

BENCHMARKING USING DATA IN REAL TIME TO TRANSFORM PRACTICE

Bridging the Gap:
Promising Strategies
at the Intersection
of Research and
Practice Series





Who We Are...

The Youth Development Institute (YDI), is a capacity building organization that provides services to youth programs both in New York City and throughout the United States. YDI provides technical assistance, disseminates information, informs policy, and conducts research to strengthen the quality and increase the availability of positive opportunities for young people.

Our Mission and Vision...

YDI's mission is to improve the lives of young people in New York City by supporting the integration of positive youth development principles in programs that serve them and by promoting practices and policies that enable youth to thrive. YDI's vision is that young people in New York City will receive high quality services, supports and opportunities that foster their assets, build healthy community connections, strengthen their skills and competencies and prepare them to transition successfully into adulthood.

Our Approach...

YDI works with organizations to apply the most promising research and practices so that young people can grow and develop through powerful, sustained, and meaningful experiences. Research demonstrates that certain experiences help young people to develop fully and successfully; these include close relationships with caring adults, high expectations, engaging activities, opportunities to contribute and continuity of support. This strength-based youth development approach has shaped YDI's work for over 20 years.

Our Clients...

YDI concentrates its activities in areas of high need and opportunity. Over the last two years YDI provided targeted technical assistance to over 200 programs that combined provide a range of services to middle and high school youth as well as older youth who are low skilled and disconnected, over-aged and under credited or court involved. Supports offered by YDI are delivered in a variety of ways including through trainings/workshops, on-site coaching and in local and national networks.

Our Partners...

YDI also invests considerable effort in developing thought partners and building learning communities, both locally and nationally, that aid in creating a collective understanding of what makes a difference in the lives of youth at the point of service. Our partners include city agencies (such as the Department of Education, Department of Youth and Community Development, Center for Economic Opportunity, Administration for Children's Services and Department of Probation), funders, policymakers, community organizations, schools, and colleges.

Acknowledgements

Benchmarking: Using Data in Real Time to Transform Practice was researched and written by Erica Ahdoot, Executive Director of the GO Project, Ji Young Park of the GO Project. We are grateful to the William T. Grant Foundation for supporting the Bridging the Gap: Promising Strategies at the Intersection of Research and Practice Initiative.

Erica Ahdoot and Ji Young Park wish to thank Rebecca Casciano who contributed her time and wisdom to this document. We would also like to thank the GO Summer 2014 Directors of Curriculum and Instruction: Amanda DaPonte, Cristina Castellon-Baron, David Patterson, and Mattie Guishard for implementing the Benchmarking Framework with our amazing team of educators over the course of the program.

Thank you to the YDI team including project lead Sarah Zeller-Berkman and editor Justine Beaton.

Copyright & Use

Bridging the Gap: Promising Strategies at the Intersection of Research and Practice is a publication series of the Youth Development Institute. YDI encourages others to copy and use these materials. Please use proper attribution when doing so. Suggested citation: Ahdoot, E.; Park, J.Y.; & Zeller-Berkman, S (2015). Bridging the Gap: Promising Strategies at Intersection of Research and Practice Series. *Benchmarking: Using Data in Real Time to Transform Practice*. Youth Development Institute, 2015. Publications in this series as well as other YDI publications are available on the YDI website at: www.ydinstitute.org.

Copyright © January 2015, Youth Development Institute, a Partner Program of the Fund for the City of New York

Bridging the Gap: Promising Strategies at the Intersection of Research and Practice

The Bridging the Gap: Promising Strategies at the Intersection of Research and Practice Series documents and highlights the innovative work of two youth development organizations in New York City. The GO Project and Groundswell Mural Arts are two former grantees of the William T. Grant Foundation's Youth Service Improvement Grants program. As grantees, these organizations conducted projects that produced valuable lessons for the youth development field. The Series is a product of the shared commitment by Groundswell Mural Arts, the GO Project, the William T. Grant Foundation and the Youth Development Institute to improving connections between research and practice

More about the William T. Grant Foundation Youth Service Improvement Grants

The William T. Grant Foundation's Youth Service Improvement Grants support community-based organizations in New York City to enhance their services for children and youth, ages 5 to 25. Since 2006 these grants have funded specific, standalone projects that make services more effective and provide young people with better experiences.

More about the Youth Development Institute's Documentation Support

For over twenty years, YDI has supported youth development practitioners to document the promising practices of their work and to disseminate to the broader field. YDI does this in an effort to make connections between research and practice and expand the literature written by and for youth development practitioners.

More about the Partnership between the William T. Grant Foundation and the Youth Development Institute

In 2010, the William T. Grant Foundation partnered with YDI to provide capacity building support to the Foundation's Youth Service Improvement Grantees. Since that time, YDI has provided onsite technical support for participating grantees and convened learning communities of grantees. The collaboration between the Foundation, YDI and youth-serving organizations across New York City has led to over 50 successful improvement projects across a dozen cohorts thus far.

About the Author: The GO Project

The GO Project's vision is to ensure that all under-resourced families with children who are struggling in New York City public schools have access to coordinated, comprehensive, and effective supplemental educational programming to ensure their child thrives in school and in life.

The GO Project employs a unique program model, which utilizes the resources of the whole community—skilled volunteers, partnerships with independent and public schools, talented educators, and engagement of families--to close the opportunity gap for students. Serving students from over 30 public elementary and middle schools on the Lower East Side and Chinatown, the GO Project offers integrated, year-round academic programs and family support services beginning in Kindergarten and continuing through 8th grade.

In 2012, the William T Grant Foundation supported the GO Project to create benchmarks, aligned with Common Core standards, to provide teachers with feedback about student progress in real time. After two years of implementation, the GO Project was asked to document the elements of the initiative as well as lessons learned in the hopes that other organizations can learn from the successes and challenges of their work.

Erica Ahdoot & Ji Young Park

Introduction

Practitioners in the fields of education and youth development continually strive to find useful ways to assess their success in supporting the achievements of the young people they serve. This is necessary given the United States' 17th place world ranking for educational outcomes. These educational outcomes are even more pronounced for people of color and those who are economically disadvantaged (Gamoran, 2007)¹. Despite research that consistently points to the ineffectiveness of standardized testing as an absolute measure of learning or progress, funders continue to disinvest in youth development and educational organizations that fail to demonstrate young people's improved performance on these tests (Lipman, 2011)². Focusing solely on formal testing outcomes fails to account for the success that these organizations have had in promoting student progress, as demonstrated through informal assessment and teacher evaluations. Test scores also fail to demonstrate the positive outcomes organizations can engender through relationship-building with families,

providing social/emotional support, focusing on the "softer" skill development essential to achievement, and increasing opportunities for advocacy and activism.

In many youth development or non-school settings, teachers and providers lack a consistent and measurable way of understanding student academic needs. Data is collected and analyzed, but this often happens only once or twice per year, through formal assessments. This limits an educators' ability to use data to differentiate instruction in real time, particularly for students with severe academic challenges.

At the GO Project, we have worked diligently to find the right tools that will allow us to expand our accountability measures beyond standardized testing outcomes and broaden our impact narrative. Over many years of tinkering, the GO Project has developed a teacher-driven, student assessment process that gives teachers the data they need in real time to improve their effectiveness, generate holistic narratives about individual young people, and demonstrate the program's success. In this document,

we outline our benchmarking strategy in the hopes of supporting other organizations to use data for ongoing assessment and tracking of student progress in their programs.

The GO Project addresses the needs of our students through three holistic, mutually reinforcing strands of service: GO Summer, GO School and GO Families. During GO Summer, students attend five weeks of full day academic and theme-based enrichment classes from July-August. Adult to student ratios are kept small through the staffing of certified teachers and specialists, enrichment teachers, teaching assistants, student teachers/teacher candidates, and skilled volunteers. Students enrolled in GO Summer continue on with GO School, which operates on Saturdays from October-April for a half-day of focused academic skill building. GO Families is a year-round student and family support program designed to help guide parents to create positive learning environments at home and school through proactively addressing student learning challenges. The following document focuses on the GO Project's work in GO Summer.

The GO Project's Educational Benchmarking Framework

The impetus for the GO Project's Educational Benchmarking Framework came from our teachers. In feedback collected through GO's biannual survey, teachers indicated that they would benefit from increased access to data about their students as well as assistance in assessing a targeted sub-set of skills students need to master within a given program cycle. In response, we developed a systematic way of supporting teachers. First, we worked collaboratively to identify the sub-set of K-8 Common Core State Standards (CCSS) that would guide GO teachers in assessing their students. These were translated into "benchmarks" of student achievement and became the focus areas of instruction during the GO Project program cycles. Second, we provided tools to aid teachers in their informal assessment of these key skills. Finally, we provided forums for peer-to-peer dialogue and expert coaching on how to use the data to effectively inform the content and structure of their instructional practices. This process became the GO Project's Educational Benchmarking Framework.

Incorporating GO's Educational Benchmarking Framework into regular organizational practice has ensured that teachers are better able to differentiate instruction. In fact, the defining feature of the GO classroom has become the use of differentiated instruction and the ongoing support provided to teachers around using assessment data to maximize the impact of each program cycle. Under the direction of the GO teachers, each classroom creatively leverages volunteers, student teachers and teacher assistants to co-facilitate targeted small group work in the classroom, accommodating the various learning styles and developmental pace for each of our students.

DEFINITION OF ROLES IN THE CLASSROOM

Head Teacher is the lead instructor that plans the curriculum, lessons and activities for the class. They manage and provide guidance and coaching to the other adults in the classroom. Head Teachers also facilitate and analyze student assessments and academic information to help plan small groups and provide information for the other adults that support students. Head Teachers also provide one-on-one support to the most struggling students in their class.

Teaching Assistants serve as group leaders in each classroom. They are in the classroom throughout the summer programming day. They assist the Head Teachers with classroom management, small group work and lead supervision of their class during lunch, recess and enrichment time.

Volunteers assist the teachers to facilitate small groups. They also help track student progress and lead small group work and discussions. Volunteers do this with the supervision and coaching of the Head Teacher.

Student Teachers support teachers by helping plan and lead lessons and activities. They also conduct individual student pull-outs of struggling students that require more individualized intervention. Student Teachers work in the academic portion of GO Summer.

Practices for Implementing a Strong Benchmarking System

In this document we will outline the following three practices necessary for implementing a strong benchmarking system:

- **Practice 1:** Ongoing Informal Assessment
- **Practice 2:** Small Group Instruction: Responsive and Individualized
- **Practice 3:** Classroom Observation, Coaching and Training

Each practice is described in detail and includes examples of how the practice plays out in the program context. Although each practice informs the other and is best implemented in tandem, each is outlined individually in the hopes that other organizations can adapt components of the GO Project's benchmarking framework that are best suited for their organizational context.

Practice 1: Ongoing Informal Assessment

At the GO Project, teachers informally assess student progress on a continual basis to ensure that appropriate learning opportunities are tailored to support students to move toward mastery of skills. Whereas formal assessments are computed mathematically and used to assess a student's general progress against standardized benchmarks, informal assessments are content and

performance driven and are used to inform real-time instruction with individual students. The various forms of informal assessment include evaluations of group or individual projects, experiments, oral presentations, demonstrations, or performances. In the informal assessment process, each student in the GO classroom works on a specific performance task (e.g. individual reading or essay writing). Their progress is evaluated and benchmarked along the following continuum: "Developing" (Approaches Proficiency), "Effective" (Proficient) and "Highly Effective" (Exceeds Proficiency). Informal assessments may also be drawn from typical classroom activities such as assignments, journals, essays, reports, discussion groups, or reading logs. To further document student progress, GO teachers keep notes or checklists to record their observations from student-teacher conferences or other informal classroom interactions. In particular, GO teachers match specific informal assessment tools to the skills they are looking to assess with particular students. This is important because each GO classroom includes students with varying performance levels. The process of implementing informal assessments in the GO classroom allows teachers to identify performance objectives, tailor instruction to these objectives and then reassess student performance against the objectives. This creates an effective

structure for monitoring and supporting student progress.

During the GO Summer program cycle, each GO teacher receives a class Assessment Binder containing an overall profile of the class as well as all relevant individual student information collected prior to the start of cycle. Each binder includes a *GO Students at a Glance* summary sheet used for charting the general progress of the class from beginning to end of the program cycle. The binders also include an *IEP* (Individual Education Plan) *at a Glance* summary sheet for each student in the class with an IEP. This sheet details classification, goals, accommodations and any additional individual learning needs of the student. Finally, the assessment binders include benchmarking tools in math, reading and writing, a collection of student work, and the teacher's notes.

Examples of benchmarking tools include:

- **Math Goal Sheet:** an individually tailored goal-setting and progress sheet that tracks the weekly academic progression of specific math standards that students work on in small groups.
- **Running Record:** a tool that allows teachers to assess student reading performance as a student reads from a leveled book

- **Words your Way:** a tool that assesses students in spelling, vocabulary and sentence structure

Teachers file their initial assessments and student work in the binders. Follow up assessments are added as they are conducted over the course of the summer. Teachers use the data and information from these ongoing assessments to regularly update class groupings. This data also informs how each adult in the room can best be utilized. Teachers share this information with Teaching Assistants, Student Teachers, and Volunteers so that everyone understands each student's needs and can play a role in supporting overall class progress. The assessment binders have two additional practical advantages: (1) they centralize information for classroom staff and (2) they make it easy to pass along information to other specialists and for the following program cycle.

With the goal of learning more about how informal assessments supported classroom instruction and teachers' ability to differentiate and support struggling students, the GO Project developed a survey for teachers that was delivered at the end of GO Summer. Twenty-eight of 38 teachers responded to the survey. Approximately 67% of teachers answered that they reassessed students more than twice throughout the summer

and 33% stated that they continuously used assessments to change or adjust groupings. Further, over 63% stated that the use of continuous informal assessments were very effective in assessing their students' progress, and supported communication about the student's progress with classroom staff. In the GO Project's experience, the most effective frequency of assessment to inform groupings was at least twice during the five-week GO summer program.

Practice 2: Small Group Instruction: Responsive and Individualized

The second defining feature of the GO Project's benchmarking framework is responsive and individualized small group instruction. The teacher develops student groupings for reading, writing, and math based on informal assessments and works with the other adults in the class to facilitate the differentiated groups. In their regular public schools, many GO Project students are in classes with over twenty other students. Even with committed teachers and dedicated school leadership, many of our students do not receive the type of individualized support in the classroom necessary to meet their academic needs. The GO Project is able to structure classroom environments that are responsive and individualized to meet student needs. According to a recent RAND study,

out-of-school time programs that intended to provide individualized instruction are more effective than programs without that intention (Cooper, Charlton, et al., 2000)³. Differentiated or individualized instruction supports various learners within the same grade and class, ensuring that all students are effectively guided towards academic success. Research also suggests that students are more successful in school if they are taught in ways that are responsive to their readiness levels and learning profiles (e.g., Sternberg, Torff, & Grigorenko, 1998).

Small groups or learning centers allow teachers to concentrate on developing and extending skills and understanding in a manner that is tailored to student needs. For example, students may solve word problems using a variety of techniques, or they may be grouped heterogeneously and encouraged to help one another answer questions about a reading passage. Each group is monitored by an adult who can provide differentiated instruction and quickly modify their approach based on the students' interaction with the material.

The GO Project's approach to small group instruction would not be possible without favorable student-teacher ratios. We maintain a 1 to 4 adult to student ratio in each class, with a maximum of

14 students per class. Classes are led by certified teachers with at least two years of teaching experience. During GO School, teachers are supported by 2-3 volunteers. During GO Summer, teachers are supported by Teacher's Assistants, Student Teachers and Volunteers. During GO Summer, specialists in reading, math, ESL, and speech also push into classes and/or work with small groups, further reducing class size. Smaller class sizes with multiple teachers provide more time to work individually with students and create opportunities to differentiate instruction.

One Kindergarten teacher explained the benefit of assessing and leveraging small groups for differentiation in the following way:

"Because there are so many adults and because so much time is given to us for assessment, the [lessons] really are tailored to their individual needs more. And that's the ideal. You want that in a regular classroom and it does happen to a certain extent, but when you're alone with 23 children, it does not work the same way. So, grouping is awesome here...Certain kids may still be working on counting accurately, so their group will work on that, whereas other kids don't need that. They need to be pushed more so they can move into more of the end of Kindergarten stuff, like base ten and breaking numbers apart that are

*greater than ten, and doing addition and subtraction with greater numbers."*¹

A first grade teacher similarly explained:

*"The kids sit down and take a formal computerized test in reading and math. I also do a lot of informal assessments with them and then I sit down and go through all the data and I create four to five goals per child for the summer. And based upon those goals, I then create their groups and different activities for them to do in a small group with another adult...A lot of these kids are not on their level and if they were in a regular class, then you know the teacher may not always be getting to [a struggling] student because of the difference in level. But [at GO] it's very much stressed that the student needs goals for the week and the next couple of weeks and that is what you focus on. I think that could definitely get lost in their regular classroom during the year."*²

An independent evaluation group, Glass Frog, was hired by the GO Project to conduct observations of GO classrooms during GO Summer 2014. In their observation of one classroom, Glass Frog noted the following:

The lesson was differentiated very well. Teachers in the classroom were assigned

¹ Interview with evaluation team, July 2014.

² Interview with evaluation team, July 2014.

certain students to check in with during independent reading. Students were reading a book on their level, determined previously by the teacher. The students knew what level they were, so they were able to choose a new and appropriate book on their own when they were done reading. Guided reading began toward the end of the period, where students were grouped according to their reading levels and the skills they needed to practice. For example, the lower group worked with the head teacher on vowels and consonants, while other groups read different books at their reading levels.

After an observation of the same teacher's math class, the evaluators similarly noted:

"Students spent a majority of the class time in small groups. Although the whole group solved the same questions (both as a group and in the small groups), they were placed in leveled groups to obtain the right amount of support. When students were in small groups, the learning centers focused on their needs. Students were all engaged in the lesson.

They learned a specific skill and then in the centers were even more focused on the skill at their level."

Practice 3: Classroom Observation, Coaching and Training

Developing teacher leadership is an important goal of the GO Project. Human capital investment, with a clear focus on teacher leadership and professional development is one of the organization's strategic priorities. The After School Corporation's Model Core Teaching Standards state that successful teachers engage in ongoing professional learning, use evidence to continually evaluate teaching practice, and adapt teaching practice to meet the needs of each learner¹. Providing both formal and informal opportunities to support growth and development can foster a teacher's ability to consistently deliver high quality instruction in the classroom.

A fundamental component of the GO Project's approach is placing experienced and high performing professional teachers in our classrooms to aid student learning. To that end, GO teachers receive support from the Directors of Curriculum and Instruction (DCI). The DCIs provide teachers with ongoing training and in-class support through formal and informal observations. The observations ensure that each GO classroom exemplifies a positive classroom atmosphere, has engaged students, differentiates instruction and shows effective classroom management. DCIs also give feedback on unit plans and student evaluations.

Additionally, DCI's guide weekly grade team meetings where grade specific challenges and planning for future unit plans/curricula are discussed with teachers.

Classroom Observations

The GO Project's Academic Team (Directors of Curriculum and Instruction and Director of Academics and Enrichment) conduct evaluations via classroom observations throughout the summer. In each observation, classrooms are rated as: "Model", "Satisfactory", or "Needs Improvement". The goal of these observations is to determine the degree to which teachers are integrating the following elements/practices into their instruction:

- **Positive Classroom:** strengths-based language, shared values, positive peer interaction, and hands-on learning.
- **Student Engagement/Accountable Talk:** student-based interaction, student facilitation, peer collaboration.
- **Differentiation:** small group work, targeting weaknesses and strengths, explicit teaching, data driven and challenging curriculum.
- **Classroom Management:** schedules and routines posted, use of incentives/ASPIRE.

The Academic Team completed 20 formal and 51 informal observations

of new and returning teachers in GO Summer 2014. Formal observations were conducted more frequently with newly hired teachers and involved observing a lesson for 40-50 minutes using a standard assessment rubric including narrative notes. Informal observations were shorter and unscheduled but used the same assessment rubric for each classroom. Overall, 68% of the academic classrooms observed throughout the summer were deemed "Model" classrooms, 28% were "Satisfactory", and 4% "Needs Improvement".

Classroom observations provided a better understanding of how teachers were using informal assessments to differentiate instruction in the classroom. In their observations, DCIs noted that groups were often created based on student needs. For example, in a model classroom, students were separated into three groups: below grade level, approaching grade level, and at grade level. The lead facilitator of the small group (Teaching Assistant or Student Teacher) recorded the progress against mastery of a skill and this information was then shared with the teacher. The DCIs were able to observe connections between teachers' modifications of student group composition using this data and positive student engagement and understanding.

Grade Team Meetings

At Grade Team Meetings held weekly throughout GO Summer, teachers shared informal assessment information, additional assessment tools and offered one another peer support. Grade Teams and DCIs worked together to codify data and share strategies for differentiating instruction, including methods for effectively using the other adults in the classroom and working in learning centers.

Teachers discussed how to use informal running records for reading assessment to ensure accuracy in their groupings, to assess the progress of students, to guide their instruction for the class and for structuring guided reading. Teachers also shared writing prompt samples that could be used during “On-Demand” writing assessment.

Each of the weekly grade team meetings also addressed learning approaches. Teachers discussed their collected assessments and how best to group students based on skill and learning style. During the summer program, teachers addressed independence and initiative in learning, aiming to support students along a continuum, moving from directed to independent learning. This included promoting social-emotional development, executive functioning skills, and information processing. These

were critical elements of the informal assessment since GO looks at the whole child in order to positively impact their overall learning.

MATH GROUPINGS AT WORK

During an initial First Grade team meeting the teachers discussed and work shopped how they assessed and grouped their students. The teachers reviewed each other's class groupings, and shared the individual math goal sheets for each student in the specific groups. The following are the general math groupings and skills that 4 of GO's first grade classes recorded:

Math Groupings:

Class #1: Juliet shared one group of Jacqueline, Leah, and Tyler and goals for their group included: count objects 1-20 and representing the numbers.

Class #2: Alison shared one group of Steven D, Camile, Katherine, Kimberly and the goals for the group included moving away from tallies and sketches and solving single plus double digit addition.

Class #3: Tamaree shared one group of Elissa, Jose, and Rachel Lo, William Zeng and the goals included operation and algebraic thinking, solving two step problems, and using base 10 blocks.

Class #4: Nitika shared one group of Sonam, Julian, Amber, and Anna and goals included operations and algebraic thinking and involved missing addend and 2 step problems.

Through ongoing assessments, teachers notice various trends in their classes and groups. In our first grade classes the teachers observed the following trends:

Class #1: Alison noticed that there's a lack of phonics foundation in her class.

Class #2: Nitika shared that her students were struggling with the inferential questioning but she's already seen an improvement with the feelings unit. She also shared that they were struggling with answering questions from the text.

Class #3: Juliet shared that the students were struggling with long and short vowels.

Class #4: Tamaree shared that her students need to work on vowel sounds and initial sounds.

Discussion

The GO Project's Benchmarking Framework can be applied to supplemental academic programs that focus on providing targeted support for students that are struggling academically. The framework supports educators to differentiate their lessons to maximize student learning, better leverage volunteers and youth development staff in the classroom, and effectively align supplemental education with school day instruction by focusing on the specific supports students need to reach grade level and beyond.

According to the Afterschool Alliance, "aligning afterschool and school-day learning can be a valuable weapon in the nation's education arsenal, combining the invaluable knowledge and instruction gained during the school day with the more flexible enrichment environment of afterschool."ⁱⁱ Aligning the GO Project's academic curricula with school and classroom activities has contributed to a shared mission of improving academic performance, while meeting the needs of parents and students.ⁱⁱⁱ Having a clearly defined benchmarking process and closely aligned method of measuring progress throughout the year can serve to clarify an organization's programmatic goals,

position educational non-profits as strong allies to struggling schools, ensure a steady stream of student referrals to the program, and establish communication between the program's leadership and public school teachers and administrators. Further, a consistent and clear framework with frequent intervals for measurement allows for real-time communication of progress beyond standardized assessment. This is critical in ensuring that students, families, partners and supporters have a holistic view of both a student's abilities and their progress.

The GO Project recommends that programs implementing a benchmarking framework include ongoing teacher support and professional development when implementing any data-driven initiative. Assessments are only as effective as the teacher and team that can implement them. Continuous training and support is necessary to shift a teacher's practice in using data to drive instruction. Teachers face tremendous pressures around standardized test scores and the introduction of the Common Core. Providing teachers with tools and strategies like GO's Educational Benchmarking Framework that bolster their practice can translate into impactful teaching and learning within every classroom.

1 Gamoran, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Standards-based reform and the poverty gap: Lessons for No Child Left Behind*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.

2 Lipman, P. (2011). Neoliberal education restructuring dangers and opportunities of the present crisis. *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, 63(3), 114.

3 Cooper, Harris, Kelly Charlton, Jeff C. Valentine, and Laura Muhlenbruck, with Geoffrey D. Borman, *Making the Most of Summer School: A Meta-Analytic and Narrative Review*, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, Vol. 65, No. 1, Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2000.

4 Sternberg, R.J., Torff, B., & Grigorenko, E.L. (1998a). Teaching for successful intelligence raises school achievement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(9), 667-669.

5 Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards: A Resource for State Dialogue*. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/documents/2011/intasc_model_core_teaching_standards_2011.pdf