

Core Principle 1: Standards **Dr. Marceta Reilly**

The first of the core principles on which the Kansas State Board of Education bases its redesign of the educational system is: *All students in Kansas must be held to essential and challenging learning standards as defined by the State Board.* The following principle and indicators will be addressed in this paper:

All students in Kansas must be held to essential and challenging learning standards as defined by the State Board.

- (a) Essential learning standards for all students are defined by those that ensure the students' success at the next level of learning.
- (b) Essential learning standards include a knowledge base that leads to conceptual understanding.
- (c) Schools ensure that students have the prerequisite skills and knowledge prior to proceeding to the next level of learning.

Introduction

There are different types of standards to address various aspects of learning. In the book *The Language of Learning*, McBrien and Brandt describe the types of standards as:

- Content standards: what students are to learn in subject areas.
- Performance standards: specify what levels of learning are expected.
- Opportunity-to-learn standards: the conditions and resources necessary to give all students an equal chance to meet performance standards.
- World-class standards: content and performances that are expected of students in other industrialized countries (p. 93).

However, Robert Marzano defines standards best:

"...when we say 'standards' in education, what we generally mean is that level of knowledge or skill we expect students to reach in a specific subject matter. It's as simple as that. Unfortunately, it's not that easy to pull off in a school." (ASCD website)

Most people agree that the current standards movement dates back to the landmark report, *A Nation At Risk* (1983). Commissioned during the Reagan presidency, its major tenet was "that American education was bankrupt." As the report noted, it was found that there was a lack of standards specifically about what topics should be covered in schools and what students were expected to learn. It was found that students could go through the system without learning very much at all. So, nationally, people began to demand rigorous standards to ensure some guarantee that when students graduated from high school, they would know "this" and be able to do "that." (ASCD website)

The Nation at Risk report also came at a time of dramatic economic changes in the United States. During the 1980s, a switch began from a "blue-collar" economy to a new "knowledge" economy. The dominance of a manufacturing-based economy shifted to a service and information-based economy. This caused persistent pressure on schools to meet higher knowledge standards for

growing numbers of students. The economic value of human capital accelerated and skill requirements for good jobs increased.

“The growing importance of education in economic growth and individual opportunity (is challenging). Efforts to establish and meet high performance standards will be key in providing the human capital necessary to maintain the United States’ global competitiveness and foster overall economic expansion in the new knowledge-based economy. Success in achieving high standards for all students will determine if ...income inequalities (can be reduced)” (Standards For What? The Economic Roots of K-16 Reform, 2003).

People have come to agree that failure to meet high standards in education jeopardizes America’s future competitiveness in the global economy, and individual education performance determines access to income and benefits. Thus, pressure for *all* students to meet high standards is here to stay because of these economic and demographic forces.

Research

In a conversation with Marge Scherer in 2001, Robert Marzano said,

“Standards hold the greatest hope for significantly improving student achievement.”

But standards, by themselves, will not create gains in student achievement. They are only one piece in the education reform puzzle. As the KSBE core principles state, learning standards are essential for all students, but instruction, adaptability, curriculum, professional growth, and engagement of parents and the community are needed as well. However, essential learning standards are the cornerstone behind these other important variables.

There are three stages in standards-based reform. The first stage is creating clear, common learning goals or “content standards.” The next stage is aligning these standards to curriculum, instruction, and assessments within the school system. Finally, in the third stage accountability measures (rewards and sanctions) for meeting the standards are put into place. Standards establish a clear link for curriculum, instruction, and assessment (Weiss, 2000). They are the driving force that creates a *congruent system*—standards determine curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, teacher education, and support programs for struggling students (ECS, 2004).

The development of standards creates a common focus and causes people to reflect and articulate their goals for students and learning. The development process forces a community to come to broad-based agreement about what students need to know and be able to do when they graduate from the school system. In this way standards create clear, public criteria for successful learning.

“The public will...support standards so long as the students who reach them are prepared to succeed in the next grade, in college, and in meaningful careers. These are the tangible outcomes that parents want for their children.” (Gandel & Vranek, 2001)

But for standards to have an impact on the classroom, they must be teachable (Gandel & Vranek, 2001), they must ensure students' success, they must include a knowledge base that leads to conceptual understanding, and they must ensure that students have the prerequisite skills and knowledge prior to proceeding to the next level of learning. As a result, standards must be clear and limited in number. Clarity requires that the standards contain enough detail and precision to allow teachers, parents, and students to know what the students need to learn. The best standards are simple and deep (Strong, Silver, & Perini, 2001). The limited number allows teachers the ability to focus on a few essential standards and afford the opportunity to provide in-depth treatment that benefits students and leads to conceptual understanding of content.

When standards are clear and precise, everyone is "on the same page." There is consistency among schools and throughout systems. It increases expectations for ALL students and ensures that demographics are not destiny (Standards For What? 2003). When done well, standards identify and support what is necessary for entry to the next level of learning—whatever that is.

Standards are the end-goal for the student, but *how* they are taught is decided by the teacher (Tomlinson, 2000). Standards focus teachers on looking at what students are *learning* as a means of determining success. Teachers use this data about what students are learning to make instructional decisions about what to teach next and how to adjust their instruction. They also begin to use this data to determine their own professional development needs. What do they need to learn in order to teach *better* so that the quality of instruction (and therefore, student learning) is improved? Hayes Mizell in an ASCD Education Update explained,

"When teachers take action by using standards to focus on improving their performance and that of their students, they shift the standards from testing to learning, from accountability to responsibility, and from obligation to opportunity." (January, 2002).

The assessments and accountability of standards create urgency and attention to the need for continuous school improvement (Marshall, 2003). There is no doubt the American public supports common academic standards for students, measuring results, and holding schools and students accountable for performance. This support, however, will dissipate if tests become viewed as instruments to criticize rather than help schools and students excel. (Achieve, Inc., 2002)

If standards are a powerful tool for organizing learning, essential for economic development, and critical for individual success, why is it so hard to make them work in schools? First, creating standards is very difficult to do. Standards are often written in terms that are too broad. They lack clarity and specificity. They identify too many low level, discrete, knowledge and skill sets, and have no connections to other content areas. (Gandel & Vranek, 2001.)

Creating *essential* standards is even harder. There is the problem of too many *non-essential* standards within a subject area. This is not surprising since content specialists most often write the standards. It is a struggle to balance what is *essential* for ALL students to know and be able to do, and what is necessary for those students who have an aptitude, inclination, or job-related interest in a subject area (Scherer, 2001). In addition, within subject area standards, there is often a lack of emphasis on conceptual understanding and learning the over-arching process

skills necessary for students to be successful in life: e.g., problem-solving, communication and creativity skills.

Additionally, when accountability systems are set in place before the curriculum/instruction/assessment loop is aligned, it leads to abuses like cheating on tests and artificial manipulation of data. Systems start to focus on the superficial rather than the substantive, more students are pushed out of the system, and “lookin’ good” becomes more important than truly *being* good. (O’Neil & Tell, 1999.) In turn, students are not being held to essential and challenging learning standards, rather, students are being held to minimal, knowledge based standards.

Some states are using one-shot, high stakes assessments to determine major decisions about a student’s academic future. (Merrow, 2001). Louisiana, Delaware, Ohio, and South Carolina were among the first states to retain thousands of elementary and middle-school students based on high stakes test scores. Florida, New York, and Chicago have recently struggled with massive numbers of students who cannot pass promotion exams to the next grade. Some advocates claim that most high-stakes testing policies discriminate against minority youth, hamstring teachers, reduce complex learning opportunities, and punish victims, not perpetrators, of educational inequities. (Orfield & Wald, 2000).

In response to these increased testing pressures, many educators are “piling on homework, abolishing recess for young children, cheating on tests, flunking more students, teaching to the tests, and seeking to rid themselves of low performers,” claims Gratz. Stressed-out students and teachers are an inevitable consequence...(O’Neil & Tell, 1999)

Finally, having ALL students meet high standards has a high price tag (Feldman, 2003). Drawing on the successes of early research, educators who make learning (not testing) the goal, must provide special assistance like tutoring and remedial programs for disadvantaged students. (Hurwitz & Hurwitz, 2000) Such systems create additional internal supports so that ALL students can meet the new standards. There must be multiple learning alternatives for students who don’t meet the standards the first (or even second) time.

And while the public wants some guarantees about educational outcomes, they are ambivalent about whether or not they *really* want ALL students to learn to high levels. There is an unspoken issue that high standards are good for “My kids”, but for “Other-people’s kids” it may not be so important. After all, if everyone is prepared for high-paying jobs, who is going to take the low-paying service jobs of the future? (Haycock, 2003; Gratz, 2000).

Given the promise for positive impact, how do the Kansas’ content standards measure up? The vision of the Kansas’ standards has been for all educators to focus on *student achievement*—not just test scores. Standards are to drive instruction, guide professional development of teachers, and ensure learning for ALL students.

This vision for the standards has evolved over the past twenty years. In the early 1980s, the Kansas State Board of Education (KSBE) had broad, general curriculum guidelines for subject areas, and state tests identified and tested students on “minimum competencies.” In the late 1980s these minimum competencies were replaced by “student outcomes”—what do we want students to know and be able to do? These student outcomes became the basis for the Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) system used to accredit schools in Kansas which began in the

early 1990s. Schools were given the charge to show that their students reached the outcomes, and state assessments of general knowledge were used as one measure for showing success.

But teachers complained that the outcomes were too broad and general, focused too much on process skills, and did not give enough guidance about what to teach. Educators wanted clearer, more specific standards, and tests that directly measured them. Thus, in the mid-1990s, “standards” were developed for four major content areas: Reading/Writing, Math, Science, and Social Studies. These standards have since been further revised. Reading/Writing has been expanded to become “Communication Skills”—that is, reading, writing, speaking, listening, and research skills. Math which always focused on numbers and computation, algebra, geometry, and data now includes reference to personal finance standards. The state assessments align directly to the standards—thereby identifying *essential* knowledge and skills for ALL Kansas students to learn. In addition, the revised school accreditation process is now based on how well students within a school meet state standards.

In 2001, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) reviewed standards, curriculum, assessments, and accountability measures for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. They judged the first iteration of the Kansas content standards which were developed in 1999/2000 as clear, specific, and grounded in content. They met the AFT criterion for “strong standards.” However, the report also noted that Kansas had not yet developed a *coherent system*—while the state reading/writing assessment was aligned with the reading/writing standards,

“the math, science, and social studies tests (were) not based on the standards; there (was) no curriculum for the assessed areas. And there (were) no consequences for students who do not meet the standards.”
(*Making Standards Matter 2001*)

The report concluded that

“Kansas has a good start with its strong standards, however work remains for the system to be complete...” (Ibid)

Since this AFT report was written, Kansas has completed assessments for all core content areas that are aligned with the content standards. The State Board has created an accreditation system that measures student progress based on these state assessments, and the Kansas State Department of Education is in the process of developing performance indicators, instructional resources, and model lesson plans as curriculum support for teachers. Clearly, Kansas standards identify the essential and challenging learning standards all students need to know, include conceptual understanding, and assure success at the next level of learning.

In January 2004, *Quality Counts 2004* produced by *Education Week*, reported that the state had adopted standards in the four core subject areas. The report also stated that the standards were clear, specific, and grounded in content; assessments had been custom-developed to match the reading and math standards; and report cards with information related to attainment of the standards were published for all schools.

“Kansas is one of seven states that have clear and specific standards for every grade span in English, mathematics, science, and social

studies/history. The state has tests aligned with those standards in English and math at all grade spans but not in science or social studies....(The) tests rely primarily on multiple-choice items except in English...The state publishes school report cards containing student achievement data and assigns rating to schools based in part on test results. While Kansas provides help to schools rated low-performing, it does not impose sanctions on ...schools that consistently receive such ratings. Kansas does not offer monetary rewards to high-performing or improving schools.”

Vision

The **state standards** define what students should know and be able to do in four core content areas. The **state assessments** are tightly aligned to these standards and identify *essential* knowledge and skills for ALL students to learn. When a *cohesive system* is in place, **student achievement of the standards** is the driving force of all educational effort. It determines what teachers teach, what professional development they need, what programs, classes, internal/external learning supports are available for students, how much the system costs, and who gets licensed and accredited. School systems with large numbers of high-need students will cost more than those with easy-to-teach students because the goal is for ALL students to meet the *essential* learning standards. Having students reach their individual learning potential is a by-product but it is not the goal.

How these state-defined standards are met by students is the work of policy-makers, communities, school districts, administrators, teachers and parents. Each play an important role in ensuring these standards are taught well and learned by all students. Their role and responsibilities are offered below.

Policymakers

It is critical that policymakers ensure that time, funding, and resources be devoted to identifying common, clear, meaningful, *essential* standards for ALL students. Having valid, reliable assessments tightly aligned to the standards are equally important.

Besides providing time, funding, and resources for the development of standards and assessments, policymakers need to ensure a fair, reasonable, and consistent system of reporting student achievement to the public. The emphasis is on achievement of the standards—not testing. Schools that need to improve must be provided technical support and additional funding—not labeled as failing. Annual School Report Cards are one way to report student achievement on state assessments as well as data about other important indicators of school success. The emphasis of these reports should be on continuous improvement—not in labeling schools as failing or creating inappropriate comparisons among schools.

Policymakers are also responsible for designing the rewards and sanctions that hold systems accountable for having all students meet the standards. The balance needed is to apply enough pressure to create urgency and attention, but not so much that teachers and students give up or resort to unethical behavior to avoid the consequences. Policies must be crafted to provide technical support and additional funding to help low-performing schools improve. Additionally,

there must be rewards for high-performing or improving schools. These rewards can be in the form of recognition or even monetary incentives.

Communities

The role of community members and business partners is to validate that the standards are both meaningful and essential. What is important for ALL students to know and be able to do? What knowledge and skills will take them to the next level after graduation? What skills and knowledge do students need to be successful in the workplace or to pursue postsecondary education?

Once these essential standards are identified, community members and businesses must show a willingness to provide the resources and support for ALL students to learn these standards. They need to provide opportunities for students to practice these essential knowledge and skills in the community, and give feedback to schools about how well the students are demonstrating these standards in the life of the community.

School Districts

The Kansas State Board of Education has defined the essential and challenging learning standards as that they ensure every child's success in knowing, understanding and having the skills in all core academic areas. In a system such as Kansas', that uses standards as the driving force, it is then up to the school districts to decide *what else* the community identifies as essential learning *in addition to* those things already defined in the state standards and assessments. These are identified in collaboration with community stakeholders and reflect the norms and values of the community itself.

Districts help the public distinguish between what is *essential* for ALL students to learn and what is important for students who have an aptitude, inclination or special interest in a specific subject area. This can be done in community conversations, community-wide surveys, Board of Education forums, and Board of Education discussions. Consensus about these issues form a "covenant" between the school, district and the community about what students will know and be able to do when they graduate.

Once the essential standards are clear, districts then provide the time, allocate resources, and adequate facilities for faculty to teach these standards to ALL students. They provide teachers with time to collaborate with colleagues about improving instruction, studying student work, identifying learning needs, and determining multiple ways to meet the diverse needs of their students. They also provide the resources so that teachers have quality training and support to implement research-based school improvement efforts, good curriculum materials aligned with instruction, and a wide range of alternatives for students who may not have learned the essential knowledge and skills the first or second time.

Districts help faculty develop informal, multiple, and frequent ways to assess the essential standards in addition to the once-per-year state assessments. They use the once-per-year state assessment information to determine how well as a system their students are doing and to what degree they are learning the standards. This information is readily reported to parents and the public in ways that are understandable and use student achievement of the standards as an indicator of their own success.

Administrators

Administrators help lead the community, school board, parents and school personnel in discussions about *essential* standards. They also ensure that student achievement of the standards is the focus of administrator meetings and Board of Education discussions.

Administrators frequently observe in classrooms and give teachers feedback about student learning. They assist faculty in designing formative assessments across grade levels for frequent monitoring of student learning of the standards. They help design report cards to show progress in achievement of the standards. They make student achievement of the standards the focus of faculty meetings and parent communications.

Administrators provide time for teachers to work with colleagues in small learning communities. This time with colleagues is spent discussing data, considering ways to meet individual learning needs, and figuring out what to do when students need more learning time.

Administrators provide quality professional development for faculty related to common learning needs of students. They also help provide systems of on-going support, like coaching, to assist teachers in implementing changes to improve instruction. Additionally, administrators provide the structure and support needed by staff to ensure learning takes place.

Administrators and teachers work together to offer extended opportunities for students to learn and practice the standards, such as: in-school and out-of-school tutoring, peer support and community volunteer programs, special events related to practicing or demonstrating the standards, or summer, holiday, or weekend learning extensions related to the standards. Besides providing multiple opportunities for students to learn the standards in a variety of settings, administrators also create incentives and celebrations for students who learn the standards.

Teachers

As schools must ensure that students have the prerequisite skills and knowledge prior to proceeding to the next level of learning, teachers are the ones responsible for making this happen. Teachers are the ones responsible for determining *how to teach* these essential standards to ALL students in their schools. They use data to determine how well students are learning the standards, develop multiple options for students to learn, assist students in demonstrating that they know the standards, and focus their report cards on student's achievement of them.

Teachers must ensure that ALL students meet the *essential* standards at a minimum. Additionally, they must assist those students with special interests or talents in meeting an expanded set of standards. They do this by becoming very knowledgeable and clear about the standards. They then use the standards as the centerpiece of their instruction, providing multiple ways for students to learn and demonstrate their attainment of the standards. This vertical and horizontal expansion of the standards ensures the learning of all students, whether at a remedial or gifted level of academic achievement.

Teachers give frequent, informal assessments about how well students are learning the standards. They continuously collect and analyze data to understand what students have learned, are learning and still need to learn to determine what to teach next. They integrate skill instruction across content areas. For example, they show students how the math concept of patterns is present in poetry, music, science, social history. Or they teach students how to apply the same

problem-solving model used in math to reading texts, solving science questions, or analyzing social issues.

After analyzing student learning data, teachers engage in professional discussions with colleagues about ways to meet individual student learning needs. They plan their own professional development based on what their students need. The question always is, What do I need to learn or do better in order to improve my students' learning?

The focus of report cards is about the achievement of standards. Teachers need to report to parents about how well their children are meeting the standards. Then they suggest ways that parents can support their children's learning at home and give them additional practice of the standards.

Parents

Parents are extremely important partners with educators in helping their children attain the essential standards. They must know what the standards are, must expect their children to devote time and attention to their school work, and should regularly talk with their child's teachers about their child's learning. They must be willing to provide support for additional learning time if their child needs it to reach the standards. This could include providing transportation to additional learning opportunities outside of school time, or offering individual incentives to reach a goal.

Recommendations for the Kansas State Board of Education to Consider

Strong standards have been put into place in Kansas. The content area standards are clear, specific, and grounded in research. The State assessments are tightly aligned to the standards, albeit in a multiple-choice format. And the state issues an annual school, district and state report card creating the attention needed to ensure the state's, the districts, and the schools' commitment to teach ALL students specific knowledge and skills that ensures success in life. Now schools and districts have work to do to make the promise of standards a reality for every Kansas student.

Policymakers need to:

- Focus policies on the achievement of standards, not on the tests.
- Ensure adequate funding and technical support for improvement in all schools,
- Create incentives to recognize and reward high-performing and improving schools.

Communities need to:

- Validate that the standards are meaningful and essential.
- Provide resources and support to ensure all students learn the essential knowledge and skills.
- Provide opportunities for students to practice the knowledge and skills in the community.
- Give feedback to schools on how well the students are demonstrating the standards.

Districts need to:

- Clearly define *essential* and challenging standards for their community.
- Provide TIME for
 - job-embedded professional collaboration,
 - quality professional development, and
 - strong follow-up support to ensure implementation;
- Commit resources to
 - purchase research-based curriculum materials aligned with the standards, and
 - provide a range of extended learning opportunities for students;
- Keep achievement of students in the public eye.

Administrators need to:

- Talk about student achievement frequently to staff and parents,
- Observe for it in the classrooms,
- Monitor it through frequent teacher reports, and
- Provide multiple opportunities for students to learn.

Teachers need to:

- Make standards the center of their instruction,
- Continuously monitor achievement by creating periodic, informal assessments to determine how well students are learning the standards,
- Focus all professional development around identified student learning needs,
- Redesign report cards to inform parents about their child's achievement of the standards and suggest ways to reinforce the learning at home.

Parents need to:

- Know what the standards are.
- Provide support at home in helping their child reach the standards.
- Discuss their child's progress with their child's teacher.

Bibliography for Standards

Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development website. *Definition of Standards*. Retrieved June 1, 2004 from <http://www.ascd.org/cms/index.cfm?TheViewID=919>.

Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development website. *What are Standards?*. Retrieved June 1, 2004 from <http://www.ascd.org/cms/index.cfm?TheViewID=1015>

Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development website. *Why is there a need for Standards?* Retrieved June 1, 2004 from <http://www.ascd.org/cms/index.cfm?TheViewID=1016>.

Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development website. *Brief History of the Standards Movement*. Retrieved June 1, 2004 from <http://www.ascd.org/cms/index.cfm?TheViewID=1017>.

Brady, Marion. "The Standards Juggernaut," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May, 2000, pp. 648-651.

Carnevale, Anthony P.& Desrochers, Donna M. *The Economic Roots of K-16 Reform*, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ, 2003.

Cohen, Michael, Finn Jr., Chester E.& Haycock, Katy. "Creating a High School Diploma That Counts," *Education Week*, March 10, 2004.

Education Commission of the States. *Standards Overview*. Retrieved April 1, 2004 from <http://www.ecs.org/html/issueSection.asp?print=true&issueID=113&subIssueID=0&s=Overview>

Education Week, *Quality Counts 2004: Count Me In: Special Education in an Ear of Standards*, Kansas Data Table, January 8, 2004.

Feldman, Sandra. "Focus on the Promise," *American Teacher: Where We Stand*, AFT Publication. April, 2003.

Gandal, Matthew & Vranek, Jennifer. "Standards: Here Today, Here Tomorrow," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 59, No. 1, September 2001, pp. 6-13.

Gibbs, Thomas J.& Howley, Aimee. "'World-Class Standards' and Local Pedagogies: Can We Do Both?" ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, Charleston, W.Va., ED448014, December, 2000.

Glickman, Carl D. "Holding Sacred Ground: The Impact of Standardization," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 58, No. 4, December 2000, pp. 46-51.

Gottlieb, Stephen S. *A Review of State Reading and Language Arts Standards*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading English and Communication, ED456425, Bloomington, Ind., August, 2001.

Gratz, Donald B. "High Standards for Whom?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 2000, pp. 681-687.

Guskey, Thomas R. "Helping Standards Make the Grade," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 59, No. 1, September 2001, pp. 20-27.

Hadderman, Margaret. *Standards: The Policy Environment*, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Ore., ED444239, August, 2000.

Haycock, Katy. "A New Core Curriculum For All: Aiming High for Other People's Children," Thinking K-16, The Education Trust, Winter, 2003.

Hurwitz, Nina & Hurwitz, Sol. "Do High Stakes Assessments Improve Learning?" *American School Board Journal*, January, 2000, pp. 20-25.

Main, Ivy. "Who's Afraid of Standards?" *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 57, No. 5, February 2000, pp. 73-74.

Making Standards Matter 2001, American Federation of Teachers, October 2001.

Marshall, Kim. "A Principal Looks Back: Standards Matter," *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vo. 85, No. 2, October 2003, pp. 104-113.

McBrien, J.L. & Brandy, P.S. *The Language of Learning: A Guide to Education Terms*, ASCD., Alexandria, VA, 1997.

Merrow, John. "Undermining Standards," *Phi Delta Kappan*, May 2001, pp. 652-659.

O'Neil, John & Tell, Carol. "Why Students Lose When 'Tougher Standards' Win: A Conversation with Alfie Kohn," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 57, No. 1, September 1999, pp. 18-22.

Quindlen, Terrey Hatcher. "Making Sense of Standards," *ASCD Education Update*, Volume 44, No. 4, June 2002.

"Executive Summary," *Ready or Not: Creating a High School Diploma That Counts*, The American Diploma Project, Education Trust, February 2004.

"Retention and Student Achievement," *ASCD Research Brief*, Vol. 2, No. 11, May 25, 2004.

Rosenbaum, James E., "It's Time To Tell Kids: If You Don't Do Well in High School, You Won't Do Well in College (or on the Job)," *American Education*, Spring 2004.

Scherer, Marge. "How and Why Standards Can Improve Student Achievement: A Conversation with Robert J. Marzano," *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 59, No. 1, September 2001, pp. 14-18.

"Shifting the Focus of Standards," *ASCD Education Update*, Vol. 44, No. 1, January 2002.

Skinner, Ronald A. & Stareshina, Lisa N., "State of the State," *Education Week*, January 8, 2004.

Standards and Accountability: A Call by the Learning First Alliance for Mid-Course Corrections, Learning First Alliance, 2001.

- Standards for What? The Economic Roots of K-16 Reform*, The Education Trust. 2003.
- “Standards from the Students’ Perspective,” *ASCD Education Update*, Vol. 43, No. 1, January 2001.
- Staying on Course—Standards-Based Reform in America’s Schools: Progress and Prospects*. Achieve, Inc., 2002.
- Strong, Richard W., Silver, Harvey F., & Perini, Matthew J. “Making Students as Important as Standards,” *Educational Leadership*, Vol. 59, No. 3, November 2001, pp. 56-61.
- Thinking K-16*, The Education Trust, Winter, 2003.
- Tienken, Christopher & Wilson, Michael. ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, College Park, Md., ED458215, May, 2001.
- Togneri, Wendy. *Beyond Islands of Excellence: What Districts Can Do to Improve Instruction and Achievement in All Schools—A Leadership Brief*, Learning First Alliance, March 2003.
- Tomlinson, Carol Ann. “Reconcilable Differences? Standards-Based Teaching and Differentiation,” *Educational Leadership*, Vol.58, No. 1, September 2000, pp. 6-11.
- Weiss, Suzanne. *The Progress of Education Reform*, Education Commission of the States, Vol. 1, No. 5, January-February, 2000.