The accountability requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), coupled with debates over reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), have brought increased attention to special education. But educators differ in how they view this additional scrutiny.

Some fear that NCLB’s accountability requirements related to special education will be impossible to reach. Others see a much-needed catalyst for improving the education of students with special needs.

It is too early to know which perspective will be most accurate. But one certainty is that NCLB and plans for IDEA reauthorization are bringing special and general education closer together than ever before.

“NCLB has been a catalyst for collaboration between general education, special education, and all aspects of the education system,” says WestEd’s Kristin Reedy, director of the Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), which is funded by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to provide special education technical assistance to eight state departments of education in its region.

TWO SEPARATE SYSTEMS

Over the years, research has demonstrated that most students with disabilities learn more when taught the standards-based general education curriculum, rather than a separate curriculum, as long as these students receive appropriate supports and accommodations for their special needs. And legislation has encouraged a trend in recent years toward including more students with disabilities in general education classes.

Nonetheless, special and general education remain two essentially separate systems. A variety of forces have kept them apart — from separate legal mandates and funding streams to the historical tendency for schools to sort students by ability.

Among the biggest factors have been accountability systems for general education in which many special education students were excluded altogether from the assessments used to gauge the performance of a school or district. It is in this area of accountability that NCLB is making the most dramatic changes.
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This is an important time for special education. Congress is negotiating a reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the most significant federal legislation guiding the education of students with disabilities and other special needs.

WestEd’s expertise in this area stretches back to our earliest years and is tied to the priority we place on addressing the needs of traditionally underserved populations.

**IMPROVING SPECIAL EDUCATION MEANS IMPROVING EDUCATION**

This issue of *R&D Alert* addresses special education primarily for an audience of general educators and policymakers. As the lead article discusses, the plight of students with disabilities and other special needs is increasingly the concern of all educators, not just those with a particular background in special education.

We selected a few topics that relate particularly to the impending IDEA reauthorization and to recent mandates from the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB).

The lead article discusses implications for special education of the standards-based assessment push embodied in part in NCLB and in changes being considered for IDEA. A potentially positive effect of this accountability push is to forge stronger relationships between general and special education. Because many schools and districts are not necessarily prepared for such change, this article also describes examples of schools and states successfully working to improve collaboration across general and special education so as to better serve all students.

The second article discusses another issue that new provisions from NCLB bring to the fore: What does "highly qualified" mean for special education professionals? The article reviews differences between NCLB’s and IDEA’s definitions of "highly qualified" and touches on how some states are responding to this issue.

And a third article describes a model being considered for inclusion in the IDEA reauthorization as a new option for identifying special education eligibility of students with specific learning disabilities. WestEd staff are pursuing research to better understand this new identification approach, and the article shares information from their work.

We hope the ideas and research in this issue are helpful as you seek to improve the education of children and youth with special needs. For more information, we encourage you to go to our Web site — WestEd.org — or use the contact information at the end of each article.

Glen Harvey, Chief Executive Officer
An experienced special education teacher typically has helped support the learning of hundreds of children with disabilities or other special needs. In order to be qualified for this work, she has had to undergo a rigorous certification process, which generally includes course work at the undergraduate and/or graduate level in special education, depending upon the specific licensure requirements in her state.

Yet, under the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), such a teacher still may not be considered “highly qualified.” As a result, school administrators across the country are scrambling to meet the provisions of NCLB with regard to special education professionals. Further complicating matters is the fact that this standard might shift in the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Current IDEA regulations indicate that states must have “policies and procedures relating to the establishment and maintenance of standards to ensure that” special education personnel “are appropriately and adequately prepared and trained.” NCLB, responding to research that links teacher quality with student success, defines “highly qualified” teachers as those who have

- a bachelor’s degree,
- full state certification and licensure, and
- competency in each core academic subject that he or she teaches.

It is this last requirement that poses a problem for many special educators, particularly veteran teachers who provide direct instruction in core academic subjects outside of the general education classroom. Although these teachers are trained to address the needs of special education students, they have not previously had to demonstrate competency in core subject areas such as those listed in NCLB. Special education is not considered a core subject area.

The issue of what it means to be a “highly qualified” special education teacher has not yet been clearly defined, says Dona Meinders, project director for the Least Restrictive Environment Project of WestEd’s Center for Prevention and Early Intervention.

“Is it more important to have subject matter expertise or more important to have pedagogical expertise for addressing the needs of special education students?” she asks. NCLB suggests the former and IDEA favors the latter, although IDEA’s requirements may also change when the law is reauthorized.
Finding the best resolution is not easy. Some experts argue that applying NCLB’s “highly qualified” standard would raise the bar higher for special educators than for other teachers because they would need credentials in special education and at least one core subject area. Furthermore, because special education teachers often work with students in multiple subjects, they may need to demonstrate competency in each.

On the other hand, if students with disabilities are to receive quality instruction in the core curriculum, their teachers — regardless of expertise in special education pedagogy — need to be competent in the subject matter. “The field is still wrestling with the issue,” says Meinders.

With definitions of “highly qualified” that are potentially inconsistent between NCLB and IDEA, it is up to each state to develop procedures to ensure that all students with disabilities have access to “highly qualified” teachers. The challenge for states is to find multiple and relatively simple ways for teachers who have special education qualifications to demonstrate that they also have competency in core academic subjects.

In California, the State Board of Education is taking up this challenge by promoting a system whereby experienced special education teachers can demonstrate competency in one of two ways. Teachers can qualify through a “high, objective, uniform state standard of evaluation” (HOUSSE) or by earning credit for years of experience, explains Janet Canning, a special education consultant with the California Department of Education, Special Education Division.

“Options include being evaluated by a teacher who has met the standard or acquiring credit for coursework or an advanced degree. Districts throughout the state are not waiting for the IDEA reauthorization to proceed, but instead are already gearing up for these kinds of assessments, especially in reading and mathematics,” says Canning.

For special education paraprofessionals, who until the 1997 reauthorization of IDEA were not mentioned in law despite their presence in the classroom since the mid-1950s, the wait for clarification of “qualified” will continue. Current IDEA regulations require them to be “appropriately trained and supervised” to assist teachers but offer no further explanation.

“NCLB defines requirements for paraprofessionals in Title I programs, but says nothing about special ed paraprofessionals. We thought the upcoming IDEA reauthorization would apply the Title I guidelines to special ed, but we don’t see that happening,” says Pat Mueller, an evaluator at NERRC and a professional development trainer.

“It will remain up to individual states to define policies. States are at different places with that and most are still struggling.” According to Mueller, states acting proactively include Rhode Island, Washington, Utah, Kansas, and Maine. Each has established standards for roles and preparation of paraprofessionals or, where legislation has been passed, outlined various requirements such as how paraprofessionals are monitored. Some states, such as Rhode Island, are applying the Title I paraprofessional requirements from NCLB across the board, even though IDEA requires a lesser standard.

For states still needing to get started on the process, a report titled *State of the Art* from the National Resource Center for Paraprofessionals recommends broad collaboration. The report suggests that state education agencies work with schools, institutions of higher education, professional organizations, unions, parents, and other stakeholders to establish standards for special education paraprofessionals that reflect best practice.

For now, special education teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators continue to play the waiting game, with more rounds of negotiating and action still expected on the reauthorization of IDEA. Regardless of what happens, Canning and others see the positive potential in the new legislation. “The real premise of IDEA is the notion of students with disabilities having access to the general education curriculum, and NCLB helps push us closer to that goal.”

For more information about:
- the Least Restrictive Environment Project, contact Dona Meinders at 916.492.4013 or dmeinde@WestEd.org;
- NERRC, contact Karen Mikkelsen at 802.951.8208 or kmikkel@WestEd.org.
FROM COMPLIANCE TO OUTCOMES

NCLB now holds schools and districts accountable for how special education students fare on state and district assessments. Schools must disaggregate, or break out, assessment results for special needs and other specified groups and show that these groups are making adequate yearly progress.

By holding them accountable for the academic performance of special education students, NCLB is increasing the responsibility of schools and districts beyond IDEA's requirements. Under IDEA, educators have had to provide specially designed instruction and supplementary aids and services for students with disabilities. Schools and districts must follow laws and regulations designed to support the academic success of special education students, but IDEA hasn’t specified sanctions when those students fail to make educational progress.

“We have assisted many schools in addressing these special populations through strategies such as inclusive education, standards-based goal writing and instruction, and differentiated instruction,” explains Virginia Reynolds, CPEI Program Director.

DIFFERENTIATING INSTRUCTION TO IMPROVE LEARNING

An example of a school successfully negotiating this new terrain is California’s Pacific Grove Middle School, where special and general education teachers collaborate to diversify their instructional strategies.

“Special ed teachers face a constant challenge of helping students get the most out of regular ed classes,” notes Moira Mahr, a Pacific Grove resource specialist. The school addresses this challenge with professional development and by extending responsibility for special education across all faculty. An in-depth training on Differentiating Instruction Across the Curriculum for All Learners recently prepared a team that included Mahr, the principal, and general education teachers to address the needs of special education students.

In differentiated instruction, the teacher varies curricular content, the learning environment, learning activities, and products based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile. Instruction focuses on making sure students learn curricular concepts and principles (rather than rigidly adhering to a highly sequential curriculum). In this system, advanced learners may accelerate or seek expanded learning, while struggling learners receive additional support.

BRINGING SPECIAL AND GENERAL EDUCATION CLOSER TOGETHER

Many special education advocates see this shift from compliance to outcomes in a positive light. If special education students aren’t learning the curriculum, then something needs to be done, and accountability measures are providing the needed push. Special education students are no longer the concern of a narrow group of educators and parents. They are increasingly the responsibility of everyone.

Federal legislators also are considering changes to IDEA that would further strengthen connections between special and general education. Proposed changes would shift the law’s focus from compliance to improving academic achievement results and could allow local education agencies to use up to 15 percent of their special education funds for professional development services to general education staff to more effectively teach students with disabilities in their classrooms.

While NCLB and proposed changes to IDEA may produce more special and general education links, many schools and districts are not sure how to make such a partnership work effectively. That is where WestEd’s NERRC and CPEI come in — working with schools, districts, and states to support their compliance with the law and to help them strengthen both special and general education.
Alyssa is not a real student, but a composite of many students familiar to virtually every experienced teacher: the ones who appear bright and engaged but inexplicably founder when trying to learn some essential part of the curriculum.

Determining whether a student like Alyssa has a specific learning disability poses a significant challenge. Because there are numerous concerns with the current model for identifying specific learning disabilities, many schools are experimenting with alternatives, and WestEd’s Northeast Regional Resource Center (NERRC), along with numerous other groups, is researching these new approaches.

Under the traditional model, the teacher’s next step with a student like Alyssa is to refer her for special education testing. If the testing reveals a “severe discrepancy” between Alyssa’s ability, as measured by intelligence tests, and her academic performance, as measured by standardized achievement tests, then Alyssa may be considered to have a specific learning disability qualifying her for special education. Her teachers, parents, educational psychologist, and others would then develop an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) outlining services the student will receive.
Alyssa” is a first grader with a wonderful imagination who loves listening to stories and quickly incorporates new words into her spoken vocabulary. Yet, while most of her classmates have begun to read fluently, she continues laboring over each word.

Sounds good in theory, but numerous problems crop up in practice. The process is often time-consuming and expensive, requiring time and specialists outside the regular classroom or school. All the while, the child isn’t getting the special education and related services that she may need.

Some critics argue that cultural biases in the assessments call into question the results of intelligence tests for identifying specific learning disabilities. Also, because the tests are often not connected to the school’s regular curriculum, the IEPs developed under this system often have limited connections to what the child is supposed to learn in a general education classroom.

Perhaps the biggest concern with the “discrepancy” model is that it relies on what WestEd’s Michael Hock calls a “wait-to-fail” approach. In the case of Alyssa, a special education referral would lead to her being tested for reading ability. But the level of reading expected of someone Alyssa’s age, first grade, is not very advanced. So, even if she doesn’t score well on reading tests, it is possible — even likely — that her score will not be low enough to indicate a statistically significant discrepancy from her intelligence level as identified by the IQ test.

Alyssa would have to “wait” until she has fallen farther behind before this “discrepancy” approach would formally identify her as eligible for special education. The identification typically isn’t made until around third grade for students who have reading difficulties.

NERRC’s Learning Disabilities Initiative, which Hock directs, has been exploring alternatives to this traditional model. In one of the most promising alternatives, schools don’t wait for formal identification of a learning disability, but instead start providing targeted interventions early on. In this “responsiveness to intervention” model (RtI), monitoring how the student responds to those interventions becomes a part of the special education identification process itself.

For Alyssa, RtI might play out like this: Having noticed Alyssa’s early difficulties in reading, her teacher monitors Alyssa’s efforts and provides focused support through daily small-group work. If this support does not seem to help, the teacher enlists the school reading specialist to work with Alyssa as well, one-on-one. Throughout the few months of these interventions, the teacher also conducts regular assessments and documents Alyssa’s limited progress. She also notes the child’s increasing discouragement.

When these interventions seem to yield no consistent or substantial gains for Alyssa, her teacher requests a meeting of a “Student Study Team.” There she presents her concerns about Alyssa’s reading and an overview of the interventions that have been conducted, along with supporting documentation, including samples of Alyssa’s work and the results of multiple classroom reading assessments. The team agrees that because Alyssa has not responded in a reasonable amount of time to appropriate interventions, she has a specific learning disability and so needs additional support through special education.

RtI is, first and foremost, about good teaching: Even before students are formally classified as having “learning disabilities,” those who need more assistance receive additional and progressively more intensive interventions. With this solid system in place in the general education classroom, a teacher is able to quickly identify students who need still more help. And for some students, the early support may make special education eligibility unnecessary. So, RtI is as much a prevention model as an identification model.
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support. Teachers routinely assess students informally and base their instruction on this information. Classes employ flexible groupings, including peer tutoring and paired reading, interest-based learning centers, and whole group instruction and sharing. All grouping is flexible and dynamic with a heterogeneous group serving as the base.

With differentiated instruction, students are engaged and learn more efficiently because “teachers look at the individual strengths of students and provide varying instruction to meet their needs,” explains Lou Denti, WestEd consultant/trainer and Lawton Love Distinguished Professor in Special Education at California State University, Monterey Bay.

“Teachers proactively plan varied approaches to what a student learns, how they learn, and how they will express what they have learned. Diversity is seen as an asset, not a deficit, and teachers build a classroom community in which students feel significant and respected,” Denti adds.

At Pacific Grove Middle School, differentiated instruction is accomplished through co-teaching. Special and general educators work together in the same classrooms. “When specialists and special educators team with general educators, the learning is powerful — for students and faculty. You have the best of both worlds: the content specialists (classroom teachers) collaborating with strategic instructional specialists (special education teachers),” says Winget.

According to Mahr, the school’s broader use of differentiated instruction has resulted in a higher attendance rate and decreased behavioral problems for students with disabilities. Research has indicated that when schools are more inclusive in this manner, overall school achievement in English/language arts and math increases when compared with schools that have more rigid ability groupings.

BUILDING INCLUSIVE EDUCATION COMMUNITIES

Another example of a school productively blending special and general education, is Whittier High School in Southern California, where school personnel work together in teams.

Collaboration is “extremely important to make this work, but you need to build structures to support the collaboration,” according to the former principal. Whittier High is organized into teams, each of which includes an administrator, counselor, general education teachers, special education teachers, and support specialists.

The school’s schedule includes time for members of each team to plan, analyze student work, and generally collaborate together. Trained instructional aides and inclusion support teachers help adapt core curriculum and modify instructional strategies and are an integral part of the collaborative instructional process.

(continued from page 5)

Improving Assessment for Special Needs

WestEd’s Assessment and Standards Development Services (ASDS) leads several ongoing efforts to help implement the assessment and accountability provisions of IDEA and NCLB as they relate to students with disabilities. Working with key partners like the National Center for Educational Outcomes in such states as California, Kansas, and Kentucky, ASDS helps ensure compliance with the letter and spirit of these and other national and state statutes. Examples include:

- Developing assessment models appropriate across the full range of special education students and exploring the applicability of principles of Universal Design to improve access for all students.
- Collaborating with the California Department of Education to study the validity of the California High School Exit Examination for special education students.
- Working with the Kansas Department of Education on development of alternate assessments linked to the state content standards and appropriate for students with disabilities.
- Joining the Kentucky Department of Education to create test forms for visually and hearing impaired students and computer-administered test forms appropriate for a wide range of students with disabilities.

In implementing this work, ASDS takes advantage of the expertise of several other WestEd programs, including its Policy Center, Evaluation Research, and the special education specialists in WestEd’s Sacramento and Vermont offices.
Whittier High restructured its entire program based on the common vision that all students belong, all students can learn, and all teachers teach all students. After careful planning with the Confederation of Inclusive Schools, a former U.S. Department of Education grantee, and WestEd’s Least Restrictive Environment Project, funded by the California Department of Education, Whittier High now includes all students with disabilities (including the most severe) in all classes and provides access to college preparatory courses.

ALIGNING STATE SYSTEMS

NCLB also has prompted collaboration across general and special educators in universities and state education agencies. For example, WestEd’s NERRC recently co-sponsored an event on the accountability provisions of NCLB that brought together teams of special and general education representatives from state education agencies in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

NERRC and the other OSEP-funded Regional Resource Centers also supported recent national forums sponsored by the federally funded Center for Improving Teacher Quality at the Council of Chief State School Officers. The forums assembled teams of university teacher education faculty and state department of education teacher licensing and program approval staff. The teams developed plans for the alignment of state systems for teacher licensing, teacher education program approval, and ongoing teacher professional development.

Their goal was for all teachers, both general and special educators, to have the skills to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities. NERRC and the other RRCs across the U.S. are providing follow-up technical assistance to states, says Reedy.

NCLB’s expectations for special education may challenge all aspects of the system, but in response, educators are increasingly bridging the divide between special and general education in order to ensure that all students succeed in learning the core curriculum. As Reedy notes, “The issues with implementation are a real challenge, but the goals of the law are right on.”


For more information about:
- NERRC, contact Kristin Reedy at 802.951.8218 or kreedy@WestEd.org;
- Differentiating Instruction Across the Curriculum, contact Pat Winget at 916.492.4000 or pwinget@WestEd.org; and
- the Least Restrictive Environment Project, contact Dona Meinders at 916.492.4013 or dmeinde@WestEd.org.

The experience of urban districts like California’s Long Beach Unified suggests the power of RtI. The district was recently honored by the Broad Foundation for Urban Education for making significant improvement in student achievement while reducing achievement gaps among ethnic groups and between high- and low-income students. Judith Elliot, Assistant Superintendent, Office of Special Education in Long Beach, credits part of that progress to implementation in all departments of interventions focused on student learning needs and the use of data to drive decision-making and problem-solving. There are no IQ tests in Long Beach Unified, but there is an abundance of student data used to identify students requiring special education resources.

While RtI seems a promising option, concerns include questions about the depth of research supporting the concept. Although multiple studies identify benefits of RtI, the studies have been relatively small. Nonetheless, several Congressional proposals for the reauthorization of IDEA include RtI as an option for identifying special education needs.

To generate additional information, the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), in collaboration with the National Research Center on Learning Disabilities and the six OSEP-funded Regional Resource Centers (including WestEd’s NERRC), has initiated a study to identify key components and outcomes of RtI in schools across the country that are using the model. Additionally, NERRC has a technical assistance agreement with one of its states to pilot RtI in four elementary schools, with plans for statewide implementation if pilot results support the promise of this approach.

For more information, contact Kristin Reedy at 802.951.8218 or kreedy@WestEd.org.
Resources on Special Education

WestEd has a number of resources addressing special education. A few are summarized here. For additional related products, please refer to the WestEd Resource Catalog 2004 or visit www.WestEd.org/catalog.

屏障的转移 知识研讨会：儿童照护 与残疾和其他特殊需要：总结
Elissa Provance (WestEd’s Center for Prevention and Early Intervention & the Child Development Policy Advisory Committee, 2003)

This report captures the events of the November 2002 symposium at which multidisciplinary teams from 51 California counties collaborated to create local action plans that address the challenges of locating and maintaining quality child care for the special needs population. The report includes a synopsis of research and investigation into the issue of quality inclusive child care; key points from presentations, including “Who Are the Children With Disabilities?” “What Do the Laws Require?” and “Seeing the Possibilities: Casting the Vision from a Parent’s Perspective”; outcomes and feedback, including information gleaned from county action plans; and recommended next steps.

40 pages / Price: $10.95 / To order, call 916.492.4000 or email cpei@WestEd.org

Barriers to Inclusive Child Care: Research Study Findings and Recommendations
Pamm Shaw, Sarita Santos, Abby Cohen, Cheri Araki, Elissa Provance, & Virginia Reynolds (California Children and Families Commission, 2001)

This report from a year-long study conducted for the California Children and Families Commission identifies existing barriers to child care for children with disabilities and other special needs. Among the barriers, for instance, are insufficient parent and provider information. The Executive Summary includes an overview of findings and recommendations. The full 234-page Research Study includes a review of relevant research and current regulations, policy, and practice; an in-depth analysis of the study findings; and recommendations for practice and future research.

234 pages / Price: $20 (full report) or $6.50 (executive summary) / To order, call 916.492.4000 or email cpei@WestEd.org

Room at the Table: Meeting Children’s Special Needs at Mealtimes
Program for Infant/Toddler Caregivers

All children are capable of growing, learning, and responding to love, no matter what their abilities, as long as they have caring adults who believe in them. This video has valuable information about including children with special needs in child care programs and how to adapt mealtime to those special needs. The second half has a discussion group with caregivers and experts demonstrating exciting techniques for meeting children’s individual needs.

23 minutes / Price: $19 / To order, contact Eva Gorman at 415.289.2315 or egorman@WestEd.org

Beginning Together: Caring for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Special Needs in Inclusive Settings

WestEd’s Center for Child and Family Studies and the California Department of Education, Child Development Division, collaborate with the California Institute on Human Services at Sonoma State University in creating and implementing Beginning Together, a five-day training institute for certified graduates of the Program for Infant/Toddler Caregivers (PITC) on issues related to children with special needs. The institute’s goal is to ensure that the training and technical assistance provided by PITC trainers incorporate issues related to children with special needs and promote appropriate inclusive practices. Beginning Together provides regional outreach activities, revision and development of written materials, assistance to institute graduates, and support for inclusive practices in other PITC activities.

For more information, call 760.471.3827 or visit www.sonoma.edu/CIHS/BT/Beginning.html

Inclusive Education Starter Kit
Jacki Anderson, Mary Falvey, Ann Halvorsen, Deborah Tweit-Hull, & Dona Meinders

The Inclusive Education Starter Kit, developed by the California Department of Education, Special Education Division, consists of two manuals and a set of accompanying resource materials to assist California districts, teachers, and families in their efforts to include students with disabilities in general education classrooms. Manual 1 provides strategies for and information about developing and enhancing general education class membership and participation for students with disabilities. Manual 2 highlights information and strategies relevant to site- and district-level teachers, administrators, parents, and support staff.
Resiliency: What We Have Learned
Bonnie Benard (WestEd, 2004)
This synthesis of more than a decade of resiliency research highlights the role that families, schools, and communities can play in supporting, and not undermining, children’s and youth’s natural capacity to lead healthy, successful lives. Of special interest is the evidence that resiliency prevails in most cases by far — even in extreme situations, such as those caused by poverty, troubled families, and violent neighborhoods. Benard also offers a practical and easy-to-read analysis of how best to incorporate the research findings in ways that support young people.
148 pages / Price: $19.50 / Order #: HD-04-01L

Belinda Williams (ed.) (ASCD, 2004)
This second edition of Closing the Achievement Gap argues that if education reform is to work, educators must become more sensitive to the worldviews of disadvantaged students, incorporating this awareness into their day-to-day work. The authors conclude that teachers, principals, and legislators must learn about cultural perceptions of human development, apply this knowledge to professional development and comprehensive reform, and align policy accordingly. WestEd researchers Bonnie Benard and Elise Trumbull contribute their respective expertise on youth resiliency and cross-cultural communication in chapters on “turnaround” teachers and cultural values in learning and education.
207 pages / Price: $25.95 / Order #: AG-03-01L

Weaving Science Inquiry and Continuous Assessment: Using Formative Assessment to Improve Learning
This book offers tools for monitoring and improving student achievement in the sciences. With over a decade of experience working with hundreds of science teachers, the authors, including WestEd’s Maura Carlson, have developed a program that enables teachers to identify specific areas in which students are struggling and to modify teaching strategies to better support their learning. This continuous assessment also allows teachers to identify and address troublesome concepts before the state and local assessments are given and their results tabulated.
179 pages / Price: $27.95 / Order #: LI-03-01L

School and College Partnerships: The Missing Link (Policy Brief)
Joan McRobbie (WestEd, 2004)
This Policy Brief examines the problem of having K-12 and higher education operate as “separate silos” and looks at how various partnerships — between individual high schools and colleges, but also between entire K-12 and postsecondary systems — are addressing it. In addition to describing approaches for achieving coherence, it examines some of the common barriers. It also offers policy recommendations for supporting partnership efforts.
4 pages / Price: Single copy, free / Order #: PO-04-01L

For ordering information, please refer to the back cover.