


TECHNICAL APPENDIX D • FEBRUARY 2010

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

A Large-Scale Study of Middle Grades
Practices and Student Outcomes



520 San Antonio Rd, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 | 650/917-9481

Fax: 650/917-9482 | edsource@edsource.org

www.edsource.org | www.ed-data.org

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

TECHNICAL APPENDIX D

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| APPENDIX D – FULL RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHY | D |
| FULL RESEARCH BIBLIOGRAPHY | 1 |

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

APPENDIX D – Full Research Bibliography

This appendix contains the full bibliography of all research and policy documents consulted during the development of the ten research domains and three survey instruments for this study, and during the subsequent conduct of the study.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Appendix D - Full research bibliography

Abbott, C., & Ganahl, J. (2008). Taking center stage—Act II: Building effective programs for English learners in the middle grades. Webinar presented October 30, 2008. SchoolsMovingUp, WestEd. <http://www.schoolsmovingup.net/>

Abelmann, C., & Elmore, R.F. (1999). *When accountability knocks, will anyone answer?* Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

ACT. (2008). *The forgotten middle: Ensuring that all students are on target for college and career readiness before high school.* Iowa City, IA.

Allensworth, E.M., & Easton, J.Q. (2005). *The on-track indicator as a predictor of high school graduation.* Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago.

Allensworth, E.M., & Easton, J.Q. (2007). *What matters for staying on-track and graduating in Chicago public high schools: A close look at course grades, failures, and attendance in the freshman year.* Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago.

Allensworth, E.M., Nomi, T., et al. (2009). College preparatory curriculum for all: Academic consequences of requiring Algebra and English I for ninth graders in Chicago. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 31(3), 367–391.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004a). *How to know a good adolescent literacy program when you see one: Quality criteria to consider.* Issue brief. Washington, DC.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2004b). *Reading for the 21st century: Adolescent literacy teaching and learning strategies.* Issue brief. Washington, DC.

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2006). *Reading and writing in academic content areas.* Issue brief. Washington, DC.

Alspaugh, J.W. (1998a). Achievement loss associated with the transition to middle school and high school. *Journal of Educational Research* 92(1), 20–25.

Alspaugh, J.W. (1998b). The relationship of school-to-school transitions and school size to high school dropout rates. *High School Journal* 81(3), 154–164.

Alt, M.N., & Hammer, C.H. (2000). *In the middle: Characteristics of public schools with a focus on middle schools.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

American Federation of Teachers. (2008). *Sizing up state standards 2008.* Washington, DC.

Anderson, E., & Newell, M. (2008). *Course placement of students entering middle school proficient in math.* Policy brief. Long Beach, CA: Office of Research, Planning and Evaluation, Long Beach Unified School District.

Armstrong, J., & Anthes, K. (2001). *Identifying the factors, conditions and policies that support schools' use of data for decision-making and school improvement.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Augustine, C.H., Gonzalez, G., et al. (2009). *Improving school leadership: The promise of cohesive leadership systems.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Balfanz, R. (2009). *Putting middle grades students on the graduation path: A policy and practice brief.* Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2006). Closing the mathematics achievement gap in high-poverty middle schools: Enablers and constraints. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 11(2), 143–159.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

- Balfanz, R., Herzog, L., et al. (2007). Preventing student disengagement and keeping students on the graduation path in urban middle grades schools: Early identification and effective interventions. *Educational Psychologist* 42(4), 223–235.
- Balfanz, R., McPartland, J., et al. (2002). *Re-conceptualizing extra help for high school students in a high-standards era*. Prepared for the Office of Vocational and Adult Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.
- Balfanz, R., Ruby, A., et al. (2004). Essential components and next steps for comprehensive whole school reform in high poverty middle schools. *Yearbook for the National Society for the Study of Education* 101(2), 128–147.
- Balfanz, R., Spiridakis, K., et al. (2002). *Will converting high-poverty middle schools to K–8 schools facilitate achievement gains? A research brief for the School District of Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Education Fund.
- Beane, J. A. (2002). *Curriculum matters: Organizing the middle school curriculum*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.
- Bedard, K., & Do, C. (2005). Are middle schools more effective? The impact of school structure on student outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources* 40(3), 660–682.
- Behn, R.D. (2003). Rethinking accountability in education: How should who hold whom accountable for what? *International Public Management Journal* 6(1), 43–73.
- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C.E. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Second edition. Washington, D.C: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Bottoms, G., Cooney, S., et al. (2003). *Improving the middle grades: Actions that can be taken now*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Bottoms, G., Cooney, S. et al. (2007). *We know what works in the middle grades: Smart district leadership can make it happen*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Brown, C.G. (2002). *Opportunities and accountability to leave no child behind in the middle grades: An examination of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. New York, NY: Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.
- Burris, C.C., Heubert, J.P., et al. (2006). Accelerating mathematics achievement using heterogeneous grouping. *American Educational Research Journal* 43(1), 137–154.
- Byrnes, V., & Ruby, A. (2007). Comparing achievement between K–8 and middle schools: A large-scale empirical study. *American Journal of Education* 114(1), 101–135.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008a). *Assignment monitoring of certificated employees in California by county offices of education 2003-2007, A Report to the Legislature*. Sacramento, CA.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008b). Professional Services Committee—Authorizations to Teach Mathematics (Item 2D), October 2008. Sacramento, CA.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2008c). Professional Services Committee—The Mathematics Specialist Credential: Discussion of Current Authorization, Adopted Standards, and Possible Future Uses of this Authorization (Item 3G), December 2008. Sacramento, CA.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009a). Professional Services Committee—Authorizations for Teaching Mathematics (Item 3E), January 2009. Sacramento, CA.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009b). Professional Services Committee—Subject Matter Competence of Teachers of Mathematics (Item 3E), April 2009. Sacramento, CA.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2009c). Professional Services Committee—Update on the Work of the Teaching Mathematics Advisory Panel (Item 3F), December 2009. Sacramento, CA.

California Council on Science and Technology & Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. (2007). *Critical path analysis of California's science and mathematics teacher preparation system*. Sacramento, CA: California Council of Science and Technology.

California Department of Education. (1997a). *English-language arts content standards for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Adopted by the California State Board of Education, December 1997. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (1997b). *Mathematics content standards for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Adopted by the California State Board of Education, December 1997. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (2001a). *Adopted programs mathematics 2001 primary adoption*. Sacramento, CA. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/im/math2001adopted.asp>

California Department of Education. (2001b). *Taking center stage: A commitment to standards-based education for California's middle grades students*. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (2002a). *English language development standards for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Adopted by the California State Board of Education, July 1999. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (2002b). *List of primary RLA/ELD adopted programs*. Sacramento, CA. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/im/rlaeld2002adoption.asp>.

California Department of Education. (2004). *NCLB teacher requirements resource guide*. Sacramento, CA: Professional Development and Curriculum Support Division.

California Department of Education. (2005a). *Reading/language arts follow-up programs*. Sacramento, CA. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/rl/im/rlaflwsbepgrams.asp>.

California Department of Education. (2005b). *Mathematics follow-up adopted-rejected programs*. Sacramento, CA. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/im/mathflsbepgrams.asp>.

California Department of Education. (2007a). *Academic program survey—Middle school level*. Sacramento, CA: Intervention Assistance Office.

California Department of Education. (2007b). *Mathematics framework for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Adopted by the California State Board of Education, March 2005. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (2007c). *Mathematics primary adoption*. Sacramento, CA. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/ma/im/mathprogramnov2007.asp>.

California Department of Education. (2007d). *Middle grades courses of study and instructional time*. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (2007e) *Reading/language arts framework for California public schools: Kindergarten through grade twelve*. Adopted by the California State Board of Education, April 2006. Sacramento, CA.

California Department of Education. (2008b). *California's middle grades at a glance, 2007–08*. Sacramento, CA. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/gs/mg/documents/ataglance.doc>

California Department of Education. (2008c). *Descriptive statistics and correlation tables for California's 2007 School Characteristics Index and Similar Schools Ranks*. 2007 Supplement to the Public School Accountability Act, Technical Report 00-1; Technical Design Group of the Advisory Committee for the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999. Sacramento, CA.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

- California Department of Education. (2008d). *Taking center stage—Act II*. Sacramento, CA. <http://pubs.cde.ca.gov/tcsii/>
- California Department of Education. (2009a). *Fact Book 2009: Handbook of education information*. Sacramento, CA.
- California Department of Education. (2009b). *STAR 2009 Standardized Testing and Reporting Program—Parent/Guardian Guide to the California Writing Standards Test*. Sacramento, CA.
- Calkins, A., Guenther, W., et al. (2007). *The turnaround challenge: Why America's best opportunity to dramatically improve student achievement lies in our worst-performing schools*. Boston, MA: Mass Insight Education & Research Institute.
- Camblin, S.J. (2003). *The middle grades: Putting all students on track for college*. PREL Briefing Paper. Honolulu, HI: Pacific Resources for Education and Learning.
- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989). *Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Carnegie Council on Advancing Adolescent Literacy. (2010). *Time to act: An agenda for advancing adolescent literacy for college and career success*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Carnoy, M., & Loeb, S. (2002). Does external accountability affect student outcomes? A cross state analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 24(4), 305–331.
- Cawelti, G. (1999). *Portraits of six benchmark schools: Diverse approaches to improving student performance*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. (2008). California's approach to math instruction still doesn't add up. *Center View*. Santa Cruz, CA.
- Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools. (1988). *A NELS:88 enhancement survey of middle grades practices*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.
- Center for Social Organization of Schools. (2006). *Teacher survey*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.
- Chen, X., & Chandler, K. (2001). *Efforts by public K-8 schools to involve parents in children's education: Do school and parent reports agree?* Statistical analysis report. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.
- Chicago Public Schools. (2007). *Strengthening the middle grades: A guide for instructional leadership*. Chicago, IL.
- Christie, K., & Zinth, K. (2008). *Ensuring successful student transitions from the middle grades to high school*. Policy brief. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Coladarci, T., & Hancock, J. Grade-span configuration. *Journal of Research in Rural Education* 17(3), 189–192.
- Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center. (2005). *Works in progress: A report on middle and high school improvement programs*. Washington, DC: The Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center and American Institutes for Research.
- Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. (2007a). *Survey of Chicago Public Schools: Elementary school teacher edition, Spring 2007*. Chicago, IL.
- Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. (2007b). *Survey of Chicago Public Schools: High school teacher edition, Spring 2007*. Chicago, IL.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Consortium on Chicago School Research at the University of Chicago. (2007c). *Survey of Chicago Public Schools: Principal edition, Spring 2007*. Chicago, IL.

Cook, P.J., MacCoun, R., et al. (2008). The negative impacts of starting middle school in sixth grade. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 27(1), 104–121.

Cooney, S., & Bottoms, G. (2003). *What works to improve student achievement in the middle grades: A Making Middle Grades Work research report*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Cooper, R., & Markoe-Hayes, S. (2005). *Improving the educational possibilities of urban high school students as they transition from 8th to 9th grade*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California All Campus Consortium On Research for Diversity.

Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Cuban, L. (1992). What happens to reforms that last? The case of junior high school. *American Educational Research Journal* 29(2), 227–251.

Cunningham, A.F., Erisman, W., et al. (2007). *From aspirations to action: The role of middle school parents in making the dream of college a reality*. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.

DeBray, E., Parson, G., et al. (2003). Internal alignment and external pressure: High school responses in four state contexts. In M. Carnoy, R. F. Elmore, & L. S. Siskin (Eds.), *The new accountability: High schools and high stakes testing* (pp. 55–85). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Dickinson, T.S., & Butler, D.A. (2001). Reinventing the middle school. *Middle School Journal*, 33(1), 7–13.

Dougherty, C., & Zavadsky, H. (2007). Giving all students the keys to college and skilled careers: One district's approach. *Phi Delta Kappan* 89(3), 194–198.

Eccles, J.S. (2008). *Can middle school reform increase high school graduation rates?* Santa Barbara, CA: California Dropout Research Project, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Echevarria, J., & Short, D. (2006). *School reform and standards-based education: A model for English language learners*. Washington, DC: Heldref Publications.

EdSource. (2008a). *English learners in California: What the numbers say*. Mountain View, CA.

EdSource. (2008b). *Raising African American student achievement: California goals, local outcomes*. Mountain View, CA.

EdSource. (2009a). *Algebra policy in California: Great expectations and serious challenges*. Mountain View, CA.

EdSource. (2009b). *Resource Cards on California schools*. Mountain View, CA.

Education Commission of the States. (2009). Middle grades. *The progress of education reform* 10(4).

Edwards, B., Crane, E., et al. (2009). *Charter schools in California: 2009 update on issues and performance*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

Elmore, R.F. (2003a). Accountability and capacity. In M. Carnoy, R.F. Elmore, & L.S. Siskin (Eds.), *The new accountability: High schools and high stakes testing* (pp. 195–209). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Elmore, R.F. (2003b). A plea for strong practice. *Educational Leadership* 61(3), 6–10.

Elmore, R.F. (2004a). *Knowing the right thing to do: School improvement and performance-based accountability*.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Washington, DC: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices.

Elmore, R.F. (2004b). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

ERIC Development Team. (1997). Qualities of effective programs for immigrant adolescents with limited schooling. *ERIC Digest*.

Fairman, J., & Firestone, W. (2001). The district role in state assessment policy: An exploratory study. In S. Fuhrman (Ed.), *From the capital to the classroom: Standards-based reform*. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

Felner, R.D., Jackson, A.W., et al. (1997). The impact of school reform for the middle years: Longitudinal study of a network engaged in *Turning Points*-based comprehensive school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78(7), 528–532, 541–550.

Fenwick, J.J. (1987). *Caught in the middle: Educational reform for young adolescents in California public schools*. Report of the Superintendent's Middle Grade Task Force. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Finkelstein, N.D., & Fong, A.B. (2008). *Course-taking patterns and preparation for postsecondary education in California's public university systems among minority youth*. (Issues and answers report, REL 2008–No. 35). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West.

Firestone, W.A., & Shipps, D. (2003). How do educational leaders interpret the multiple accountabilities they face? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2007). A tale of two middle schools: The differences in structure and instruction. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 51(3), 204–211.

Flowers, N., Mertens, S.B., & Mulhall, P.F. (1999). The impact of teaming: Five research-based outcomes. *Middle School Journal* 31(2), 57–60.

Flowers, N., Mertens, S.B., & Mulhall, P.F. (2003). Lessons learned from more than a decade of middle grades research. *Middle School Journal* 35(2), 55–59.

Freeman, B., & Crawford, L. (2008). Creating a middle school mathematics curriculum for English language learners. *Remedial and Special Education* 29(1), 9–19.

Freeman, Y., Freeman, D., et al. (2003). Helping middle and high school age language learners achieve academic success. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice* 1(1), 110–122.

Gallucci, C., Knapp, M.S., et al. (2007). Converging reform “theories” in urban middle schools: District-guided instructional improvement in small schools of choice. *Teachers College Record* 109(12), 2601–2641.

Gándara, P. (2004). *Latino achievement: Identifying models that foster success*. Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.

George, P.S. (2001). The evolution of middle schools. *Educational Leadership* 58(4), 40–44.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English learners: What the research does—and does not—say. *American Educator* 32(2), 8–23, 42–44.

Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools—A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

- Guha, R., Shields, P., et al. (2008). *California's teaching force 2008: Key issues and trends*. Santa Cruz, CA: The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education* 94(3), 328–355.
- Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., et al. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Hamilton, L.S., Stecher, B.M., et al. (2007). *Standards-based accountability under No Child Left Behind: Experiences of teachers and administrators in three states*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media. (2009). *Understanding and reporting on academic rigor: A Hechinger Institute primer for journalists*. New York, NY: Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Heller, R., Calderon, S., et al. (2002). *Academic achievement in the middle grades: What does research tell us? A review of the literature*. Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Berkeley, CA: MPR Associates.
- Heller, R., & Greenleaf, C. (2007). *Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Herman, J.L. (2002). *Instructional effects in elementary schools*. Los Angeles, CA: Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Herman, J.L. (2003). The effects of testing on instruction. In S. Fuhrman & R.F. Elmore (Eds.), *Redesigning accountability systems for education*, 141–166. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Hill, H.C., Rowan, B., & Ball, D.L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement, *American Educational Research Journal* 42(2), 371–406.
- Hill, N.E. & Tyson, D.F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. *Developmental Psychology* 45(3), 740–763.
- Horwitz, A., & Snipes, J. (2008). *Supporting successful transitions to high school*. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools.
- Hough, D.L. (2005). The rise of the “elemiddle” school. *School Administrator* 62(3), 10–11, 13–14.
- Howley, C.B. (2002). Grade-span configurations. *School Administrator* 59(3), 24–29.
- Hurd, P.D. (1978). *Early adolescence: Perspectives and recommendations*. Prepared for the National Science Foundation, Directorate for Science Education, and Office of Program Integration. Washington, DC.
- Ingram, D., Louis, K.S., et al. (2004). Accountability policies and teacher decision making: Barriers to the use of data to improve practice. *Teachers College Record* 106(6), 1258–1287.
- International Reading Association. (2006). *Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches*. Newark, DE.
- Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates. (2002). *Academic literacy: A statement of competencies expected of students entering California's public colleges and universities*. Sacramento, CA.
- Jackson, A.W., & Davis, G.A. (2000). *Turning points 2000: Educating adolescents in the 21st century*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Jerald, C.D. (2006). *Identifying potential dropouts: Key lessons for building an early warning data system. A dual agenda of high standards and high graduation rates*. Washington, DC: Achieve, Inc.

Johnson, H., Sengupta, R., & Murphy, P. (2009). *Closing the gap: Meeting California's need for college graduates*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.

Juvonen, J., Le, V., et al. (2004). *Focus on the wonder years: Challenges facing the American middle school*. Prepared for the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Kamil, M.L. (2003). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Kannapel, P.J., Clements, S.K., et al. (2005). *Inside the black box of high-performing, high-poverty schools*. Lexington, KY: The Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence.

Klein, D., Braams, B.J., et al. (2005). *The state of state math standards 2005*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Klein, L., Johnson, J., et al. (1997). *Successful Texas school-wide programs*. Austin, TX: The Charles A. Dana Center, University of Texas at Austin.

Knapp, M.S., Copland, M.A., & Talbert, J.E. (2003). *Leading for learning: Reflective tools for school and district leaders*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Kriegler, S., & Lee, T. (2008). *Using standardized test data as guidance for placement into 8th grade algebra*. Los Angeles, CA: Department of Mathematics, University of California, Los Angeles.

Kurlaender, M., Reardon, S.F., et al. (2008). *Middle school predictors of high school achievement in three California school districts*. Santa Barbara, CA: California Dropout Research Project, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Lee, V.E., Bryk, A.S., et al. (1993). The organization of effective secondary schools. *Review of Research in Education* 19(1), 171–267.

Lee, V.E., Smith, J.B., et al. (1999). *Social support, academic press, and student achievement: A view from the middle grades in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Annenberg Research Project.

Leinwald, S., & Edwards, S. (2009). *Validating the impact of Strategic Learning Initiatives' Focused Instruction Process (FIP) model*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.

Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). What do we know about successful school leadership? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., et al. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38(1), 94–119.

Levine, D., & Lezzotte, L. (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice*. Madison, WI: The National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Lewis, A.C., & Berry, B. (1999). *Figuring it out: Standards-based reforms in urban middle grades*. New York, NY: The Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

Linquanti, R., Carstens, L., et al. (2006). *Expectations by instructional program: Session 2, NCLB Title III Institute—Ensuring academic success for English learners*. California Department of Education. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Lipsitz, J., Jackson, A.W., et al. (1997). What works in middle-grades school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78(7), 517–519.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Lipsitz, J., Mizell, M.H., et al. (1997). Speaking with one voice: A manifesto for middle-grades reform. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78(7), 533–540.

Loveless, T. (2008). *The misplaced math student: Lost in eighth-grade algebra*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, Brown Center on Education Policy.

Loveless, T. (2009). *Tracking and detracking: High achievers in Massachusetts middle schools*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

MacIver, D.J., Balfanz, R., et al. (2004). Developing adolescent literacy in high poverty middle schools: The impact of Talent Development's reforms across multiple years and sites. In P.R. Pintrich & M.L. Maehr (Eds.), *Motivating students, improving school: The legacy of Carol Midgley (Advances in Motivation and Achievement, vol. 13)* (pp. 185–207). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

MacIver, D.J., Ruby, A., et al. (2007). The Talent Development Middle Grades model: A design for improving early adolescents' developmental trajectories in high-poverty schools. In J. Meece, & J. Eccles (Eds.), *Handbook of research on schools, schooling, and development*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

MacIver, M.A., & MacIver, D.J. (2006). Which bets paid off? Early findings on the impact of private management and K–8 conversion reforms on the achievement of Philadelphia students. *Review of Policy Research* 23(5), 1077–1093.

MacIver, M.A., & MacIver, D.J. (2007). The impact of comprehensive school reform with NSF-supported mathematics curricula on urban middle grades student mathematics achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 10, 2007. Chicago, IL.

Maryland Middle School Steering Committee. (2008). *The critical middle: A reason for hope*. Baltimore, MD: Maryland State Department of Education.

Massell, D. (2000). *The district role in building capacity: Four strategies*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Matsumura, L.C., Slater, S.C., et al. (2008). Classroom climate, rigorous instruction and curriculum, and students' interactions in urban middle schools. *The Elementary School Journal* 108(4), 293–312.

McEwin, C.K., Dickinson, T.S., et al. (1996). *America's middle schools: Practices and progress. A 25 year perspective*. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

McLaughlin, M.W., & Talbert, J.E. (2003). *Reforming districts: How districts support school reform*. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

McPartland, J.M. (1987). *Balancing high quality subject-matter instruction with positive teacher-student relations in the middle grades: Effects of departmentalization, tracking and block scheduling on learning environments*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University.

McPartland, J., Ruby, A., et al. (2006). Getting real about implementing reforms for pre-college math and science education: Classroom instruction, student motivation and accountability. The 3rd Annual Johns Hopkins Education Summit, May 23, 2006. Baltimore, MD.

Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E.T. (2004). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content area learning—Part one: Focus on motivation and engagement*. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory.

Meltzer, J., & Hamann, E.T. (2005). *Meeting the literacy development needs of adolescent English language learners through content area learning—Part two: Focus on classroom teaching and learning strategies*. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Mertens, S.B., & Anfara, V.A., Jr. (2006). *Research summary: Student achievement and the middle school concept*. Westerville, OH: National Middle Schools Association. Retrieved 9/1/2008 from: <http://www.nmsa.org/ResearchSummaries/StudentAchievement/tabid/276/Default.aspx>

Mertens, S.B., & Flowers, N. (2003). Middle school practices improve achievement in high poverty schools. *Middle School Journal* 35(1), 33–43.

Mertens, S.B., Flowers, N., et al. (2001). School size matters in interesting ways. *Middle School Journal* 32(5), 51–55.

Mertens, S. B., Flowers, N., et al. (2003). Should middle grades students be left alone after school? *Middle School Journal* 34(5), 57–61.

Mizell, H. (2005). Grade configurations for educating young adolescents are still crazy after all these years. *Middle School Journal* 37(1), 14–23.

Morocco, C.C., Clark-Chiarelli, N., et al. (2002). Cultures of excellence and belonging in urban middle schools. *Research in Middle Level Education (RMLE) Online* 25(2).

Mulhall, P.F., Mertens, S.B., et al. (2001). How familiar are parents with middle level practices? *Middle School Journal* 33(2), 57–61.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2006). *Breaking ranks in the middle: Strategies for leading middle level reform*. Reston, VA.

National Council of Teachers of English ELL Task Force. (2006). *NCTE position paper on the role of English teachers in educating English language learners (ELLs)*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform. (2001). *Student assignment in the middle grades towards academic success for all students*. Policy statement. Savoy, IL.

National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform. (2002a). *High stakes testing*. Policy statement. Savoy, IL.

National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform. (2002b). *Teacher preparation, licensure, and recruitment*. Policy statement. Savoy, IL.

National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reform. (2004). *Small schools and small learning communities*. Policy statement. Savoy, IL.

National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform & California Middle Grades Alliance. (2009). *Schools to watch—Taking center stage (STW–TCS): School self-study and rating rubric (SSRR)*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education. <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/g/mg/documents/criteria.doc>

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. (2005). *Reading to achieve: A governor's guide to adolescent literacy*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices.

National Mathematics Advisory Panel. (2008). *Foundations for success: The final report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Middle School Association. (2003). *This we believe: Successful schools for young adolescents*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

National Middle School Association. (2010). *This we believe: Keys to educating young adolescents*. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

National Staff Development Council. (2001). *NSDC's standards for staff development*. <http://www.nsd.org/standards/index.cfm> (Accessed December 22, 2009.)

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

- Neild, R.C., & Balfanz, R. (2006). *Unfulfilled promise: The dimensions and characteristics of Philadelphia's dropout crisis, 2000–2005*. Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Youth Network, The Johns Hopkins University and University of Pennsylvania.
- Neild, R.C., Farley-Ripple, E.N., et al. (2009). The effect of teacher certification on middle grades achievement in an urban district. *Educational Policy* 23(5), 732–760.
- New Leaders for New Schools. (2009). *Principal Effectiveness: A new principalship to drive student achievement, teacher effectiveness, and school turnarounds*. New York, NY.
- Newmann, F.M., Smith, B., et al. (2001). Instructional program coherence: What it is and why it should guide school improvement policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 23(4), 297–321.
- Newmann, F.M., & Wehlage, G.C. (1995). *Successful school restructuring*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin-Madison School of Education.
- Noyce, P., Perda, D., et al. (2000). Creating data driven schools. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 52–56.
- O'Day, J., & Bitter, C. (2003). *Evaluation study of the Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program and the High Achieving/Improving Schools Program of the Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999*. Final Report. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research.
- Pardini, P. (2002). Revival of the K–8 school. *School Administrator* 59(3), 6–12.
- Parrish, T.B., Merickel, A., et al. (2006). *Effects of the implementation of proposition 227 on the education of English learners, K-12: Findings from a five-year evaluation*. American Institutes for Research & WestEd.
- Patton, D.C., & Munoz, L. (2008). *Examining middle schools that narrowed the achievement gap in the Los Angeles Unified School District*. Publication No. 2008-13. Research and Planning, Los Angeles Unified School District.
- Petrides, L., & Nodine, T, et al. (2005). *Anatomy of school system improvement: Performance-driven practices in urban school districts*. San Francisco, CA: NewSchools Venture Fund.
- RAND Corporation. (2006a). *Implementing standards-based accountability: 2006 teacher survey (California version)*. Rockville, MD.
- RAND Corporation. (2006b). *Implementing standards-based accountability: 2006 principal survey (California version)*. Rockville, MD.
- RAND Corporation. (2006c). *Implementing standards-based accountability: 2006 district superintendent survey (California version)*. Rockville, MD.
- Research for Action. (2009). *Effective organizational practices for middle and high school grades: A qualitative study of what's helping Philadelphia students succeed in grades 6–12*. Prepared for the Accountability Review Council. Philadelphia, PA.
- Resnick, L.B., Rothman, R., et al. (2003/2004). Benchmarking and alignment of standards and testing. *Educational Assessment* 9(1/2), 1–27.
- Rosenholtz, S.J. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. *American Journal of Education* 93(3), 352–388.
- Rotermund, S. (2008). *When Do California Students Drop Out of School?* Statistical Brief 9. Santa Barbara, CA: California Dropout Research Project, University of California, Santa Barbara.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

- Rouse, C.E., Hannaway, J., et al. (2007). *Feeling the Florida heat? How low-performing schools respond to voucher and accountability pressure*. Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.
- Rubenstein, R., Schwartz, A.E., et al. (2009). Spending, size, and grade span in K–8 schools, *Education Finance and Policy* 4(1), 60–88.
- Ruby, A. (2006). Improving science achievement at high-poverty urban middle schools. *Science Education* 90(6), 1005–1027.
- Rumberger, R.W. (1995). Dropping out of middle school: A multilevel analysis of students and schools. *American Educational Research Journal* 32(3), 583–625.
- Rumberger, R., & Lim, S.A. (2008). *Why students drop out of school: A review of 25 years of research*. Santa Barbara, CA: California Dropout Research Project, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Salinger, T., & Bacevich, A. (2005). *Lessons and recommendations from the Alabama Reading Initiative—Sustaining focus on secondary reading*. Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Schmidt, W., Houang, R., et al. (2002). A coherent curriculum: The case of mathematics. *American Educator* 26(2).
- Schmidt, W.H., McKnight, C.C., et al. (1997). *A splintered vision: An investigation of U.S. science and mathematics education*. Dordrecht, NL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Schmidt, W.H., Tatto, M.T., et al. (2007). *The preparation gap: Teacher education for middle school mathematics in six countries*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Center for Research in Mathematics and Science Education.
- Schmitt, V.L. (2004). The relationship between middle level grade span configuration, professional development, and student achievement. *RMLE Online* 27(2).
- Sharkey, N.S., & Murnane, R.J. (2003). Learning from student assessment results. *Educational Leadership* 61(3), 77–81.
- Short, D.J., & Fitzsimmons, S. (2007). *Double the work: Challenges and solutions to acquiring language and academic literacy for adolescent English language learners*. A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York, NY: Alliance for Excellent Education, Carnegie Corporation.
- Simmons, W. (2005). *District reform action guide*. Unpublished. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University.
- Smith, M.S., & O’Day, J.A. (1991). Systematic school reform. In S. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing* (pp. 233–267). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.
- Snipes, J., Doolittle, F., et al. (2002). *Foundations for success: Case studies of how urban school systems improve student achievement*. Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.
- Socias, M., Chambers, J., et al. (2007). *The distribution of teaching and learning resources in California’s middle and high schools* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 023). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2005). *Best practices for implementing HSTW and MMGW: Keeping students moving forward on the journey from the middle grades into high school*. Atlanta, GA.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2009a). *A critical mission: Making adolescent reading an immediate priority in SREB states*. Atlanta, GA.

Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades: Why Some Schools Do Better

Southern Regional Education Board. (2009b). *The district leadership challenge: Empowering principals to improve teaching and learning*. Atlanta, GA.

Southern Regional Education Board. (2009c). *Keeping middle grades students on the path to success in high school: Increasing engagement and achievement in SREB states*. Atlanta, GA.

Sternberg, B.J., Kaplan, K.A., et al. (2007). Enhancing adolescent literacy achievement through integration of technology in the classroom. *Reading Research Quarterly* 42(3), 416–420.

Stotsky, S. (2005). *The state of state English standards 2005*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

United Way of Greater Los Angeles. (2008). *Seizing the middle ground: Why middle school creates the pathway to college and the workforce*. Los Angeles, CA.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary. (1999). *Hope for education: A study of nine high-performing, high-poverty, urban elementary schools*. Washington, DC.

Vasudeva, A., Darling-Hammond, L., et al. (2009). *Oakland Unified School District New Small Schools Initiative evaluation*. Stanford, CA: The School Redesign Network at Stanford University.

Weiss, C.C., & Kipnes, L. (2006). Reexamining middle school effects: A comparison of middle grades students in middle schools and K–8 schools. *American Journal of Education* 112(2), 239–272.

WestEd. (2008). *R&D alert* 10(1). (Issue focus: English learners.)

What Works Clearinghouse. (2008). *Accelerated middle schools*. WWC Intervention Report, July 2008. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences.


Wilcox, K.C., & Angelis, J.I. (2007). *What makes middle schools work: A report on best practices in New York state middle schools*. Part of *Just For the Kids—New York*. Albany, NY: University at Albany School of Education, The State University of New York.

Williams, T., Kirst, M., Haertel, E., et al. (2005). *Similar students, different results: Why do some students do better? A large-scale survey of California elementary schools serving low-income students*. Mountain View, CA: EdSource.

Yecke, C.P. (2005). *Mayhem in the middle: How middle schools have failed America—and how to make them work*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Institute.

Zau, A.C. & Betts, J.R. (2008). *Predicting success, preventing failure: An investigation of the California High School Exit Exam*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California.

EdSource is an independent, impartial, not-for-profit organization whose sole mission is to clarify complex education issues and to promote thoughtful decisions about public school improvement. Founded in California in 1977, EdSource is a respected source of information for K–14 education policy, data, and research.



520 San Antonio Rd, Suite 200, Mountain View, CA 94040-1217 | 650/917-9481

Fax: 650/917-9482 | edsource@edsource.org

www.edsource.org | www.ed-data.org