Section VI

Wisconsin's Guiding Principles for Teaching and Learning

This page intentionally left blank.

Guiding Principles for Teaching and Learning

These guiding principles are the underpinnings of effective teaching and learning for every Wisconsin teacher and every Wisconsin student. They are larger than any one initiative, process or set of standards. Rather, they are the lens we look through as we identify teaching and learning standards, design assessments and determine what good instruction looks like. These principles recognize that every student has the right to learn and are built upon three essential elements: high quality instruction, balanced assessment and collaboration. They are meant to align with academic excellence, rigorous instruction and college and career readiness for every Wisconsin student. For additional research, resources and probing questions to support professional learning on the six principles, please see the Wisconsin Research and Resources section of this document.

Every student has the right to learn.
It is our collective responsibility as an education community to make certain each child receives a high-quality, challenging education designed to maximize potential, an education that reflects and stretches his or her abilities and interests. This belief in the right of every child to learn forms the basis of equitable teaching and learning. The five principles that follow cannot exist without this commitment guiding our work.

Instruction must be rigorous and relevant.
To understand the world in which we live, there are certain things we all must learn. Each school subject is made up of a core of essential knowledge that is deep, rich and vital. Every student, regardless of age or ability, must be taught this essential knowledge. What students learn is fundamentally connected to how they learn and successful instruction blends the content of a discipline with processes of an engaging learning environment that changes to meet the dynamic needs of all students.

Purposeful assessment drives instruction and affects learning.
Assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning. Purposeful assessment practices help teachers and students understand where they have been, where they are and where they might go next. No one assessment can provide sufficient information to plan teaching and learning. Using different types of assessments as part of instruction results in useful information about student understanding and progress. Educators should use this information to guide their own practice and in partnership with students and their families to reflect on learning and set future goals.

Learning is a collaborative responsibility.
Teaching and learning are both collaborative processes. Collaboration benefits teaching and learning when it occurs on several levels: when students, teachers, family members and the community collectively prioritize education and engage in activities that support local schools, educators and students; when educators collaborate with their colleagues to support innovative classroom practices and set high expectations for themselves and their students; and when students are given opportunities to work together toward academic goals in ways that enhance learning.

Students bring strengths and experiences to learning.
Every student learns. Although no two students come to school with the same culture, learning strengths, background knowledge or experiences and no two students learn in exactly the same way, every student's unique personal history enriches classrooms, schools and the community. This diversity is our greatest education asset.

Responsive environments engage learners.
Meaningful learning happens in environments where creativity, awareness, inquiry and critical thinking are part of instruction. Responsive learning environments adapt to the individual needs of each student and encourage learning by promoting collaboration rather than isolation of learners. Learning environments, whether classrooms, schools or other systems, should be structured to promote engaged teaching and learning.

Guiding Principle 1:
Every student has the right to learn.

It is our collective responsibility as an education community to make certain each child receives a high-quality, challenging education designed to maximize potential, an education that reflects and stretches his or her abilities and interests. This belief in the right of every child to learn forms the basis of equitable teaching and learning. The five principles that follow cannot exist without this commitment guiding our work.

Every student's right to learn provides the overarching vision for Wisconsin's Guiding Principles for education. To be successful, education must be committed to serving the learning needs of students from various social, economic, cultural, linguistic and developmental backgrounds. For all students to have a guaranteed right to learn, schooling must be equitable.

Research Summary

Focusing on Equity
The belief that each student has the right to learn despite differences in educational needs and backgrounds has important implications for ensuring an equitable education for all students. In the education research literature, the term *educational equality* refers to the notion that all students should have access to an education of similar quality—the proxy for which is frequently educational *inputs* such as funding, facilities, resources and quality teaching and learning. In contrast, the term *educational equity* connotes the requirement that all students receive an education that allows them to achieve at a standard level or attain standard educational *outcomes* (Brighouse & Swift, 2008). Importantly, equality in terms of educational resources or inputs may not guarantee equity in educational outcomes because not all students reach the same level of achievement with the same access to resources (Brighouse & Swift, 2008).To serve students of varying economic, social, developmental or linguistic backgrounds, achieving equity in education may require more resources to meet the greater educational needs of certain students (Berne & Stiefel, 1994).

The research literature offers several components that provide a framework for understanding what an equitable education for all students looks like at the classroom level. These components include a call for all students to be provided with the following:

- Access to resources and facilities
- Instruction in all areas tailored to their needs
- Curriculum that is rigorous and relevant
- Educators who are culturally sensitive and respectful
- Interactions with staff and other students that are positive and encouraging in an atmosphere of learning
- Assessment that is varied to give each student the opportunity to demonstrate learning (Education Northwest, 2011)

Access
Access to resources and facilities largely refers to various legal mandates that all children have the right to attend school and participate in all school activities. Since the landmark ruling *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954), court decisions and federal regulations have mandated equality of access to all educational opportunities for students regardless of race, ethnicity or gender (Civil Rights Act, 1964), disability (Education for All Handicapped Children Act, 1975) or language (*Lau v. Nichols, 1974*). Equity in the provision of educational resources and funding was improved with the passage of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA; 1965), which provided additional resources for economically disadvantaged students to meet their learning needs. Since Title I, research on equity in education has grown and with the reauthorization of ESEA in the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001, equity in educational outcomes for all students was emphasized in the law. Access to an equitable education is a legal right for all children and the quality of that access in classroom instruction is a moral and ethical right.

Instruction
Instruction that is tailored to meet all students' needs goes beyond simply providing equal access to education. High-quality instruction has increasingly been defined in the literature as a key factor in student achievement. High-quality instruction includes differentiated instructional strategies, teaching to students' learning styles and provision of instructional support for students who are educationally, socially or linguistically challenged. Differentiated instruction involves utilizing unique instructional strategies for meeting individual student needs as well as modifying curriculum for both high- and low-performing students. Assessing and teaching to student learning styles is one form of differentiation. Research has shown the value of adapting instructional strategies to different student learning styles (Gardner, 1999) and supports the practice of classroom differentiation (Mulroy & Eddinger, 2003; Tomlinson, 2005).

Curriculum
Designing curriculum that is rigorous and relevant provides an important foundation for a high-quality learning environment by helping make

standards-based content accessible to all students. A relevant, rigorous curriculum has been found to be important for all students. Although advanced and rigorous curriculum is generally viewed to be an important factor of academic success for high-achieving students, research also indicates that using challenging, interesting and varied curriculum for students of all achievement levels improves student achievement (Daggett, 2005). Rigorous curriculum can be adapted for low-performing students in a way that challenges them and helps them meet learning standards. For example, the universal design for learning (UDL) offers strategies for making the general curriculum accessible to special education students (Rose, Hasselbring, Stahl, & Zabala, 2009). Similarly, research on lesson scaffolding emphasizes strategies for providing a rigorous content curriculum to student who are culturally or linguistically diverse or who need additional context to understand certain concepts (Gibbons, 2002).

Climate

Interactions with staff and students that are positive and focused on learning are part of an emotionally safe school climate, but the literature also supports the need for a climate of high academic expectations (Haycock, 2001). Schools with large numbers of high-poverty and racially diverse students have shown significant academic growth when teachers and staff members create an environment of high expectations for achievement (Reeves, 2010). In addition, research on school climate has asserted the need for students to feel emotionally safe and respected as well as physically safe in school (Gronna & Chin-Chance, 1999).

A positive, respectful learning environment with high expectations and curricular and instructional supports for all students offers an avenue to genuine educational equity.

Probing Questions

- What are some of the needs and challenges your school faces in moving toward a fully equitable education for all students?
- How could you provide leadership in your school to work to ensure an equitable education for all students?

Resources

A variety of resources are available for teachers and leaders on educational equity for all students. A few websites and links are highlighted below:

The School Improvement Center developed activities to help districts develop an equity framework. These resources can be found at Actualizing Equity: The Equity Framework: http://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/NoChildLeftBehind/Admin/Files/ conference_032010/Actualizing_Equity.pdf.

The Education Equality Project developed a website with useful resources for educators. It can be found at http://www.edequality.org.

The Equity Center has a website with a variety of resources. The resources can be found at http://educationnorthwest.org/project/Equity%20Program/resource/.

The Midwest Equity Assistance Center has a website with many resources. It can be found at http://www.meac.org/Publications.html.

The Office for Civil Rights has a useful website for educators. It can be found at http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/index.html.

Southern Poverty Law Center, Teaching Tolerance Program. Resources can be found at http://www.splcenter.org/what-we-do/teaching-tolerance.

References

Berne, R., & Stiefel, L. (1994). Measuring educational equity at the school level: The finance perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16(4), 405–421.

Brighouse, H., & Swift, A. (2008). Putting educational equality in its place. *Education, Finance and Policy*, 3(4), 444–446.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

Civil Rights Act, Title IX, Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241 (1964).

Daggett, W. R. (2005). *Achieving academic excellence through rigor and relevance* [White paper]. Rexford, NY: International Center for Leadership in Education. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.leadered.com/pdf/Academic_Excellence.pdf.

Education Northwest. (2011). *Key components of educational equity* [Website]. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://educationnorthwest.org/equity-program/educational.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act, Pub. L. No. 94-142 (1975).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-10) (1965).

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. New York: Basic Books.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Westport, CT: Heinemann.

Gronna, S. S., & Chin-Chance, S.A. (1999, April). *Effects of school safety and school characteristics on grade 8 achievement*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 430292). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED430292.pdf.

Haycock, K. (2001). Closing the achievement gap. *Educational Leadership*, 58(6), 6–11.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 565 (1974).

Mulroy, H., & Eddinger, K. (2003, March). *Differentiation and literacy.* Paper presented at the Institute on Inclusive Education, Rochester, NY.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf.

Reeves, D. B. (2010). The 90/90/90 schools: A case study. In D. B. Reeves, *Accountability in action* (2nd ed., 185–196). Denver, CO: Advanced Learning Press.

Rose, D., Hasselbring, T., Stahl, S., & Zabala, J. (2009). Assistive technology, NIMAS and UDL: From some students to all students. In D. Gordon, J. Gravel, & L. Schifter (Eds.), *A policy reader in universal design for learning* (pp. 133–154). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Tomlinson, C.A. (2005). Grading and differentiation: Paradox or good practice? *Theory Into Practice,* 44(3) 262–269.

Guiding Principle 2:
Instruction must be rigorous and relevant.

To understand the world in which we live, there are certain things we all must learn. Each school subject is made up of a core of essential knowledge that is deep, rich and vital. Every student, regardless of age or ability, must be taught this essential knowledge. What students learn is fundamentally connected to how they learn and successful instruction blends the content of a discipline with processes of an engaging learning environment that changes to meet the dynamic needs of all students.

Research Summary

Instruction should connect directly to students' lives and must deeply engage them with the content in order for students to be better prepared for college and careers. To succeed in postsecondary education and in a 21st century economy, students must be afforded opportunities to practice higher-order thinking skills, such as how to analyze an argument, weigh evidence, recognize bias (their own and others' bias), distinguish fact from opinion, balance competing principles, work collaboratively with others and be able to communicate clearly what they understand (Wagner, 2006). In order to accomplish these goals, instruction must be rigorous and meaningful.

The definition of rigor varies greatly in both research and practice. Bower and Powers (2009) conducted a study to determine the essential components of rigor. They defined rigor through their research as "how the standard curriculum is delivered within the classroom to ensure students are not only successful on standardized assessments but also able to apply this knowledge to new situations both within the classroom and in the real world." They also identified higher-order thinking and real-world application as two critical aspects of rigor, suggesting that it is not enough for students to know how to memorize information and perform on multiple-choice and short-answer tests. Students must have deep and rich content knowledge, but rigor also includes the ability to apply that knowledge in authentic ways.

Teaching and learning approaches that involve students collaborating on projects that culminate with a product or presentation are a way to bring rigor into the classroom. Students can take on real problems, use what they know and research to come up with real solutions to real problems. They must engage with their subject and with their peers.

In August 2010, the Institutes of Education Sciences reported the results of a randomized control trial showing that a problem-based curriculum boosted high school students' knowledge of economics. This research suggests that students using this learning system and its variants score similarly on standardized tests as students who follow more traditional classroom practices. The research also suggests that students learning through problem-solving and projects are more adept at applying what they know and are more deeply engaged.

The notion of a meaningful curriculum is not a new one. John Dewey (1990), writing in 1902, called for a curriculum that involves a critical but balanced understanding of the culture and the prior knowledge of each child in order to extend learning. According to Spillane (2000), presenting content in more authentic ways—disciplinary and other real-world contexts—has become a central theme of current reform movements. Schools should be places where "the work students are asked to do [is] work worth doing" (Darling-Hammond, 2006, p. 21). Research collected by the International Center for Leadership in Education shows that "students understand and retain knowledge best when they have applied it in a practical, relevant setting" (Daggett, 2005, p. 2).A skilled 21st century educator helps students master learning targets and standards using purposefully crafted lessons and teaches with appropriate instructional strategies incorporated. The students understand why they are learning particular skills and content and are engaged in learning opportunities that allow them to use their inquiry skills, creativity and critical thinking to solve problems.

According to Brown, Collins and Duguid (1989), instruction connected to individual contexts has been found to have a significant impact on learning. Research conducted by Sanbonmatsu, Shavitt and Sherman (1991) and Petty and Cacioppo (1984) also contends that student learning is directly influenced by how well it is connected to a context. Much of this research began with the analysis of how people learn when they find the ideas significant to their own world. It begins to show the importance

of connecting content and instruction to the world of the students. Weaver and Cottrell (1988) point out that how content is presented can affect how students retain it. They state instruction that connects the content to the students' lives and experiences helps students to internalize meaning. Sass (1989) and Keller (1987) suggest that if teachers can make the content familiar to the students and link it to what they are familiar with, students' learning will increase. Shulman and Luechauer (1993) contend that these connections must be done by engaging students with rigorous content in interactive learning environments.

Higher-Order Thinking

Higher-order thinking, according to Newmann (1990),"challenges the student to interpret, analyze or manipulate information" (p. 45).This definition suggests that instruction must be designed to engage students through multiple levels in order for them to gain a better understanding of the content. An analysis of the research by Lewis and Smith (1993) led to their definition of higher-order thinking: "when a person takes new information and information stored in memory and interrelates and/ or rearranges and extends this information to achieve a purpose or find possible answers in perplexing situations" (p. 44).This definition emphasizes the level of complexity necessary to help students reach a deeper and higher level of understanding of the content. Shulman (1987) points out teachers will need an in-depth knowledge of their content to be able to fit these types of strategies to their instruction.

Real-World Application

VanOers and Wardekker (1999) indicate that connecting instruction to real-world applications gives meaning to learning, makes it practical and can help to develop connections with the greater community. Incorporating real-world examples becomes more authentic to students because they will be able to connect the learning to the bigger picture rather than just the classroom. Newmann and Wehlage (1993) describe the three criteria developed by Archbald and Newmann (1988) for this type of authentic learning:"Students construct meaning and produce knowledge, students use disciplined inquiry to construct meaning and students aim their work toward production of discourse, products and performances that have value or meaning beyond success in school" (p. 8) These criteria, when reflected upon by teachers, can be a useful tool to ensure that instruction is authentic and engaging for all students.

Authentic Learning

Authentic learning builds on the concept of "learning by doing" to increase a student's engagement. To succeed, this method needs to have meaning or value to the student, embody in-depth learning in the subject and allow the student to use what he or she learned to produce something new and innovative (Lemke & Coughlin, 2009). For example, in project-based learning, students collaborate to create their own projects that demonstrate their knowledge (Bell, 2010). Students start by developing a question that will guide their work. The teacher acts as the supervisor. The goal is greater understanding of the topic, deeper learning, higher-level reading and increased motivation (Bell, 2010). Research has shown that students who engage in project-based learning outscore their traditionally educated peers in standardized testing (Bell, 2010).

Constructivist learning is also a way to bring authenticity to the classroom. Richard Mayer (2004) defines constructivist learning as an "active process in which learners are active sense makers who seek to build coherent and organized knowledge." Students co-construct their learning, with the teacher serving as a guide or facilitator (oftentimes using technology as a facilitating tool).The teacher doesn't function in a purely didactic manner. Neo and Neo (2009) state that constructivism helps students develop problem-solving skills, critical thinking and creative skills and apply them in meaningful ways. Inquiry-based instruction, a type of constructivist learning, has students identify real world problems and then pose and find answers to their own questions. A study by Minner, Levy and Century (2010) has shown this method can improve student performance. They found inquiry-based instruction has a larger impact (approximately 25-30% higher) on a student's initial understanding and retention of content than any other variable.

Another form of authentic learning involves video simulated learning or gaming. Research has shown that video games can provide a rich learning context by fostering creative thinking. The games can show players how to manage complex problems and how their decisions can affect the outcome (Sharritt, 2008). This form of learning also can engage students in collaboration and interaction with peers.

Multimodal Instruction

Multimodal teaching leverages various presentation formats—such as printed material, videos, PowerPoints and computers—to appeal to different learning styles (Birch, 2009; Moreno & Mayer, 2007). It

accommodates a more diverse curriculum and can provide a more engaging and interactive learning environment (Birch, 2009).According to research, an effective way of learning is by utilizing different modalities within the classroom, which can help students understand difficult concepts—therefore improving how they learn (Moreno & Mayer, 2007).

An example of multimodal learning that incorporates technology is digital storytelling. Digital storytelling is the practice of telling stories by using technology tools (e.g., digital cameras, authoring tools, computers) to create multimedia stories (Sadik, 2008). Researchers have found that using this form of learning facilitates student engagement, deep learning, project-based learning and effective integration of technology into instruction (Sadik, 2008).

Probing Questions

Research emphasizes the need for higher-order thinking embedded in instructional practice. How might you learn to incorporate higher-order thinking strategies into your practice?

The research also suggests the need to connect learning experiences to the real world of the students. How can you use real-world examples in your practice to better engage students in their learning?

Resources

The Rigor/Relevance Framework created by Daggett (2005) is a useful tool to create units, lessons and assessments that ask students to engage with content at a higher, deeper level. The model and examples are available on the following website: http://www.leadered.com/rrr.html.

Newmann's Authentic Intellectual Work Framework (Newmann, Secada & Wehlage, 1995) gives teachers the tools to analyze instructional practices and student work in regard to indicators of rigor. The research and tools are available at the Center for Authentic Intellectual Work website: http://centerforaiw.com/.

References

Archbald, D., & Newmann, F. M. (1988). Beyond standardized testing: Assessing authentic academic achievement in the secondary school. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. The Clearing House, 83, 39–43.

Birch, D. (2009). PowerPoint with audio: A breeze to enhance the student learning experience. E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching, 3(1), 36–42.

Bower, H.A., & Powers, J. D. (2009, Fall).What is rigor? A qualitative analysis of one school's definition. Academic Leadership Live: The Online Journal, 7(4). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.academic leadership.org/article/What_is_Rigor_A_Qualitative_Analysis_of_One_School_s_ Definition.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18(1), 32–42.

Daggett, W. R. (2005). Achieving academic excellence through rigor and relevance. Rexford, NY: International Center for Leadership in Education.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Securing the right to learn: Policy and practice for powerful teaching and learning. Educational Researcher, 35(7), 13–24.

Dewey, J. (1990). School and society [and] The child and the curriculum. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Finkelstein, Neal, Thomas Hanson, Chun-Wei Huang, Becca Hirschman and Min Huang. (2010). Effects of problem based economics on high school economics instruction." Institute For Education Sciences. West Ed.

Keller, J. M. (1987). Strategies for stimulating the motivation to learn. Performance & Instruction, 26(8), 1–7.

Lemke, C., & Coughlin, E. (2009, September).The change agents: Technology is empowering 21st century students in four key ways. Educational Leadership, 67(1), 54–59.

Lewis, A., & Smith, D. (1993). Defining higher order thinking. Theory Into Practice, 32(3), 131–137.

Mayer, R.E. (2004). Should There Be a Three-Strikes Rule Against Pure Discovery Learning? The Case for Guided Methods of Instruction. American Psychologist, 59(1), 14-19.

Minner, Daphne D., Abigail Jurist Levy and Jeanne Century. “Inquiry-Based Science Instruction—What Is It and Does It Matter? Results from a Research Synthesis years 1984 to 2002.” JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SCIENCE TEACHING 47.4 (April 2010): 474-96.

Moreno, R., & Mayer, R. (2007). Interactive multimodal learning environments [Special issue on interactive learning environment-contemporary issues and trends]. Educational Psychology Review, 19, 309–326.

Neo, M. & Neo, T.K. (2009). Engaging students in multimedia-mediated Constructivist learning-Students’ perceptions. Educational Technology & Society, 12(2), 254-266.

Newmann, F. M. (1990). Higher order thinking in teaching social studies: A rationale for the assessment of classroom thoughtfulness. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 22(2), 41–56.

Newmann, F. M., Secada, W. G., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards and scoring. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Newmann, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1993, April). Five standards of authentic instruction. Educational Leadership, 50(7), 8–12.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J.T. (1984). The effects of involvement on responses to argument quality: Central and peripheral routes to persuasion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46(1), 69–81.

Sadik, A. (2008). Digital storytelling: A meaningful technology-integrated approach for engaged student learning. Educational Technology Research & Development, 56, 487–506.

Sanbonmatsu, D. M., Shavitt, S., & Sherman, S. J. (1991). The role of personal relevance in the formation of distinctiveness-based illusory correlations. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17(2), 124–132.

Sass, E. J. (1989). Motivation in the college classroom: What students tell us. Teaching of Psychology, 16(2), 86–88.

Sharritt, M. J. (2008). Forms of learning in collaborative video game play. Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning, 3(2), 97–138.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1–22.

Shulman, G., & Luechauer, D. (1993). The empowering educator: A CQI approach to classroom leadership. In D. L. Hubbard (Ed.), Continuous quality improvement: Making the transition to education (pp. 424–453). Maryville, MO: Prescott.

Spillane, J. P. (2000). A fifth-grade teacher’s reconstruction of mathematics and literacy teaching: Exploring interactions among identity, learning and subject matter. Elementary School Journal, 100(4), 307–330.

VanOers, B., & Wardekker, K. (1999). On becoming an authentic learner: Semiotic activity in the early grades. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31(2), 229–249.

Wagner, T. (2006, January 11). Rigor on trial [Commentary]. Education Week, 25(18), 28–29. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/01/11/18wagner.h25.html?tkn=NXVFlUJgch3u9KNoybF2gM%2BinCPa3hvbbWkj&print=1

Weaver, R. L., & Cottrell, H.W. (1988). Motivating students: Stimulating and sustaining student effort. College Student Journal, 22, 22–32.

Wentling, R. M., & Waight, C. L. (2001). Initiative that assist and barriers that hinder the successful transition of minority youth into the workplace in the USA. Journal of Education and Work, 14(1), 71–89.

Guiding Principle 3:
Purposeful assessment drives instruction and affects learning.

Assessment is an integral part of teaching and learning. Purposeful assessment practices help teachers and students understand where they have been, where they are and where they might go next. No one assessment can provide sufficient information to plan teaching and learning. Using different types of assessments as part of instruction results in useful information about student understanding and progress. Educators should use this information to guide their own practice and in partnership with students and their families to reflect on learning and set future goals.

Research Summary

Assessment informs teachers, administrators, parents and other stakeholders about student achievement. It provides valuable information for designing instruction; acts as an evaluation for students, classrooms and schools; and informs policy decisions. Instruments of assessment can provide formative or summative data and they can use traditional or authentic designs. Research on assessment emphasizes that the difference between formative and summative assessment has to do with how the data from the assessment is used.

Dunn and Mulvenon (2009) define summative assessment as assessment "data for the purposes of assessing academic progress at the end of a specified time period (i.e., a unit of material or an entire school year) and for the purposes of establishing a student's academic standing relative to some established criterion" (p. 3).

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) (2008) define formative assessment as a process "used by teachers and students during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students' achievement of intended instructional outcomes" (p. 3).

Wisconsin's approach to balanced assessment www.dpi.wi.gov/oea/balanced emphasizes the importance of identifying the purposes for administering an assessment. Identifying the purpose or data needed establishes whether a particular assessment is being used formatively or summatively. There can be multiple purposes for giving a particular assessment, but identifying how the data will be used helps to ensure that the assessment is collecting the data that is needed for educators, students and their families.

Assessments, whether formative or summative, can be designed as traditional or authentic tools. Traditional assessment uses tools such as paper and pencil tests, while authentic assessment focuses on evaluating student learning in a more "real life" situation. The bulk of the research on assessment design focuses on authentic assessment.

Formative Assessment

Using formative assessment as a regular part of instruction has been shown to improve student learning from early childhood to university education. It has been shown to increase learning for both low-performing and high-performing students. Black and Wiliam's (1998) seminal study found that the use of formative assessment produces significant learning gains for low-achieving students. Other researchers have shown similar results for students with special learning needs. (McCurdy & Shapiro, 1992; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1986). Research also supports the use of formative assessment in kindergarten classes (Bergan, Sladeczek, Schwarz, & Smith, 1991) and university students (Martinez & Martinez, 1992).

Formative assessment provides students with information on the gaps that exist between their current knowledge and the stated learning goals (Ramaprasad, 1983). By providing feedback on specific errors it helps students understand that their low performance can be improved and is not a result of lack of ability (Vispoel & Austin, 1995). Studies emphasize that formative assessment is most effective when teachers use it to provide specific and timely feedback on errors and suggestions for improvement (Wininger, 2005), when students understand the learning objectives and assessment criteria and when students have the opportunity to reflect on their work (Ross, 2006; Ruiz-Primo & Furtak, 2006). Recent research supports the use of web-based formative assessment for improving student achievement (Wang, 2007).
A number of studies emphasize the importance of teacher professional development on formative assessment in order to gain maximum student achievement benefits (Atkins, Black & Coffey, 2001; Black & Wiliam, 1998).A 2009 article in *Educational Measurement* asserts that teachers

are better at analyzing formative assessment data than at using it to design instruction. Research calls for more professional development on assessment for teachers (Heritage, Kim, Vendlinski, & Herman, 2009).

Authentic Assessment
Generating rich assessment data can be accomplished through the use of an authentic assessment design as well as through traditional tests. Authentic assessments require students to "use prior knowledge, recent learning and relevant skills to solve realistic, complex problems" (DiMartino & Castaneda, 2007, p. 39). Research on authentic assessment often explores one particular form, such as portfolios (Berryman & Russell, 2001; Tierney et al., 1998); however, several studies examined more than one form of authentic assessment: portfolios, project-based assessment, use of rubrics, teacher observation and student demonstration (Darling-Hammond, Rustique-Forrester, & Pecheone, 2005; Herman, 1997; Wiggins, 1990). Authentic assessment tools can be used to collect both formative and summative data. These data can provide a more complete picture of student learning.

Balanced Assessment
Wisconsin's Next Generation Assessment Task Force (2009) defines the purpose and characteristics of a balanced assessment system:

> Purpose: to provide students, educators, parents and the public with a range of information about academic achievement and to determine the best practices and policies that will result in improvements to student learning.
> Characteristics: includes a continuum of strategies and tools that are designed specifically to meet discrete needs–daily classroom instruction, periodic checkpoints during the year and annual snapshots of achievement. (p. 6)

A balanced assessment system is an important component of quality teaching and learning. Stiggins (2007) points out that a variety of quality assessments must be available to teachers in order to form a clearer picture of student achievement of the standards. Popham (2008) believes that when an assessment is of high quality, it can accurately detect changes in student achievement and can contribute to continuous improvement of the educational system.

Probing Questions

- How might you use questioning and discussion in your classroom in a way that gives you formative assessment information on all students?
- How can you use assignments and tests as effective formative assessment?
- How could you design and implement a balanced assessment system that includes pre- and post-assessments for learning?

Resources
Rick Stiggins, founder and director of the Assessment Training Institute, provides resources on the practice of assessment at http://www.assessmentinst.com/author/rick-stiggins/.

Margaret Heritage's books Formative Assessment for Literacy and Academic Language (2008, coauthored with Alison Bailey) and Formative Assessment: Making It Happen in the Classroom (2010) provides resources and practices. These books are available through bookstores.

ASCD has publications on assessment at http://www.ascd.org/SearchResults.aspx?s=assessment&c=1&n=10&p=0.

The National Middle Schools Association provides assessment information through a search for "assessment" at http://www.nmsa.org/.
Boston (2002) recommends the following resources for assessment:

A Practical Guide to Alternative Assessment, by J. R. Herman, P. L. Aschbacher and L.Winters. Available at a variety of booksellers.

Improving Classroom Assessment: A Toolkit for Professional Developers
http://educationnorthwest.org/resource/700
Classroom Assessment and the National Science Education Standards
http:www.nap.edu/catalog/9847.html

References
Atkins, J. M., Black, P., & Coffey, J. (2001). *Classroom assessment and the National Science Education Standards*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bergen, J. R., Sladeczek, I. E., Schwarz, R. D., & Smith, A. N. (1991). Effects of a measurement and planning system on kindergartners' cognitive

development and educational programming. *American Educational Research Journa*l, 28(3), 683–714.

Berryman, L., & Russell, D. R. (2001). Portfolios across the curriculum: Whole school assessment in Kentucky. *English Journal*, 90(6), 76–83.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 7–74.

Boston, C. (2002).The concept of formative assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 8(9). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=8&n=9.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Attributes of effective formative assessment*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2008/Attributes_of_Effective_2008.pdf.

Darling-Hammond, L., Rustique-Forrester, E., & Pecheone, R. (2005). *Multiple measure approaches to high school graduation*. Stanford, CA: School Redesign Network at Stanford University.

DiMartino, J., & Castaneda, A. (2007).Assessing applied skills. *Educational Leadership*, 64(7), 38–42.

Dunn, K. E., & Mulvenon, S.W. (2009). A critical review of research on formative assessment: The limited scientific evidence of the impact of formative assessment in education. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 14(7). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://pareonline.net/pdf/v14n7.pdf

Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (1986). Effects of systematic formative evaluation: A meta-analysis. *Exceptional Children*, 52(2), 199–208.

Heritage, M., Kim, J., Vendlinski, T., & Herman, J. (2009). From evidence to action: A seamless process in formative assessment? *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 28(3), 24–31.

Herman, J. (1997).Assessing new assessments: Do they measure up? *Theory Into Practice*, 36(4), 196–204.

Martinez, J. G. R., & Martinez, N. C. (1992). Re-examining repeated testing and teacher effects in a remedial mathematics course. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 62(3), 356–363.

McCurdy, B. L., & Shapiro, E. S. (1992).A comparison of teacher monitoring, peer monitoring and self-monitoring with curriculum-based measurement in reading among student with learning disabilities. *Journal of Special Education*, 26(2), 162–180.

Next Generation Assessment Task Force. (2009). *Crafting a balanced system of assessment in Wisconsin*, Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://www.dpi.state.wi.us/oea/pdf/NGTFbr.pdf.

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

Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral Science*, 28(1), 4–13.

Ross, J.A. (2006).The reliability, validity and utility of self-assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 11(10). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://pareonline.net/pdf/v11n10.pdf

Ruiz-Primo, M.A., & Furtak, E. M. (2006). Informal formative assessment and scientific inquiry: Exploring teachers' practices and student learning. *Educational Assessment*, 11(2), 205–235.

Stiggins, R. J. (2007, November–December).Assessment for learning: A key to student motivation and learning. Edge, 2(2), 1–20.

Tierney, R., Clark, C., Fenner, L., Herter, R. J., Simpson, C. S., & Wiser, B. (1998). Portfolios: Assumptions, tensions and possibilities. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 33(4), 474–486.

Vispoel, W. P., & Austin, J. R. (1995). Success and failure in junior high school: A critical incident approach to understanding students' attributional beliefs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(2), 377–412.

Wang, T. H. (2007).What strategies are effective for formative assessment in an e-learning environment? *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 23(1), 171–186.

Wiggins, G. (1990). The case for authentic assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 2(2). Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=2&n=2.

Guiding Principle 4:
Learning is a collaborative responsibility.

Teaching and learning are both collaborative processes. Collaboration benefits teaching and learning when it occurs on several levels: when students, teachers, family members and the community collectively prioritize education and engage in activities that support local schools, educators and students; when educators collaborate with their colleagues to support innovative classroom practices and set high expectations for themselves and their students; and when students are given opportunities to work together toward academic goals in ways that enhance learning.

Research Summary

Collaborative learning is an approach to teaching and learning that requires learners to work together to deliberate, discuss and create meaning. Smith and MacGregor (1992) define the term as follows:

> "Collaborative learning" is an umbrella term for a variety of educational approaches involving joint intellectual effort by students or students and teachers together. Usually, students are working in groups of two or more, mutually searching for understanding, solutions or meanings or creating a product. Collaborative learning activities vary widely, but most center on students' exploration or application of the course material, not simply the teacher's presentation or explication of it. (p. 1)

Collaborative learning has been practiced and studied since the early 1900s.The principles are based on the theories of John Dewey (2009), Lev Vygotsky (1980) and Benjamin Bloom (1956).Their collective work focusing on how students learn has led educators to develop more student-focused learning environments that put students at the center of instruction. Vygotsky specifically stated that learning is a social act and must not be done in isolation. This principle is the foundation of collaborative learning.

The research of Vygotsky (1980) and Jerome Bruner (1985) indicates that collaborative learning environments are one of the necessities for learning. Slavin's (1989) research also suggests that students and teachers learn more, are more engaged and feel like they get more out of their classes when working in a collaborative environment. Totten, Sills, Digby and Russ (1991) found that those involved in collaborative learning understand content at deeper levels and have higher rates of achievement and retention than learners who work alone. They suggest that collaborative learning gives students opportunities to internalize their learning.

A meta-analysis from the Cooperative Learning Center at the University of Minnesota concluded that having students work collaboratively has significantly more impact on learning than having students work alone (Johnson, Maruyama, Johnson, Nelson, & Skon, 1981).An analysis of 122 studies on cooperative learning revealed:

- More students learn more material when they work together—talking through the material with each other and making sure that all group members understand—than when students compete with one another or work alone individualistically.
- More students are motivated to learn the material when they work together than when students compete or work alone individualistically (and the motivation tends to be more intrinsic).
- Students have more positive attitudes when they work together than when they compete or work alone individualistically.
- Students are more positive about the subject being studied, the teacher and themselves as learners in that class and are more accepting of each other (male or female, handicapped or not, bright or struggling or from different ethnic backgrounds) when they work together.

Collaboration can be between teachers, between students and between teacher and student.

Teacher-Teacher Collaboration

It is critical for teachers to have the time to collaborate. Professional learning communities, which provide teachers with established time to collaborate with other teachers, have become a more common practice in recent years. Louis and Kruse (1995) conducted a case study analysis that highlighted some of the positive outcomes associated with professional learning communities, including a reduction in teacher isolation, increases in teacher commitment and sense of shared responsibility and a better understanding of effective instructional practices. Professional learning

communities encourage collaborative problem solving and allow teachers to gain new strategies and skills to improve and energize their teaching and classrooms.

Another example of teacher-to-teacher collaboration is lesson study. This professional development process began in Japan. Lesson study is a collaborative approach to designing and studying classroom lessons and practice. The most critical components of lesson study are observation of the lesson, collection of data about teaching and learning and a collaborative analysis of the data to further impact instruction (Lewis, 2002; Lewis & Tsuchida, 1998; Wang-Iverson & Yoshida, 2005). Some of these characteristics are similar to other forms of professional development—analyzing student work, cognitive coaching and action research, to name a few—but the fact that it focuses on teachers observing a live lesson that was collaboratively developed is different than any other form of professional development. Lesson study is a way for teachers to work together, collect data and analyze data to reflect on teaching and learning (Lewis, 2002).

Student-Student Collaboration
Collaborative learning not only allows students to engage deeply with content but also helps students build the interpersonal skills needed to be successful in college and careers. Johnson, Johnson and Holubec (1993) state that collaborative learning provides students with the opportunity to develop social skills. They found that many of the outcomes expected as part of a collaborative learning activity corresponded with goals for student content understanding and skill attainment. The strategies associated with collaborative learning—such as role assignments, collaborative problem solving and task and group processing—all build the social skills that students need to be successful when working with others. Additionally, these skills are important in preparing students for the world of work, where collaborative writing and problem-solving are key elements of many careers.

There is a plethora of instructional and learning strategies that encourage student collaboration, including peer teaching, peer learning, reciprocal learning, team learning, study circles, study groups and work groups, to name just a few (Johnson & Johnson, 1986). Collaborative inquiry, which combines many of the elements of student collaboration just mentioned, is a research-based strategy in which learners work together through various phases "of planning, reflection and action as they explore an issue or question of importance to the group" (Goodnough, 2005 88). Collaborative inquiry brings together many perspectives to solve a problem, engaging students in relevant learning around an authentic question. It allows students to work together toward a common purpose to explore, make meaning and understand the world around them (Lee & Smagorinsky, 2000).

Teacher-Student Collaboration
The purpose for collaboration in an educational setting is to learn and unpack content together to develop a shared understanding. Harding-Smith (1993) points out that collaborative learning approach is based on the idea that learning must be a social act. It is through interaction that learning occurs. Johnson and Johnson (1986) similarly emphasize that when students and teachers talk and listen to each other; they gain a deeper understanding of the content and can develop the skills necessary to negotiate meaning throughout their lives.

Collaboration requires a shift from teacher-led instruction to instruction and learning that is designed by both teachers and students. Collaboration between student and teacher plays a critical role in helping students reflect and engage in their own learning experiences. The constructivist learning movement is one current example of efforts to increase the amount of collaboration between student and teacher occurring in the classroom. Mayer (2004) defines constructivist learning as an "active process in which learners are active sense makers who seek to build coherent and organized knowledge" (p. 14). Students co-construct their learning, with the teacher serving as a guide or facilitator. The teacher does not function in a purely didactic (i.e., lecturing) role. Neo and Neo (2009) found that constructivism helps students develop problem-solving skills, critical thinking and creative skills and apply them in meaningful ways.

Probing Questions

- How can you use collaborative learning processes to engage students in their learning?
- How might you create space for teacher-teacher collaboration within your context?

Resources

All Things PLC website provides a number of resources on professional learning communities. Links to these resources can be found at http:// www.allthingsplc.info/.

The Wisconsin Center for Education Research hosts a website with many resources for collaborative and small group learning. It can be found at http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/archive/cl1/cl/.

The Texas Collaborative for Teaching Excellence has created a professional development module about collaborative learning, which provides readings, research and resources. It can be found at http://www. texascollaborative.org/Collaborative_Learning_Module.htm.

A review of research on professional learning communities, presented at the National School Reform Faculty research forum in 2006, contains findings that outline what is known about professional learning communities and how they should be structured. This paper is available at http://www.nsrfharmony.org/research.vescio_ross_adams.pdf.

References

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Bruner, J. (1985).Vygotsky: An historical and conceptual perspective. In J. V.Wetsch (Ed.), *Culture, communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 21–34). London: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, J. (2009). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Cosimo Classics.

Goodnough, Karen. (2005). Fostering teacher learning through collaborative inquiry. *The Clearing House* 79(2), 88-92.

Harding-Smith, T. (1993). *Learning together: An introduction to collaborative learning*. New York: HarperCollins.

Johnson, R.T., & Johnson, D.W. (1986).Action research: Cooperative learning in the science classroom. *Science and Children*, 24(2), 31–32.

Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T., & Holubec, E. J. (1993). *Circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction.

Johnson, D.W., Maruyama, G., Johnson, R.T., Nelson, D., & Skon, L. (1981). Effects of cooperative, competitive and individualistic goal structures on achievement: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 89(1), 47–62.

Lee, C. D., & Smagorinsky, P. (Eds.). (2000). *Vygotskian perspectives on literacy research: Constructing meaning through collaborative inquiry*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, C. (2002). *Lesson study: A handbook of teacher-led instructional change*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Lewis, C., & Tsuchida, I. (1998, Winter).A lesson is like a swiftly flowing river: Research lessons and the improvement of Japanese education. *American Educator*, 14–17, 50–52.

Wang-Iverson, P., & Yoshida, M. (2005). Building our understanding of lesson study. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Mayer, R. E. (2004). Should there be a three strikes rule against pure discovery? The case for guided methods of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 14–19.

Neo, M., & Neo, T.-K. (2009). Engaging students in multimedia-mediated constructivist learning: Students' perceptions. *Educational Technology and Society*, 12(2), 254–266.

Slavin, R. E. (1989). Research on cooperative learning: An international perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 33(4), 231–243.

Smith, B. L., & MacGregor, J.T. (1992). *What is collaborative learning?* Olympia, WA: Washington Center for Improving the Quality of Undergraduate Education. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http:// learningcommons.evergreen.edu/pdf/collab.pdf

Totten, S., Sills, T., Digby, A., & Russ, P. (1991). *Cooperative learning: A guide to research*. New York: Garland.

Vygotsky, L. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guiding Principle 5:
Students bring strengths and experiences to learning.

Every student learns. Although no two students come to school with the same culture, learning strengths, background knowledge or experiences and no two students learn in exactly the same way, every student's unique personal history enriches classrooms, schools and the community. This diversity is our greatest education asset.

Research Summary

The authors of the groundbreaking work How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience and School (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000) found that students' preconceptions may clash with new concepts and information they learn in school. If those preconceptions are not addressed, students may fail to grasp what is being taught or may learn only to pass a test. In other words, a student might enter kindergarten believing the world is flat because he or she has seen a flat map. Despite the presentation of geographic names and principles, the student still maintains the fundamental preconception about the shape of the world. Developing competence—or in this case, a knowledge of the shape of the world—requires that students have a deep foundation of factual knowledge, a context or conceptual framework to place it in and the opportunity to explore how it connects to the real world. Ultimately, a metacognitive approach—one that pushes students to think about their own thought processes—can help them take control of their own learning.

As educational research on how people learn advances, so does our approach to teaching and learning. Strategies to advance teaching and learning are constantly evolving into new and innovative ways to reach learners. When a teacher uses students' interests, curiosity and areas of confidence as starting points in planning instruction, learning is more productive. Teachers who are cognizant of these issues—and reflect on how to use them as strengths upon which they can build—ensure that all students have access to the content. Areas to consider are student strengths, gender, background knowledge and connections to the home environment.

Building on Student Strengths

Teaching to students' strengths can improve student engagement (Sternberg, 2000, Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2000). Many students have strengths that are unrecognized and neglected in traditional schooling. Students in underrepresented minority groups have culturally relevant knowledge that teachers can use to promote learning. Sternberg et al. (2000) found that conventional instruction in school systematically discriminates against students with creative and practical strengths and tends to favor students with strong memory and analytical abilities. This research, combined with Sternberg's earlier (1988) research showing that teaching for diverse styles of learning produces superior results, suggests that capitalizing on the various strengths that all students bring to the classroom can positively affect students' learning. When students are taught in a way that fits how they think, they do better in school (Sternberg, 2000; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2000). Sternberg and O'Hara (2000) found that when students were taught in a way that incorporated analytical thinking, creative thinking (creating, imagining and inventing) and practical thinking (applying, implementing and putting into practice)—students achieved at higher levels than when taught using conventional instructional methods.

Gender Considerations

Changing instruction might help alleviate the gender gap in literacy achievement. Research conducted by Sax (2005) reveals that boys fall behind girls in reading and writing early on and never catch up. Sax (2007) found that this dynamic plays a role in higher high school dropout rates for males, particularly black males. The college graduation rate for females approaches twice that of males in Hispanic and black populations. Many classrooms are a better fit for the verbal-emotive, sit-still, take-notes, listen-carefully, multitasking girl (Sax, 2005).The characteristics that boys bring to learning—impulsivity, single-task focus, spatial-kinesthetic learning and physical aggression—often are viewed as problems.

Researchers such as Blum (1997) have identified more than 100 structural differences between the male and female brains. Altering strategies to accommodate more typically male assets—for example, the use of multimodal teaching (discussed on pages 10-11 of this report); the use of various display formats, such as printed material, videos, presentations and computers; and an interactive learning environment to appeal to different learning styles—can help bridge the gap between what students are thinking and what they are able to put down on paper. Sadik's (2008) research suggests that using multimodal instructional strategies like digital

storytelling—allowing students to incorporate digital cameras, creative and editing tools, computers and other technology to design multimedia presentations—deepens students' learning.

Background Knowledge Bransford et al. (2000) note in How People Learn, learning depends on how prior knowledge is incorporated into building new knowledge and thus teachers must take into account students' prior knowledge. Jensen's (2008) research on the brain and learning demonstrates that expertise cannot be developed merely through exposure to information. Students must connect the information to their prior knowledge to internalize and deepen their understanding. Teachers can connect academic learning with real-life experiences. Service learning, project-based learning, school-based enterprises and student leadership courses are some examples of how schools are trying to make the curriculum relevant. The key to making the curriculum relevant is asking the students to help connect the academics to their lives; this approach gets students actively engaged in their learning, which builds a stronger connection and commitment to school. Bell (2010) suggests that strategies such as project-based approaches to learning can help ensure that content and skills are taught together and connected to prior knowledge, which helps students understand how to develop and apply new skills in various contexts.

Connections to the Home Environment
Cochran-Smith (2004) emphasizes family histories, traditions and stories as an important part of education. Often, children enter school and find themselves in a place that does not recognize or value the knowledge or experience they bring from their homes or communities. This situation can create a feeling of disconnect for students—a dissonance obliging them to live in and navigate between two different worlds, each preventing them from full participation or success in the other. Districts and schools can alleviate this dissonance by valuing and taking advantage of the unique experiences that each student brings to the classroom. Emphasizing connections to parents and community, recognizing and utilizing student strengths and experiences and incorporating varied opportunities within the curriculum can help alleviate this dissonance.

Ferguson (2001) points out that it is particularly important to establish connections that not only bring the parents into the school environment but also encourage school understanding and participation within the community. Social distinctions often grow out of differences in attitudes, values, behaviors and family and community practices (Ferguson, 2001). Students need to feel their unique knowledge and experience is valued by the school and parents and community members need to feel they are respected and welcome within the school.

Although much attention has been paid to No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements for annual achievement tests and high-quality teachers, the law also includes important requirements for schools, districts and states to organize programs of parental involvement and to communicate with parents and the public about student achievement and the quality of schools. Epstein (2005) offers perspectives on the NCLB requirements for family involvement; provides a few examples from the field; suggests modifications that are needed in the law; and encourages sociologists of education to take new directions in research on school, family and community partnerships.

Probing Questions

- What are some ways that you currently use students' background knowledge to inform instruction?
- Does your experience teaching boys to read and write concur with the research? What ideas do you have to address the achievement gaps related to gender?
- What are ways you can uncover, acknowledge and use students' backgrounds and strengths to enhance learning?
- What are some strategies for valuing and taking advantage of the unique experiences that each student brings to the classroom?

Resources
A good resource still valid today is Making Assessment Work for Everyone: How to Build on Student Strengths. See the SEDL website to download this resource: http://www.sedl.org/pubs/tl05/.

A short, easy-to-digest article from Carnegie Mellon University is titled Theory and Research-Based Principles of Learning. The article and full bibliography are at http://www.cmu.edu/teaching/principles/learning.html.

References
Bell, S. (2010). Project-based learning for the 21st century: Skills for the future. The Clearing House, 83(2), 39–43. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http://teacherscollegesj.org/resources/publications/PBL%20for%20the%20 21%20Century.pdf

Blum, D. (1997). Sex on the brain: The biological differences between men and women. New York: Viking.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L. & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school (Expanded ed.). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). Walking the road: Race, diversity and social justice in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Epstein, J. (2005). Attainable goals? The spirit and letter of the No Child Left Behind Act on parental involvement. Sociology of Education, 78(2), 179–182.

Ferguson, A. A. (2001). Bad boys: Public schools in the making of black masculinity. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Jensen, E. P. (2008). A fresh look at brain-based education. Phi Delta Kappan, 89(6), 408–417.

Sadik, A. (2008). Digital storytelling: A meaningful technology-integrated approach for engaged student learning. Educational Technology Research and Development, 56(4), 487–506.

Sax, L. (2005). Why gender matters: What parents and teachers need to know about the emerging science of sex differences. New York: Doubleday.

Sax, L. (2007). Boys adrift: The five factors driving the growing epidemic of unmotivated boys and underachieving young men. New York: Basic Books.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). The triarchic mind: A new theory of human intelligence. New York: Viking.

Sternberg, R. J. (2000). Wisdom as a form of giftedness. Gifted Child Quarterly, 44(4), 252–259.

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2000). Teaching for successful intelligence. Arlington Heights, IL: Skylight Training.

Sternberg, R. J., Grigorenko, E. L., Jarvin, L., Clinkenbeard, P., Ferrari, M., & Torff, B. (2000, Spring). The effectiveness of triarchic teaching and assessment. NRC/GT Newsletter, 3–8. Retrieved June, 3, 2011, from http:// www.gifted.uconn.edu/nrcgt/newsletter/spring00/spring00.pdf

Sternberg, R. J., & O'Hara, L.A. (2000). Intelligence and creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Handbook of intelligence (pp. 611–628). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Guiding Principle 6:
Responsive environments engage learners.

Meaningful learning happens in environments where creativity, awareness, inquiry and critical thinking are part of instruction. Responsive learning environments adapt to the individual needs of each student and encourage learning by promoting collaboration rather than isolation of learners. Learning environments, whether classrooms, schools or other systems, should be structured to promote engaged teaching and learning.

Research Summary

To be effective for all students, classroom learning environments must be responsive to a broad range of needs among a diverse student population. These diverse needs include cultural and linguistic differences as well as developmental levels, academic readiness and learning styles. A responsive learning environment engages all students by providing a respectful climate where instruction and curriculum are designed to respond to the backgrounds and needs of every student.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

Research on culturally responsive teaching emphasizes the importance of teachers' understanding the cultural characteristics and contributions of various ethnic groups (Smith, 1998) and showing respect toward these students and their culture (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Pewewardy & Cahape, 2003). Culturally responsive teaching is defined by Gay (2002) as "using the cultural characteristics, experiences and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively" (p. 106).

Research on culturally responsive teaching has found that students both are more engaged in learning and learn more effectively when the knowledge and skills taught are presented within a context of their experience and cultural frames of references (Au & Kawakami, 1994; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995).Areas considered part of creating a culturally responsive learning environments are (1) understanding the cultural lifestyles of their students, such as which ethnic groups give priority to communal living and problem solving; (2) knowing differences in the modes of interaction between children and adults in different ethnic groups; and (3) becoming aware of cultural implications of gender role socialization among different groups (Banks & Banks, 2001).To provide a culturally responsive learning environment teachers need to:

- Communicate high expectations for all students (Gay, 2000; Hollins & Oliver, 1999; Ladson-Billings, 1994, Nieto, 1999).
- Use active teaching methods and act as learning facilitators (Banks & Banks, 2001; Gay, 2000).
- Maintain positive perspectives on families of diverse students (Delgado-Gaitin & Trueba, 1991).
- Gain knowledge of cultures of the students in their classrooms (Banks & Banks, 2001; Nieto, 1999).
- Reshape the curriculum to include culturally diverse topics (Banks & Banks, 2001; Gay, 2000; Hilliard, 1991).
- Use culturally sensitive instruction that includes student-controlled discussion and small-group work (Banks & Banks, 2001; Nieto, 1999).

Further research asserts that culturally responsive teachers help students understand that knowledge is not absolute and neutral but has moral and political elements. This knowledge can help students from diverse groups view learning as empowering (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Tharp & Gallimore, 1988).

Strategies for designing curriculum and instruction for culturally diverse students are similar to the strategies for differentiating curriculum and instruction. In fact, Mulroy and Eddinger (2003) point out that the research on differentiation emerged, in part, because of the demand on schools to serve an increasingly diverse student population. Heacox (2002) asserts that classrooms are diverse in cognitive abilities, learning styles, socioeconomic factors, readiness, learning pace and gender and cultural influences.

Differentiation

Research on differentiation includes meeting the learning needs of all students through modifying instruction and curriculum to consider developmental level, academic readiness and socioeconomic backgrounds, as well as cultural and linguistic differences. Tomlinson (2005) defines differentiated instruction as a philosophy of teaching based on the premise that students learn best when their teachers accommodate the difference in their readiness levels, interests and learning profiles. In a differentiated learning environment, each student is

valued for his or her unique strengths while being offered opportunities to learn and demonstrate learning through a variety of strategies (Mulroy & Eddinger, 2003). Hall (2002) states, "To differentiate instruction is to recognize students' varying backgrounds, readiness, language, learning preferences and interests and to react responsively" (p. 1).

According to Tomlinson (2005), who has written extensively on differentiation, three elements guide differentiated instruction: content, process and product. Content means that all students are given access to the same content but are allowed to master it in different ways. Process refers to the ways in which the content is taught. Product refers to how students demonstrate understanding. Corley (2005) provides three questions that drive differentiation: (1) What do you want the student to know? (2) How can each student best learn this? and (3) How can each student most effectively demonstrate learning? Maker (1986) offers a framework through which differentiation can occur in the classroom:

- Create an encouraging and engaging learning environment through student-centered activities, encouraging independent learning, accepting student contributions, using a rich variety of resources and providing mobility and flexibility in grouping.
- Modify the content according to abstractness and complexity. Provide a variety of content and particularly content focused on people.
- Modify the learning process through use of inquiry, higher-order thinking activities, group interactions, variable pacing, creativity and student risk-taking and freedom of choice in learning activities.
- Modify the product through facilitating different ways for students to demonstrate learning, such as the use of authentic assessments.

In addition, researchers have found that the use of flexible grouping and tiered instruction for differentiation increases student achievement (Corley, 2005; Tomlinson & Eidson, 2003). Heacox (2002) describes differentiation as follows:

> The focus is not on the adjustment of the students, but rather the adjustment of teaching and instructional strategies making it about learning, not teaching. The teacher is the facilitator who…puts students at the center of teaching and learning and lets his or her students' learning needs direct instructional planning (p. 1).

Several studies conducted in elementary and middle school classroom have found that student achievement is increased in differentiated classrooms (Connor, Morrison, & Katch 2004; McAdamis, 2001). Tomlinson and Eidson (2003) emphasize the need to include the components of student readiness, student interest and student learning profile in differentiating instruction. Students' interests and learning profiles are often tied to their learning styles.

Learning Styles

The body of research on learning styles has coalesced around the work of Howard Gardner, who introduced the theory of multiple intelligences in 1983. Gardner's work suggests that the concept of a pure intelligence that can be measured by a single I.Q. score is flawed and he has identified nine intelligences that people possess to various degrees. His theory asserts that a person's type of intelligence determines how he or she learns best (Gardner, 1999).

Learning style refers to how a student learns and the concept takes into account cultural background and social and economic factors as well as multiple intelligences. Beishuizen and Stoutjesdjik (1999) define learning style as a consistent mode of acquiring knowledge through study or experience. Research has shown that the quality of learning at all levels of education (primary, secondary and higher education) is enhanced when instruction and curriculum take into account individual learning styles (Dunn, Griggs, Olsen, Beasley & Gorman, 1995).Another study found that student learning improved when the learning environment was modified to allow students to construct personally relevant knowledge and to engage in the materials at different levels and from different points of view (Dearing, 1997).

A responsive classroom environment considers the individual learning needs of all students. These learning needs include a variety of factors that influence how students learn: culture, language, developmental level, readiness, social and economic background and learning style.

Creativity

Creativity is an essential component for creating an engaging and accessible classroom environment. The Wisconsin Task Force on Arts and Creativity in Education (2009) defines creativity as a process that combines "imagination, creativity and innovation to produce something novel that has value" (p. 14). Sir Ken Robinson (2011) and Daniel Pink

(2006) both support the need for schools to focus on creating classroom that foster this type of creativity in students. According to Robinson (2011), classrooms that foster creativity and allow students to question assumptions, look at content through various lenses and create new understandings can help students be more successful in postsecondary education and the workplace.

Probing Questions

- Describe two or three ways you might differentiate the instruction in your classroom. How might you share this with a new teacher?
- How might you implement a simple strategy for assessing your students' learning styles?

Resources

ASCD offers a number of resources on differentiated instruction, including work by Carol Ann Tomlinson, at http://www.ascd.org.
For resources on culturally responsive teaching, the Center for Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning can be accessed at http://www.culturallyresponsive.org/.

The website of the National Center for Culturally Responsive Education Systems (NCCRESt) can be accessed at http://www.nccrest.org.
For learning styles and resources on multiple intelligences, Thomas Armstrong hosts a website with information on Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences and related teaching resources at http://www.thomasarmstrong.com/multiple_intelligences.php.

Creativity: Its Place in Education is a report that offers suggestions for creative classrooms and teaching. This report can be found at http://www.jpb.com/creative/Creativity_in_Education.pdf.

The report of the Wisconsin Task Force on Arts and Creativity in Education offers recommendations for policy and practice. This report can be found at ftp://doaftp04.doa.state.wi.us/doadocs/taskforce_report_final2009pdf.

References

Au, K. H., & Kawakami, A. J. (1994). Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. R. Hollins, J. E. King, & W. C. Hayman (Eds.), Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base (p. 5–23).Albany: State University of New York Press.

Banks, J.A., & Banks, C.A. (2001). Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (4th ed.). New York: Wiley.

Beishuizen, J. J., & Stoutjesdjik, E.T. (1999). Study strategies in a computer assisted study environment. Learning and Instruction, 9(3), 281–301.

Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J., & Katch, L. E. (2004). Beyond the reading wars: Exploring the effect of child-instruction interactions on growth in early reading. Scientific Studies of Reading, 8(2), 305–336.

Corley, M. (2005). Differentiated instruction: Adjusting to the needs of all learners. Focus on Basics: Connecting Research and Practice, 7(C), 13–16.

Dearing, R. (1997). Higher education in the learning society: Report of the National Committee. London: HMSO.

Delgado-Gaitan, C., & Trueba, H. (1991). Crossing cultural borders: Education for immigrant families in America. London: Falmer.

Dunn, R., Griggs, S., Olsen, J., Beasley, M., & Gorman, B. (1995). A meta analytic validation of the Dunn and Dunn model of learning-style preferences. Journal of Educational Research, 88(6), 353–362.

Gardner, H. (1999). Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century. New York: Basic Books.

Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 53(2) 106–116.

Heacox, D. (2002). Differentiating instruction in the regular classroom: How to reach and teach all learners, Grades 3–12. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.

Hilliard,A. G., III. (1991). Why we must pluralize the curriculum. Educational Leadership, 49(4), 12–16.

Hollins, E. R., & Oliver, E. I. (1999). Pathways to success in school: Culturally responsive teaching. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32(3), 465–491.

Maker, C. J. (1986). Critical issues in gifted education: Defensible programs for the gifted. Rockville, MD: Aspen.

McAdamis, S. (2001). Teachers tailor their instruction to meet a variety of student needs. Journal of Staff Development, 22(2), 1–5.

Mulroy, H., & Eddinger, K. (2003, June). Differentiation and literacy. Paper presented at the Institute on Inclusive Education, Nazareth College of Rochester, Rochester, NY.

Nieto, S. (1999). The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning opportunities. New York: Teachers College Press.
Pewewardy, C. H., & Cahape, P. (2003). Culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students. ERIC Digest. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from http:// www.ericdigests.org/2005-1/teaching.htm.

Pink, D. H. (2006). A whole new mind: Why right-brainers will rule the future. New York: Riverhead.

Robinson, Ken. (2011). Out of our minds: Learning to be creative. West Sussex, United Kingdom: Capstone.

Smith, G. P. (1998). Common sense about common knowledge: The knowledge bases for diversity. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Tharp, R. G., & Gallimore, R. (1988). Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context. Cambridge: England: Cambridge University Press.

Tomlinson, C.A. (2005). Grading and differentiation: Paradox or good practice? Theory Into Practice, 44(3) 262–269.

Tomlinson, C.A., & Eidson, C. C. (2003). Differentiation in practice: A resource guide for differentiating curriculum. Grades 5–9.Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wisconsin Task Force on Arts and Creativity in Education. (2009). A plan for action. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. Retrieved June 3, 2011, from ftp://doaftp04.doa.state.wi.us/doadocs/ taskforce_report_final2009.pdf