Career and Technical Education
Promising Practices Initiative

Sponsored by the Maine Department of Education,
Division of Career and Technical Education,
and the Maine Association of Career and Technical Educators

Featured Promising Practice:
Literacy Integration Across the Curriculum

Maine CTE Centers
working with this *Promising Practice*:
United Technologies Center, Region 4

Mid-Coast School of Technology, Region 8

October 2006

Promising Practices descriptions and mini-case studies developed by
Julie Meltzer, Director of Literacy Research and Development for
Public Consulting Group's Center for Resource Management, Portsmouth, NH.

PUBLIC CONSULTING GROUP
CRM CENTER FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
SOLUTIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE

PROMISING PRACTICE: *LITERACY INTEGRATION ACROSS THE CURRICULUM*

Description

CTE teachers provide reading and writing instruction and opportunities/expectations to read and write in every course. CTE classes provide authentic contexts for literacy learning. Each CTE program area provides students with the opportunity to read a variety of types of text—articles, textbooks, Internet sites, manuals, etc. Academic rigor is promoted through asking students to read, write, speak/present, and think about projects they complete and the topics of study they address in their CTE program.

There are common literacy expectations for all program areas (e.g., common portfolio requirements; specified amounts and types of expected reading and writing; speaking/presenting requirements scored using a common rubric; use of common vocabulary development strategies) and specific supports to meet the types of literacy demands of each area (e.g., a focus on diagnostics and analysis; a focus on math literacy; a focus on reading; applying information from complicated tables and graphs). Metacognition, critical thinking, and problem solving are expected in conjunction with all reading, writing, speaking/presenting, and learning.

Why Is This a *Promising Practice*?

"Adolescents entering the adult world in the 21st century will read and write more than at any other time in human history. They will need advanced levels of literacy to perform their jobs, run their households, act as citizens, and conduct their personal lives. They will need literacy to cope with the flood of information they will find everywhere they turn. They will need literacy to feed their imaginations so they can create the world of the future. In a complex and sometimes even dangerous world, their ability to read will be crucial. Continual instruction beyond the early grades is needed" (Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999)[1].

In the last few years, several policy reports in education, business, and government have drawn direct connections between literacy development and academic, career, and life success.[2] Responding to the challenge of supporting all students to develop the literacy habits and skills necessary to meet the demands of the 21st century will require that schools think *systemically*. Leaving literacy development up to chance is not a good option. What is needed? Intensive interventions for struggling readers and writers coupled with deliberate ongoing literacy support in all classrooms and program areas are needed.

CTE centers face an additional challenge and responsibility to develop literacy habits and skills within the context of CTE classes. Many of the students who come to CTE centers are not strong readers, writers, and thinkers; in fact, they are referred to career and vocational education as an alternative hands-on learning environment. But, CTE centers also have an advantage—they can tie the need to develop literacy skills to career demands and they are a motivating context for learning for the students who attend. CTE centers have the ability to connect purpose, teach academic and literacy skills in context, and promote rigor and relevance simultaneously. This means that CTE centers have the potential to launch successful school-

[1] Moore, D. W., Bean, T., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). Adolescent Literacy: A position statement for the Commission on Adolescent Literacy of the International Reading Association. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

[2] See, for example, the ACT Report (2006). *Reading for college and reading for work: Same or different?*; College Board (2004). *Writing: A ticket to work or a ticket out*; National Governor's Association (2006). *Reading to Achieve: A governor's guide to adolescent literacy*; Alliance for Excellent Education (2002). *Every child a graduate;* Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2004) *Learning for the 21st century.*

wide efforts that improve students' reading, writing, presenting, and thinking skills while preparing them for specific career paths.

Setting up a successful school-wide program requires simultaneous attention to many fronts. Irvin, Meltzer, and Dukes (in press)[3] say that leaders need to set up structures and policies to support both strategic interventions for struggling readers and writers, along with literacy development across all classrooms/program areas. They describe five actions that school leaders of a successful literacy initiative need to take:

- Have a good literacy action plan
- Support teachers
- Use data
- Build leadership capacity
- Allocate resources

Biancarosa and Snow (2004)[4] outline instructional and infrastructural elements key to effective school-wide efforts at improving adolescents' literacy skills. These include:

Instructional Improvements

- Direct, explicit comprehension instruction
- Effective instructional principles embedded in content
- Motivation and self-directed learning
- Text-based collaborative learning
- Strategic tutoring
- Diverse texts
- Intensive writing
- A technology component
- Ongoing formative assessment of students

Infrastructure Improvements

- Extended time for literacy
- Professional development
- Ongoing summative assessment of students and programs
- Teacher teams
- Leadership
- A comprehensive and coordinated literacy program

In the case of literacy integration, providing teacher professional development and on-site support for teachers and students will be essential. In the case of improving academic rigor, time, structures, expectations, and teacher knowledge will be key. Both involve new ways of thinking on the part of teachers, leaders, and students. Fullan (2000)[5] and others discuss the structures, policies, and resource supports that need to be in place to support cultural shifts from "doing business as usual." Strong leadership is critical to build collaborative energy around the work and ensure that adequate and appropriate resources are there to support the effort.

What Does It Look Like in Maine?

In Maine, two CTE centers are putting this school-wide approach in place. The first of the two mini-case studies describes an initiative launched this past year. The second represents work that has been underway for several years. What differentiates this promising practice from others is the *systemic nature of the implementation from the beginning of the initiative.* That is, the work began with putting expectations and structures in place *across the school.*

[3] Irvin, J., Meltzer, J., & Dukes, M. (in press). *A Leadership Model for Improving Adolescent Literacy.* Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

[4] Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. E. (2004). Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York . Washington, DC:Alliance for Excellent Education. Accessed July 26, 2006 at http://www.all4ed.org/publications/ReadingNext/ReadingNext.pdf

[5] Fullan, M. (2000). Leading in a culture of change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Note: Implementation of this promising practice in each of the two centers involved elements of three of the other approaches described in the Promising Practices project (use of an on-site academic/literacy specialist, teacher professional development, academic/literacy integration). For both centers, the goals of increasing academic rigor and ensuring literacy development are highly intertwined.

Promising Practice in Action: *Literacy Integration Across the Curriculum*

United Technologies Center (UTC)[6]
Vocational Region 4
Bangor, ME
Greg Miller, Director

- **Location:** North-central Maine on an independent campus
- **Student population:** varies between 450 and 550 students
- **Sending schools/districts:** 7 public and 2 private high schools

    - **Program focus:** Increasing literacy development and academic rigor in every program area.

Greg Miller, UTC's director, was enthusiastic about what has been put in place school-wide to support increased academic rigor and literacy development. During the 2005–06 school year, a new expectation for students to spend 50% of their time on hands-on projects in the shop and 50% of their time on academics was put into place with a new speaking/presentation requirement, inclusion of some type of research/inquiry in all programs, and an explicit focus on critical thinking and problem solving. Although several instructors were already doing some or all of these, making implementation a school-wide effort changed the culture of the school. According to Miller, the changes were necessitated by the fact that students need to be prepared for the 21st century workplace. He explained that the curriculum is driven by industry and that the school listened carefully to the advisory board for each program, which is made up of local employers in that field. There was an emphasis on professionalism and on the ability to work independently. Most of the 17 programs focused on industry standards and certification requirements. "This led to some school-wide decisions. It's not that many of the teachers weren't already doing it, but that we now say we are doing it and making it more important to do. The 50–50 academic/hands-on split seems to be about right. If we go over 50% on the academic side, we'll lose them. If we do less, we're shortchanging them. They tolerate the 50–50 without choking on it."

What It Looks Like in Action

One day in May 2006…

- Teachers were happy to discuss what students have worked on and how they have tried to help students improve the quality of their work. Several described what they have planned to do next year to build on what occurred during 2006. A focus on critical thinking and problem solving was evident. A five-student team came in after break and continued, without teacher prompting or direction, to work together to solve a robotics problem. A student in the auto repair program asked a question and the instructor turned it right back to the student: "So what does that tell you? What are your options?" Students discussed how to frame the window in the super energy-efficient house project they were working on. This interdisciplinary project required research on insulation, mechanical systems, and heating systems. Blueprints were created on the computer. Two students discussed how to solve an animation problem. "I think you could try it in FLASH MX because when I did it, it worked and it gave me the flexibility to make the other motions I wanted [the character] to make." Three students were critiquing a music video that one had just produced. Their comments were specific and respectful and the student producer thanked them and worked on making some suggested changes at the editing board.

[6] This mini case study is based on information gathered from conversations with UTC staff, document review, and data collected during on-site visits in May 2006.

- That year all program areas at UTC required students to do presentations. Presentations needed to be keyed to the Maine Learning Results and a common rubric was used for assessment. In auto repair, for example, students were asked to select the topic in the 2nd quarter, do a rough draft in the 3rd quarter, and do the presentation and pass in a written report on what they did and what they learned in the 4th quarter. In a nearby darkened room, a student presented a PowerPoint presentation on hybrid cars. When the student asked if there were questions, other students asked several and a lively peer-to-peer discussion ensued. In culinary arts, the instructor described the one week, end-of-year presentation project: students select a product, research it, make a sample, develop a poster or a PowerPoint, and present the food to the class. Practice at public speaking came earlier during the year through serving customers in the restaurant.

- Posters relevant to each program area were on the walls. Some of the classrooms had word walls. Some teachers asked students to read articles from trade journals, although most saw this as "an extra." Many teachers assigned chapters in the text and asked students to answer the questions. Vocabulary development, expectations about the presentation, and use of strategies were all decided by each individual teacher. There was enthusiasm for working on literacy development among many of the teachers. But teachers needed to expand their repertoires of strategies so they would have more tools to support students' growth as readers and writers within the context of each program area. In the words of the student services coordinator: "People see the need, but they don't yet have the strategies."

There were suggested pre-requisites for all program areas listed in the 2006–07 courses of study. The director explained that these are to help students to understand that "this is what you need to know to succeed." UTC worked with local community colleges to get some course credits for some of their certification courses, and students can be dual enrolled in some cases. There is no doubt expectations were high—and getting higher. Three instructors described, without prompting, how they planed to "up" their expectations next year—in one class, students will be expected to read more; in another, they will be expected to do more presentations; in a third, they will be expected to design to a higher level of criteria.

Supports for Struggling Students

There were special education students in all programs. The student services coordinator monitored all IEP's of special education students from sending schools and assisted teachers to know the needs of the students. According to the director and the coordinator, there were successful special education students in all programs. The NWEA MAP test results provided information to help staff determine where additional literacy and math support was needed.

During the 2005–06 school year there was a pilot Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA) program. Three students, all in the welding program, met once per week with an LVA tutor during class time. It is planned that the program will expand to ten students sometime in the fall of 2006. Training for volunteers included information about adult learning theory, learning disabilities, strategies, resources, and the reading process, as well as an overview of materials and how to set up and plan the tutoring sessions.

Academic Resource Center

About 90 of the school's 500 students use the Academic Resource Center, designed for credit recovery or to help students who missed essential credits at their own school. The center ran like an independent study lab with support. There were reading and writing assignments and templates on the computer. Students scheduled time out of their shops to work on these other courses; if they completed the work, they received the credit.

Use of Data
Last fall, UTC gave the NWEA reading survey test for the first time to all of its students and teachers received their students' lexile scores. Next fall all of the math, reading, and language use subtests will be given at the beginning and end of the year.

Next Steps
- Establish clear expectations for the amount, scoring, and use of scaffolding strategies for reading, writing, vocabulary development, and presenting in all program areas.
- Provide professional development for all staff to expand teachers' understandings about literacy and showcase additional strategies they can use.
- Continue having outside consultants come in and work with the staff on a regular basis.
- Continue to build the literacy expertise of on-site staff and find ways to make them available as resources to teachers.
- Use data to inform instruction and to monitor progress.
- As the NWEA is put in place in the spring and fall
  - Distribute the information to the teachers.
  - Provide training to teachers on the NWEA, lexile scores, and use of data.
  - Establish a plan for discussing students' reading levels with them and "creating the need" for them to improve their reading.
- Ensure there is at least one set of trade journals available in each program area.
- Share literacy strategies at every Wednesday faculty meeting during the 2006–07 school year.
- Establish a professional library on-site for teachers to use.
- Establish common reading and writing components across programs to be included in career portfolios.

For more information, contact Greg Miller, Director, or Sandy Gemmel, Student Services Coordinator.

Promising Practice in Action: *Literacy Integration Across the Curriculum*

Mid-Coast School of Technology (MCST)[7]
Vocational Region 8
Rockland, ME
Tim Hathorne, Director

- **Location:** Independent building on the seacoast
- **Student population:** 300 students on-site; another 150 are served off site
- **Sending schools/districts:** 7 (3 are island districts)

    - **Program focus:** Literacy integration across the curriculum

Under the leadership of director Tim Hathorne, MCST has been working on integrating literacy development into all CTE program areas for several years. Literacy, at MCST, is defined as "reading, writing, math, and critical thinking." The benefits are clear. "Quite simply," says Hathorne, "students are doing higher quality work."

Getting Started

The path to a program that fully integrated literacy into all CTE program areas did not happen overnight—nor was it straightforward.

Some milestones of the process:

1999–00 The School-Based Learning Team (SBLT) at MCST was established and met monthly. During the first two years there was a focus on instructional planning and design and portfolio development.

2001–02 An all-school portfolio requirement was implemented by vote of the faculty. Assessment tools (rubrics, checklists), a mission statement, vision statement, and code of conduct were also developed that year.

2002–03 Jean Lawrence (SBLT chair) was hired as Staff Development Coordinator and the SBLT began to look at the lack of math and reading skills some students brought to MCST. Monthly meetings continued with up to 85% of the staff voluntarily attending. There were also twice monthly staff development workshops and faculty meetings once per month. Staff met frequently—this was a big shift. The SBLT "recognized a literacy problem and decided to study it" by reading a variety of texts together. Based on this study, a common definition of literacy was adopted (Meltzer, 2001, p. 6). The team also decided that baseline testing should be done using the WRAT to assess students' skill levels in math, reading, and spelling, and that trade magazines should be ordered for all programs.

2003–04 The SBLT lexiled all texts and recommended the use of Bloom's Taxonomy in the classrooms. Jean Lawrence and Tim Hathorne worked with literacy consultant, Dr. Candice Bray, to get input on specific literacy strategies that teachers could use and direction for how to continue to deepen the literacy improvement focus.

2004–05 MCST was selected to be part of the Model Schools Program. The school implemented the Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) at the beginning and end of the year, which provided all students with a lexile score. Teachers in each program area adapted the idea of bellwork from Dr. Harry Wong. Lawrence created and shared literacy model lessons with staff. The Lexile Framework was hung up in every classroom. Exhibitions and presentations began in the English and medical science classrooms and grew to several other program areas. Lawrence conducted a

[7] This mini case study is based on information gathered from multiple conversations with MCST staff, document review, review of student work, and data collected during a site visit in April 2006.

Literacy in the Content Areas workshop for BRVC educators in February 2005. Lawrence and Hathorne played a leadership role for academic instructors at CTE centers in the state Maine Association of Vocational Education Administrators (MAVEA) organization.

2005–06 Literacy assessment in reading and math was increased to fall, mid-year, and end of year. Re-emphasis of the literacy focus, the focus on the use of Bloom's Taxonomy, and the teachings of Harry Wong's *Effective Teacher* series occurred. Twenty-five common strategies the faculty had researched and been using were put together into a booklet in March 2006 and "refresher" training on the strategies was done to promote renewed emphasis. Teachers were asked to reflect on SRI results mid-year and to continue or alter the use of strategies based on the results of student performance compared with scores at the beginning of the year. Teacher professional development and support from the professional development coordinator was ongoing.

Components of Literacy Integration

At MCST, a strong set of 12 common practices was embedded within all program areas:

1. Common set of literacy support strategies—25 common reading comprehension and vocabulary development strategies have been identified and are known and used by teachers and students. This includes Word Walls in every classroom. Many of the strategies include an emphasis on critical thinking and use of the upper levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.
2. All work projects have a writing component.
3. Career portfolios completed in every program area have common required written elements— personal essay, resume, letter of application, list of references, written reflections on work completed.
4. Career portfolios completed in every program area have common required reading elements, for example, a career explorations section for articles that the student read that contributed to career selection and planning.
5. Scaffolding of writing assignments—special education and students with weak reading and writing skills use worksheets that guide reflective reading and writing from which more independent writing can be developed. Many assignments are "chunked."
6. Bellwork—instructors use the first few minutes of classroom time to have students focus on a reading, writing, or math assignment related to the topic at hand.
7. Focus on vocabulary—vocabulary discussions, use of Word Walls, and expectations that students use technical vocabulary in the shops and the classroom all assist vocabulary development in each program area and support content-area reading comprehension.
8. Article responses—all areas have trade magazines and use articles from the Internet for students to respond to and make connections with. Instructors develop short guided reading assignments for various articles that everyone in the class reads, or students choose articles to respond to and discuss/present to the class.
9. Presentations—students in most program areas are expected to do presentations and demonstrations. This occurs informally as students present articles they have read to their peers using a specific protocol. More formal presentations and demonstrations are scored using rubrics and the feedback is provided to the students. For example, four-point rubric provided to students in the Tech I and II classes included the following categories: *organization, content knowledge, visuals,* and *preparation.*
10. Common use of rubrics—common rubrics have helped both instructors and students focus on clarifying expectations and recognizing levels of quality. They are used to evaluate common portfolio elements and support school-wide development of student habits of reflection and metacognition ("thinking about your thinking"—a critical habit for a quality worker, reader, or writer).

11. Lexiling of all texts—MCST has lexiled all texts and is developing an online library of lexiled articles so they can match students with texts at their lexile level and/or know when scaffolding or use of strategies will be needed to help students understand what they read.
12. Reading assessment three times per year—recognizing that just knowing where students begin or end is not enough, MCST has instituted a mid-year assessment to allow instructors to respond appropriately to growth patterns through continued support or changes in instruction.

What It Looks Like in Action

At MCST there were bookmarks with the school's logo and motto: "Education through **applied learning**—where academic literacy finds meaning." For MCST, the definition of literacy included reading, writing, and math literacy. To know what was talked about, one only had to visit the maze of classrooms and shops that make up MCST. Students were *busy* at MCST—creating, fixing, designing, reading, writing, discussing, problem solving—amidst the whir of machinery and the echoes of hammering. Most were quite articulate when asked to describe what they were working on. There was a clear belief in the importance of student choice—students work on different projects or project components, read various articles, research different topics—depending on interest and, perhaps as a result, student engagement was high. Words and expectations for high quality work in the classroom and in the shop were everywhere.

- In the carpentry classroom, the words on the white board included: *miter joints, tenons, tang, oilstones.* There was a reading assignment in the NCCER textbook—Section 3, p, 52–53. Students recently completed a research project to develop and price out a tool list. The bellwork assignment was portfolio related.

- In the precision machinery classroom, the word wall included: *traverse, rate of feed, arbor cutters, shank cutters, facing cutters, side cutters*. Students self-assessed their work against criteria and added to their portfolios. Required portfolio contents and some math problems were on the board. The instructor said: "No matter what they do in here, it's all math-based." Every week or two he has students: 1) pick an article (copies of trade journals were scattered around on the tables and the shelves); 2) identify their own key words and answer questions; and 3) figure out the procedure or actually make the part or describe how it is done. "Once they get started, they love the magazines and are always looking at them." A glance at the portfolio requirements revealed that for each project, students were to include a procedure sheet, a blueprint, sketch or drawing, a photo and comparison sheet, a photo with a written description, a work sample summary, and a project feedback form.

- In the auto collision classroom, the words on the word wall included: *isocyanates, viscometer, Zahn cup, mill thickness*. The instructor explained about a three-part project that students completed that quarter in which they 1) selected an article which was connected to what they were working on and current; 2) filled out a reading guide as they read the article; and 3) presented an oral presentation to the other students about the article. The goal was to stress the importance of "reading the literature so they keep current." Students received a packet with a planning worksheet, a speaker's checklist, a self-evaluation sheet, and a rubric for the oral article presentation. Presentations were evaluated using a rubric which showed how well they met the criteria. "It worked well, it really, really did. I would do it again. I wasn't too sure about it but they did a great job."

What Teachers Said

"Kids in this class have to do a lot of reading—they have to know how to get it, where to find it, and how to apply it. I make them read before we even start doing a project…They don't give me much trouble about the reading. Just keep it in the content area and you're fine."

"Students have to be able to read the tables and the diagrams, know how to interpret the information and where to find the relevant information."

"I don't accept 'do you have a thingy?'—I don't even acknowledge that…Make-up work is always reading. They choose. I say "make it something that will excite me," not the latest model of Yamaha, but something about a diesel motorcycle. I ask them to read and highlight the information that is interesting and going to make it different. Then I check what they highlight."

What Students Said
Students seem mostly unfazed by the reading, writing, and math focus at MCST. One student said: "There's a lot more reading and writing and math. I knew math was involved but I didn't know it would be that extreme." The following quotes are from students who were in classes during the April 28, 2006 site visit.

About reading at MCST:
"The reading here is much more beneficial than reading Shakespeare. It's interesting. I can understand it." …"It's very straightforward, tells you the facts. It's written in 'English' and I'm just more interested in it." …"Here I read and it's about construction. At the high school it's like literature and stuff. I like reading here better than at the high school. I don't really like to read. You need to pay attention to everything but [in the reading we do here] there are pictures and diagrams."

About writing at MCST:
"Writing is different here because we actually use it. I used my portfolio to get a job. I just started there. They do the same stuff we do here. I know exactly what they're talking about."

About achievement:
"I do better academically here than at the high school—by far."… "Coming here got me out of trouble, it really did." …"Wish I'd come here sooner."

Academic Classes
MCST offers technical English classes for credit, utilizing a range of literacy support strategies and the PLATO system to provide instruction. The literature anthologies contain pieces related to work and career settings, and ethical dilemmas and the projects are connected to the student's CTE program area. Research skills, presentation skills, close reading, writing, and other academic literacy skills are the focus of the curriculum. Math classes are also taught at MCST for students who cannot take them at their sending high school.

Use of Data
"Data-driven decision-making is key" says Hathorne. MCST tests all students using the SRI to get a lexile score for each student. Teachers have taken the test themselves and they talked to the students about the importance of the test so they won't "blow it off." Students were retested at mid-year and again at the end of the year to track growth in reading. Teachers were asked at mid-year to look at how many of their students have grown as readers since the beginning of the year and what types of instruction they think contributed to this growth. Then they were asked to look at the students making little or no progress and to determine how instruction should change to better support the growth of these students as readers. MCST provides close and personal accountability and parallels the types of self-assessing programs students are asked to do. MCST also used the WRAT math test to track student progress.

Improving Academic Rigor
The reading, writing, presenting, and self-assessing demanded in all program areas increases the rigor of whatever is being taught. Every program has the Maine Learning Results (MLRs)

that are integrated into it posted as part of the course description. For example, there was a scope and sequence overview of the teaching plan by quarter for program competencies that outlines the learning tasks, MLRs taught and assessed, and the types of reading and math activities that support the instruction of each area. When students do a work sample for their portfolio, they are required to list the relevant MLRs they have addressed during the project.

Additional Supports in Place
There were on-site technical English classes, an integrated Medical Science/English program where students received credit for both subjects, ongoing professional development, and participation by the majority of teachers in the school-based learning community (SBLT). Both Lawrence and Hathorne placed articles in teachers' mail boxes relative to the importance of academic and literacy integration to prepare students for the 21st century workplace; emphasized the importance of data-driven decision-making; and found resources for professional development, trade magazines, assessments, and other key supports.

Evidence that It Makes a Difference
Evidence of teacher buy-in to the notion of academic and literacy integration into all program areas was readily seen on a quick tour, as was evidence of student engagement and the common literacy integration components. All scope and sequence documents included literacy supports. But is it making a difference for student achievement? Hathorne and Lawrence claimed that SRI and WRAT end-of-year trend data showed a steady increase in reading and math scores over the past three years. MCST is in the process of looking at additional ways to use the data it has collected to support individual student progress. The center wants to document and track how well it serves students across the board, and which types of learners meet with success, given program supports. Preliminary data from last year showed that the majority of students made gains as readers based on SRI data. More planning and analysis are needed for current data to serve adequately for progress monitoring.

Next Steps
Continue to:

- Develop a more comprehensive data analysis and progress monitoring system.
- Use the Successful Schools Network membership to support emphasis on literacy integration.
- Review schedules for island students and students from sending schools, and utilize technology to ensure that the academic and literacy integration is not inadvertently left out of their program of study.
- Review, on a rotational basis, the common practices, requirements, and strategies to ensure ongoing effectiveness.
- Provide teachers with professional development.
- Ensure that new teachers are introduced to, and supported to use, common practices and skills.
- Strengthen communication with the sending schools/districts and develop, where possible, more understanding of MCST offerings, goals, and expectations.

For more information, contact Tim Hathorne, Director, or Jean Lawrence, Staff Development Coordinator.