

Teaching and Learning through the Standards Aligned System™

Course Description

Pennsylvania has undertaken a significant effort to improve its schools through the focused development and deployment of elements, strategies, practices, and resources aligned to the Pennsylvania academic standards. The components of this comprehensive approach comprise the state's Standards Aligned System (SAS).

While there are many intangible components, research supports the notion that effective schools and school systems have six elements that ensure student achievement: Clear Standards, Fair Assessments, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, and Interventions. When schools and school systems use these elements in concert with a common vision, they will experience continuous enhancement and improvement within their schools, districts, and communities. This course examines the six components of a Standards Aligned System (SAS) and provides methods for implementing SAS to enhance student learning, engagement, and achievement. It also explores ways to use SAS to help students develop the critical thinking, collaboration, innovation, and creativity skills that will equip them for lifelong learning.

Course Outcomes

Upon completion of this class, the learner is expected to be able to:

1. Analyze the gap that exists between what many current graduating seniors know, and the skills that higher educational institutions and employers look for in candidates.
2. Use a Standards Aligned System (SAS) approach to teaching and learning to improve student learning and achievement.
3. Identify the six components of SAS and the theoretical and research base for each component.
4. Demonstrate methods to implement all components of SAS.
5. Demonstrate knowledge on how to align materials and resources to standards by selecting those which are grade-appropriate activities and learning approaches.
6. Utilize a variety of assessment approaches and identify ways to use assessment information to inform decisions.
7. Develop a variety of assessments aligned to standards and curriculum.
8. Engage in comprehensive and collaborative planning and discussion related to curriculum and instruction.
9. Utilize the SAS portal and related technologies to develop lesson plans based on curriculum frameworks that integrate best instructional strategies, resources, and sound assessment approaches and techniques.
10. Demonstrate understanding and application of instruction and intervention strategies to enhance student learning, engagement, and achievement through creation of lesson plans.
11. Explore the relationship between Standards Aligned System and Response to Intervention and Instruction (RtII).
12. Identify ways to emphasize student responsibility for behavior and achievement.

13. Utilize Teacher Tools (Web site builder and ePortfolio) to enhance effectiveness and improve home-school communications.
14. Reflect upon and continuously evaluate personal practice, and adjust accordingly.
15. Generalize course content to reflect how diverse populations within classrooms have their needs met by applying the skills, strategies, and knowledge taught in this course.
16. Adapt course activities to create grade-level or content area learning activities for the classroom.
17. Work collaboratively to refine understanding of content, give and receive feedback, improve expertise, and share knowledge, skills, and experiences through the SAS Professional Learning Communities.

Required Text

Instructors and learners will also use instructor-generated materials, learner-generated materials, and Web-based resources to facilitate learning.

Topical Outline	List of Concepts
Introduction to SAS	Explore the education gap; how standards aligned instruction helps students achieve; the six common elements that support student achievement; how the Standards Aligned System (SAS) methodology aligns the six common elements to ensure students have the resources to be academically successful; examine the theoretical framework and rationale for the implementation of SAS
Clear Standards	Review historical background; review of PA Academic Standards; research-based arguments for standards-based education, synthesizing the common core and PA standards; develop an understanding of why assessments are intentionally aligned to standards
Fair Assessments	Analyze types of assessment and purposes; data-based decision making; using data to inform instruction; develop assessments and align to standards
Curriculum Framework	General curriculum information; components of Curriculum Framework; connection to standards; using curriculum to guide instruction; utilize ELL techniques to benefit all learners
Instruction	Explore RtII, the core characteristics of RtII; Understanding by Design [®] theory; examine various instructional techniques, best practices, and instructional resources to enhance teaching; utilize instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of all learners
Materials & Resources	Apply materials and resources in instruction; examine the various types of resources on SAS; alignment of materials and resources to standards; relevance and implementation of resources; practice aligning resources to standards
Interventions	Connection to RtII; accommodations; explore purposes of differentiating instruction; examine resources for specific populations; integrate these resources into daily instruction and SAS

Integrating SAS	Synthesize all pieces to develop unit and lessons integrating all components of SAS
------------------------	---

Course Assessments and Links to Course Outcomes

Throughout the course, the learner will be assessed and evaluated on the completion of the following assessments. Learning activities include large- and small-group discussions and assessments for a total of 575 points.

Modules	Topics of Modules	Points	Correlation With Course Outcomes
Module 1:	Introduction to SAS	60	1, 2, 3
Module 2:	Clear Standards	70	1, 5
Module 3:	Fair Assessments	70	6, 7
Module 4:	Curriculum Framework	70	8, 9
Module 5:	Instruction	90	1, 8, 9, 10, 11
Module 6:	Materials & Resources	55	5, 9, 15, 16
Module 7:	Interventions	60	1, 10, 11, 12, 13
Module 8:	Integrating SAS	100	1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
Total		575	

Criteria specific to each assessment will be explained in conjunction with the instructional activities.

Instructional Methodology

The instructional methodology of this course focuses on developing, enhancing, and improving the instructional expertise and pedagogical knowledge base of practicing educators. Strategies include presentation of new content through online readings, active construction of knowledge through practice and problem solving, collaborative group work, personal reflection, structured small-group or whole-class discussion, analysis of assigned reading, and the application of course content and skills to participant's individual grade level, subject area(s), and classroom.

Grading Scale

The course facilitator will post the grading scale.

Performance Learning Systems' Late Policy

There will be a 10% deduction of points per day for all posts and submitted assignments which are late. Replies posted after the due date will earn no points. In rare cases, partially or poorly completed assignments may be resubmitted for partial credit at the discretion of the instructor. The following exceptions apply:

- If a participant is sick/hospitalized or has a death in the family, the timing of makeup work may be arranged with the course facilitator. No points will be deducted if the work is completed according to the agreement.
- If a participant is on vacation/traveling/etc., the participant must contact the course facilitator ahead of time to avoid a penalty. This type of absence may occur only once during a course. All posts should be submitted for the missed module before leaving.

- If a participant has difficulty completing everything in a week, an extension can be granted if the participant contacts the facilitator during the week (not at the last minute).

Performance Learning Systems' Participant Drop Policy

- Participants are eligible to receive a refund if they attend class for one week or less. This means participants must withdraw by the end of Module 1 to receive a refund.
- Refunds of the balance of tuition paid will be given, minus the \$50 deposit.

Performance Learning Systems' Academic Integrity Policy

Performance Learning Systems expects absolute academic honesty and integrity from every course participant. The specific Academic Integrity and Honor Code policies of our partner colleges and universities are embraced and enforced by PLS instructors. The following are considered to be serious violations:

- Plagiarism: the use of another's ideas, data, or words without proper acknowledgment.
- Fabrication: the use of invented information or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive.
- Collusion: improper collaboration with another in preparing assignments or projects.
- Cheating: an act of deception by which a student misrepresents that he or she has mastered information on an academic exercise that he or she has not mastered.
- Academic Misconduct: tampering with grades, or taking part in obtaining or distributing any part of student work that is not his or her own.

Violation(s) or suspected violation(s) will be investigated and pursued according to specific college/university procedures.

Identity Authentication

The college/university, Performance Learning Systems (PLS), and students share a joint responsibility to ensure that each student's contribution in an online course activity comes from that student alone. For the student, this responsibility has two parts:

1. Students are responsible for positively ensuring that every contribution to an online course created with the students' computer account is made by the student alone. Contributions covered under this policy include: written assignments; quiz and exam submissions; discussion forum postings; live participation in text-based chat sessions, phone conferences, and videoconferences. If a student allows another person to write or make any kind of submission to an online activity in the student's name, then this constitutes cheating and will be treated as a violation of academic honesty.
2. Students are responsible for ensuring the integrity of their computer account security by following the actions required of them by the PLS Acceptable Use Policy. These actions include keeping passcodes private, updating passcodes when required by Performance Learning Systems, and reporting breaches of the security policy to the IT Helpdesk.

Course Evaluation

The evaluation of learner work will be based on the defined criteria for learner assessments. The criteria for learner assessments will be outlined for students prior to instructional activities and engagement with student learning targets (outcomes). Grading

is based solely on the evaluation of student learning targets and defined criteria for learner assessments.

Formative assessment of learning outcomes is conducted throughout the course, using a variety of means that include the following: completion of assessments; constructive contributions to class discussions (whole-class as well as small-group); sharing of valuable, pertinent, and/or applicable ideas and experiences; and active participation in online interactions. It is expected that each participant will contribute to the academic quality of the course.

Summative assessment includes the completion of weekly learning activities and assignments for which the participant will need to synthesize class content, apply it to his or her own practice, and complete a plan for implementing the major components of content and skill acquired during the course.

Course Outcome Correlations With INTASC Standards for Teachers

	Course Outcomes
Standard 1: Subject Matter The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.	2, 4, 5, 9, 16
Standard 2: Student Learning The teacher understands how children and youth learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 12, 16
Standard 3: Diverse Learners The teacher understands how students differ in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.	1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11
Standard 4: Instructional Strategies The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10
Standard 5: Learning Environment The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	2, 3, 4, 12
Standard 6: Communication The teacher uses knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.	8, 13, 17
Standard 7: Planning Instruction The teacher plans and manages instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10
Standard 8: Assessment The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9
Standard 9: Reflection and Professional Development The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of her/his choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.	8, 13, 14, 17
Standard 10: Collaboration, Ethics, and Relationships The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.	2, 8, 13, 14, 17

The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and the Support for Consortium (INTASC) standards were developed by the Council of the Chief State School Officers and member states. Copies may be downloaded from the Council's website at <http://www.ccsso.org>.

© Council of Chief State School Officers. (1992) Model standards for beginning teacher licensing, assessment, and development: A resource for state dialogue. Washington, DC: Author. <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf>.

Course Outcome Correlations With National Board for Professional Teaching (NBPTS) Propositions and Standards

Proposition 1: Teachers are Committed to Students and Their Learning.	Course Outcomes
NBCTs are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn.	1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16
They treat students equitably. They recognize the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice.	2, 9, 10, 15
NBCTs understand how students develop and learn.	1, 5
They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.	13, 15
They are concerned with their students' self-concept, their motivation and the effects of learning on peer relationships.	1, 10, 12
NBCTs are also concerned with the development of character and civic responsibility.	1, 12
Proposition 2: Teachers Know the Subjects They Teach and How to Teach Those Subjects to Students.	
NBCTs have mastery over the subject(s) they teach. They have a deep understanding of the history, structure and real-world applications of the subject.	2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 16, 17
They have skill and experience in teaching it, and they are very familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to the subject.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 17
They are able to use diverse instructional strategies to teach for understanding.	1, 5, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17
Proposition 3: Teachers are Responsible for Managing and Monitoring Student Learning.	
NBCTs deliver effective instruction. They move fluently through a range of instructional techniques, keeping students motivated, engaged and focused.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16
They know how to engage students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to meet instructional goals.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
NBCTs know how to assess the progress of individual students as well as the class as a whole.	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16
They use multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding, and they can clearly explain student performance to parents.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13
Proposition 4: Teachers Think Systematically about Their Practice and Learn from Experience.	
NBCTs model what it means to be an educated person – they read, they question, they create and they are willing to try new things.	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17
They are familiar with learning theories and instructional strategies and stay abreast of current issues in American education.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17
They critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice.	1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17
Proposition 5: Teachers are Members of Learning Communities.	
NBCTs collaborate with others to improve student learning.	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 13, 17
They are leaders and actively know how to seek and build partnerships	2, 4, 8, 9, 13, 17

with community groups and businesses.

They work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development.

2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17

They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of resources in order to meet state and local education objectives.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17

They know how to work collaboratively with parents to engage them productively in the work of the school.

2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17

Reprinted with permission from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, www.nbpts.org. All rights reserved.

Bibliography

- Ainsworth, L., & Viegut, D. (2006). *Common formative assessments: How to connect standards-based instruction and assessment*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Alberto, P. A., & Troutman, A. C. (2003). *Applied behavior analysis for teachers* (6th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- American Psychological Association. (1997). *Learner-centered psychological principles: A framework for school reform*. Washington, DC: The Learner-Centered Work Group of the American Psychological Association's Board Of Education Affairs.
- A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform* (1983). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
- Apthorp, H., Dean, C., Florian, J., Lauer, P., Reichardt, R., Sanders, N., & Snow-Renner, R. (2001). *Standards in classroom practice research synthesis*. Aurora, CO: McREL.
- Apthorp, H. S., DeBassige D'Amato, E., & Richardson, A. (2003). *Effective standards-based practices for Native American students: A review of research literature* (Rev. ed.). Aurora, CO: McREL.
- Balfanz, R. (2009). Can the American high school become an avenue of advancement for all? *Future of Children*, 19(1), 17–36.
- Barell, J. (2007). *Problem-based learning—An inquiry approach* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- Barley, Z., Lauer, P. A., Arens, S. A., Apthorp, H. S., Englert, K. S., Snow, D., & Akiba, M. (2002). *Helping at-risk students meet standards: A synthesis of evidence-based classroom practices*. Aurora, CO: McREL.
- Benson, B. P. (2008). *How to meet standards, motivate students, and still enjoy teaching!: Four practices that improve student learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Brown, D. (2009). Do national standards make sense? *Teacher Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.teachermagazine.org/tm/articles/2009/08/19/tln_brown.html?tkn=XURDNVdGkWkL6cCKMzQGrIS%2FnxGkgBqATSk&print=1
- Butler, R. (2006). *Are mastery and ability goals both adaptive? Evaluation, initial goal construction and the quality of task engagement*. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76, 595–611.
- Carr, J. F., & Harris, D. E. (2001). *Succeeding with standards: Linking curriculum, assessment, and action planning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Casey, L., Bicard, D., et al. (2008). A much delayed response to “A Nation at Risk”: Recent innovations in general and special education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89, 593–596.

- Center on Education Policy. (2007a). *Choices, changes, and challenges: Curriculum and instruction in the NCLB era*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Center on Education Policy. (2007b). *State high school exit exams: Working to raise test scores*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE). (1998). *Developing language proficiency and connecting school to students' lives: Two standards for effective teaching*. Santa Cruz, CA: CREDE.
- Clair, N., & Adger, C. T. (2003). *Standards-based teaching in culturally diverse schools*. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Corpus, J. H., Hayenga, A. O., & McClintic-Gilbert, M. S. (2007, April). *Contextual predictors of within-grade changes in children's intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations*. Poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Boston, MA.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dell'Olio, J. M., & Donk, T. (2007). *Models of teaching: Connecting student learning with standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Easton, L. B. (2007). Walking our talk about standards, *Phi Delta Kappan*, 88(5), 391-394.
- Finn, Jr., C. E., Liam, J., et al. (2006). *To dream the impossible dream: Four approaches to national standards and tests for America's schools*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Retrieved January 13, 2010, from http://www.edexcellence.net/detail/news.cfm?news_id=361
- Firestone, W. A., Schorr, R. Y., & Monfils, L. F. (2004). *The ambiguity of teaching to the test: Standards, assessment, and educational reform*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2007). *Checking for understanding: Formative assessment techniques for your classroom*. Alexandria, VA : Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Fullan, M. (2009). Large-scale reform comes of age. *Journal of Educational Change*, 10(2), 101–113.
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crevola, C. (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gentile, J. R., & Lalley, J. P. (2003). *Standards and mastery learning: Aligning teaching and assessment so all children can learn*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Gibbs, G. & Simpson, C. (2004) Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, 1, 3–31.
- Global SchoolNet. (2003). *Global Schoolhouse Collaborative Learning Projects*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalschoolnet.org/index.html>
- Goodwin, B. (2003). *Digging deeper: Where does the public stand on standards-based education?* Aurora, CO: McREL.

- Guhn, M. (2009). Insights from successful and unsuccessful implementations of school reform programs. *Journal of Educational Change*, 4, 337–363.
- Hamilton, L. S., Halverson, R., et al. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved January 23, 2010, from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>
- Hamilton, L. S., Stecher, B. M., & Yuan, K. (2008). *Standards-based reform in the United States: History, research, and future directions*. Washington, DC: RAND Corporation, Center on Education Policy.
- Helm, J. H. (2008). Got standards? Don't give up on engaged learning! *Young Children*, 63(4), 14–20.
- Herman, J. L. (2009). *Moving to the next generation of standards for science: Building on recent practices* (CRESST Report 762). National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing. Los Angeles: University of California, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies. (ERIC Document No. ED507092)
- Howell, W., Peterson, M., & West, P. (2009). *Education Next—PEPG survey of public opinion*. Cambridge, MA: Education Next. Retrieved January 8, 2010, from <http://educationnext.org/files/pepg2009.pdf>
- Kendall, J. S., DeFrees, K. L., Pierce, J., Richardson, A., & Williams, J. (2003). *Connecting ideas: A strategy for extending the curriculum*. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org/PDF/Curriculum/5021RR_Connecting_Ideas.pdf
- Kendall, J. S., & Marzano, R. J. (2004). *Content knowledge: A compendium of standards and benchmarks for K–12 education*. Retrieved from <http://www.mcrel.org/standards-benchmarks/>
- Khan, B. H. (Ed.). (2007). *Flexible learning in an information society*. Hershey, PA: Information Science.
- Kohn, A. (2010, January 14). Debunking the case for national standards. *Education Week*, 29(17). Retrieved February 20, 2010, from <http://www.alfiekohn.org/teaching/edweek/national.htm>
- Lauer, P. A., Snow, D., Martin-Glenn, M., VanBuhler, R. J., Stoutemeyer, K., Snow-Renner, R. (2005). *The influence of standards on K–12 teaching and learning: A research synthesis*. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org/pdf/synthesis/5052_RSInfluenceofStandards.pdf
- Marzano, R. J. (1992). *Toward a comprehensive model of assessment*. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/13/a8/19.pdf
- Marzano, R. J. (2009). Setting the record straight on “high-yield” strategies. *Phi Delta Kappan*, (91)1, 30-37.

- Marzano, R. J., Norford, D. E., Paynter, D. E., Pickering, D. J., & Gaddy, B. B. (2004). *A handbook for classroom instruction that works*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McTighe, J., & Brown, J. L. (2005). Differentiated instruction and educational standards: Is détente possible? *Theory Into Practice*, 44, 234–244.
- Moersch, C. (1995). *Levels of technology implementation (LoTi): A framework for measuring classroom technology use*. Retrieved from <http://loticonnection.com/pdf/LoTiFrameworkNov95.pdf>
- National Academy of Education. (2009). *Standards, assessment, and accountability*. Washington, DC: Author.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Norton, J. (2009). *Should we have national standards?* Retrieved from http://www.teachermagazine.org/login.html?source=http://www.teachermagazine.org/tm/articles/2009/03/18/031809tln_norton.h20.html&destination=http://www.teachermagazine.org/tm/articles/2009/03/18/031809tln_norton.h20.html&levelId=1000
- Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). (2007). *PISA 2006: Science competencies for tomorrow's world, briefing note for the United States*. Paris: Author.
- Orefield, G., Losen, D., Wald, J., & Swanson, C. (2004). *Losing our future: How minority youth are being left behind by the graduation rate crisis*. Retrieved from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410936_LosingOurFuture.pdf
- O'Shea, M. R. (2005). *From standards to success: A guide for school leaders*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Pemberton, J. B., Rademacher, J. A., Tyler-Wood, T., & Cerejio, M. V. P. (2006). Aligning assessments with state curriculum standards and teaching strategies. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, (41)5, 283-90.
- Phillips, V., & Wong, C. (2010). Tying together the common core of standards, instruction, and assessments. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(5), 37–42.
- Pica, R. (2007). *Moving & learning across the curriculum: More than 300 games and activities to make learning fun! Ages 4–8* (2nd ed.). Clifton Park, NY: Thomson Delmar Learning.
- Porter, A., Polikoff, M., & Smithson, J. (2009). Is there a de facto national curriculum? Evidence from state standards. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31, 238–268.
- Reese, W. J. (2005). *America's public schools: From the common school to "No Child Left Behind."* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Reeves, D. B. (2002). *The leader's guide to standards: A blueprint for educational equity and excellence*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Resnick, L. B. (2006). Making accountability really count. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 25(1), 33–37.
- Rothman, B. (2009). *Common standards: The time is now*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved January 6, 2010, from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/TheTimeIsNow.pdf>
- Rothman, R. (1999). Standards and assessment: The foundation of high student achievement. In D. D. Marsh & J. B. Coddling (Eds.), *The new American high school* (pp. 37–61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Rothman, R., Slattery, J. B., et al. (2002). *Benchmarking and alignment of standards and testing* (CSE Technical Report 566). Los Angeles: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Sammons, Pam. (1995). *Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of school effectiveness research*. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/14/49/79.pdf
- Sanders, N. M. (2001). Introduction. In H. Apthorp, C. Dean, et al. (Eds.), *Standards in classroom practice research synthesis* (pp. 1–6). Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Schmoker, M., & Marzano, R. (1999). Realizing the promise of standards-based education. Retrieved from <http://mikeschmoker.com/promise.html>
- Sherhoff, D. J., Csikszentmihalyi, M., et al. (2003). Student engagement in high school classrooms from the perspective of Flow Theory. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 18, 158–176.
- Shkolnik, J., Song, M., et al. (2007). *Changes in rigor, relevance, and student learning in redesigned high schools*. Washington, DC: The American Institutes for Research. Retrieved January 11, 2010, from http://www.air.org/publications/documents/Gates%20Report_TASW-Redesigned_Schools_10_29_07.pdf
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153-189.
- Slavkin, M. L. (2004). *Authentic learning: How learning about the brain can shape the development of students*. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Snow-Renner, R., Lauer, P. A. (2005). *McREL Insights—Standards-based education: Putting research into practice*. Aurora, CO: McREL. Retrieved from http://www.mcrel.org/pdf/standards/5051IR_Standards_synthesis.pdf
- Squires, D. A. (2009). *Curriculum alignment: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Stiggins, R. J. (2001). *Student-involved classroom assessments*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Strong, R. W., Silver, H. F., & Perini, M. J. (2001). *Teaching what matters most: Standards and strategies for raising student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Thorson, A. (Ed.). (2001). *Teaching in the standards based classroom*. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICEstSearch_SearchValue_0=ED452051&ERICEstSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED452051
- Tileston, D. E. W. (2005). *Ten best teaching practices: How brain research, learning styles, and standards define teaching competencies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Toch, T. (2009). Washington view: National standards closer to reality. *Phi Delta Kappan*, (91)1, 72-73.
- Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Understanding by design*. Retrieved from <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/ssc/downloads/toolkits/Shared%20Sections/Understanding%20By%20Design/Introduction%20to%20UBD.pdf>
- Wandberg, R. (2002). *Teaching to the standards of effective practice: A guide to becoming a successful teacher*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.
- Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Wurdinger, S. D. (2005). *Using experiential learning in the classroom: Practical ideas for all educators*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Yates, T. K. (2006). A criticism of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Whittier Journal of Child and Family Advocacy*, 399, 408–411.
- Yazzie-Mintz, E. (2007). *Voices of students on engagement: A report on the 2006 High School Survey of Student Engagement*. Bloomington: Indiana University, Center for Evaluation & Education Policy.
- Young, J. W., Cho, Y., Ling, G., et al. (2008). Validity and fairness of state standards-based assessments for English language learners. *Educational Assessment*, 13, 170–192.
- Zakaria, F. (2009, November 23). Is America losing its mojo? *Newsweek*, 38–41.
- Zhao, Y. (2009). Comments on the common core standards initiative. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice*, 6(3), 46–54.
- Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2005). *Best practice, today's standards for teaching and learning in America's schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Supplemental Standards Aligned System (SAS) Links

SAS Portal <http://www.pdesas.org/default.aspx>

SAS Portal Clear Standards <http://www.pdesas.org/Standard/Views>

SAS Portal Curriculum Framework
<http://www.pdesas.org/module/sas/curriculumframework/>

SAS Portal Fair Assessments <http://www.pdesas.org/Assessment/About>

SAS Portal Instruction <http://www.pdesas.org/Main/Instruction>

SAS Portal Interventions <http://www.pdesas.org/Main/Interventions>

SAS Portal Materials and Resources <http://www.pdesas.org/module/content/search/>