIC #1

Standards	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
OLAC 3.1, OLAC 3.4, OLAC 3.5, OPS 2.1, OPS 2.2, OPS 2.3, ELCC 1.3, ELCC 2.1, ELCC 2.2:	The rationale for picking a particular framework references school circumstances and performance levels that the candidate substantiates with relevant data.	The rationale for picking a particular framework references school circumstances and performance levels.	A framework is selected but no rationale provided.
	The discussion of the benefits of selecting a particular framework draws on a research-based understanding of the framework's purposes and uses.	The discussion of the benefits of selecting a particular framework draws on an evident understanding the framework's purposes and uses.	The response show limited understanding of the possible benefits of the framework.
	The analysis of how to reconcile differences between the new framework and current instructional programs, policies, and/or practices draws on an understanding of both the new framework and the current instructional programs, policies, and/or practices.as well as a evident understanding of theories of change.	The analysis of how to reconcile differences between the new framework and current instructional programs, policies, and/or practices draws on an understanding of the new framework as well as the current instructional programs, policies, and/or practices.	There is little effort to reconcile differences between the new framework and current instructional programs, policies, and/or practices.
	The written or oral expression is clear and concise.	The written or oral expression is either clear or concise, but not both.	The written or oral expression is neither clear nor concise.

## LS RUBRIC #2

Standards	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
OLAC 3.4, OLAC 3.5, OLAC 5.7, OPS 2.2, OPS 2.3, OPS 2.6, OPS 3.4, ELCC 2.1, ELCC 2.2, ELCC 2.3	The analysis of teachers' practices makes reference to relevant evidence.	The analysis of teachers' practices makes reference to some evidence but is mostly speculative.	The analysis of teachers' practices is speculative.
	The selection of a strategy with potential benefit is based in a deep understanding of a school culture and practices that is carefully articulated orally or in writing.	The selection of a strategy with potential benefit is keyed to particular features of a school culture and practices.	The selection of a strategy with potential benefits appears to be unconnected to knowledge about a school's culture and practices.
	The plan for helping teachers learn about a promising practice is detailed and relevant to the aim of improving teachers' competence.	The plan for helping teachers learn about a promising practice is relevant to the aim of improving teachers' competence but lacks sufficient detail.	The plan for helping teachers learn about a promising practice is unspecific and not likely to result in the learning it intends to promote.
	The written or oral expression is clear and concise.	The written or oral expression is either clear or concise, but not both.	The written or oral expression is neither clear nor concise.

**LS RUBRIC #3**

<b>Standards</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Unacceptable</b>
OLAC 3.4, OLAC 3.5, OLAC 5.7, OPS 2.2, OPS 2.3, OPS 2.6, ELCC 2.3	The five videos or webinars are directly related to the instructional framework or practice.	The five videos or webinars have some bearing on the instructional framework or practice.	Five videos or webinars are included but they have limited connection to the instructional framework or practice.
	All five videos are ranked on the three criteria and careful, detailed discussions present rationales for each rating.	All five videos are ranked on the three criteria, and there are rationales for each rating.	All five videos are ranked on the three criteria, but rationales are either very sketchy (e.g., just a few words) or missing.
	The written or oral expression is clear and concise.	The written or oral expression is either clear or concise, but not both.	The written or oral expression is neither clear nor concise.

## LS RUBRIC #4

Standards	Target	Acceptable	Unacceptable
<p>OLAC 5.7, OLAC 6.2, OPS 2.6, OPS 5.4, ELCC 2.3, ELCC 5.3, ELCC 5.5</p>	<p>The PD activity responds to research on high-quality PD and addresses the needs of adult learners as presented in recent empirical research.</p>	<p>The PD activity responds to research on high-quality PD and attempts to be responsive to the needs of adult learners.</p>	<p>The PD activity does not appear to take into account either the research on the characteristics of high-quality PD or the research on the needs of adult learners.</p>
	<p>The content and instructional design of the PD activity is likely to achieve the intended objective of increasing cultural sensitivity among members of a school staff.</p>	<p>The content, but not necessarily the instructional design of the PD activity addresses the intended objective of increasing cultural sensitivity among members of a school staff.</p>	<p>Neither the content nor the instructional design of the PD activity addresses the intended objective of increasing cultural sensitivity among members of a school staff.</p>
	<p>The description of why the activity is likely to have its intended effect applies knowledge about high-quality PD and principles of effective adult learning.</p>	<p>The description of why the activity is likely to have its intended effect applies either knowledge about high-quality PD or principles of effective adult learning, but not both.</p>	<p>The description of why the activity is likely to have its intended effect fails to consider the either knowledge about high quality PD or principles of adult learning.</p>
	<p>The discussion of the challenges that might impinge on the use of the PD activity reveals a deep understanding of the current levels of cultural sensitivity among a school staff as well as at least one organizational constraint.</p>	<p>The discussion of the challenges that might impinge on the use of the PD activity offers at least two observations about the current levels of cultural sensitivity among a school staff.</p>	<p>The discussion of the challenges that might impinge on the use of the PD activity is unrelated to the current levels of cultural sensitivity among a school staff.</p>
	<p>The written or oral expression is clear and concise.</p>	<p>The written or oral expression is either clear or concise, but not both.</p>	<p>The written or oral expression is neither clear nor concise.</p>