
DESIGN**MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS**

Accelerated Schools

Developer: Henry Levin, Stanford University, now at Columbia University

Primary goal: Bring children in at-risk situations at least to grade level by the end of sixth grade.

Main features:

- 1) Gifted-and-talented instruction for all students through “powerful learning.”
- 2) Participatory process for whole-school transformation.
- 3) Three guiding principles: unity of purpose; empowerment plus responsibility; and building strengths.

Primarily for grades K-8. Training and training materials provided.

Costs:

The cost for the first year of implementation of Accelerated Schools is \$28,129. First-year costs include: an internal facilitator; training for the coach, principal, and internal facilitator (excluding travel); training materials; three copies of the *Accelerated Schools Resource Guide*; one visit by a project staff member; technical assistance by phone and e-mail; a year-end retreat; a subscription to the Accelerated Schools newsletter; and access to an electronic network of Accelerated Schools. Schools can bring this cost down by reassigning current staff to fill key positions, such as internal facilitator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Accelerated Schools is fairly extensive and, for the most part, of good quality. In our search, we found 30 separate evaluations of Accelerated Schools. Of those 30 studies, 11 focused on student achievement as an outcome and the others focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From those 11 studies, 8 provided sufficient information for inclusion in the meta-analysis. Of those 8 studies, 6 provided independent samples and data that were not duplicated in other studies and were included in the final analysis. Most evaluations have taken place in high-poverty or high-minority contexts in both urban and rural settings. Location data were available for five of the six studies. Those studies were conducted in Houston, TX, Sacramento, CA, Las Vegas, NV, Memphis, TN, and Lakewood, WA. Most of the researchers studying Accelerated Schools described their research methods and samples clearly, but outcomes were not always presented in sufficient detail. For instance, although means or effect sizes were provided, sample sizes and standard deviations sometimes were not reported. Over 90% of the outcome data required imputation of the sample size and over 10% needed imputed standard deviations. The 6 studies included in the quantitative synthesis included two quasi-experimental matched control-group comparison designs, one pre-post design comparing Accelerated Schools to non-Accelerated Schools, and three one-group pre-post designs. Researchers other than the developer conducted three of the six studies and provided 88% of the outcome data, which was a higher rate than that found for the CSR literature as a whole. All studies presented outcomes in terms of mean percentile scores rather than as categorical or correlational outcomes.

Accelerated Schools

Contact Information:

Gene Chasin, Director
National Center for Accelerated Schools Project
University of Connecticut
2131 Hillside Road, Unit 3224
Storrs, CT 06269
Phone: 860-486-6330
Fax: 860-486-6348
E-mail: info@acceleratedschools.net
Web site: <http://www.acceleratedschools.net>

America's Choice

Developer: National Center on Education and the Economy

Primary goal: Enable all students to reach internationally benchmarked standards.

Main features:

- 1) Learning is focused on getting all students to standards, varying only the time and resources needed, using prevention, early intervention, and acceleration strategies.
 - 2) There are five key design features: standards and assessments; student learning; teacher training; community supports; and parent-public involvement.
- For grades K-12. Materials provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost for implementing America's Choice is \$197,943. This provides for professional development, including estimated staff- release time, materials, and two staff positions. Schools can lower this cost by reassigning current staff to fill key positions, such as coach and coordinator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

In our search, we found eight studies of America's Choice schools, three of which contained useful information on student achievement outcomes. The other studies focused on implementation, theory, or other types of student outcomes. Of the three studies amenable to meta-analysis, two provided independent samples and data that were not duplicated in other studies and were included in the final analysis. America's Choice is used in a collection of urban schools around the country. One study provided multi-year test score data on 56 schools implementing the reform. The other study provided information on 15 schools. The evaluations of America's Choice were conducted in an array of locations, including: Kentucky; Baltimore, MD; St. Louis, MO; Pittsburgh, PA; Sumter, SC; LaVilla, TX; Plainfield, NJ; throughout the state of New York; Hawaii; Jacksonville, FL; Los Angeles and San Gabriel. CA; Chicago, IL; and the District of Columbia. In this literature, much less focus has been on the achievement outcomes for the schools. Half of the outcome data come from a quasi-experimental matched control-group design and the other half from a pre-post analysis of America's Choice schools. All of the analyses used a cohort design. Of the studies that examined America's Choice schools, the researchers did not always describe the school demographics clearly and did not provide information regarding the student sample sizes involved. Categorical outcomes were provided for more than half of the useful outcomes, over one third of the outcome data came from group means, and the

America's Choice

rest involved a mixture of these outcomes. The developer generated about half of the outcomes.

Contact Information:

Judy Aaronson
National Center on Education and the Economy
One Thomas Circle, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-783-3668
Fax: 202-783-3672
E-mail: schooldesign@ncee.org
Web site: <http://www.ncee.org>

Atlas Communities

Developer: Coalition of Essential Schools, Education Development Center, Project Zero, School Development Program

Primary goal: Develop PreK-12 pathways organized around a common framework to improve learning outcomes for all students.

Main features:

- 1) PreK-12 pathways.
- 2) Development of coherent K-12 educational programs for every student.
- 3) Authentic curriculum, instruction, and assessment.
- 4) Whole-faculty study groups.
- 5) School/pathway planning and management teams.

For grades PreK-12. Materials are provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost of adopting ATLAS is \$102,097. This amount covers technical assistance and professional development, including teacher release time (e.g., for weekly study groups); materials; and the salary for a pathway coordinator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for ATLAS is not very extensive for the purposes of evaluating its impacts on student achievement. In our search, we found seven studies of ATLAS. Of those seven studies, five focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. Three of the five studies presented outcome data amenable to meta-analysis, but the others lacked basic information including means or standard deviations for the outcomes. The data were based on evaluations of schools in Memphis, TN, Prince George's County, MD, Norfolk, VA, and Philadelphia, PA. The quality of the three studies was good. The researchers included detailed information about their samples and the methodology of their evaluations, but sample sizes were provided in only one of the three studies. Two of the three studies incorporated a comparison group, with one study comparing two ATLAS schools to a group of demographically matched, non-reforming schools and the other comparing an ATLAS school's outcomes to those for the district as a whole. Only 25% of all of the outcome data, though, were based on control-group comparisons. The third study, which used a one-group pre-post design, contributed 75% of the outcome data. Outcomes were presented in terms of effect sizes and the

Atlas Communities

percent passing a state-developed test.

Contact Information:

Sharon Dash
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02158
Phone: 617-969-7100 or 617-618-2401
Fax: 617-969-3440
E-mail: atlas@edc.org
Web site: <http://www.edc.org/ATLAS/>

*Audrey Cohen College
System of Education*

Developer: Audrey Cohen College, New York.

Primary goal: Development of scholarship and leadership abilities using knowledge and skills to benefit students' community and larger world.

Main features:

- 1) Student learning focused on complex and meaningful purposes.
- 2) Students use what they learn to reach specific goals.
- 3) Curriculum focused on Constructive Actions (individual or group projects that serve the community).
- 4) Classes structured around five dimensions (e.g., Self and Others, Values, etc.) that incorporate core subjects.

For grades K–12. Materials and training provided.

Costs:

The cost for the first year of implementing Audrey Cohen is \$167,731. This cost covers professional development, including staff release time for orientation; materials; a licensing fee; and additional staff. Schools can reduce this cost by approximately half by assigning a current staff member to serve as the Staff Resource Specialist. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

At the time our search concluded, the research base for Audrey Cohen was extremely limited, with only one of three studies that was amenable to meta-analysis. A great deal of available information on Audrey Cohen is qualitative and does not include quantitative achievement outcomes. For the two studies not included in the meta-analysis, when achievement data were reported, there was not enough information available to calculate an effect size. In the one study in our meta-analysis, Audrey Cohen was implemented in a school in which more than half of the students received free or reduced lunch prices. The study was performed by a researcher other than the developer, was longitudinal in design, and presented outcomes in terms of mean test scores. In this study, the Audrey Cohen school was matched to a non-reforming school based on demographics.

Contact Information:

Ms. Janith Jordan, Vice President
Audrey Cohen College
75 Varick Street
New York, NY 10013-1919
Phone: 212-343-1234, ext. 3400
Fax: 212-343-8472
E-mail: janithj@aol.com
Web site: <http://www.audrey-cohen.edu>

Center for Effective Schools

Developer: Beverly Bancroft, Larry Lezotte, and Barbara Taylor at Michigan State University. Current service provider is Phi Delta Kappa International Center for Effective Schools.

Primary goal: Improve the academic achievement of all students.

Main features:

- 1) A continuous improvement process based upon the precepts that all children can and will learn, increased academic achievement is the mark of effectiveness, the unit of change in the individual school within the systemic arena, improvement plans must involve all stakeholders.
- 2) Increased teacher ownership in instructional decision-making.
For grades K-12. Books, videos, and other materials provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost to implement the Effective Schools model is \$55,000. Specific costs depend on the need, size of the school/district, and level of involvement. A sliding cost schedule is available based on increased district involvement and/or multiple schools' participation. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

In our analyses, the research base for the Center of Effective Schools consisted of a single study. Other available studies of the Center for Effective schools were theoretical in nature and did not provide analyses of achievement outcomes. There is also an extensive literature on "effective schools" that dates back to the writings and empirical work of Ronald Edmonds and others during the 1970s and 1980s. This research, though, does not evaluate a replicable effective schools intervention. It simply establishes correlations between various effective schools principles and student achievement. The one study of the Effective Schools reform model that was amenable to meta-analysis was a third-party evaluation that presented data across six schools in rural, suburban, and urban areas in which the program had been implemented for 3 years with at least 2 years between data points. The study did not present student sample sizes, and we had to impute this information. The evaluation used a one-group pre-post design and reported categorical outcome data for cohorts rather than for a longitudinal sample.

Center for Effective Schools

Contact Information:

Center for Effective Schools
Phi Delta Kappa International
408 North Union
PO Box 789
Bloomington, IN 47402-0789
Phone: 800-766-1156
Fax: 812-339-0018
E-mail: effective.schools@pdkintl.org
Web site: <http://www.pdkintl.org>

Child Development Project

Developer: Developmental Studies Center

Primary goal: Help schools become caring communities of learners that promote students' intellectual, social, and ethical development.

Main features:

- 1) Literature-based reading and language arts curriculum.
 - 2) Cooperative learning and developmental discipline.
 - 3) School wide community-building activities.
 - 4) Restructuring to support teacher collaboration, planning, and reflection.
- For grades K-6. Materials provided.

Costs:

The cost for the first year of implementation of the Child Development Project is \$160,675. This cost covers staff development, including release time for teachers for four to six days, on-site assistance, instructional, curricular, and implementation materials, and a full-time on-site coordinator. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

Although there are 14 studies of the Child Development Project, only 4 focused on student achievement outcomes. The remaining studies focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From those four studies, two presented information appropriate for meta-analysis. Both were conducted in California in a suburban district near San Francisco. The quality of the research was fair to good. In both studies, students in Child Development Project schools were compared to students in non-Child Development Project schools in the same district. No mention was made as to the equivalence on achievement of the two schools. The evaluations, both conducted by the developers, included detailed information about the sample and methodology. One of the studies presented outcomes in terms of mean scale scores and standard deviations. The other study presented T-scores, allowing us to use the population standard deviation of 10 to compute effect sizes.

Child Development Project

Contact Information:

Denise Wood Developmental Studies Center
2000 Embarcadero, Suite 305
Oakland, CA 94606
Phone: 510-533-0213
Fax: 510-464-3670
E-mail: dsc_information@devstu.org
Web site: <http://www.devstu.org>

Coalition of Essential Schools

Developer: Ted Sizer, Brown University, Providence, RI. Now based in Oakland, CA.

Primary goal: Help create schools where students learn to use their minds well.

Main features:

- 1) Set of Ten Common Principles upon which schools base their practice
- 2) Personalized learning
- 3) Mastery of a few essential subjects and skills
- 4) Graduation by exhibition
- 5) Sense of community
- 6) Instruction and organization depend on how each school interprets the Common Principles (may involve interdisciplinary instruction, authentic projects, etc.)

For grades K-12. No materials. Range of training options mostly provided by regional centers.

Costs:

A school with 500 students receiving \$5,000 per student might spend as much as \$250,000 per year. This cost would cover a full range of programs and services including regular on-site coaching, networking meetings, regional conferences, Trek summer institutes and “critical friends” school visits, workshops and seminars on curriculum/ assessment/instruction, and evaluation of school progress. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

The Coalition of Essential Schools research base is extensive, but provides relatively little information regarding the potential effects of the reform on student achievement. In our search, we found 34 evaluations, but only 7 focused on student achievement as an outcome. The rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From those seven studies, three were amenable to meta-analysis. The other four studies were not useful because they did not present the information needed to compute an effect size, such as means or standard deviations. The evaluations took place in moderate to high-poverty or moderate to high-minority contexts in both urban and rural settings. One study was conducted in Winchester, NH and another occurred in Miami, FL. The school’s location was not reported in the third study. The quality of the research ranged from fair to good. In two of the three studies, researchers described their methods and samples clearly and presented their outcomes in good detail. In the remaining study, the student sample size had to be imputed. In two of the studies, standard deviations were not included, but population standard deviations for the percentile data and NCE scores were employed as estimates. Standard

Coalition of Essential Schools

deviations were imputed for over 80% of the outcome data. Of the three useful studies, one involved a quasi-experimental matched-group comparison design and two studies relied on a one-group pre-post design. Thus, only 17% of the outcomes were based on a control-group comparison. Researchers other than the developer conducted all three of the studies.

Contact Information:

Hudi Podolsky, Executive Director
Coalition of Essential Schools
1814 Franklin Street, Suite 700
Oakland, CA 94612
Phone: 510-433-1451
Fax: 510-433-1455
Web site: <http://www.essentialschools.org>

Community for Learning

Developer: Margaret C. Wang, Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.

Primary goal: Achieve social and academic success for students by linking schools with community institutions.

Main features:

- 1) Collaboration with homes, libraries, museums, and other places where students can learn.
- 2) Coordinated health and human services delivery.
- 3) Site-specific implementation design.
- 4) Adaptive learning environments model of instruction.
- 5) Teams of regular teachers and specialists work together in the classroom to provide individual and small-group instruction for regular and special students.
- 6) Individualized learning plans for all students.

For grades K-12.

Costs:

The first-year cost for adopting Community for Learning is \$163,564. This cost covers professional development and includes staff release time, technical assistance, and additional staff. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

There is a fair amount of research on Community for Learning. In our search, we found 15 studies of Community for Learning or the Adaptive Learning Environment Model incorporated in Community for Learning. Of those 15 studies, 8 focused on student achievement as an outcome while the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. Only one of these eight studies, though, presented useful outcome data amenable to meta-analysis. The other studies lacked the basic information needed to compute an effect size, such as means or standard deviations. The quality of the research on Community for Learning was fair. The one evaluation in our meta-analysis was a one-group pre-post analysis conducted by the developer. The study did not include detailed information about the sample or the achievement tests used in the

Community for Learning

evaluation. Sample sizes were provided as were mean percentile scores, from which effect sizes were calculated based on the population standard deviation.

Contact Information:

Karen Gerdts, CFL Field Coordinator
Laboratory for Student Success
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091
Phone: 800-759-1495
Fax: 217-732-3696
E-mail: kgerdts@adi.org
Web site: <http://www.temple.edu/LSS>

Community Learning Centers

Developer: Wayne B. Jennings, Designs for Learning (St. Paul, Minnesota)

Primary goal: To dramatically increase the achievement of all learners.

Main features:

- 1) Powerful learning experiences in active learning environments
- 2) Personal learning plan for each student
- 3) Integrated social services
- 4) Decentralized decision making

For grades PreK-Adult.

Costs:

A new school requires about \$61,700 in the first year. This amount provides for consulting support and for ongoing membership and participation in and support from the CLC network of schools. It also pays for 30 days of consultation over 10-15 visits. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Community Learning Center (CLC) included a total of 10 studies. Of the 10 studies we found, only 5 provided data useful for calculating effect sizes. Each of the 5 studies was presented in the same format, as longitudinal case studies of sites implementing CLC. All but one of the five studies was produced in conjunction with the developer and the school/site where the reform was initiated. All of the evaluations were based on data gathered in St. Paul, MN schools. Almost all of the outcome data were based on longitudinal analyses, which followed the same group of students over time. The general quality of the reporting was good. Most often, results were presented as mean test scores. In most cases, actual sample sizes and group standard deviations were given and rarely did we have to impute this information.

*Community Learning
Centers*

Contact Information:

Designs for Learning, Inc.
1021 Bandana Blvd. East, Suite 214
St. Paul, MN 55108
Phone: 651-645-0200
Fax: 651-645-0240
Web site: <http://www.designlearn.net/clc.html>

Co-Nect

Developer: BBN Corporation

Primary goal: Improve student achievement in core subjects.

Main features:

- 1) Organization of school into small learning communities (clusters).
- 2) Design-based assistance for comprehensive K-12 school reform.
- 3) Customized on-line/on-site training and personnel support.
- 4) National critical friends program.
- 5) Leadership processes for whole-school technology integration.
- 6) Emphasis on authentic problems and practical applications.

For grades K-12. Print and on-line materials provided.

Costs:

The cost for the first year of implementation of Co-Nect can be as high as \$612,582. This amount provides for professional development, including staff release time; participation in the Critical Friends network; and an estimate for installing start-up technology in a school that has no hardware or software. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

There is a fair amount of research on the Co-Nect model. In our search, we found 15 separate evaluations of Co-Nect. Nine of the 15 studies focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From those 9 studies, 7 were amenable to meta-analysis. The studies not used in the meta-analysis did not present the information needed to compute an effect size, such as means or standard deviations. Of the 7 studies amenable to meta-analysis, 5 provided independent samples and data that were not duplicated in other studies and were included in the final analysis. The evaluations of Co-Nect mostly occurred in high-poverty or high-minority contexts in both urban and non-urban settings across the following major school districts: Memphis, TN, Cincinnati, OH, Miami, FL, Broward County, FL, Harford County, MD, San Antonio, TX, and Worcester, MA. The quality of the research on Co-Nect was generally good. Most of the research methodology was described clearly and outcome data were presented in good detail. However, samples sizes were imputed for almost all of the outcomes (98%). Means or effect sizes were provided for most of the studies. Standard deviations were not included but, because we were able to apply population standard deviations to the often-reported percentile data, many could be estimated. Four of the 5 studies compared Co-Nect schools to a comparison group. One study used a quasi-experimental matched-group comparison design. Another study compared Co-Nect

Co-Nect

schools to demographically similar non-Co-Nect schools, and two studies compared Co-Nect schools to district means. Researchers other than the developer provided over 90% of the outcome data, a much higher rate than for the CSR literature as a whole. Studies of Co-Nect presented outcomes in terms of effect sizes, mean percentile scores, or percent passing on a state-developed test.

Contact Information:

Co-nect
37 Broadway
Arlington, MA 02474
Phone: 617-995-3100 or 877-7CONNECT
Fax: 617-955-3103
E-mail: info@co-nect.net
Web site: <http://www.co-nect.net>

Core Knowledge

Developer: E.D. Hirsch, Jr. (University of Virginia) and the Core Knowledge Foundation, Charlottesville, VA.

Primary goal: Help students establish a strong foundation of core knowledge for higher levels of learning.

Main features:

- 1) Sequential program of specific grade-by-grade topics for core subjects, the rest of curriculum (approximately half) is left for schools to design.
- 2) Instructional methods (to teach core topics) are designed by individual teachers/schools.

For grades K-8. Curriculum guidelines provided. Training available but not required.

Costs:

The first year implementation cost for Core Knowledge is \$58,341. This cost covers professional development, including staff release time, materials, and a membership fee. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base on the achievement effects of Core Knowledge is fairly extensive and of good quality. In our search, we found 13 separate studies of Core Knowledge that evaluated the program. Of those 13 studies, 8 focused on student achievement as an outcome while the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From the 8 studies related to student achievement, 6 were useful for computing an effect size. The evaluations of Core Knowledge occurred in various poverty and minority contexts in urban, suburban, and rural settings involving school districts in Maryland, Miami, FL, San Antonio, TX, Oklahoma, and Washington. Most of the researchers described their methods and samples clearly and presented data in good detail. Sample sizes were included in five of the six studies, but over 75% of the outcomes required imputation of standard deviations. All of the six useful studies compared Core Knowledge schools to a comparison group. Five of the six studies involved quasi-experimental matched-group comparison designs and the other study compared the Core Knowledge school to a district average. Researchers other than the

Core Knowledge

developer conducted all of the studies used in the meta-analysis. Most studies of Core Knowledge presented outcomes in terms of NCE scores, standardized scores, actual effect sizes, or the percent of students passing a state assessment, rather than as categorical or correlational outcomes.

Contact Information:

Yolanda VanNess
Core Knowledge Foundation
801 East High Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Phone: 434-977-7550 or 800-238-3233, ext. 237
Fax: 434-977-0021
E-mail: yvancore@aol.com
Web site: <http://www.coreknowledge.org>

Different Ways of Knowing

Developer: Galef Institute

Primary goal: Raise students' academic achievements and improve their attitudes toward their school.

Main features:

- 1) An interdisciplinary arts-infused curriculum.
- 2) Development of multiple intelligences.
- 3) Promotion of collaborative learning and higher-order thinking.
- 4) Increase in independent research and engaged learning time.

For grades K-8. Materials are provided.

Costs:

Costs are based on the partnership-building plan created with a given district or cluster of schools. The average cost is \$87,512 for the first year of the adoption of the Different Ways of Knowing. This cost covers professional development, including staff release time, and other services provided by the developer. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK) is fairly limited, including only two evaluations of the reform within three states: Kentucky, California (San Francisco and Los Angeles), and Massachusetts (Boston and Cambridge). The reform has been implemented in urban areas in many schools serving minority students. In a few cases, we were sent data tables or executive report/summary report without any data. This information, though, did not provide clear information that could be used to calculate effect sizes. Of the two studies included in our analysis, one used a one-group pre-post design and the other employed a district-based comparison. The developer conducted one of the two evaluations. The research was of good quality. Research methods and samples were described clearly and outcomes were provided in good detail, including group means, sample sizes and standard deviations. All of the evaluations presented outcomes in terms of mean test scores.

Different Ways of Knowing

Contact Information:

Lin Shakir
The Galef Institute
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 20th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90036
Phone: 323-525-0042
Fax: 323-525-0408
E-mail: lshakir@galef.org
Web site: <http://www.dwoknet.galef.org/>

Direct Instruction

Developer: Siegfried Engelmann (University of Oregon)

Primary goal: Improve academic performance so that by fifth grade, students are at least a year and a half beyond grade level.

Main features:

- 1) Field-tested reading, language arts, and math curricula.
- 2) Highly scripted lesson strategies.
- 3) Extensive writing.
- 4) Highly interactive lessons presented to small groups of students, flexible grouping students by performance level, frequent assessment of student progress, no pull out programs.

For grades K-6. Detailed materials provide by publisher.

Costs:

The cost of implementation in the first year for Direct Instruction is \$254, 201. This amount covers professional development, including staff release time; materials; and additional staff. However, schools can decrease the amount by reassigning a current staff member to serve as the facilitator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Direct Instruction (DI) is very extensive and of very good quality. In our search, we found 48 separate studies of DI that presented results amenable to meta-analysis. About half of the studies deemed not useful for our purposes were deemed so simply because they were reviews or reanalyses of previous research, and the other half because the research was presented without sufficient detail to calculate an effect size. DI evaluations mostly occurred in high-poverty or high-minority contexts, both urban and rural, but have occasionally been conducted in less disadvantaged sites. DI evaluations have been conducted in a number of states throughout the U.S., including Texas, Florida, Illinois, and California. Most of the researchers described their research methods and samples clearly, and presented outcomes in excellent detail, including group means, standard deviations, and sample sizes. Of the 48 studies in our analysis, most involved district comparisons or quasi-experimental matched-group comparison designs. A small number relied on the less preferred one-group pre-post design. Two studies used an experimental design with random assignment to treatment and control groups. The developer generated less than 10% of the outcomes. About two-thirds of the studies of DI presented outcomes in terms of mean test scores or actual effect sizes, and a little less than a third

Direct Instruction

presented outcomes as categorical, with a small fraction presented as correlational. Also, most studies presented the actual sample sizes and group standard deviations, and only occasionally did we have to impute a sample size or standard deviation.

Contact Information:

Kurt Engelmann
National Institute for Direct Instruction
PO Box 11248
Eugene, OR 97440
Phone: 877-485-1973 or 541-485-1973
Fax: 541-683-7543
E-mail: kurt@nifdi.org
Web site: <http://www.nifdi.org>

Edison Schools

Developer: Chris Whittle and the Edison Project Design Team.

Primary goal: Create innovative schools that operate at current public school spending levels and provide all students with an academically excellent education rooted in democratic values.

Main features:

- 1) Contracts with school districts or charter schools.
- 2) Schools within schools.
- 3) Challenging curriculum utilizing traditional and non-traditional approaches.
- 4) Instruction tailored to meet individual students' needs.
- 5) Emphasis on computer technology.
- 6) Schools use Success for All reading program and the University of Chicago math program.

For grades K-12. Broad ranges of curricular materials are provided as part of the design.

Costs:

The school incurs no additional costs. Instead, the school district pays Edison Schools the same amount per pupil as it spends on other pupils in the district. For example, if the average per-pupil operating revenue in a district is \$5,000, Edison receives \$5,000 for each student who chooses to enroll in its schools (plus whatever Title I, special education, and other funding would normally flow to the school). The developer provided this information.

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base is somewhat extensive, due in large part to the annual reports produced by the developer that provide data for a large number of Edison schools. In our search, we found 13 separate evaluations of Edison Schools. Of those 13 studies, 8 focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. Of those eight studies, five provided independent samples and data that were not duplicated in other studies and were included in the final analysis. The evaluations of Edison Schools mostly occurred in moderate to high-poverty or moderate to high-minority contexts in urban, suburban, and rural settings across the United States. Most of the researchers

described their research methods and samples clearly and outcome data were presented in good detail. Within each study, multiple methodologies were used. For the clear majority of outcome data we had to impute standard deviations and sample sizes. Most of outcomes presented in the developer's annual reports examined cohort-level data. Only a few studies followed a true longitudinal sample, namely the research of Miron and Applegate. Seventy-five percent of the outcome data was based on a one-group pre-post design. A quasi-experimental matched-group comparison design, a comparison of Edison Schools to non-Edison Schools using a pre-post design, pre-post comparisons with demographically similar neighborhood schools, and pre-post comparisons to district averages were used in the remaining 25% of the outcomes. Most of the outcome data (69%) was provided by the developer, as the Edison annual reports presented outcomes on almost every Edison school. Outcomes were presented in terms of effect sizes, mean percentile scores, or percent passing on a state-developed test.

Contact Information:

Edison Schools
5211 Fifth Avenue, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10175
Phone: 212-419-1600
Web site: <http://www.edisonschools.com>

***Expeditionary Learning
Outward Bound***

Developer: Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound

Primary goal: High achievement for all students.

Main features:

- 1) Challenging learning expeditions that involve authentic projects and fieldwork.
- 2) High expectations for all students.
- 3) Shared decision-making.
- 4) Regular review of student achievement and level of implementation.

For grades K-12. Materials provided.

Costs:

The cost for implementing Expeditionary Learning varies with the size of the school and the number of participating schools in the district. In the first year, a school with 25 faculty members and 500 students would pay \$84,386 (\$3,375 per faculty member). Costs are higher if there are less than three or four participating schools in the district. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

In our search, we found nine separate studies of Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB) that evaluated the program. Of those nine studies, six focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. ELOB research has been conducted in several states including 3 schools in Portland, ME; 1 school in Boston, MA, 4 schools in Dubuque, IA, 1 school in Decatur, GA, 1 school in Denver, CO; 1 school in New York City; 2 schools in Memphis, TN, 5 schools in Cincinnati, OH, and in San Antonio, TX. The developer conducted only one study. Various methodologies were employed. One study used a quasi-experimental matched-group comparison design, one study used

***Expeditionary Learning
Outward Bound***

a district comparison, and four studies employed a one-group pre-post design. Four of the studies were true longitudinal designs and one employed a cohort design. The other study used both cohort and longitudinal data. Almost one third of the outcomes involved a cohort analysis. About three fourths of the data were presented in terms of mean test scores and one fourth were categorical outcomes. In many studies, actual sample sizes and standard deviations were not presented. For nearly half of the cases we had to impute sample sizes, and over 60% of the time we had to impute standard deviations.

Contact Information:

Greg Farrell, President
Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound
100 Mystery Point Road
Garrison, NY 10524
Phone: 845-424-4000
Fax: 845-424-4280
E-mail: greg_farrell@elob.org
Web site: <http://www.elob.org>

High Schools that Work

Developer: Southern Regional Education Board in Atlanta, Georgia

Primary goal: Increase the achievement of career-bound students by blending the content of traditional college prep studies with quality vocational and technical studies.

Main features:

- 1) Upgraded academic core.
- 2) Common planning time for teachers to integrate instruction.
- 3) Higher standards/expectation.

For grades 9-12. Specific materials are suggested to guide schools in making changes but not provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost for adopting High Schools that Work is \$50,007. This amount covers the average cost for professional development, technical assistance, assessment, materials, and an estimated amount that schools should set aside for expenses, such as teacher release time. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

High Schools that Work (HSTW) has an extensive research base, with 45 evaluations of student achievement that were included in our synthesis. The developer, though, has conducted all but one of the studies, and nearly all have used the less-preferred one-group pre-post design. The evaluation literature includes studies conducted in 54 schools in Virginia, 119 schools in West Virginia, 112 schools in Georgia, 100 schools in Kentucky, 28 schools in Maryland, 33 schools in South Carolina, 70 schools in North Carolina, 55 schools in Tennessee, 40 schools in Oklahoma, 74 schools in Louisiana, 40 schools in Florida, 56 schools in Alabama, 20 schools in

High Schools that Work

Arkansas, 7 schools in Delaware, 12 schools in Hawaii, 19 schools in Indiana, 9 schools in Kansas, 25 schools in Massachusetts, 4 schools in Ohio, 27 schools in Pennsylvania, and 53 schools in Texas. Most of the studies employed the same type of analysis: a cohort design that tracked the progress of HSTW schools by examining the outcomes of successive senior classes from year to year. The studies that were not amenable to meta-analysis lacked standard deviations or other information necessary to calculate an effect size. In some cases, only posttest data were reported with no comparison groups, no pretests, or no other reference from which to estimate the value-added effect of the model. For most of the studies it was necessary to impute a sample size. A little over half of the outcomes were categorical and a little less than half involved mean test scores.

Contact Information:

Scott Warren, Director of CSRD
Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street NW
Atlanta, GA 30318
Phone: 404-875-9211
Fax: 404-872-1477
E-mail: scott.warren@sreb.org
Web site: <http://www.sreb.org>

High/Scope Primary Grades Approach to Education

Developer: David P. Weikart

Primary goal: Provide children with effective, developmentally sound learning experiences in all curriculum areas and to be sensitive to their backgrounds, strengths, and interests.

Main features:

- 1) Small group instruction, active learning, learning centers, observational and portfolio assessment
 - 2) Manipulative materials
 - 3) Technology integration
- For grades K-3.

Costs:

The first-year cost for adopting High/Scope is \$135,435. This is based on an estimate of one year of professional development, including estimated teacher release time; materials; and consultant travel expenses. Costs the schools pay the developer are negotiated on an individual basis and are influenced by the number of classrooms in the school and travel costs for High/Scope trainers. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

Information on High Scope is often associated with the Perry Preschool Project, but some information is available on the program's impacts on K-3 students. High Scope is one of several models, along with Direct Instruction, that has a very long evaluation history. The early data on High Scope were part of the 1970s Follow Through

High/Scope Primary Grades**Approach to Education**

evaluation of 10 school designs. Only one study provided data from the 1990s. High Scope has been evaluated in schools in Denver, Chicago, New York, Seattle, Leflore County, MS, Central Ozark, MO, Oskaloosa County, FL, and Richmond, VA. More than half of the outcome data are from matched comparison studies and one third used comparison groups and covariate-adjusted outcomes. The developer conducted two of the four studies in our meta analysis. One of the studies involved a cohort design and three used a true longitudinal design. For data from one of the studies, the standard deviation had to be imputed. All outcome data were presented as mean test scores and no categorical or correlational outcomes were provided.

Contact Information:

Gavin Haque
High/Scope Education Research
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, MI 48198
Phone: 734-485-2000
Fax: 734-485-0704
E-mail: gavin@highscope.org
Web site: <http://www.highscope.org>

Integrated Thematic**Instruction**

Developer: Susan Kovalik

Primary goal: Apply current brain research to teaching strategies and curriculum to develop responsible citizens.

Main features:

- 1) Reform is based on current brain research and use of multiple intelligences.
- 2) Year-long theme to integrate curriculum.
- 3) Enriched school and classroom environment.
- 4) Lifelong guidelines and LIFESKILLS.
- 5) Learning tied to locations and issues in the community.

For grades K-12. A full line of books and materials are available for purchase.

Costs:

The first-year cost for implementing Integrated Thematic Instruction is \$61,235. This cost provides for a start-up package, on-site coaching, an initial training for three associates, seminars for three associates, and on-site training. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

Integrated Thematic Instruction (ITI) has a research base that is mostly focused on the implementation of the reform and the goals behind the program. We did, though, find two useful studies with achievement data. One study employed a matched-group quasi-experimental design and the other involved a single-group pre-post comparison. Researchers other than the developer conducted the evaluations of ITI, including one doctoral dissertation. All of the presented information was longitudinal in design. One of the studies did not include standard deviations and these data were imputed. All

***Integrated Thematic
Instruction***

of the data were presented as mean test scores. The data for ITI were derived from schools in Lebanon, IN and Texas.

Contact Information:

Jane McGeehan
Susan Kovalik & Associates, Inc.
17051 SE 272nd Street, Suite 17
Covington, WA 98042
Phone: 253-631-4400
Fax: 253-631-7500
E-mail: skovalik@oz.net
Web site: <http://www.kovalik.com>

MicroSociety

Developer: George H. Richmond

Primary goal: Prepare students to become active, caring, responsible citizens by multiplying opportunities for success.

Main features:

- 1) Allows children to create a miniature society in the school.
- 2) Adapts instruction to real world experience.
- 3) Incorporates democratic ideals and entrepreneurship in a culturally sensitive community.
- 4) Helps children develop positive attitudes toward learning, school, themselves, and their community.

For grades K-8. Training materials are provided.

Costs:

The start up cost for the first year of implementing Microsociety is \$67,450. This amount covers travel for three to the annual conference, supplies for agencies and ventures, and the basic cost for 20-40 teachers at Level II. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

In our search, we found nine separate studies of Microsociety that evaluated the program. Of those nine studies, three focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. Microsociety schools exist in urban, suburban, and rural settings in schools in El Paso, TX; Detroit, MI; Monroe, Silverdale, Tacoma, Port Orchard and Edmonds, WA; 3 schools in Jacksonville, FL; Winterville and Athens, GA, Glendale and 2 in Phoenix, AZ; Boaz, AL; and Las Vegas, NV. The developer conducted all three studies amenable to meta-analysis. Two of these studies were reports stating that the school had made national Blue Ribbon status. The Blue Ribbon program identifies and recognizes schools that are models of excellence and equity, schools that demonstrate a strong commitment to educational excellence for all students, and that achieve high academic standards or significant academic improvement over five years. The other study involved provided data for Microsociety schools across several states. Most outcome data were based on a one-group pre-post design and in half of the cases a

MicroSociety

cohort design was used to measure achievement gains. Imputation for missing standard deviations was not often necessary, but one study that provided about half of the outcome data did not include sample sizes and required imputation. A little over one third of the results were based on categorical outcomes and the remaining results involved mean test scores.

Contact Information:

Katherine Primus, Director of Business Development

MICROSOCIETY

13 South Third Street, Suite 500

Philadelphia, PA 19106

Phone: 215-922-4006

Fax: 215-922-3303

E-mail: kprimus@microsociety.com

Web site: <http://www.microsociety.org>

Modern Red Schoolhouse

Developer: The Modern Red Schoolhouse Institute, Nashville.

Primary goal: High achievement for all students through development of a coherent instructional program aligned with state standards and implementation of school governance practices that support school improvement.

Main features:

- 1) Differentiated instruction.
- 2) Data-based schoolwide planning process.
- 3) Alignment with state standards and assessments.
- 4) Participatory governance structure (leadership team and task forces).
- 5) Integration of instructional technology.
- 6) Parent and community partnerships

For grades K–12. Some materials and training provided.

Costs:

The cost for the first year of implementing Modern Red Schoolhouse (MRS) is \$223,988. This includes an average fee for training and technical assistance, an estimated cost for technology, and estimated release time for training (assuming that all teachers participate in five days of training and groups of eight teachers participate in 25 days of training). These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

Six studies amenable to meta-analysis exist concerning the achievement effects of Modern Red Schoolhouse (MRS). MRS has been evaluated in Title I schools with large minority populations in New York City, Gallup, NM; San Antonio TX; Miami, FL; Memphis, TN, Hagerstown, MD; Pompano Beach, CA and Jackson, MS. Three fourths of the outcome data relied on the school district as the comparison group, a small percentage of the research used a one-group pre-post design, and an even smaller percentage of outcome data were generated from matched-comparison group studies. Three fourths of the studies used a cohort design. Three of the six useful studies were produced by the developer, meaning that about half of the outcome data was produced by the developer and the other half was generated by other researchers.

Modern Red Schoolhouse

Imputation of sample size was necessary in three of the six studies, comprising three fourths of the available outcome data for MRSH, but no standard deviations required imputation. In most cases, standard deviations were not required for computation of effect sizes, as over 90% of the results was based on categorical data and only 9% was based on means and standard deviations.

Contact Information:

Modern Red Schoolhouse
208 23rd Avenue North
Nashville, TN 37203
Phone: 888-275-6774 (ext. 17) or 615-320-8804 (ext. 17)
Fax: 615-320-5366
E-mail: info@mrsh.org
Web site: <http://www.mrsh.org>

Montessori

Developer: Maria Montessori

Primary goal: Help each child reach his or her fullest potential.

Main features:

- 1) Multi-age groups.
 - 2) Self-correcting, manipulative materials.
 - 3) Open time, free choice of activity, and learning driven by child's interests.
 - 4) Work matched to child's developmental level.
 - 5) Interdisciplinary curriculum.
- For grades PreK-8. Specialized materials replace textbooks, workbooks, and dittos.

Costs:

The start-up cost for becoming a Montessori school is \$939,723. This amount provides a school with 18 classrooms key books (in place of text books), materials, furniture, training, and para-professionals. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

Though the research base for the Montessori preschool model is fairly extensive, the amount of research evaluating the effectiveness of the Montessori model in elementary schools is somewhat sparse. In our search, we found 19 separate evaluations of the Montessori school reform model. Only 4 of the 19 studies focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From those four studies, two were found to be useful for computing an effect size. One involved Cincinnati, OH schools and the other took place in a North Texas district. Researchers studying the Montessori reform model described their research methods and samples clearly and their outcomes were presented in adequate detail. One study looked at all alternative schools in the district, of which Montessori was one. In this study, Montessori schools and the other alternative schools were compared to all non-alternative schools in the district. In the second study, kindergarten through third-grade Montessori students were compared to students matched on gender, race, and grade from a traditional elementary school.

Montessori

Sample sizes were given in both studies. Race/ethnicity information was reported for the schools in one of the two studies. Both studies presented outcomes in terms of NCE scores. Effect sizes were computed based on the NCE population standard deviation of 21.06, or from the results of an analysis of covariance. Researchers other than the developer conducted both of the studies.

Contact Information:

David Kahn
Montessori Public School Consortium and
North American Montessori Teachers' Association (NAMTA)
13693 Butternut Road
Burton, OH 44021
Phone: 440-834-4011
Fax: 440-834-4016
E-mail: davidjkahn@aol.com
Web sites: <http://www.montessori-namts.org> (NAMTA)
<http://www.amshg.org/> (American Montessori Society)
<http://www.ami.edu> (Association Montessori Internationale)

Onward to Excellence

Developer: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL)

Primary goal: Help schools build capacity through shared leadership for continuous improvement.

Main features:

- 1) School leadership teams.
- 2) Two-year improvement process, curriculum mapping, and school profiles (data on student achievement).
- 3) Effective practices research.

For grades K-12. Materials are provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost for implementing Onward to Excellence is \$75,010. This cost covers half of the two-year professional development fee, estimated expenses for staff release time, travel for the developer staff, and a quarter-time facilitator's salary. The first-year cost can be reduced if a current staff member is reassigned to the role of quarter-time facilitator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Onward to Excellence and Onward to Excellence II (OTE) is composed of four developer-compiled case studies. The OTE evaluations have included schools in urban, rural, and suburban areas in Snoqualmie Valley, Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Calhoun, Columbus, Lowndes, Neshoba, and Philadelphia school districts in Mississippi, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming. The research presented on OTE is based solely on the one-group pretest-posttest design. Two of the studies used a cohort design and two used a true longitudinal design. Sample means and standard deviations had to be imputed for all of the studies, as this information was not provided in the reports. A little less than one third of the outcomes were based on categorical outcomes and the rest were based on mean test

Onward to Excellence

scores.

Contact Information:

Robert E. Blum, Director
School Improvement Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: 503-275-9615
Fax: 503-275-9621
E-mail: blumb@nwrel.org
Web site: <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/ote>

Paideia

Developer: Mortimer Adler

Primary goal: Prepare students to be lifelong learners, to earn a living, and to be citizens of this country and of the world.

Main features:

- 1) Socratic seminars,
- 2) Didactic instruction,
- 3) One-on-one coaching.

For grades K-12.

Costs:

The first-year cost to implement Paideia is \$152,104. This cost covers professional development, including teacher release time, and the salary of a full-time facilitator. The first-year cost can be reduced if a current staff member is reassigned to the role of full-time facilitator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The Paideia research base is not extensive, but it is of good quality. Paideia has been evaluated in Cincinnati, OH, Chicago, IL, Memphis, TN, and in school districts in North Carolina. The four studies that provided quantitative reports of student achievement outcomes were performed by researchers other than the developer. Two of the studies used a one-group pre-post design. One study, though, a doctoral dissertation by Tarkington, employed a true randomized design. Other outcome data were derived from a comparison with a matched control group and a comparison of Paideia outcomes to those for the district as a whole. Almost all Paideia outcomes were from longitudinal designs. In all cases, sample sizes were provided and in 80% of the cases, standard deviations were available. The remaining 20% of the outcomes required imputed standard deviations for the effect size calculations. All outcomes were based on mean test scores.

Paideia

Contact Information:

Terry Roberts
National Paideia Center
University of North Carolina Greensboro
PO Box 26171
Greensboro, NC 27402
Phone: 336-334-3831 or 336-334-3729
Fax: 336-334-3739
E-mail: tdrober3@uncg.edu
Web site: <http://www.paideia.org>

Roots & Wings

Developer: Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers from Johns Hopkins University. Now based at the Success for All Foundation in Baltimore.

Primary goal: To ensure that all children learn to read, acquire basic skills in other subject areas, and build problem solving and critical thinking skills.

Main features:

- 1) Research-based, prescribed curriculum in the areas of literacy, math, and social and scientific problem solving.
- 2) Integrated science and social studies program.
- 3) One-to-one tutoring, family support team, cooperative learning, on-site facilitator, and building advisory team.

For grades K-6. Mostly all materials provided. Training required.

Costs:

The first-year cost for implementing Roots & Wings is \$281,288. This includes: professional development, including teacher release time; materials; and salaries for a full-time facilitator; and three tutors. However, schools can reduce the cost by reassigning current staff to serve as the full-time facilitator and/or reading tutors. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Roots & Wings (R&W) is modest and of moderate quality. In our search, we found six separate studies of R&W that presented data amenable to meta-analysis. Most of the studies deemed not useful for our purposes were deemed so simply because they were reviews of previous research, not because the research was presented poorly. R&W evaluations mostly occurred in high-poverty or high-minority contexts, both urban and rural, but have occasionally been conducted in less disadvantaged areas and have included bilingual students and English language learners. R&W evaluations have been conducted in several cities and states throughout the US, including Memphis, Cincinnati, California, and Texas. Most of the researchers studying R&W described their research methods and samples clearly and generally presented outcomes in sufficient detail, though frequently we did have to impute sample size or standard deviation in order to calculate an effect size. Some of the R&W studies used a quasi-experimental matched-sample design, but most involved district comparisons, and a small handful relied on the less preferred one-group pre-post design. About two thirds of the outcome data were generated by the developer, a somewhat higher rate than for the CSR literature as a whole. Most studies

Roots & Wings

of R&W presented outcomes in terms of mean test scores or actual effect sizes, rather than as categorical or correlational outcomes.

Contact Information:

Roots & Wings
Success For All Foundation
200 West Towsontown Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21204
Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-324-4444
E-mail: sfainfo@successforall.net
Web site: <http://www.successforall.net>

School Development Program

Developer: James Comer, Yale University, New Haven, CT.

Primary goal: Mobilize entire community of adult caretakers to support students' holistic development to bring about academic success.

Main features:

- 1) Three teams (school planning and management team, student and staff support team, parent team)
 - 2) Three operations (comprehensive school plan, staff development plan, monitoring and assessment)
 - 3) Three guiding principles (no-fault, consensus, collaboration)
- For grades K-12. Training and manual with materials.

Costs:

The School Development Program contracts with districts for the participation of four or more schools. The cost for one school for the first year of implementation is \$46,881. This includes workshops for five teachers and the principal, including release time; technical assistance; a fee to the developer; and the salary of a quarter-time facilitator. Schools can reduce the cost by reassigning a current staff member to serve as the facilitator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for the School Development Program (SDP) is extensive and of very good quality, in general. In our search, we found 38 separate studies that evaluated the SDP. Of those 38 studies, 18 focused on student achievement as an outcome and the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other student outcomes. From those 18 studies, 10 were useful for evaluating the effects of the reform on student achievement. Most of the studies not amenable to meta-analysis did not present the information needed to compute an effect size, such as means or standard deviations. The evaluations mostly occurred in high-poverty or high-minority contexts and were generally within urban settings. From the 10 studies in our meta-analysis that reported location data, the evaluations were conducted in the following urban areas: Detroit, MI, Benton Harbor, MI, Prince George's County, MD, Miami, FL, and New York, NY. One other study stated its locations as East Coast, West Coast, and Southeast Coast. The quality of the research ranged from good to very good. Most of the researchers described their research methods and samples clearly, however, outcomes were not

*School Development
Program*

always presented in good detail. Within some studies, multiple methodologies were used. Means or effect sizes were provided for most of the studies. However, sample sizes and standard deviations were imputed for 60% of the outcomes used in the meta-analysis. For our analyses, 72% of the data were based on quasi-experimental matched-group designs. The rest of the data were based on one-group pre-post designs. Researchers other than the developer provided a little more than a third of the outcome data, a somewhat lower rate than for the CSR literature as a whole. Studies presented outcomes in terms of effect sizes, mean percentile scores, raw scores, and percent passing on a state-developed test.

Contact Information:

Beverly Crowther, Research Associate
School Development Program
53 College Street
New Haven, CT 06510
Phone: 203-737-4008
Fax: 203-737-4001
E-mail: beverly.crowther@yale.edu
Web site: <http://www.schooldevelopmentprogram.org>

Success for All

Developer: Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers from Johns Hopkins University. Now based at the Success for All Foundation in Baltimore.

Primary goal: Guarantee that every child will learn to read.

Main features:

- 1) Research-based, prescribed curriculum in the areas of reading, writing, and language arts.
- 2) One-to-one tutoring, family support team, cooperative learning, on-site facilitator, and building advisory team.

For grades PreK-8. Mostly all materials provided. Training required.

Costs:

The first-year cost for implementing Success for All is the same as the cost for Roots & Wings, \$281,288. This includes professional development, including teacher release time; materials; and salaries for a full-time facilitator; and an average of three tutors. However, schools can reduce the cost by reassigning current staff to serve as the full-time facilitator and/or reading tutors. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base for Success for All (SFA) is very extensive and of very good quality. In our search, we found 42 separate studies that presented data amenable to meta-analysis. Most of the studies that were not useful for our purposes were deemed so simply because they contained samples or data that were already included in other research, not because the research was presented poorly. The evaluations mostly occurred in high-poverty or high-minority contexts, both urban and rural, but have occasionally also been conducted in less disadvantaged areas and have included bilingual students and English language learners. SFA evaluations have been

conducted in many cities and states throughout the U.S.: Baltimore, Philadelphia, Memphis, California, and Texas are five of the most heavily researched areas. Most of the researchers studying SFA described their research methods and samples clearly, and presented outcomes in good detail, including group means, standard deviations, and sample sizes. Of the 57 SFA studies, most involved quasi-experimental matched-group comparison designs, some as complex as matching individual students across matched comparison schools. Only a handful of studies relied on the less preferred one-group pre-post design. A little less than half of the outcomes were reported by researchers other than the developer, a rate that is essentially the same as that for the CSR literature as a whole. Most studies of SFA presented outcomes in terms of mean test scores or actual effect sizes, rather than as categorical or correlational outcomes. Also, most studies presented the actual sample sizes and group standard deviations. Only occasionally did we have to impute a sample size and rarely did we have to impute standard deviations.

Contact Information:

Success For All Foundation
200 West Towsontown Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21204
Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-324-4444
E-mail: sfainfo@successforall.net
Web site: <http://www.successforall.net>

*Talent Development
High Schools*

Developer: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University and Howard University

Primary goal: Improve achievement and other outcomes for at-risk students in large high schools.

Main features:

- 1) Ninth grade Success Academy, career academies for grades 10-12
- 2) Core curriculum in a four-period day
- 3) Twilight school

For grades 9-12. Supporting materials are provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost for a school of 500 students to adopt Talent Development High School is \$59,382. This cost covers professional development, including teacher release time and stipends; materials; building renovations; discretionary funds; and additional staff. However, schools can reduce this cost by reassigning current staff to fill the role of the half-time organizational facilitators. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

At the time we completed our search, there was not a great deal of research available for Talent Development High School (TDHS). Through our search, we found four separate developer-conducted studies of TDHS. Of those four studies, one focused

***Talent Development
High Schools***

on student achievement as an outcome while the rest focused on implementation, theory, or other outcomes important to TDHS such as school climate. The evaluation of TDHS occurred in a high-poverty, high-minority context in an urban reconstitution-eligible school in Baltimore, MD. The quality of this study was good. Research methods and samples were described clearly, however, standard deviations were not provided for some outcomes. These outcomes had to be excluded from the meta-analysis. The school analyzed in the TDHS evaluation was compared to other high schools in the district. The data reported and compared in this study were the percentages of students who had passed the Maryland state functional test.

Contact Information:

James McPartland
Talent Development High Schools
3003 North Charles Street, Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21218
Phone: 410-516-8800
Fax: 410-516-8890
E-mail: jmcpartland@csos.jhu.edu
Web site: <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/tdhs/index.htm>

The Learning Network

Developer: Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.

Primary goal: Support school wide changes in teachers' theory and practice that lead to improved learning outcomes for children.

Main features:

- 1) Built into each school is a mechanism for continuous professional development.
- 2) Use of classroom observation, action plans, and instructional dialogue as the vehicle for change.
- 3) Focus on literacy as key curricular area
- 4) Emphasis on the Literacy Learning Model: assessment, evaluation, planning, and teaching.

For grades K-8. Teacher handbooks and professional resources are provided.

Costs:

The cost of implementing The Learning Network (TLN) in the first year is \$77,342. This amount covers the training of two team leaders, travel for The Learning Network coordinator, teacher materials, a literacy seminar, release time for staff, travel expenses for the principal and TLN facilitator to attend TLN annual conference, two days with the coordinator, a literacy workshop, and extra costs for contact with TLN. These costs are derived from estimates provided by the developer.

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base on TLN consists of studies of schools with high- minority populations in rural and urban areas in Montana, Colorado, Texas, Florida, and Arizona. The developer produced case reports on schools in various districts. Almost all of the outcome data are derived from studies that employed a one-group pretest-

The Learning Network

posttest design. More than half of these outcomes were based on a cohort design and a little more than one fourth used a longitudinal design. One quarter of the outcome data required the imputation of the standard deviation, but most data did include information regarding the sample size. Half of the results were based on categorical analyses, slightly less than half were based on mean test scores, and a fraction included a mixture of the two types of data.

Contact Information:

Richard C. Owen, President
The Learning Network
Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
PO Box 585
Katonah, NY 10536
Phone: 914-232-3903
Fax: 914-232-3977
E-mail: RichardOwen@rcowen.com
Web site: <http://www.rcowen.com>

Urban Learning Center

Developer: Los Angeles United School District, United Teachers Los Angeles, Los Angeles Educational Partnership

Primary goal: Create learning environments where high-quality instruction is supported by a well-organized school strongly connected to its community.

Main features:

- 1) Thematic, interdisciplinary curriculum.
- 2) Transitions from school to work and postsecondary education.
- 3) Integrated health and human services on site.
- 4) Collaborative governance model.

For grades PreK-12. Materials provided.

Costs:

The first-year cost for adopting Urban Learning Centers is \$176,065. This covers professional development, including teacher release time, and additional staff. However, schools can reduce the cost by reassigning current staff to serve as the part-time coordinator. These costs are derived from Herman et al. (1999).

Narrative summary of the research:

The research base on Urban Learning Centers consisted of three developer-conducted evaluations of centers in Los Angeles. All results were based on a one-group pre-post design. Two of the studies used a longitudinal design and the other study used a cohort design. The reports did not provide standard deviations and rarely provided student sample sizes. These omissions necessitated imputation for every outcome included in the meta-analysis. All outcome data were based on mean test scores.

Urban Learning Center

Contact Information:

Rita Flynn, Director

Urban Learning Centers

315 West 9th Street, Suite 1110

Los Angeles, CA 90015

Phone: 213-622-5237, ext. 274

Fax: 213-629-5288

E-mail: rflynn@laep.org

Web site: <http://www.urbanlearning.org>
