

Revised  
November 2006

# Executive Summary

THIS MATERIAL IS EXTRACTED FROM *CSRQ CENTER REPORT ON MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM MODELS*

<http://www.csrq.org>

OCTOBER 2006



AMERICAN  
INSTITUTES  
FOR RESEARCH®

The contents of this report were developed by the Comprehensive School Reform Quality (CSRQ) Center, which is operated by the American Institutes for Research (AIR), under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education, AIR, or the CSRQ Center.

# CSRQ Center Report on Middle and High School Comprehensive School Reform Models

## Executive Summary

Education must improve for all students in the United States—particularly poor and minority students who attend middle and high schools. The accountability requirements established by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 translate this need into an urgent imperative. So far, however, most of the attention has focused on initiatives aimed at improving elementary schools. Only recently have policymakers, researchers, foundations, and a variety of other organizations begun to attend to the challenging work of improving middle and high schools. The implementation of NCLB in high schools focuses on closing the achievement gap, putting high-quality teachers in every classroom, and empowering parents.<sup>1</sup>

The *CSRQ Center Report on Middle and High School Comprehensive School Reform Models* is a first-of-its-kind, scientifically based, consumer-oriented review of the effectiveness and quality of 18 widely implemented school improvement models. These models provide several approaches to whole-school improvement. Several models focus on districtwide implementation within a “feeder” system in which students in elementary schools transition to middle schools and then transition to a particular high school. Other models focus on implementing different strategies only at the middle or high school level, such as small learning communities. Some middle and high school reform models call for a rigorous standards-based curriculum but do not prescribe particular curricula; others include

<sup>1</sup>For more information about NCLB and high schools, see “No Child Left Behind and High Schools” at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/hs/nclb.html>.



AMERICAN  
INSTITUTES  
FOR RESEARCH®

The Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center (CSRQ Center) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, through a Comprehensive School Reform Quality Initiative Grant (S222B030012), and is operated by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) (<http://www.air.org>). Since 1946, AIR—a not-for-profit social science research and technical assistance organization—has engaged in a variety of research, evaluation, technical assistance, and communication projects that help to make research relevant to education policymakers and practitioners. The views expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education, AIR, or the CSRQ Center.

For more information on the CSRQ Center or to download reports, visit our Web site (<http://www.csrq.org>), contact us via e-mail ([csrqa@air.org](mailto:csrqa@air.org)), or call our toll-free telephone number (866-544-8686).

curricula as part of their products and services. Furthermore, several middle and high school whole-school improvement models offer intensive literacy and math courses for students who are below grade level when they enter middle and/or high school. Middle schools focus on preparing students for rigorous high school-level coursework, and high schools prepare students for academically demanding courses, such as Advanced Placement and advanced math.

Eighteen models are reviewed in this report:

- Accelerated Schools PLUS
- America's Choice School Design (America's Choice)
- ATLAS Communities
- Coalition for Essential Schools
- Expeditionary Learning
- First Things First
- High Schools That Work
- Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP)
- Making Middle Grades Work
- Middle Start
- Modern Red SchoolHouse
- More Effective Schools
- Onward to Excellence II
- Project GRAD
- School Development Program
- Success for All–Middle Grades
- Talent Development High School
- Turning Points

Together, these models operate in thousands of schools throughout the United States.

Each model is profiled and rated in five main categories, with three subcategories under Category 1 and two subcategories under Category 5:

- **Category 1.** Evidence of positive effects on student achievement:
  - a. Evidence of positive overall effects
  - b. Evidence of positive effects for diverse student populations
  - c. Evidence of positive effects in subject areas
- **Category 2.** Evidence of positive effects on additional outcomes
- **Category 3.** Evidence of positive effects on parent, family, and community involvement
- **Category 4.** Evidence of link between research and the model's design
- **Category 5.** Evidence of services and support to schools to enable successful implementation:
  - a. Evidence of readiness for successful implementation
  - b. Evidence of professional development/technical assistance for successful implementation

This consumer-oriented guide provides education stakeholders with a decision-making tool that can help them sort through the range of middle and high school reform models that are available to support whole-school or districtwide improvement. Nine of these models also serve elementary schools and were reviewed in *CSRQ Center Report on Elementary School Comprehensive School Reform Models*, which was released in November 2005 and has an updated release scheduled for fall 2006. (CSRQ Reports are available online at <http://www.csrq.org/reports.asp>.) This guide reviews evidence about the implementation of 18 models at the middle and high school levels. As with all reports from the Comprehensive School Reform Quality (CSRQ) Center, these reviews are intended to clarify options, not to point to or endorse best buys from among the reform models that are profiled.

### Background on Whole-School Improvement

For the past decade, increased attention has focused on finding effective strategies to improve schools and student achievement. Whole-school improvement, often referred to as comprehensive school reform, is one approach. It has been tried in thousands of schools nationwide, mostly for high-poverty students in low-performing schools.

This trend is driven by the recognition that school improvement efforts are complex and require a coordinated, systematic approach that addresses every aspect of a school, including curriculum; instruction; governance; scheduling; professional development; assessment; and parent, family, and community involvement. Rather than use individual, piecemeal programs or approaches, effective whole-school improvement is meant to integrate research-based practices into a unified effort to raise student achievement and achieve other important outcomes, such as reducing dropout rates or improving behavior. To support implementation, whole-school improvement models typically provide schools with materials, professional development, and technical assistance.

Given the increased emphasis on accountability for results that was established by NCLB, education decision makers are continually searching for new and more effective school improvement options. This interest is likely to heighten in the coming years as NCLB's "restructuring" provisions begin to take effect for thousands of schools.

The 18 middle and high school whole-school improvement models described in this report are of great interest to decision makers because of the models' claims that they are research-based and provide the training and other supports needed to encourage a coordinated approach to achieve student success. The research evidence indicates that some whole-school improvement models are more effective than others and results vary greatly—even for effective models—depending on the quality of implementation (see Desimone, 2000).

### The CSRQ Center's Rating System

The production of this report was guided by the CSRQ Center's Quality Review Tool (QRT). The QRT provides the criteria and procedures for independent, fair, and credible model reviews. The QRT development process involved several steps.

First, the CSRQ Center's staff developed review frameworks in consultation with some of the nation's most respected education researchers, program evaluators, and school improvement experts. The QRT also drew on previous and current efforts to conduct rigorous research reviews, including standards set by the U.S. Department of Education's What Works Clearinghouse. Then, the QRT was reviewed and revised with the help of the CSRQ Center's Advisory

Committee, a nationally respected panel of experts that includes leading education practitioners, methodologists, and researchers from a variety of fields, including education, sociology, psychology, and economics.

Using the QRT, the CSRQ Center applied separate rubrics for each of the five categories of effectiveness and quality (listed previously) to arrive at its ratings, which are expressed by a set of symbols. In general, the rubrics resulted in the following ratings:

- **Very strong** rating is symbolized by a fully shaded circle (●). This is the “highest” rating provided by the CSRQ Center.
- **Moderately strong** rating is symbolized by a three-fourths shaded circle (◐). This is the “second highest” rating.
- **Moderate** rating is symbolized by a half-shaded circle (◑). Models that receive this rating may still have notable evidence of positive outcomes but not as strong as those that receive the ratings above.
- **Limited** rating is symbolized by a one-fourth shaded circle (◒). This rating indicates that while the CSRQ Center found some evidence of effectiveness, more rigorous research needs to be conducted on the model to fully support its effectiveness or quality for the category reviewed.
- **Zero** rating is symbolized by a circle with a horizontal slash (⊘). This rating means that while the CSRQ Center found evidence that allowed it to provide a rating for a category or subcategory, none of the studies were of sufficient quality to be counted as reliable evidence.
- **Negative** rating is symbolized by a circle with a minus sign (⊖). This rating indicates that the CSRQ Center found strong evidence of detrimental effects in a given category or subcategory. In practice, the CSRQ Center did not find any evidence of this kind for any model.
- **No rating** is symbolized by “NR” in a circle (Ⓝ). This rating indicates that the model has no studies (i.e., evidence) available for review for a category or subcategory.

### The CSRQ Center’s Findings

The rating process for Categories 1, 2, and 3 is complex and combines two elements to provide a single rating:

- The strength of the evidence based on the causal validity of the research design (e.g., how reliable and credible is it)
- The strength of the reported impact or effect (e.g., does the model raise student achievement a little or a lot)

The CSRQ Center identified few rigorous studies that were relevant for rating each model’s overall evidence of positive effects on student achievement for middle and high school students. In Category 1, after screening approximately 1,500 studies and documents for quality, only 42 studies met the CSRQ Center’s standards for rigor of research design. (Table 1 summarizes the quantitative study findings that were used to rate evidence of overall positive effects on student achievement.) These 42 studies represent 14 of the 18 models.

For Category 1 (Evidence of Positive Effects on Student Achievement), the CSRQ Center rated the models as follows:

- **Five models as *moderate*:** America's Choice, First Things First, School Development Program, Success for All–Middle Grades, and Talent Development High School
- **Five models as *limited*:** Expeditionary Learning, KIPP, Middle Start, More Effective Schools, and Project GRAD
- **Eight models as *zero*:** Accelerated Schools PLUS, ATLAS Communities, Coalition of Essential Schools, High Schools That Work, Making Middle Grades Work, Modern Red SchoolHouse, Onward to Excellence II, and Turning Points

In reviewing the findings for Category 1, readers should keep in mind that many of the models in the report serve high-poverty students in low-performing schools. Thus, the evidence of effectiveness that the studies present is for success in educating students in highly challenging conditions.

The research base on which to rate models in Categories 2 (Evidence of Positive Effects on Additional Outcomes) and 3 (Evidence of Positive Effects on Parent, Family, and Community Involvement) is sparse.

Category 4 rated evidence of a link between research and the model's design. The rating system for Category 5 (Evidence of Services and Support to Schools to Enable Successful Implementation) depended on two subcategories: (a) evidence of readiness for successful implementation and (b) evidence that the model provider offers professional development and technical assistance to enable successful implementation. The same rating scale and symbols were used to rate Categories 4 and 5 as were used to rate Categories 1–3; however, the meanings of the ratings are category specific.

Although the CSRQ Center contacted each model provider to verify information to complete ratings in Categories 4 and 5, two models (Expeditionary Learning and KIPP) did not participate in such conversations. Thus, these models received no rating in Categories 4 and 5.

For Category 4, the CSRQ Center rated the models as follows:

- **Fourteen models as *very strong*:** Accelerated Schools PLUS, America's Choice, First Things First, High Schools That Work, Making Middle Grades Work, Middle Start, Modern Red SchoolHouse, More Effective Schools, Onward to Excellence II, Project GRAD, School Development Program, Success for All–Middle Grades, Talent Development High School, and Turning Points
- **One model as *moderately strong*:** Coalition for Essential Schools
- **One model as *limited*:** ATLAS Communities

For Category 5a, the CSRQ Center rated the models as follows:

- **Seven models as *very strong*:** America's Choice, ATLAS Communities, First Things First, More Effective Schools, School Development Program, Success for All–Middle Grades, and Turning Points

- **Seven models as *moderately strong*:** Accelerated Schools PLUS, Coalition of Essential Schools, High Schools That Work, Middle Start, Modern Red SchoolHouse, Project GRAD, and Talent Development High School
- **Two models as *moderate*:** Making Middle Grades Work and Onward to Excellence II

For Category 5b, the CSRQ Center rated the models as follows:

- **Thirteen models as *very strong*:** Accelerated Schools PLUS, ATLAS Communities, Coalition of Essential Schools, First Things First, High Schools That Work, Modern Red SchoolHouse, More Effective Schools, Onward to Excellence II, Project GRAD, School Development Program, Success for All–Middle Grades, Talent Development High School, and Turning Points
- **Three models as *moderately strong*:** America’s Choice, Making Middle Grades Work, and Middle Start

Given the importance of implementation to the success of any whole-school reform, consumers who select models that have low rankings in evidence of positive effects on student outcomes may still experience success if the models are implemented faithfully. Table 2 summarizes basic model information and model ratings for Categories 1–5.

## Conclusions

To date, education stakeholders at the national, state, and local levels have had few objective, rigorous, and consumer-friendly sources to turn to when making choices from among the models that are available for adoption. This report serves as a consumer guide to help meet this need and is the first-ever comprehensive review of middle and high school whole-school improvement models.

Sorting through and making sense of claims made by researchers and model developers is hard work, even for research scientists with years of training and experience. Despite substantial advances in developing standards and processes for judging and adding up the evidence in education, areas of disagreement exist in the research community. To prepare this report, the CSRQ Center reviewed nearly 1,500 articles, abstracts, and summaries of existing studies on 18 widely implemented middle and high school whole-school improvement models. To conduct the analysis, the CSRQ Center used rigorous standards that are aligned with the requirements for scientifically based research established by NCLB.

Even when the procedures necessary for reviewing and comparing large numbers of studies exist, the process is often complex and painstaking. Therefore, education decision makers often turn to others, such as the CSRQ Center, to sort through the evidence and report it as actionable information. Readers should keep in mind the following points and limitations as they use this guide as a decision-making tool:

- **Only five models profiled in this report have a solid body of evidence about their effectiveness.** In many instances, the evidence base for middle and high school whole-school improvement models is just emerging, particularly for models most recently introduced on a large scale. Compared with *CSRQ Center Report on Elementary School Comprehensive School Reform Models*, this report fully reviews less than one fourth as many studies (42 vs. 157) and has a slightly smaller sample size (18 vs. 22). Some of the new models may not have had enough time to demonstrate their full value. Therefore, the “jury is out” on the effectiveness of many



middle and high school models. What is clear is that any model that claims to improve student achievement will be increasingly challenged to demonstrate effectiveness based on rigorous studies.

- **The CSRQ Center’s standards were deliberately set very high.** In an environment that requires scientifically based research for model adoption decisions, particularly for schools with a history of low performance, consumers can be confident that the models in this report were reviewed against stringent standards. The CSRQ Center is encouraged that more than half of the models in this report achieved a rating of limited or moderate in terms of evidence of positive overall effects. This indicates that—despite the difficulties in providing improvement support or of conducting rigorous research in complex organizations, such as secondary schools—a number of models can demonstrate a positive impact on the students whom they serve.
- **The same high standards are used in all reports from the CSRQ Center.** With the release of this report, readers now have an opportunity to compare the ratings of nearly 50 distinct approaches to improve outcomes in elementary and secondary schools. For the first time, education decision makers can compare “apples to apples” on key dimensions that they care about, such as improved achievement outcomes, strong implementation support, effective professional development, solid links between research and the model’s design, and involvement of parents and the community. Although models deliver services differently to achieve these outcomes, the models can now be judged by the same performance standards.
- **A low rating does not necessarily mean that a model is less effective than a model with a high rating.** A low rating may mean that a model’s effectiveness has not yet been established through rigorous research. In addition, as noted previously, solid implementation is often the key to strong outcomes. The past few years have seen an increase in the quantity and quality of studies that models can provide to demonstrate their effectiveness and quality. However, middle and high school model providers must continue to conduct research to ensure consumers that their models (a) may work under some conditions and (b) do work under most conditions. Only the results of systematic, rigorous evidence based on well-established scientific standards can provide this assurance.

The purpose in providing ratings in the CSRQ Center’s reviews is to expand and clarify options for decision makers, not to dictate choices by picking winners and losers. Models that receive low ratings in one category may receive high ratings in other categories. Education consumers should take a holistic view of the evidence presented across all five categories to make decisions about meeting locally defined needs.

In turning to research to help sort through expanding school improvement options, the education community must have confidence that studies are well-conducted, accurate, and comparable. A reliance on solid evidence helps to meet an NCLB provision that requires school improvement efforts to be driven by scientifically based research. More importantly, using science to support decision making helps to meet the urgently felt need on the part of educators and policymakers to ensure that their efforts will succeed in improving the lives of children. The CSRQ Center issues these consumer guides with the hope that rigorous analysis and straightforward information will contribute to making research relevant to improving the education of the nation’s students.



## Reference

Desimone, L. (2000). *Making comprehensive reform work* (Urban Diversity Series 112). New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 441915)

**Table 1. Quantitative Study Findings Used to Rate Evidence of Overall Positive Effects on Student Achievement**

Comprehensive School Reform Model	Number of Studies					Number of Findings	Percentage of Positive Findings
	Initially Relevant	Eligible for Full Review	Meeting Standards	Conclusive	Suggestive		
Accelerated Schools PLUS—Secondary	13	2	1	0	1	5	0%
America's Choice School Design—Secondary	10	6	6	5	1	14	44%
ATLAS Learning Communities—Secondary	4	1	0	0	0	0	N/A
Coalition of Essential Schools—Secondary	23	4	0	0	0	0	N/A
Expeditionary Learning—Secondary	13	5	2	0	2	6	50%
First Things First—Secondary	7	2	2	2	0	6	50%
High Schools That Work—Secondary	48	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Knowledge Is Power Program—Secondary	7	2	1	1	0	3	44%
Making Middle Grades Work—Secondary	7	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Middle Start—Secondary	15	4	2	1	1	3	33%
Modern Red SchoolHouse—Secondary	4	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
More Effective Schools—Secondary	6	2	2	0	2	9	78%
Onward to Excellence II—Secondary	7	1	1	0	1	2	0%
Project GRAD USA—Secondary	7	4	2	1	1	30	23%
School Development Program—Secondary	8	3	3	2	1	4	50%
Success for All—Middle Grades—Secondary	6	2	2	2	0	5	80%
Talent Development High School—Secondary	6	4	4	2	2	8	88%
Turning Points—Secondary	6	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>95</b>	

*Note.* Some studies examined more than one comprehensive school reform model. Such studies were reviewed and counted once per model discussed. In these cases, a single study is counted more than once, and therefore, the total of the columns in this table exceeds the total number of studies reviewed.

**Key:**

**Initially Relevant:** Of the nearly 1,500 studies screened, the number of studies per model found to be relevant to this review.

**Eligible for Full Review:** The number of studies per model that used research designs that were sufficiently rigorous and included student achievement outcomes.

**Meeting Standards:** The number of studies per model considered to be *suggestive* or *conclusive* according to the causal validity rubrics of the CSRQ Center's Quality Review Tool.





















































**Conclusive:** The number of studies per model that used a rigorous research design (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental) with no critical threats to validity.

**Suggestive:** The number of studies per model that used a less rigorous research design (e.g., longitudinal) with no critical threats to validity.

**Number of Findings:** The total number of individual measured outcomes found in the studies that met the CSRQ Center's standards.


































































**Percentage of Positive Findings:** The percentage of total findings in the studies that met the CSRQ Center's standards that were statistically significant and indicated that a model had a positive impact. The N/A designation provided in this column indicates models in which zero studies met the CSRQ Center's standards.

**Table 2. Summary of Basic Information by Model**

Comprehensive School Reform Model	Grade Levels Served	Number of Schools	Year Introduced in Schools	Costs (Year 1)	Evidence of Positive Overall Effects	Evidence of Positive Effects for Diverse Student Populations	Evidence of Positive Effects in Subject Areas	Evidence of Positive Effects on Additional Outcomes	Evidence of Positive Effects on Parent, Family, and Community Involvement	Evidence of Link Between Research and the Model's Design	Evidence of Readiness for Successful Implementation	Evidence of Professional Development/ Technical Assistance for Successful Implementation
Accelerated Schools PLUS—Secondary	K–12	143	1986	\$61,500								
America's Choice School Design—Secondary	K–12	364	1998	\$80,000–\$100,000 (MS) \$85,000–\$105,000 (HS)			Reading and math:  Writing: 					
ATLAS Learning Communities—Secondary	K–12	100	1993	\$60,000–\$80,000								
Coalition of Essential Schools—Secondary	K–12	600	1984	Varies								
Expeditionary Learning—Secondary	K–12	150	1993	N/A			Reading and math:  Language arts, science, and social studies: 					
First Things First—Secondary	K–12	69	1996	\$315,000 <sup>1</sup>			Reading and math:  Communication arts:  Retention: 	Attendance, graduation, and dropout rates and school climate: teacher support, teacher engagement, student support, and student engagement: 				





































<sup>1</sup> Although this is the total cost, costs per school are based on the number of schools within a district that implement the model. These costs are shared among all of the district's schools and reduced with more schools implementing the model.

**Table 2. Summary of Basic Information by Model (continued)**

Comprehensive School Reform Model	Grade Levels Served	Number of Schools	Year Introduced in Schools	Costs (Year 1)	Evidence of Positive Overall Effects	Evidence of Positive Effects for Diverse Student Populations	Evidence of Positive Effects in Subject Areas	Evidence of Positive Effects on Additional Outcomes	Evidence of Positive Effects on Parent, Family, and Community Involvement	Evidence of Link Between Research and the Model's Design	Evidence of Readiness for Successful Implementation	Evidence of Professional Development/ Technical Assistance for Successful Implementation
High Schools That Work—Secondary	9–12	1,094	1987	\$38,400 (an additional \$32,000 for personnel)								
Knowledge Is Power Program—Secondary	5–12	52	1994	N/A			Reading, math and language arts: 					
Making Middle Grades Work—Secondary	6–8	280+	1997	\$26,672								
Middle Start—Secondary	6–8	39	1994	\$66,000 <sup>2</sup>			Reading:  Math: 					
Modern Red SchoolHouse—Secondary	K–12	344	1996	\$50,000–\$100,000								
More Effective Schools—Secondary	K–12	405	1982	\$60,000–\$90,000			Reading, math, language arts, science, social studies, and foreign language: 					
Onward to Excellence II—Secondary	K–12	1,000+	1981	\$18,000								
Project GRAD USA—Secondary	K–16	208	1993	5–7% of per-pupil costs in the school implementing the model			Reading and math: 	Graduation rates and college attendance: 				

<sup>2</sup>Cost may vary considerably beyond this depending on schools and districts' choices of Middle Start program components, intensity of engagement, and adaptations made to address particular needs and interests.

**Table 2. Summary of Basic Information by Model (continued)**

Comprehensive School Reform Model	Grade Levels Served	Number of Schools	Year Introduced in Schools	Costs (Year 1)	Evidence of Positive Overall Effects	Evidence of Positive Effects for Diverse Student Populations	Evidence of Positive Effects in Subject Areas	Evidence of Positive Effects on Additional Outcomes	Evidence of Positive Effects on Parent, Family, and Community Involvement	Evidence of Link Between Research and the Model's Design	Evidence of Readiness for Successful Implementation	Evidence of Professional Development/ Technical Assistance for Successful Implementation
School Development Program—Secondary	K–12	195	1968	Varies			Reading and math: 	Attendance rate:  Student discipline and school climate: 				
Success for All—Middle Grades—Secondary	5–8	1,510	2001	\$53,000			Reading: 					
Talent Development High Schools—Secondary	9–12	68	1994	\$82,000			Reading and math:  Writing and science: 	Attendance and grade promotion rates:  Dropout and graduation rates and student discipline:  Completion of college preparatory courses: 				
Turning Points—Secondary	5–9	71	1998	\$50,000 (up to 750 students)								

*Note.* Readers are encouraged to use this table in conjunction with the entire report, which explains in detail how the approaches were reviewed and rated. The report also provides detailed information about each model's ratings and offers in-depth descriptions of each model's services.

**Table 2. Summary of Basic Information by Model (continued)****Key:**

**Grade Levels Served:** Although this report focuses on a review of models implemented at the elementary school level, the grade levels served represents the full range of grades that the model serves.

**Number of Schools:** This reflects the number of schools using the model as reported by the model provider. This number includes all schools regardless of the length of time implemented or the level of implementation.

**Year Introduced in Schools:** This date refers to the year in which schools first implemented the model. This is included so that readers can judge whether the ratings are influenced by the relative newness of the model.

**Costs (Year 1):** The costs are estimates provided by the model provider. The full report provides additional details on costs for each model.

**Evidence of Positive Overall Effects:** This rating focuses on a model's overall effects on student achievement. The rating is a function of the number of studies that were rated as *suggestive* and *conclusive*, the percentage of findings in the suggestive and conclusive studies that demonstrated a positive impact, and the average effect size of those findings. The final rating reflects the amount of rigorous research and the strength of the effects reported in that research. The full report provides complete information about the methodology used to produce all ratings in this report.

**Evidence of Positive Effects for Diverse Student Populations:** This rating refers to positive effects for the achievement of students from diverse backgrounds, such as low socioeconomic status, minority, special needs, or English language learners.

**Evidence of Positive Effects in Subject Areas:** This rating refers to positive effects on achievement in specific subject areas, such as reading, math, writing, science, or social studies.

**Evidence of Positive Effects on Additional Outcomes:** This rating refers to positive effects on additional outcomes, such as student discipline, student attendance, school climate, retention/promotion rates, or teacher satisfaction.

**Evidence of Positive Effects on Parent, Family, and Community Involvement:** This rating refers to positive effects for improvement in family and community involvement, such as involvement in school governance, participation in family nights, or homework support.

**Evidence of Link Between Research and the Model's Design:** This rating refers to evidence that the model developer can provide explicit links between research and the core components of the model. Core components are considered essential to successful implementation.

**Evidence of Readiness for Successful Implementation:** This rating refers to evidence that the model provider ensures initial commitment from schools, tracks and supports full implementation, and helps schools allocate resources for successful implementation.

**Evidence of Professional Development/Technical Assistance for Successful Implementation:** This rating refers to evidence that the model provider offers comprehensive training opportunities and supporting materials, ensures that professional development effectively supports full model implementation, and develops the school's internal capacity to provide professional development.

 = Very Strong  
  = Moderately Strong  
  = Moderate  
  = Limited  
  = Zero  
  = Negative  
  = No Rating