



**General
Education
Leadership
Network**

Essential School-Wide and Center-Wide Practices in Literacy and Mathematics, Prekindergarten and Elementary Grades

A document of the Michigan General Education Leadership Network (GELN)

This document is intended to be read in concert with Essential Instructional Practices in Early Mathematics: Prekindergarten to Grade 3; Early Literacy: Prekindergarten, Early Literacy Grades K to 3, Literacy Grades 4 to 5, Coaching Practices for Elementary Literacy, and other forthcoming documents from the Early Literacy and Early Mathematics Task Forces. The systems and practices outlined here provide school-level and program-level support for effective classroom instruction in prekindergarten and elementary literacy and mathematics.



ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICES

Purpose The purpose of this document is to increase Michigan’s capacity to improve children’s literacy and mathematics learning by identifying systematic and effective practices that can be implemented at the organizational level in educational and care settings that serve young children. To meet the needs of all young learners, organizational practices must support literacy and mathematics development in ways that systematically impact learning throughout elementary schools, early childhood learning centers, and other learning environments and programs.¹

Each of the ten recommended school-level or center-level systems and practices should occur in all Michigan prekindergarten and elementary school learning

environments. These essential practices should be viewed, as in practice guides in medicine, as presenting a minimum ‘standard of care’ for Michigan’s children and educators.

The practices listed can be used in a variety of educational settings for young children. The document does not specify any particular programs or policies but focuses on research-supported practices that can apply to a number of programs and settings. As the local systems and practices occur at the building or center level, it is the responsibility of the school, center, or program leadership to ensure that these systems and practices are implemented consistently and are regularly enhanced through strategic planning.

Our Values

Our values fundamentally shape our design of, and practice within, educational systems. Interpretation and implementation of the Essential School-Wide and Center-Wide Practices in Literacy and Mathematics, Prekindergarten and Elementary Grades should be shaped by the following research-supported values:

- We value a sustained, collaborative, and systemic approach to improving teaching and learning, with the acknowledgement that meaningful change takes time, requires ongoing inquiry and revision, and is never done.
- We value equity and inclusion for all children, families, and educators, with the recognition that schools and centers must resist and dismantle institutional practices that have historically marginalized some individuals and communities.
- We value children’s and educators’ social identities like age, race, ethnicity, gender, language, socio-economic status, and geographic context (e.g., urban, rural, suburban).
- We value caring learning environments where children, families, and educators have trusting relationships with one another and feel supported to learn and take risks.
- We value strategic, research-supported development of educators’ practices, knowledge, and identities because powerful learning for children requires powerful learning for educators.

1. The *leadership team* is composed of instructional leaders committed to continuous improvements in literacy and mathematics with ongoing attention to data.

Under the guidance of the lead administrator, the school or program leadership team:

- includes members with considerable, current, and collective expertise in literacy, mathematics, instructional improvement, systems change, and early childhood education;
- promotes the implementation of evidence-based, high-quality literacy and mathematics curriculum, instructional practices, resources, and assessments aligned across the learning environment;²
- develops a vision, mission, set of goals, and educational philosophy that guide school climate, children’s learning, and educator learning and that are shared school-wide and aligned across all ages and grade levels, including Pre-K, and across all professional roles for the purpose of continuous improvement;³
- engages in ongoing learning about high-quality instruction, educator learning, equity oriented continuous improvement, and systems leadership;⁴
- maintains a comprehensive system for assessing children’s strengths and needs that focuses on multiple points of data (e.g., formative, summative, family input, student voice) and keeps the best interests of children paramount in assessment, knowing the primary purpose is to promote equity by improving teaching and learning;⁵
- makes decisions based on deep understanding of community, school and district goals, strengths, and needs using iterative strategies such as Plan, Do, Study, Act cycles;⁶
- ensures a collaborative problem-solving approach that may include administrators, teachers, instructional coaches, parents, aides, reading and mathematics specialists, library media specialists, special educators, and others as needed;⁷ and
- distributes leadership throughout the organization for the purposes of drawing on multiple perspectives, working collectively for improvement, and building leadership capacity among all staff.⁸

2. The *organizational climate* reflects a collective sense of responsibility for all children, a focus on developing child independence and competence, and support for the learning of all children and adults.

All adults—administrators, teachers, specialists, aides, and support staff—throughout the organization:

- share and act upon a sense of collective responsibility for the literacy and mathematics growth and overall well-being of every child that is grounded in the shared belief that every child can and will be successful and that draws upon assets from children’s families, communities, cultures, and identities;⁹
- ensure that the entire learning environment is physically safe and emotionally supportive, such that all children feel a sense of belonging, and there are positive educator-child-family, child-child, and educator-educator relationships throughout the building;¹⁰
- support the development of children’s independence, competence, self-efficacy, and identity in reading, writing, and mathematics through practices such as helping children identify and build on their academic strengths, providing specific feedback to help children grow, and modeling the thoughts and practices of successful readers, writers, and mathematicians;¹¹
- promote authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students by building culturally sustaining and responsive learning environments;¹² and
- share professional trust, collective efficacy, and a sense of agency and voice in shaping the organization.¹³

3. The *learning environment* reflects a strong commitment to literacy and mathematics.¹⁴

Throughout the learning environment, there is evidence that:

- literacy is a priority, such that:
 - print experiences are meaningful with consideration of the amount, type, and use;¹⁵
 - children and teachers are actively engaged with the school library, media center, and library media specialist;¹⁶
 - guest readers and volunteers (e.g., parents, college students, community members) are recruited and trained to support literacy in an ongoing manner;¹⁷
 - events and activities generate excitement around books and other texts, for example through the announcement of the publication of the latest book in a series or posting of book reviews throughout the school; and
- mathematics is a priority, such that:
 - children’s developing and varied mathematical ideas are central to instruction and fostered through collective learning;¹⁸
 - learning environments are designed to foster mathematical experimentation, practice, and play, including access to mathematical tools and manipulatives;¹⁹
 - educator professional learning emphasizes an ongoing focus on supporting rich mathematical discussion and problem-solving and fostering positive mathematical identities;²⁰
 - goals for and celebrations of learning emphasize reasoning and problem solving and are not limited to performance on standardized assessments;²¹
- literacy and mathematics are integrated and occur throughout the day including during science and social studies learning;²²
- children regularly use literacy and mathematics concepts by reading, writing, speaking, and listening for multiple purposes, and student products are made prominently visible;²³
- books, learning materials, student tasks, and classroom decor reflect diversity across cultures, ethnic and racial groups, geographic locations, genders, and social roles;²⁴
- school staff aim to foster intrinsic motivation to learn, such that:
 - in literacy, there is only temporary and sparing, if any, use of non-reading related prizes such as stickers, coupons, or toys, and avoiding using reading and writing as “punishment.”²⁵
 - in mathematics, there is emphasis on the relevant, real-world use of mathematical concepts and problem-solving and avoidance of mathematical activities that can lead to anxiety²⁶

4. Ongoing *professional learning* opportunities reflect research on learning and effective literacy and mathematics instruction.

School, center, and program leaders prioritize educator learning²⁷ and ensure that professional learning opportunities are:

- intentional in terms of content, such that learning opportunities are:
 - responsive and data informed so that they meet the needs and best interests of educators and their students²⁸;
 - focused on development of educators’ understanding of content, instructional practices, context, and student learning, motivation, and engagement²⁹;
 - integrating learning about content instruction with learning about culturally responsive, asset-based, and equity-oriented instructional practice³⁰;
 - aligned with the research-supported, developmentally appropriate practices outlined in the Essential Instructional Practices for Literacy and Mathematics;
 - focused on the “why” as well as the “how” of effective whole-class and small group instructional practices;
- intentional in terms of context, such that learning opportunities are:
 - collaborative in nature, involving colleagues working together in ways that foster trust, vulnerability, curiosity, experimentation, and critical reflection³¹;
 - inclusive of multiple roles, such as: school leaders, teachers, specialists, paraprofessionals, aides, and support staff;
 - part of coherent, ongoing, and sustained systems of educator learning supports that occur over extended periods of time³²
- intentional in terms of design, such that learning opportunities are:
 - structured in ways that foster job-embedded, collaborative learning (e.g., study groups, collaborative inquiry, and problem solving)³³
 - designed to include, and be followed by, opportunities for teachers to experiment with and observe effective practice and receive feedback from mentors, peers, coaches, and/or principal;³⁴
 - based in an understanding of the educator knowledge, skills, and identities reflected in the Essential Instructional Practices for Literacy and Mathematics;³⁵
 - inclusive of modeling and instructional coaching with colleagues who demonstrate effective practices with children and provide opportunities for teachers to reflect on their knowledge, practice, and goals in an ongoing and continuous manner³⁶

5. There is a system for determining the allocation of *literacy and mathematics support* in addition to high-quality classroom instruction with multiple layers of support available to children, building on existing skills.

School, center, and program leaders ensure that:

- instruction and additional supports are implemented across learning environments in addition to, not instead of, core instruction, and are coherent and consistent with the Essential Instructional Practices for Literacy and Mathematics;³⁷
- supports are differentiated to the individual child’s specific profile of strengths and needs;³⁸
- highly trained educators are those teaching the children needing the most support;³⁹
- teachers are supported to design needs-based instruction by using and analyzing multiple, varied, systematic, formative assessments and observation as appropriate in an ongoing basis to:
 - identify individual child needs early and accurately;
 - tailor whole group, small group, and one-on-one instruction;
 - measure progress regularly; and
 - move students fluidly among layered supports as their needs change in order to avoid ability grouping that is long-term and static in nature; and⁴⁰
- formal and informal assessment practices disrupt historical patterns of marginalization with respect to race, ethnicity, gender, ability, socio-economic status, language, etc.⁴¹.

6. Organizational systems assess and respond to *individual needs* that may impact learning and development.

School, center, or program systems and leaders ensure that:

- any potential learning, physical, visual, regulatory, mental health, and social-emotional needs that require specific conditions and supports are identified;⁴²
- assessments, interventions, and initiatives align with family and community values, culture, and history and attend to student strengths, assets, and funds of knowledge;⁴³
- every adult has access to research-supported strategies and tools to support culturally responsive, whole-child development for each child, including, for example, strategies for improving socio-emotional skills such as emotional understanding and techniques for helping children develop executive function skills such as planning;⁴⁴
- children receive coordinated, intensive supports and services that include continued collaboration among

teachers, interventionists, family, and others whose expertise is relevant (e.g., special education teacher, school psychologist, school nurse, social worker),⁴⁵ and

- all adults intentionally work to:
 - identify systems and conditions that may hinder or support learning for each child;
 - modify learning environments to recognize and respond to children’s individual, developmental, and cultural needs;
 - foster collaborative relationships with professional colleagues and children’s families; and
 - assess whether school-wide patterns in learning and/or behavior warrant adopting strategies or programs and, if so, implement ones that are caring, student-centered, and equity-oriented and that have been shown to positively impact both academic and socio-emotional learning.⁴⁶

7. Adequate, high-quality *instructional resources* are well maintained and utilized in ways that align with the Essential Instructional Practices for Literacy and Mathematics.

Leaders and systems within the school, center, or program ensure that:

- teachers are provided with resources, including technological and curricular resources, that support research-supported instruction in all components of literacy and mathematics instruction and that provide continuity across ages and grade levels;
- teachers have professional learning opportunities and support for effective use of available technologies, materials, and resources;⁴⁷
- each child has access to cognitively demanding mathematical tasks and materials that include diverse problem contexts, engage children in learning mathematics through play and experimentation, provide space for a range of mathematical problem solving, and foster growth along coherent learning progressions;⁴⁸

- each child has access to many informational and literature texts in the classroom and school, with culturally diverse characters and themes, that they want to read and that they can read independently or with the support of others;⁴⁹ and
- well-stocked school libraries and/or media centers, with library media specialists, offer a large collection of digital books, print books, and other reading materials for reading independently and with the support of others to immerse and instruct children in varied media, genres of texts, and accessible information.⁵⁰

8. A consistent *family collaboration* strategy includes specific attention to literacy and mathematics development.

Members of the learning organization collaborate with families to:

- prioritize learning about families and the language, literacy, and mathematics practices in which they engage to inform instruction, drawing from families' daily routines that build on culturally developed knowledge and skills accumulated in the home (e.g., inviting families to share texts they read and write and mathematical problems they encounter as part of their lives at home or at work);⁵¹
- provide regular opportunities for families to be in schools and centers and for educators to be in community spaces;
- enable families and educators to build a network of social relationships to support children's language, literacy, and mathematics development (e.g., connect families with community organizations and with each other to celebrate and support learning);⁵²
- foster familial and community partnerships in the education of children and the work of the learning environment through equitable collaboration and reciprocal relationships;⁵³
- engage families to build leadership and gather feedback to guide future collaboration and promote positive experiences for each child; and⁵⁴
- examine how families can utilize research-supported strategies to foster literacy and mathematics development at home (see *Essential Instructional Practices for Literacy and Mathematics*).⁵⁵

9. A *summer learning* initiative fosters continued engagement with literacy and mathematics.⁵⁶

To support summer reading and mathematics learning, the school, center, or program:

- facilitates opportunities for every child to read books and access texts during the summer through strategies, including:
 - providing books that are of high interest to children and within the likely range of reading levels within each class;⁵⁷
 - connecting children to summer reading programs offered through school and public libraries;
 - providing instruction at the end of the school year to re-emphasize reading comprehension strategies and orient children to summer reading by encouraging use of effective strategies while reading at home;⁵⁸ and
 - collaborating with families to support reading at home, such as by encouraging family members to listen to their child read aloud, discuss books with their child, and provide feedback on their child's reading.⁵⁹
- facilitates opportunities for children to engage with mathematics during the summer through strategies including:
 - providing access to games and other activities that families can do together;⁶⁰ and
 - collaborating with families to learn about strategies for supporting relevant and joyful mathematical talk, play, and problem solving within home and community contexts.⁶¹
- facilitates access to a free, voluntary, high-quality instructional summer program for children that includes five to six weeks of programming, research-supported and small-group learning, highly qualified teachers, a positive learning environment, and meaningful partnerships with families.⁶²

10. A network of *connections in the community* provides authentic purposes and audiences for children's work and helps facilitate use of quality out-of-school programming.

Connections beyond the school, center, or program walls provide:

- organization-wide and classroom-level networking with local businesses, cultural centers, and community organizations to:
 - tap into available funds of knowledge⁶³,
 - support development of children's content knowledge and identities, and
 - facilitate opportunities for children to read, write, and do mathematics for purposes and audiences beyond school assignments;⁶⁴

- access to opportunities for individualized support that aligns with *Essential Instructional Practices for Literacy and Mathematics*, for example through one-on-one tutoring;⁶⁵ and
- opportunities for children to develop literacy and mathematics outside of the school hours, including through engaging out-of-school time library, community, and school programs in the summer and after school.⁶⁶

References

- 1 For example, Hubbard, L., Mehan, H., & Stein, M. K. (2006). *Reform as learning: School reform, organizational culture, and community politics in San Diego*. Routledge. Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Peterson, D. S., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2004). The CIERA school change framework: An evidence-based approach to professional development and school reading improvement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40(1), 40-69; Wilcox, K. C., Lawson, H. A., & Angelis, J. (2015). Classroom, school, and district impacts on diverse student literacy achievement. *Teacher College Record*, 117, 1-38. National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press.
- 2 For example, Cobb, P., Jackson, K., Henrick, E., & Smith, T. M. (2018). *Systems for instructional improvement: Creating coherence from the classroom to the district office*. Harvard Education Press; Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). *Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade* (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCEE 2012- 4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Holmes, G., Madden, N. A., & Chamberlain, A. (2013). Effects of a data-driven district reform model on state assessment outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal*, 50(2), 371-396. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author; National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics. (2020). *NCSM Essential Actions: Framework for leadership in mathematics education*. Author.
- 3 For example, Michigan State Board of Education. (2005, revised 2013). *Early childhood standards of quality for prekindergarten*. Lansing, MI: Author; Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: The mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(1), 7- 30; Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University. Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Luppescu, S., & Easton, J. O. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. University of Chicago Press.
- 4 For example, Cobb, P., Jackson, K., Henrick, E., & Smith, T. M. (2018). *Systems for instructional improvement: Creating coherence from the classroom to the district office*. Harvard Education Press; Hubbard, L., Mehan, H., & Stein, M. K. (2006). *Reform as learning: School reform, organizational culture, and community politics in San Diego*. Routledge. Stein, M. K., & Nelson, B. S. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 25(4), 423-448.
- 5 For example, Taylor, B., Pearson, P., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade reading instruction in low-income schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101(2), 121-165. National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (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; *Standards for the assessment of reading and writing* (2010). Newark, DE: International Reading Association. Joint Task Force on Assessment of the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English; Burns, M. K., Vanderwood, M., & Ruby, S. (2005). Evaluating the readiness of pre-referral intervention teams for use in a problem-solving model: Review of three levels of research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 20, 89-105. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author; Shepherd, L. A., Diaz Biilello, E., Penuel, W. R., & Marion, S. F. (2020). *Classroom assessment principles to support teaching and learning*. Boulder, CO: Center for Assessment, Design, Research and Evaluation, University of Colorado Boulder.
- 6 Green, T. L. (2018). Enriching educational leadership through community equity literacy: A conceptual foundation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 17(4), 487-515; Leithwood, K. (2021). A review of evidence about equitable school leadership. *Education Sciences*, 11, 377-426; Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1272- 1311; Bryk, A. S. (2021). *Improvement in action: Advancing quality in America's schools*. Harvard Education Press.
- 7 For example, Bean, R. M. (2004) Promoting effective literacy instruction: The challenge for literacy coaches. *The California Reader*, 37(3), 58-63; Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating*

References

- the links to improved student learning. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement. University of Minnesota. Bean, R. M., Kern, D., Goatley, V., Ortlieb, E., Shettel, J., Calo, K., & Cassidy, J. (2015). Specialized literacy professionals as literacy leaders: Results of a national survey. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 54(2), 83–114. Cobb, P., Jackson, K., Henrick, E., & Smith, T. M. (2018). *Systems for instructional improvement: Creating coherence from the classroom to the district office*. Harvard Education Press.; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.; National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics. (2020). *NCSM Essential Actions: Framework for leadership in mathematics education*. Author.
- 8 For example, Spillane, J. P., Diamond, J. B. & Jita, L. (2003). Leading instruction: The distribution of leadership for instruction. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 35(5), 533–543.
- 9 For example, Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Seashore Louis, K. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(Supplement), 751–781; Murphy, J. (2004). Leadership for literacy: A framework for policy and practice. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15(1), 65–96; Tomlinson, C. A. & Jarvis, J. M. (2014). Case studies of success: Supporting academic success for students with high potential from ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(3), 191–219. National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. Jackson, K., Gibbons, L. K., & Dunlap, C. (2017). *Teachers' views of students' mathematical capabilities: Challenges and possibilities for ambitious reform*. *Teachers College Record*, 119(7), 1–43.
- 10 For example, Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323–367; Dennis, S. E. & O'Connor, E. (2013). Reexamining quality in early childhood education: Exploring the relationship between the organizational climate and the classroom. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 27, 74–92. Battey, D. (2013). "Good" mathematics teaching for students of color and those in poverty: The importance of relational interactions within instruction. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 82(1), 124–144.
- 11 For example, Joseph, L. M. & Eveleigh, E. L. (2011). A review of the effects of self-monitoring on reading performance of students with disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 45(1), 43–53; Allan, N. P., Hume, L. E., Allan, D. M., Farrington, A. L., & Lonigan, C. J. (2014). Relations between inhibitory control and the development of academic skills in preschool and kindergarten: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(10), 2368–2379; Sporer, N. & Schunemann, N. (2014). Improvements of self-regulation procedures for fifth graders' reading competence: Analyzing effects on reading comprehension, reading strategy performance, and motivation for reading. *Learning and Instruction*, 33, 147–157. Gresalfi, M., & Hand, V. M. (2019). Coordinating situated identities in mathematics classrooms with sociohistorical narratives: A consideration for design. *ZDM*, 51(3), 493–504; Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(2), 193–158; Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 23(1), 7–25. National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics & TODOS Mathematics for All. (2016). *Mathematics education through the lens of social justice: Acknowledgment, actions, and accountability*. Retrieved from: <https://www.mathedleadership.org/docs/resources/positionpapers/NCSMPositionPaper16.pdf>
- 12 For example, New York State Education Department (2019). *Culturally Responsive-Sustaining Education Framework*. New York: The University of the State of New York. Celedón-Pattichis, S., & Turner, E. E. (2012). "Explicame tu Respuesta": Supporting the development of mathematical discourse in emergent bilingual kindergarten students. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(2), 197–216.
- 13 For example, Goddard, R., Goddard, Y., Kim, E. S., & Miller, R. (2015). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the roles of instructional leadership, teacher collaboration, and collective efficacy beliefs in support of student learning. *American Journal of Education*, 121(4), 501–530; Bryk, A. S. & Schneider, B. (2004). *Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement*. Sage; Stein, K. C., Kintz, T., & Miness, A. (2016). Reflectiveness, adaptivity, and support: How teacher agency promotes student engagement. *American Journal of Education*, 123, 109–136.
- 14 For example, International Reading Association. (2001). Integrating literacy and technology in the curriculum: A position statement of the International Reading Association. Newark, DE: Author; Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read*. Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.
- 15 For example, Duke, N. K. (2000). For the rich it's richer: Print experiences and environments offered to children in very low- and very high-socioeconomic status first-grade classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(2), 441–478.
- 16 For example, Scholastic Library Publishing Company (2016). *School libraries work! A compendium of research supporting the effectiveness of school libraries*. New York: Scholastic.
- 17 For example, Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T. & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605–619. Markovitz, C. E., Hernandez, M. W., Hedberg, E. C., & Whitmore, H. W. (2022). Evaluating the Effectiveness of a Volunteer One-on-One Tutoring Model for Early Elementary Reading Intervention: A Randomized Controlled Trial Replication Study. *American Educational Research Journal*.
- 18 Langer-Osuna, J. M. (2017). Authority, identity, and collaborative mathematics. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 48(3), 237–247.
- 19 National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. The National Academies Press.
- 20 Gresalfi, M. S., & Cobb, P. (2006). Cultivating students' discipline-specific dispositions as a critical goal for pedagogy and equity. *Pedagogies*, 1(1), 49–57.
- 21 Esmonde, I. (2009). Ideas and identities: Supporting equity in cooperative mathematics learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2), 1008–1043.; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.; Wood, M. B. (2013). Mathematical micro-identities: Moment-to-moment positioning and learning in a fourth-grade classroom. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 44(5), 775–808.
- 22 For example, Michigan Department of Education. (2015). *Michigan K-12 Standards Science*. Lansing, MI: Author. http://www.michigna.gov/documents/mde/K-12_Science_Performance_Expectations_v5_496901_7.pdf; Michigan Department of Education. (2007). *Social studies grade level content expectations grades K-8*. Lansing, MI: Author. http://www.michigna.gov/documents/mde/SSGLCE_218368_7.pdf
- 23 For example, Michigan Department of Education. (nd). *Michigan K – 12 Standards for English Language Arts*. Lansing, MI. https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/K-12_MI_ELA_StandardsREV_470029_7.pdf; Hoffman, J.V., Sailors, M., Duffy, G.R., & Beretvas, S.N. (2004). The effective elementary classroom literacy environment: Examining the validity of the TEX-IN3 observation system. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 36(3), 303–334.

References

- 24 For example, National Council of Teachers of English and International Reading Association (2012). *Standards for the English Language Arts*. Urbana, IL, and Newark, DE: Authors. Zapata, A., Kellcamp, M., & King, C. (2018). *Literacy Leadership Brief: Expanding the Canon How Diverse Literature Can Transform Literacy Learning*. International Literacy Association.
- 25 For example, Marinak, B. A. & Gambrell, L. B. (2008). Intrinsic motivation and rewards: What sustains young children's engagement with text? *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47, 9-16; Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(6), 299-310; Becker, M., McElvany, N., & Kortenbruck, M. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation as predictors of reading literacy: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(4), 773-785. Ives, S. T., Parsons, S. A., Parsons, A. W., Robertson, D. A., Daoud, N., Young, C., & Polk, L. (2020). Elementary students' motivation to read and genre preferences. *Reading Psychology*, 41(7), 660-679.
- 26 Boaler, J. (2014). Research suggests that timed tests cause math anxiety. *Teaching children mathematics*, 20(8), 469-474. Turner, E. E., Varley Gutiérrez, M., Simic-Muller, K., & Diez-Palomar, J. (2009). "Everything is math in the whole world": Integrating critical and community knowledge in authentic mathematical investigations with elementary Latina/o students. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 11(3), 136-157. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.
- 27 For example, Podhajski, B., Mather, N., Nathan, J., & Sammons, J. (2009). Professional development in scientifically based reading instruction: Teacher knowledge and reading outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 42(5), 403-17. Bannister, N. A. (2015). Reframing practice: Teacher learning through interaction in a collaborative group. *Journal of Learning Sciences*, 24(3), 347-372. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute; Fletcher-Wood, H., & Zuccollo, J. (2020). *The effects of high-quality professional development on teachers and students: A rapid review and meta-analysis*. Education Policy Institute. Learning Forward. (2020, December 5). Standards revision. <https://learningforward.org/standards/standards-revision/>; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.
- 28 Fletcher-Wood, H. & Zuccollo, J. (2020). *The effects of high-quality professional development on teachers and students: A rapid review and meta-analysis*. Education Policy Institute. Hauge, K (2019). Teachers' collective professional development in school: A review study. *Cogent Education*, 6.
- 29 For example, Marinak, B. A. & Gambrell, L. B. (2008). Intrinsic motivation and rewards: What sustains young children's engagement with text? *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47, 9-16; Guo, Y., Sun, S., Breit-Smith, A., Morrison, F. J., & Connor, C. M. (2015). Behavioral engagement and reading achievement in elementary-school-age children: A longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(2), 332-347. Gresalfi, M. S., & Cobb, P. (2011). Negotiating identities for mathematics teaching in the context of professional development. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 42(3), 270-304. Ball, D.L., Thames, M.H., & Phelps, G.C. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special?. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(5), 389-407.
- 30 Gutiérrez, R. (2017). Political conocimiento for teaching mathematics: Why teachers need it and how to develop it. In S. Kastberg, A. M. Tymninski, A. Lischka, & W. Sanchez (Eds.), *Building support for scholarly practices in mathematics methods* (pp. 11-38). Charlotte, NC: Information Age. Poekert, P. E., Swaffield, S., Demir, E. K., & A. Wright, S. (2020). Leadership for professional learning towards educational equity: A systematic literature review. *Professional Development in Education*, 46(4), 541-562. Battey, D., & Franke, M. (2013). Integrating professional development on mathematics and equity: Countering deficit views of students of color. *Education and Urban Society*, 47(4), 433-462. Slama, R., Moussapour, R., Benoit, G., Anderson, N., & Reich, J. (2021). *The future of math teacher professional learning*. <http://edarxiv.org/kncs9>
- 31 Vangrieken, K., Meredith, Packer, C. T., Kyndt, E. (2017). Teacher communities as a context for professional development: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 47-59. Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., Kyndt, E. Teacher collaboration: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review*, 15, 17-40. Nelson, T. H., Slavit, D., Perkins, M., & Hathorn, T. (2008). A culture of collaborative inquiry: Learning to develop and support professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record*, 110(6), 1269-1303. Gibbons, L. K., Lewis, R. M., Nieman, H., & Resnick, A. F. (2021). Conceptualizing the work of facilitating practice-embedded teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 101. Little, J. W. (2002). Locating learning in teachers' communities of practice: Opening up problems of analysis in records of everyday work. *Teaching and teacher education*, 18(8), 917-946.
- 32 Sims, S., & Fletcher-Wood, H. (2021). Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: a critical review. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 32(1), 47-63. Cobb, P., Jackson, K., Henrick, E., & Smith, T. M. (2018). *Systems for instructional improvement: Creating coherence from the classroom to the district office*. Harvard Education Press. Darling-Hammond, L., & Richardson, N. (2009). Teacher learning: What matters? *Educational Leadership*, 66(5), 46-53.
- 33 For example, Cunningham, A. E., Etter, K., Platas, L., Wheeler, S., & Campbell, K. (2014). Professional development in emergent literacy: A design experiment of teacher study groups. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 31, 62-77; Wilson, S., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of the research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 173-209; Nelson, T. H., Slavit, D., Perkins, M., & Hathorn, T. (2008). A culture of collaborative inquiry: Learning to develop and support professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record*, 110(6), 1269-1303. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980. Jaworski, B. (2006). Theory and practice in mathematics teaching development: Critical inquiry as a mode of learning in teaching. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 9, 187- 211.
- 34 Gibbons, L. K., & Cobb, P. (2017). Focusing on teacher learning opportunities to identify potentially productive coaching activities. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(4), 411-425.; Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1-2), 21-34. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- 35 For example, Lane, C., Prokop, M. J. S., Johnson, E., Podhajski, B., & Nathan, J. (2013). Promoting early literacy through the professional development of preschool teachers. *Early Years: An International Research Journal*, 34(1), 67-80; Wasik, B.A., & Hindman, A.H. (2011). Improving vocabulary and pre-literacy skills of at-risk preschoolers through teacher professional development. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(2), 455-468; Porche, M. V., Pallante, D. H., & Snow, C. E. (2012). Professional development for reading achievement: Results from the Collaborative Language and Literacy Instruction Project (CLLIP). *The Elementary School Journal*, 112(4), 649-671. Jackson, K., Cobb, P., Wilson, J., Webster, M., Dunlap, C., & Appelgate, M. (2015). Investigating the development of mathematics leaders' capacity to support teachers' learning on a large scale. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 47(1), 93-104. Munter, C. (2014). Developing visions of high-quality mathematics instruction. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 45(5), 584-635. Russ, R. S., Sherin, B. L., & Sherin, M. G. (2016). What constitutes teacher learning. *Handbook of research on teaching*, 391-438.

References

- 36 For example, Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A. S., & Dexter, E. R. (2010). Assessing the value-added effects of literacy collaborative professional development on student learning. *The Elementary School Journal*, *111*(1), 7–34; Powell, D. R. & Diamond, K. E. (2013). Implementation fidelity of a coaching-based professional development program for improving Head Start teachers' literacy and language instruction. *Journal of Early Intervention*, *35*(2), 102–128; Learning Forward. (2020, April 24). <https://learningforward.org/standards/standards-revision/>; Gibbons, L. K., & Cobb, P. (2017). Focusing on teacher learning opportunities to identify potentially productive coaching activities. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *68*(4), 411–425. Gibbons, L. K., Kazemi, E., & Lewis, R. M. (2017). Developing collective capacity to improve mathematics instruction: Coaching as a lever for school-wide improvement. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, *46*, 231–250.
- 37 For example, Gersten, R. (2016). What we are learning about mathematics interventions and conducting research on mathematics interventions. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *9*, 684–688.; Ketterlin-Geller, L. R., Chard, D. J., & Fien, H. (2008). Making connections in mathematics: Conceptual mathematics intervention for low-performing students. *Remedial and Special Education*, *29*(1), 33–45.; Austin, C. R., Vaughn, S., & McClelland, A. M. (2017). Intensive Reading Interventions for Inadequate Responders in Grades K–3: A Synthesis. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *40*(4), 191–210. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26742876>. Dallas, W. P. (2017). Systemic Sustainability in RtI Using Intervention-Based Scheduling Methodologies. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, *40*(2), 105–113. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44280683>. Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., Dimino, J., Taylor, M. J., Newman Gonchar, R., Krowka, S., Kieffer, M. J., McKeown, M., Reed, D., Sanchez, M., St. Martin, K., Wexler, J., Morgan, S., Yañez, A., & Jayanthi, M. (2022). *Providing Reading Interventions for Students in Grades 4–9* (WWC 2022007). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <https://whatworks.ed.gov/>; O'Connor, R. E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of reading intervention in kindergarten through third grade: Changes in teaching and student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *38*(5), 440–55. Michigan Department of Education, (2020). *Michigan department of education multi-tiered system of supports practice profile v.5.0*. Authors.
- 38 For example, Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. D. (2008). Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention and multi-tier intervention for reading in the primary grades: A practice guide. (NCEE 2009-4045). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Vadasy, P. F. & Sanders, E. A. (2008). Benefits of repeated reading intervention for low-achieving fourth- and fifth grade students. *Remedial and Special Education*, *29*(4), 235–249. Ebby, C. B., & Petit, M. (2018). Using learning trajectories to elicit, interpret and respond to student thinking. In E. A. Silver & V. L. Mills (Eds.), *A fresh look at formative assessment in mathematics teaching* (pp. 81–101). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics; Heritage, M. (2008). *Learning progressions: Supporting instruction and formative assessment*. Washington D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- 39 For example, McGill-Franzen, A., Payne, R., & Dennis, D. (2010). Responsive intervention: What is the role of appropriate assessment? In P. H. Johnston (Ed.), *RTI in literacy: Responsive and comprehensive*, (115–132). Newark, DE. International Reading Association; Scanlon, D. M., Gelsheiser, L. M., Vellutino, F. R., Schatschneider, C., & Sweeney, J. M. (2010). Reducing the incidence of early reading difficulties: Professional development for classroom teachers versus direct interventions for children. In P. H. Johnston (Ed.), *RTI in literacy: Responsive and comprehensive*, (115–132). Newark, DE. International Reading Association.
- 40 For example, Puzio, K., Colby, G. T., & Algeo-Nichols, D. (2020). Differentiated Literacy Instruction: Boondoggle or Best Practice? *Review of Educational Research*, *90*(4), 459–498. Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F. & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read*. Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Ann Arbor, Michigan; O'Connor, R., E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of reading intervention in kindergarten through third grade: Changes in teaching and student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *38*(5), 440–55; Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F. & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade instruction in low-income schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, *101*, 121–165.; Gamoran, A. (1992). Synthesis of research: Is ability grouping equitable? *Educational Leadership*, *50*(2), 11–17.; William, D., & Bartholomew, H. (2004). It's not which school but which set you're in that matters: The influence of ability grouping practices on student progress in mathematics. *British Educational Research Journal*, *30*(2), 279–293. Ebby, C. B., & Petit, M. (2018). Using learning trajectories to elicit, interpret and respond to student thinking. In E. A. Silver & V. L. Mills (Eds.), *A fresh look at formative assessment in mathematics teaching* (pp. 81–101). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics;
- 41 BELE Framework developed by the BELE Network [Scholarly project]. (2020). Retrieved April 15, 2022, from <https://belenetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/The-BELE-Framework.pdf>. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.
- 42 For example, Montroy, J. J., Bowles, R. P., Skibbe, L. E., & Foster, T. D. (2014). Social skills and problem behaviors as mediators of the relationship between behavioral self-regulation and academic achievement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *29*(3), 298–309; Weiland, C., Barata, C. M., & Yoshikawa, H. (2014). The co-occurring development of executive function skills and receptive vocabulary in preschool-aged children: A look at the direction of the developmental pathways. *Infant and Child Development*, *23*(1), 4–21; Kulp, M. T., Ciner, E., Maguire, M., Moore, B., Pentimonti, J., Pistilli, M., Cyert, L., Candy, T. R., Quinn, G., & Ying, G. (2016). Uncorrected hyperopia and preschool early literacy: Results of the vision in preschoolers-hyperopia in preschoolers (VIP-HIP) study. *Ophthalmology*, *123*(4), 681–689; Allan, N. P., Hume, L. E., Allan, D. M., Farrington, A. L., & Lonigan, C. J. (2014). Relations between inhibitory control and the development of academic skills in preschool and kindergarten: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, *50*(10), 2368–2379.
- 43 For example, Splett, J. W., Smith-Millman, M., Raborn, A., Brann, K. L., Flaspohler, P. D., & Maras, M. A. (2018). Student, teacher, and classroom predictors of between-teacher variance of students' teacher-rated behavior. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *33*(3), 460. Snow, C. E. & Van Hemel, S. B., (Eds.) (2008). *Early childhood assessment: Why, what and how*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Raines, T.C., Dever, B.V., Kamphaus, R.W., & Roach, A.T. (2012). Universal Screening for Behavioral and Emotional Risk: A Promising Method for Reducing Disproportionate Placement in Special Education. *Journal of Negro Education* *81*(3), 283–296.
- 44 For example, Gregory, A., Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Jagers, R. J., & Sprague, J. R. (2021). Good intentions are not enough: Centering equity in school discipline reform. *School Psychology Review*, *50*(2–3), 206–220.; Fuhs, M. W., Nesbitt, K. T., Farran, D. C., & Dong, N. (2014).

- Longitudinal associations between executive functioning and academic skills across content areas. *Developmental Psychology*, 50(6), 1698-1709; Nix, R. L., Bierman, K. L., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gill, S. (2013). Promoting children's social-emotional skills in preschool can enhance academic and behavioral functioning in kindergarten: Findings from Head Start REDI. *Early Education and Development*, 24, 1000-1019; Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., & Aber, J. L. (2011). Two-year impacts of a universal school-based social-emotional and literacy intervention: An experiment in translational developmental research. *Child Development*, 82(2), 533-554. Zelazo, P. D., Blair, C. B., & Willoughby, M. T. (2016). *Executive function: Implications for education*. (NCER 2017-2000). National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. The Charles A. Dana Center at The University of Texas at Austin and the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (2016). *Integrating Social and Emotional Learning and the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics*. Author.
- 45 For example, Hunt, P., Soto, G., Maier, J., Liboiron, N., & Bae, S. (2004). Collaborative teaming to support preschoolers with severe disabilities who are placed in general education early childhood programs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*, 24(3), 123-142; Mattern, J.A. (2015). A mixed-methods study of early intervention implementation in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Supports, services, and policies for young children with development delays and disabilities. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 43(1), 57-67.
- 46 For example, Gregory, A., Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Jagers, R. J., & Sprague, J. R. (2021). Good intentions are not enough: Centering equity in school discipline reform. *School Psychology Review*, 50(2-3), 206-220.; Muñoz, M. A. & Vanderhaar, J. E. (2006). Literacy-embedded character education in a large urban district: Effects of the child development project on elementary school students and teachers. *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 4(1&2), 47-64; Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Larsen, R. A. A., Baroody, A. E., Curby, T. W., Ko, M., Thomas, J. B., Merritt, E. G., Abry, T., & DeCoster, J. (2014). Efficacy of the Responsive Classroom Approach: Results from a 3- Year, Longitudinal Randomized Controlled Trial. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51(3), 567-603. Gomez, J. A., Rucinski, C.I. & Higgins-D'Allesandro, A. (2020). Promising pathways from school restorative practice to educational equity. *Journal of Moral Education*, 1-19. George, H. P., Cox, K. E., Minch, D., & Sandomierski, T. (2018). District practices associated with successful SWPBIS implementation. *Behavioral Disorders*, 43(3), 393-406.
- 47 For example, Wilcox, K. C., Lawson, H. A., & Angelis, J. (2015). Classroom, school, and district impacts on diverse student literacy achievement. *Teacher College Record*, 117, 1-38; Knezek, G. & Christensen, R. (2007). Effect of technology-based programs on first- and second-grade reading achievement. *Computers in Schools*, 24(3- 4), 23-41; Cheung, A. C. K. & Slavin, R. E. (2013). Effects of educational technology applications on reading outcomes for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 48(3), 277-299. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.
- 48 National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. Siegler, R. S., & Ramani, G. B. (2009). Playing linear number board games promotes low-income children's numerical development. *Developmental Science*, 11(5), 655-661; Boaler, J. The role of contexts in the mathematics classroom: Do they make mathematics more "real"? *For the Learning of Mathematics*, 13(2), 12-17; Drake, C., Land, T. J., Bartell, T. G., Aguirre, J. M., Foote, M. Q., McDuffie, A. R., & Turner, E. E. (2015). Three strategies for opening curriculum spaces. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 21(6), 346-353. National Research Council, & Mathematics Learning Study Committee. (2001). *Adding it up: Helping children learn mathematics*. Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press; Stein, M. K., Grover, B. W., & Henningsen, M. (1996). Building student capacity for mathematical thinking and reasoning: An analysis of mathematical tasks used in reform classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(2), 455-488.; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. (2014). *Principles to actions: Ensuring mathematics success for all*. Author.
- 49 For example, Neuman, S. B. (1999). Books make a difference: A study of access to literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(3), 286-311; Bell, Y. R. & Clark, T. R. (1998). Culturally relevant reading material as related to comprehension and recall in African American children. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24(4), 455-475; Cartledge, G., Keeseey, S., Bennett, J. G., Ramnath, R., & Council, M. R. (2016). Culturally relevant literature: What matters most to primary-age urban learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 32(5), 399-426.
- 50 For example, Scholastic Library Publishing Company (2016). *School libraries work! A compendium of research supporting the effectiveness of school libraries*. New York: Scholastic.
- 51 For example, Bartell, T., Turner, E. E., Aguirre, J. M., Drake, C., Foote, M. Q., & McDuffie, A. R. (2017). Connecting children's mathematical thinking with family and community knowledge in mathematics instruction. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 23(6), 326-328.; Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Fund of knowledge: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141; National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. Turner, E. E., Gutiérrez, M. V., Simic-Muller, K., & Díez Palomar, J. (2009). "Everything is math in the whole world": Integrating critical and community knowledge in authentic mathematical investigations with elementary Latina/o students. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 11(3), 136-157. Ishimaru, A.M., Barajas-López, F., & Bang, M. (2015). Centering family knowledge to develop children's empowered mathematics identities. *Journal of Family Diversity in Education* 1(4), 1-21.
- 52 For example, Ren, L. & Hu, G. (2013). A comparative study of family social capital and literacy practices in Singapore. *Journal of Early Childhood*, 13, 98-130. Ishimaru, A.M., Barajas-López, F., & Bang, M. (2015). Centering family knowledge to develop children's empowered mathematics identities. *Journal of Family Diversity in Education* 1(4), 1-21.
- 53 For example, Ishimaru, A.M. (2017). From family engagement to equitable collaboration. *Educational Policy*, Warren, M. R. (2005). *Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform*. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133-173. Warren, M. R., Hong, S., Rubin, C. L., & Sychitkokhong, P. U. (2009). Beyond the bake sale: A community-based relational approach to parent engagement in schools. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2209-2254.. Baquedano-López, P., Alexander, R. A., & Hernández, S. J. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of research in education*, 37(1), 149-182. Leo, A., Wilcox, K. C., & Lawson, H. A. (2019). Culturally responsive and asset-based strategies for family engagement in odds-beating secondary schools. *School Community Journal*, 29(2), 255-280.

References

- 54 For example, Jung, S. B., & Sheldon, S. (2020). Connecting Dimensions of School Leadership for Partnerships with School and Teacher Practices of Family Engagement. *School Community Journal*, 30(1), 9-32. Ishimaru, A. M., Lott, J. L., Torres, K. E., & O'Reilly-Diaz, K. (2019). Families in the driver's seat: Catalyzing familial transformative agency for equitable collaboration. *Teachers College Record*, 121(11), 1-39. Auerbach, S. (2007). Visioning parent engagement in urban schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(6), 699-734; Auerbach, S. (2009). Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools. *School Community Journal*, 19(1), 9-32.
- 55 For example, Sénéchal, M., & Young, L. (2008). The effects of family literacy interventions on children's acquisition of reading from kindergarten to grade 3: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 880-907; Jordan, G. E., Snow, C. E., & Porche, M. B. (2000). Project EASE: The effort of a family literacy project on kindergarten students' early literacy skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(4), 524-546. Sheldon, S. B., Epstein, J. L., & Galindo, C. L. (2010). Not just numbers: Creating a partnership climate to improve math proficiency in schools. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 9(1), 27-48; Phillipson, S., Gervasoni, A., & Sullivan, P. (2016). *Engaging Families as Children's First Mathematics Educators*. Springer.
- 56 For example, Kim, J. S. & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's literacy achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386-431.
- 57 Schwartz, H. L., McCombs, J. S., Augustine, C. H., & Leschitz, J. T. (2018). *Getting to Work on Summer Learning: Recommended Practices for Success, 2nd Ed.* Rand Corporation; Zvoch, K. & Stevens, J. (2013). Summer school effects in a randomized field trial. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 28, 24-31. Borman, G. D. & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Longitudinal Achievement Effects of Multiyear Summer School: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore Randomized Field Trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 25-48.
- 58 For example, Allington, R. L., McGill-Franzen, A., Camilli, G., Williams, L., Graff, J., Zeig, J. & Nowak, R. (2010). Addressing summer reading setbacks among economically disadvantaged elementary students. *Reading Psychology*, 31(5), 411-427. A target number of 6 books over the course of a summer originated with Heyns, B. (1978). *Summer learning and the effects of schooling*. New York: Academic Press. Based on Heyns' finding that students in the sixth and seventh grades who read at least 6 books during the summer had greater gains in reading than those who did not, experimental studies of summer reading interventions tend to provide participating students with 6-10 books.
- 59 For example, White, T. G., Kim, J. S., Kingston, H. C., & Foster, L. (2014). Replicating the effects of a teacher scaffolded voluntary summer reading program: The role of poverty. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(1), 5-30.
- 60 For example, Cooper, H., Charlton, K., Valentine, J. C., Muhlenbruck, L., & Borman, G. D. (2000). Making the most of summer school: A meta-analytic and narrative review. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 65(1), i-127; Kim, J. S. & White, T. G. (2008). Scaffolding voluntary summer reading for children in grades 3 to 5: An experimental study. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 12(1), 1-23.
- 61 Berkowitz, T., Schaeffer, M. W., Maloney, E. A., Peterson, L., Gregor, C., Levine, S. C., & Beilock, S. L. (2015). Math at home adds up to achievement in school. *Science*, 350(6257), 196-198.
- 62 For example, LeFevre, J. A., Skwarchuk, S. L., Smith-Chant, B. L., Fast, L., Kamawar, D., & Bisanz, J. (2009). Home numeracy experiences and children's math performance in the early school years. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, 41(2), 55.; Susperreguy, M. I., & Davis-Kean, P. E. (2016). Maternal math talk in the home and math skills in preschool children. *Early Education and Development*, 27(6), 841-857.
- 63 Civil, M. (2007). Building on community knowledge: An avenue to equity in mathematics education. In N. Nasir & P. Cobb (Eds.), *Improving access to mathematics: Diversity and equity in the classroom* (pp. 105-117). New York: Teachers College Press.
- 64 For example, Bartell, T., Turner, E. E., Aguirre, J. M., Drake, C., Foote, M. Q., & McDuffie, A. R. (2017). Connecting children's mathematical thinking with family and community knowledge in mathematics instruction. *Teaching Children Mathematics*, 23(6), 326-328.; Purcell-Gates, V., Duke, N. K., & Martineau, J. A. (2007). Learning to read and write genre-specific text: Roles of authentic experience and explicit teaching. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(1), 8-45; Teale, W. H. & Gambrell, L. B. (2007). Raising urban students' literacy achievement by engaging in authentic, challenging work. *The Reading Teacher*, 60(8), 728-739. Baquedano-López, P., Alexander, R. A., & Hernández, S. J. (2013). Equity issues in parental and community involvement in schools: What teacher educators need to know. *Review of research in education*, 37(1), 149-182.
- 65 For example, Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T. & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605-619; Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006, July). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 275-313. Lindo, E. J., Weiser, B., Cheatham, J. P., & Allor, J. H. (2018). Benefits of structured after-school literacy tutoring by university students for struggling elementary readers. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 34(2), 117-131.
- 66 For example, Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006, July). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 275-313; Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. National Research Council. (2009). *Mathematics learning in early childhood: Paths toward excellence and equity*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press; Wager, A. A. (2012). Incorporating out-of-school mathematics: From cultural context to embedded practice. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 15(1), 9-23.

Process for Development and Review

This document was developed by the Early Mathematics Task Force, a subcommittee of the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA) General Education Leadership Network (GELN), which represents Michigan's 56 Intermediate School Districts. The Task Force included representatives from the following organizations:

Early Childhood Administrators' Network, MAISA	Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association
English Language Arts Leadership Network, MAISA	Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative
General Education Leadership Network, MAISA	Michigan Mathematics and Science Leaders Network Michigan State
Grand Valley State University	Michigan Reading Association
Kalamazoo Public Schools	Michigan State University
Michigan Association for Computer Users in Learning	Michigan Virtual University
Mathematics Leadership Team	MiSTEM Network
Michigan Assessment Consortium	Reading NOW Network
Michigan Association of Mathematics Teacher Educators	REMC Association of Michigan
Michigan Association of Superintendents & Administrators	Southwest Michigan Reading Council
Michigan Association of Supervisors of Special Education	Technology Readiness Infrastructure Grant
Michigan Council of Teachers of Mathematics	University of Michigan
Michigan Department of Education	University of Washington

Feedback on drafts of the document was elicited from other stakeholders, resulting in a number of revisions to the document.

Essential School-Wide and Center-Wide Practices in Literacy and Mathematics, Prekindergarten and Elementary Grades

Literacyessentials.org #MichiganLiteracy

MathEssentials.org #MiMathEssentials

