

PRODUCT RESEARCH & DOCUMENTATION

# CA CCSS Mastery Series: ELA

After evaluating the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (CCSSO, 2010), the California State Board of Education took action on the standards for the state of California. On August 2, 2010 the California Common Core State Standards for ELA/Literacy were adopted by the State Board of Education. To continue the state's high expectations for students, additional phrasing, terms, and select California standards recommended by the California Academic Content Standards Commission were inserted. Based on the recommendation of State Superintendent of Public Instruction, an update with modifications to the California Common Core State Standards: English Language Arts and Literacy in History/ Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (CA CCSS for ELA/Literacy) occurred on March 13, 2013.

While the federal law Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) continues to hold states accountable for academic success, it empowers each state to develop its own accountability plan with continuous improvement as the central focus. To fully prepare students for success in college, in the workplace, and life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, rigorous academic standards were developed. These standards place a focus on improving student achievement and go beyond fundamental knowledge and skills. The California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy (CA DE, 2010) promote increased accountability in education. Educators may examine the Standards for English Language Arts to improve the *what* and *how* of instruction. While these standards identify what students are to know and be able to do, the how decision remains with individual districts, schools, and teachers. Schools must align standards, instruction, and assessments with 21<sup>st</sup> century skills. Furthermore, students must learn how to apply these skills in the context of the real world. Research indicates that students understand and retain more when learning is relevant, engaging, and meaningful to students' lives. Instruction that focuses on the CCSS demonstrates rigor and relevance in today's classrooms.

Teachers at every grade level must teach the standards so students do not experience gaps in learning. The California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy demand rigorous requirements from students, including students should be taught to make inferences and to draw conclusions, citing evidence from texts. Students need to be provided opportunities to use and apply skills and strategies to make real-world applications. Knowing and understanding the standards is of utmost importance, but locating resources that help teachers transfer the ELA Standards into classroom learning experiences is a concern. The California Common Core State

Standards Mastery Series flip charts were developed specifically around the California Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy (CADE, 2010; CADE 2013) and serve teachers as planning and implementation resources. The flip charts are resources for 1-6 grades that will help teachers of English Language Arts acquire a clear understanding of the expectations of the standards as they design engaging learning activities, vocabulary instruction, assessment opportunities, interventions, and extension activities in addition to what is provided. Prompts to develop the 9 Traits of Critical Thinking™, ideas for formative assessment, and other questioning prompts for designing questions that elicit different types of thinking are offered to enable teachers to determine how they choose to integrate these components into their lessons. This planning tool helps teachers work independently and collaboratively so they can maximize instructional time and ensure that an organized delivery of essential components is integrated into daily instruction. The California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts are created for flexible usage, allowing teachers to determine the standard(s) they wish to address after accessing their district's scope and sequence.

Students' achievement in ELA, however, is ultimately determined and limited by the opportunities they have had to learn. "All students must learn to think no matter the subject area. With the passing of Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), this federal law requires that academic assessments for "math and reading or language arts be administered annually in grades 3-8 and at least once in grades 9-12..." (Mandlawitz, 2016, p.1). As mentioned earlier, the critical issue of accountability will continue with ESSA, with assessments being used to help improve schools and inform instruction. The law allows the state and local levels the opportunity to create systems for accountability, resources, interventions and teacher evaluation systems. The federal requirements of Every Student Succeeds Act mandate that all students participate in the state assessment program.

According to the Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development (2013), many adults in the U.S. lack the literacy skills needed to negotiate work and everyday life. Overall, the literacy rates of American adults are below the international average. Approximately 30 million American adults are unable to read and comprehend a newspaper article, while another 27 million cannot follow map directions due to a lack of literacy skills required to understand and use the documents (Kutner et al., 2007). These limited skills result in higher levels of unemployment and lower wages. The community is impacted by lost taxes, increased demand for social services, and perhaps low participation at voting time (Jerald, 2009). However, it does appear that American students are skilled at reading

literature. The National Center for Education Statistics (2012) report that American fourth-graders are outperformed by Finland's students by significant margins on international assessments of reading for "literary experience" based on the 2011 Progress in International Reading Literacy Study. It is important to note that the performance of fourth graders in the United States do dip behind four other countries due to informational reading. Reportedly teens in the United States appear to use the skills of reflect and evaluate when reading fiction and poetry with only five nations performing better; however, when acquiring and using information from written text, the 2009 PISA reports that the teens are behind 14 other countries. The California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts support developing standards using a wider range of strategies for a variety of purposes. Teachers are encouraged to introduce varied forms of written content and additional reading across the curriculum.

Building and checking for mastery is emphasized throughout the California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts. This is essential as results based on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show that many students are not mastering the skills needed when interacting with texts. While there are reported reading gains, still one-third of tested fourth graders score below the basic level of reading as measured by NAEP. This means they have not achieved mastery of locating relevant information, making basic inferences, identifying details that support interpretations or conclusions (NCES, 2014; NCES, 2013b). Although eighth-graders perform better, one in five still scores below the basic level.

America's schools are charged with equipping students with the literacy skills they need to succeed school and in life. Teaching informational texts along with literary texts provides students essential cross-curricular applications in acquiring critical comprehension strategies in subjects with real-world content. The flip charts are designed to offer teachers quality resources for increasing student performance and improving teacher instruction in English Language Arts. Thus, the California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts enable teachers to teach ELA standards and to align their instruction and increase their own skills to transfer the standards into applicable and relevant instructional activities and practices.

Student success hinges on teacher practice. One important function of formative assessment is to inform instruction. Rice (2003) states that teacher quality weighs heavily on student achievement. Formative assessment will help teachers make more targeted adjustments and increase responsive

adjustments and interventions based on student needs. A panel is dedicated to formative assessment in the California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts. Suggestions are shared to encourage teachers to utilize formative assessment and to offer formative feedback to students. According to (Black et al., 2013) formative assessment contributes to achievement of standards and intervention support. The incorporation of formative assessment is essential because it improves teaching and learning. Several researchers indicate the difference that can be made when formative assessment is embedded into instruction (Darling-Hammond, 2004; Marzano, 2003, 2006; Shepard, 2000; Heritage, 2007).

Vocabulary plays a significant role in comprehension. An extensive review of research indicates effective vocabulary instruction allows for both incidental and planned experiences (National Reading Panel, 2000). The theory that students will learn the necessary vocabulary by chance is merely an assumption. A word that is not part of a student's oral vocabulary causes difficulty in grasping the meaning of what the student is reading. All students need and benefit from direct vocabulary instruction (Gunning, 2003; Vacca et al., 2003). A variety of strategies for acquiring new vocabulary and extending the depth of vocabulary learning should be employed. Encountering the vocabulary frequently to deepen the meaning is a finding upheld by Beck, McKeown and Kucan (2002) and Nagy (2005). The Vocabulary Mastery activities included with each standard develop or reinforce essential vocabulary. A separate panel for glossary support at each grade level is included in the California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts so that teachers can guide students to build the academic background knowledge they need to fully understand content.

Critical thinking skills are essential for students to succeed, not only in their school work but also in their life after graduation. In order for students to meet state content standards, they must be able to critically examine information. After graduation, the ability to think and adapt will stand them in good stead in college and in their careers. Albert Einstein stated that education "is not the learning of the facts, but the training of the mind to think" (as cited in Frank, 1947, p. 185). Similarly, Margaret Mead (n.d.) commented, "Children must be taught *how to think*, not what to think." Educators have an opportunity and a responsibility to equip students with the critical thinking skills that can help them organize their thinking and transfer what they have learned to new situations.

Critical thinking and problem-solving skills are identified as two key areas in preparing students for college and career readiness (MetLife, 2011; Achieve, 2015). Based on an examination of top-performing global educational systems, a key identifier of successful systems is rigor (Ripley,

2013). Schools have been criticized for not adequately preparing students for the level of rigor they will encounter in college (Achieve, 2006). In 2011, only 25% of high school graduates taking the ACT successfully passed all four of the ACT's College Readiness Benchmarks, and 28% of high school students did not pass any of them. ACT predictions have been confirmed: nearly one third of students entering post-secondary education take remedial courses in one or more subjects because they lack the skills to take standard credit-bearing courses (National Center for Education Statistics, 2011). Moreover, research into the success rates of college students and high school seniors has shown that students' level of critical thinking is predictive of their grades or cumulative college grade point average (Facione, 1990a, 1990b; Sternberg, 2008).

In terms of employment, an overwhelming percentage of employers (93%) have indicated that job candidates' capacity to think critically, communicate clearly, and solve complex problems is more important than their college major (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013). When asked in 2015 how American public high schools could do a better job of preparing students for the expectations of college and the working world, college instructors and employers emphasized the need for critical thinking and problem-solving skills. This is especially true today, where new knowledge is rapidly accelerating and information is instantly available. Students with critical thinking and problem-solving skills can interpret and evaluate what they read, see, and hear to effectively make the transition to college and career.

Educators, parents, and community members also agree that critical thinking and problem-solving skills are important skills for students. The findings of the Project Tomorrow (2014), a survey of district administrators, teachers, parents, and community members, show critical thinking and problem-solving skills as essential skills needed by students for future success. There is even a connection between critical thinking skills and success in life—not just in college and the workplace. Research has found that adults who scored higher on critical thinking assessments reported fewer negative life events. Possessing critical thinking skills helped the participants make positive life choices (de Bruin, Parker & Fischhoff, 2007). This is echoed by Nisbett (2016), who states, “Schools cannot claim to prepare students for life unless they help students learn to reason effectively and to make choices that will improve their lives and the lives of others” (p. 28).

In short, thinking skills can help equip students with the ability to navigate challenging life circumstances, economic changes, and complex political challenges. There are direct implications for educators in elementary and high schools. As educators design instruction, it is crucial to design

curricula and assessment that emphasize authentic real-world problems, inquiry-based learning, and opportunities for students to apply what they know in meaningful ways (Stobaugh, 2013a; 2013b).

Promoting thinking is central to student learning. In education, a shift from a focus on content to an emphasis on thinking skills is apparent. Thinking must be integrated with content to make meaning and deepen learning. Costa and Kallick (2009, p. 5) state that the standards “suggest that successful instruction in skillful thinking should be done *while* teaching subject matter instead of *in addition to* teaching subject matter. Thinking and subject matter content are neither separate from nor in opposition to each other. The implication is that a student cannot demonstrate mastery of any of these required standards without performing one or more important thinking skills.” Thus, the California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts promote deeper learning, encouraging students to share evidence or reasoning for solutions, rather than simply providing facts or a single answer.

Multiple classroom examples and tools exist to support teachers. As educators conceptualize critical thinking, there are a number of frameworks that define the various levels of critical thinking. In 1956, Benjamin Bloom in his book *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* proposed a thinking taxonomy that is still used by teachers as an established hierarchy of critical thinking skills. Recognizing the existence of different levels of thinking behaviors important to learning, Benjamin Bloom and his colleagues developed Bloom’s Taxonomy, a common structure for categorizing test questions and designing instruction. The taxonomy is divided into six levels, from basic factual recall, or Knowledge, to the highest order, Evaluation, which assesses value or asks the teacher or learner to make judgments among ideas. This framework was revised and clarified (Anderson et al., 2001). The revised taxonomy changed the names of each level to verbs to show that thinking is active and changed the order of the sixth or highest level of thought, making Evaluate the fifth level and Create the sixth level. The six levels of thinking are known as the Cognitive Domain and a second domain was added, termed the Knowledge Domain. Each flip chart identifies and defines the six levels of thinking and suggests multiple questioning prompts for each of the levels.

Another framework highlighted is Norman Webb’s Depth of Knowledge (DOK), which was developed in 1997. Norman Webb’s Depth of Knowledge framework (2002) was expanded to the content areas and is used to categorize a task or an assessment item according to the complexity of thinking required of students to successfully engage with and complete the task or item. The four levels of DOK require students to interact with content in different and deeper ways as the cognitive demand

progresses with each level: Level 1: Recall and Reproduction; Level 2: Skills and Concepts; Level 3: Strategic Thinking/Reasoning; Level 4: Extended Thinking. Webb's DOK levels can be applied across all content areas. This useful tool guides teachers to better design instruction and assessment that increases rigor and develops deeper understanding. Unlike RBT, the verb does not categorize the level of thinking; the key factor is the context in which the verb is used and the depth of thinking required. Attention seems to increase so much more than in previous years in the amount of attention given to students' abilities to think critically (Hobgood, Thibault, and Walberg, 2005). Still another framework described is the Cognitive Rigor Matrices (CRMs) devised in 2009 by Karin Hess by combining Revised Bloom's Taxonomy with Webb's DOK. Instructional curricular examples are featured on each matrix. Teachers can use these frameworks to guide instructional planning and assessment to ensure that higher-level thinking is incorporated into everyday learning.

In the 1950s, Bloom found that 95% of the test questions developed to assess student learning only required thinking at the lowest level of learning, recall of information. Similar findings indicated an overemphasis on lower-level questions and activities with little emphasis on the development of students' thinking skills (Risner, Skeel, and Nicholson, 1992). Studies over the last 40 years have confirmed Bloom's Taxonomy of the Cognitive Domain as a framework to establish intellectual and educational outcomes. The conclusions reached by researchers substantiate that students achieve more when they manipulate topics at the higher levels of thinking.

Studies show that the art of asking questions with an emphasis on higher-level thinking can advance student achievement. Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001) reported how teachers can increase their effectiveness in teaching and learning by using research findings on questioning strategies. An important conclusion showed learning to increase in classrooms where teachers asked questions related to essential content rather than questions teachers gleaned would interest students (Alexander, Kulikowich, & Schulze, 1994; Risner, Nicholson, & Webb, 1994). Fillippone (1998) found that teachers ask lower-level questions more times than not.

Evolving teaching standards have embraced a new view of questioning. Danielson's Framework for Teaching (2013), adopted in many states as a basis for their teaching standards, has included an indicator based on effective questioning and discussion techniques. New teaching standards promote more student engagement in the questioning process and call for higher levels of thinking with more open-ended questions allowing multiple correct answers.



Wait-time should be acknowledged before and after asking a question. Usually teachers give less than one second for students to respond to a question and the results are short responses or no response at all. Student-to-student interaction and quality of responses increase when wait-time is addressed noted Fowler (1975). Rowe (1974a;1974b) studied the effect of questions used by teachers on elementary students. Results showed three to five seconds of wait-time led to increases in student responses, student confidence, evidence supporting the response, and student conversation. This finding is consistent at the middle and high school levels when wait-time is allowed after asking a question. A recommendation is to allow five seconds of wait-time. Students must be informed that this time is their think-time and time should also be adjusted to the cognitive level of the questions. Near the back of the California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts direction is offered for using use wait-time and think-time.

Research indicates there are specific behaviors that high-quality thinkers demonstrate. Effective thinkers and high-performing individuals do appear to portray certain characteristics (Goleman, 1995; Perkins, 1991). Costa and Kallick (2008, p.16) report there are certain characteristics that successful individuals “such as lawyers, mechanics, teachers, entrepreneurs, salespeople, physicians, athletes, entertainers, leaders, parents, scientists, artists, and mathematicians” tend to exhibit when faced with solving problems. They define these identifiable characteristics as “habits of mind.”

In 2017, a group of educators from Mentoring Minds generated a list of “traits” they have observed throughout their education careers that were indicative of students who exhibited skillful thinking and deeper levels of thought. Based on their varied backgrounds of teaching and leadership experiences; elementary and secondary levels of curricula expertise; a range of 5-38 years working with children; and 7 months of focused discussions, careful study, and deliberation; these educators collaboratively narrowed their lists to nine behaviors that students exhibited more times than not when thinking critically. Collectively, these nine behaviors were entitled the 9 Traits of Critical Thinking™. These nine traits, when explicitly taught, modeled, and practiced, will guide students in becoming more successful when engaging in cognitively demanding tasks and in social interactions at school and in life beyond the classroom. The traits are emphasized in context with the activities that align to each featured standard as well as appear in a separate panel to help teachers integrate them into their content and social interactions with students. The traits help students become increasingly aware of thinking and more alert to mindful strategies that can be utilized in a variety of settings. The intent is for students to practice and skillfully apply each trait, causing their actions to

become more productive and automatic when they encounter unknown or challenging situations in the classroom and in the real world. With the resources or support provided, The California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts empower teachers to establish a thinking climate.

Research indicates that thinking skills instruction makes a positive difference in the achievement levels of students. Past studies that reflect achievement over time show that learning gains can be accelerated. In verbal learning, research reports that the depth with which students process information has a definite impact on retention ( Craik, 1979; Haller, Child, and Walberg, 1988). These results indicate that the teaching of thinking skills can enhance the academic achievement of participating students (Bass and Perkins, 1984; Freseman, 1990; Matthews, 1989; Nickerson, 1984). In the flip charts, emphasis is placed on an expectation of higher order thinking and learning. This is a significant shift towards what Ritchhart (2015) describes as cultures of thinking. Zohar and Dori (2003) found that when such a shift was placed on thinking and learning that all students, both high achievers and low achievers made considerable progress in higher order thinking when exposed to processes that were designed to nurture higher order thinking skills. It appears that when higher order skills are used in the application of knowledge then diverse students grasp a better understanding of content. Activities within the flip charts are designed to be cognitively challenging. According to Tharp et al., (2000, p. 30), cognitively challenging activities should reflect “productive tension” which means they are neither too easy or difficult. Producing correct answers is not always the goal of such challenging activities, but rather the goal is to lead students to consider alternatives as they think and problem solve. High expectations for learning are intended to be the result of cognitively challenging activities. Therefore, the use of thinking frameworks provide evidence that higher order thinking not only appears to improve language arts achievement but can favorably impact English language development for non-native speakers of English. Therefore, Mentoring Minds’ California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts for English Language Arts provide support in setting higher expectations in teaching critical thinking and meeting the requirements for incorporating research-based strategies and pedagogically sound principles for teaching and learning. A review of literature does suggest that a focus on higher order thinking can yield positive achievement gains.

Based on each state’s accountability plans, all states and schools will have challenging, yet well-defined standards of achievement and accountability plans, requiring all students to reach mastery of the standards for each content area. These standards give direction to teachers as they

strive to prepare and deliver high-quality lessons in English Language Arts. The California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts ensure that teachers who use these resources are provided a set of academic standards as required for one through sixth grade levels in ELA. These skillfully designed teaching tools provide quick-and-easy access to State Standards. The California Common Core State Standards Mastery Series flip charts for English Language Arts are excellent critical thinking resources to help educators prepare students for success.

## **Bibliography for the CA CCSS Mastery Series (ELA)**

Achieve. (2006). *Closing the expectations gap 2006: An annual 50-state progress report on the alignment of high school policies with the demands of college and work*. Retrieved from [www.achieve.org/files/50-state-06-Final.pdf](http://www.achieve.org/files/50-state-06-Final.pdf).

Achieve (2015). *Rising to the challenge: Views on high school graduates' preparedness for college and careers*. Retrieved from <http://www.achieve.org/rising-challenge-survey-2-powerpoint>

Alexander, P., Kulikowich, J., & Schulze, S. (1994). How subject-matter knowledge affects recall and interest. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(2), 313-337.

Anderson, L., Krathwohl, D., Airasian, P., Crusikshank, K., Mayer, R., Pintrich, P., Raths, J., & Wittrock, M. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing*. New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Association of American Colleges and Universities (2013). *It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success*. Washington, DC: Hart Research Associates. [https://209.29.151.145/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2013\\_EmployerSurvey.pdf](https://209.29.151.145/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2013_EmployerSurvey.pdf)

Bass, G., Jr. & Perkins, H. (1984). Teaching critical thinking skills with CAI. *Electronic Learning* 14, 32, 34, 96.

Beck, I., McKeown, M., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction*. New York: Guilford Press.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003, April). *A successful intervention —Why did it work?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Bloom, B., Englehart, M., Furst, E., Hill, W., & Krathwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: McKay.

California Department of Education (CDE) Press. (2010; 2013). *The Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts & Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects (Modified)*. Retrieved from <https://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/finalelaccsstandards.pdf>

Costa, A. & Kallick, B. (Eds) (2008). *Learning and leading with habits of mind: 16 essential characteristics for success*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Costa, Arthur & Kallick, Bena, Eds. (2009). *Habits of mind across the curriculum: Practical and creative strategies for teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Curriculum and Development.

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices. (2010). Common core state standards English language arts. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington D.C. Retrieved from [http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA\\_Standards1.pdf](http://www.corestandards.org/wp-content/uploads/ELA_Standards1.pdf)

Craik, F. (1979). Human memory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 30, 63-102.

Danielson, C. (2013). *The framework for teaching evaluation instrument*. Author.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Standards, accountability and school reform. *The Teachers College Record*, 106(6), 1047–1085.

de Bruin, W. B., Parker, A. M., & Fischhoff, B. (2007). Individual differences in adults decision-making competence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 938–956.

Facione, P. A. (1990a). *Technical report #1: Experimental validity and content validity*. Millbrae: California Academic Press. (ERIC 327 549).

Facione, P. A. (1990b). *Technical report #2: Factors predictive of ct skills*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC ED 327 550).

Fillippone, M. (1998). *Questioning at the elementary level*. Master's thesis, Kean University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417 421).

Fowler, T. (1975). *An investigation of the teacher behavior of wait-time during an inquiry science lesson*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 108 872).

Frank, P. (1947). *Einstein: His Life and Times*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Freseman, R. (1990). *Improving higher order thinking of middle school geography students by teaching skills directly*. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova University.
- Gunning, T. (2003). *Creating literacy instruction for all children*, Fourth Edition. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.
- Haller, E., Child, D., & Walberg, H. (1988). Can comprehension be taught? A quantitative synthesis of metacognitive studies. *Educational Researcher*, 17, 5-8.
- Heritage, M. (2007). Formative assessment: What do teachers need to know and do? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(2), 140-145.
- Hess, K., Carlock, D., Jones, B., & Walkup, J. (2009). What exactly do fewer, clearer, and higher standards” really look like in the classroom? Using cognitive rigor matrix to analyze curriculum, plan lessons, and implement assessments. In Hess’ Local Assessment Toolkit: Exploring Cognitive Rigor. Retrieved from <http://www.karin-hess.com/#!Fewer-clearer-and-higher-standards/cmbz/91/01F31B21-D92E-4550-AEB6-81AFBE0A20BC>
- Hobgood, B., Thibault, M., & Walbert, D. (2005). *Kinetic connections: Bloom’s taxonomy in action*. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Learn NC.
- Jerald, Craig D. (2009, September), *Defining a 21st Century Education*. Alexandria, Va.: Center for Public Education. <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Policies/21stCentury/Executive-summary-Defining-a-21st-Century-education-.html>
- Kutner, M., Greenberg, E., Jin, Y., Boyle, B., Hsu, Y., & Dunleavy, E. (2007). *Literacy in everyday life: Results from the 2003 national assessment of adult literacy (NCES 2007–480)*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Mandlawitz, Esq., M.R. (January, 2016). Every student succeeds act: Summary of key provisions. Retrieved from [http://www.casecec.org/legislative/Every%20Student%20Succeeds%20Act\\_CASE%20\(2\).pdf](http://www.casecec.org/legislative/Every%20Student%20Succeeds%20Act_CASE%20(2).pdf)
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Marzano, R. (2006). *Classroom assessment and grading that work*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Marzano, R., Pickering, D., & Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Matthews, D. (1989). The effect of a thinking-skills program on the cognitive abilities of middle school students. *Clearing House*, 62, 202-204.

MetLife. (2011). The MetLife survey of the American teacher: Preparing students for college and careers. Retrieved from [www.metlife.com/about/corporate-profile/citizenship/metlife-foundation/metlife-survey-of-the-american-teacher.html?WT.mc\\_id=vu1101](http://www.metlife.com/about/corporate-profile/citizenship/metlife-foundation/metlife-survey-of-the-american-teacher.html?WT.mc_id=vu1101).

Nagy, W. (2005). Why vocabulary instruction needs to be long-term and comprehensive. In E. Hiebert & M.L. Kamil (Eds.), *Teaching and learning vocabulary: Bringing research to practice* (27-44). Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.

National Reading Panel (NRP). (2000). *The Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read*. Washington, D.C: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Clearinghouse.

National Center for Education Statistics (2011). The condition of education 2011. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011033\\_4.pdf](http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2011/2011033_4.pdf)

National Center for Education Statistics (2012).

*Highlights from PIRLS 2011*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/2013010rev.pdf>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013a). NAEP 2012 Trends in academic progress (NCES 2013-456). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/publications/main2012/pdf/2013456.pdf>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2013b). The NAEP reading achievement levels by grade. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/achieve.asp>

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). A first look: 2013 mathematics and reading National Assessment of Educational Progress at grades 4 and 8. (NCES 2014-451). Washington, D.C.:

U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/subject/publications/main2013/pdf/2014451.pdf>

Nickerson, R. (1984). *Research on the Training of Higher Cognitive Learning and Thinking Skills*.

Final Report # 5560. Cambridge, MA: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc.

Nisbett, R. E. (2016). Tools for smarter thinking. *Educational Leadership*, 73(6), 24-28.

Organization of Economic Co-operation and Development. (2013). Time for the U.S. to reskill? What the Survey of Adult Skills says. Retrieved from [http://skills.oecd.org/Survey\\_of\\_Adult\\_Skills\\_US.pdf](http://skills.oecd.org/Survey_of_Adult_Skills_US.pdf)

Perkins, D. (1991). What creative thinking is. In A. Costa (Ed.), *Developing minds: A resource book for teaching thinking* (Rev. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 85–88). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Project Tomorrow (2014). The new digital learning playbook: Advancing college and career ready skill development in K-12 schools. Irvine, CA: Project Tomorrow. Retrieved from: [http://www.tomorrow.org/speakup/pdfs/SU13Educatorreport\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.tomorrow.org/speakup/pdfs/SU13Educatorreport_WEB.pdf)

Rice, J. (2003). *Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Ripley, A. (2013). *The smartest kids in the world*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Risner, G., Nicholson, J., & Webb, B. (1994). *Levels of comprehension promoted by the cooperative integrated reading and composition (CIRC) program*. Florence: University of North Alabama. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 751).

Risner, G., Skeel, D., & Nicholson, J. (1992). A closer look at textbooks: what research says. *Science and Children*, 30, 42-45, 73.

Ritchhart, R. (2015). *Creating cultures of thinking: The 8 forces we must master to truly transform our schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rowe, M. (1974). Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic, and fate control: part one - wait-time. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 1974, 11, (2), 81-94.



- Rowe, M.B. (1974b). Reflections of wait-time: Some methodological questions. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 11(3), 263-279.
- Shepard, L. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), 4-14.
- Stahl, S. & Fairbanks, M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 72-110.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2008). *Cognitive psychology* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson-Wadsworth
- Stobaugh, R. (2013a). *Assessing critical thinking in elementary schools: Meeting the common core*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Stobaugh, R. (2013b). *Assessing critical thinking in middle and high schools: Meeting the Common Core*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Tharp, R. G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S.S. & Yamauchi, L.A. (2000). *Teaching Transformed. Achieving Excellence, Fairness, Inclusion, and Harmony*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 30-31.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1990–2007). National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved September 1, 2007 from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- Vacca, J., Vacca, R., Cove, M., Burkey, L., Lenhart, L., & McKeon, C. (2003). *Reading and learning to read*, Fifth Edition. New York, NY: Longman.
- Webb, N. (March 28, 2002) "Depth-of-Knowledge Levels for four content areas," unpublished paper. Retrieved from <http://facstaff.wcer.wisc.edu/normw/All%20content%20areas%20%20DOK%20levels%2032802.pdf>
- Zohar, A., Degani, A., & Vaaknin, E. (2001). Teachers' beliefs about low achieving students and higher-order thinking. *Teaching and Teachers' Education*, 17, 469-485.