



# Addressing Barriers

New ways to think . . .  
Better ways to link

# to Learning



Volume 17, Number 4

## Whole Person, Whole School

*Educating the whole child" is a phrase that has been in and out of style for over 100 years, but as the engines rev up for the re-authorization of ESEA ... At the core of the "whole child" concept is the understanding that children grow physically, emotionally, and intellectually; therefore, school should attend to all of these areas of growth.*

Center for Inspired Teaching

We have been pleased to see the American Association of School Administrators and ASCD adopt initiatives respectively for the *total* child and the *whole* child. In great part, the renewed interest in the whole student and *all* students reflects widespread recognition of major gaps related to what schools do in facilitating learning and development and in addressing interfering factors.

One result is greater attention in schools to mental and physical health concerns. This includes a growing interest in social and emotional development as a curriculum consideration, a broadening of interventions for psychosocial and health problems, and a greater emphasis on the needs of specific subgroups of students.

All this is to the good. It expands appreciation of the role schools should play in enabling all students to have an equal opportunity to develop to their fullest. In particular, it highlights what's missing in too many public schools, and it underscores the reality that concern for the whole student requires developing whole schools.

### Enhancing Equity of Opportunity for All Students Requires a Whole School

A whole school has three primary, essential, and overlapping primary components: (1) curriculum and teaching, (2) a learning supports system to address factors that interfere with learning and teaching, and (3) school governance/management. While every school pursues functions related to all three, each component continues to be the focus of what often are controversial school improvement efforts.

The *curriculum and teaching component*, for example, currently is enmeshed in the movement for Common Core State Standards for *curriculum*. This movement has generated legislative action in almost every state focusing on adopting some of the initial common core curricula arenas that have been developed.

With respect to *teaching*, the emphasis most prominently and controversially has been on accountability measures. However, a set of

updated model teaching standards have been offered through the Council for Chief State Officers. Relatedly, the Obama administration's "Race to the Top" initiative has emphasized the importance of personalizing instruction.

Attention to the *governance/management component* generally has focused on diversifying types of schools in terms of their governance and management, with a strong emphasis on business and market place models. This has included district-run schools, charter schools, contract schools managed by private for-profit and nonprofit operators, moving away from centralized decision making, and enhancing integration across grades and levels (e.g., K-16, P-16, or P-20 systems).

The *learning supports component* has a long history of marginalization in school improvement policy and practice. Indeed, it has been so neglected that it is not seen as a component. Towards establishing it as such, our Center has designed prototypes to enhance a school's ability to address factors that interfere with enhancing equal opportunity for all students to succeed at school. As conceived and under development by trailblazing states, districts, and schools, the component establishes an umbrella under which fragmented efforts to address barriers to learning and teaching can be unified and then developed into a comprehensive, multifaceted, and cohesive system of student and learning supports. The component's framework stresses a full continuum of interventions and a delineated set of six content arenas encompassing classroom and school-wide supports to strengthen students, teachers, families, schools, and the surrounding community. Common core standards currently are being proposed for this component.

Any analysis of school improvement plans and proposals underscores how far away most schools are from playing an effective role in enabling equity of opportunity – never mind filling gaps to promote whole student development. And given how many powerful economic and political forces are in pursuit of conflicting agenda for public schools, addressing equity concerns in policy and practice always is an enormous challenge.

## What Can Be Done Now

While continuing to call for policy enhancements that promote equity and a focus on whole student development, some immediate steps related to each of the three components can and need to be taken to move schools forward.

### Enhancing the Instructional Component

The primary role good teaching plays in student outcomes is widely stressed. Moreover, when the media zeroes in on a good teacher, the portrayal often suggests the individual is a world class *soloist*. This has allowed the brunt of criticism for public education's problems to fall on teachers as a group. In doing so, too many critics downplay factors that limit who chooses teaching as a profession and how little is done to enhance the effectiveness of those who become teachers.

Fundamentally, society needs to recruit and retain a substantially greater proportion of the best and brightest college graduates as career teachers and student support staff. Given this is a long-range goal, the immediate need is to enhance teacher and support staff preparation and inservice programs and give up the myth that teachers can do it alone.

The following are immediate steps for enhancing teacher and support staff effectiveness:

- **Revamp personnel preparation and continuing professional development.**

**Process** – provide (a) in-depth opportunities during preservice preparation to apprentice with master practitioners and observe others and (b) systematically build on preservice education by providing personalized inservice professional development for everyone on staff at every school (i.e., focusing on whole school improvements, personalize continuing education and include all staff).

**Content** – enhance emphasis on equity of opportunity for success at school through improving staff motivation and capability for (a) working collaboratively with others, (b) personalizing student instruction (see box below), and (c) using accommodations and special interventions when necessary (and particularly in the classroom).

- **Establish a collaborative approach in the classroom, school-wide, and with the home to enable teacher effectiveness** – enhance emphasis on how to invite in and effectively work with other teachers, student support staff, volunteers, and those at home.

### What is Personalized Learning?

Policy makers have embraced the concept of personalized learning, but personnel preparation and continuing professional development for most school personnel has not included an in-depth focus on this with respect to content or in its processes.

It is commonplace to see references to meeting learners where they are; analyses indicate the emphasis often is on *individualized* approaches that stress matching individual differences in *developmental capabilities*. In contrast, we define *personalization* as the process of accounting for individual differences in both capability and *motivation*.

Furthermore, from a psychological perspective, we stress that it is the learner's perception that determines whether the fit is good or bad. Given this, personalizing learning means ensuring learning opportunities are perceived by learners as good ways to reach their goals. Thus, a basic intervention concern is that of eliciting learners' perceptions of how well what is offered matches both their interests and abilities. This has fundamental implications for all efforts to improve education.

Discussions of personalized learning also often leave the impression that the process is mainly about incorporating technological innovations. Moreover, discussions of personalized learning often fail to place the practices within the context of other conditions that must be improved in classrooms and school-wide to address factors interfering with student learning and performance.

Based on our work over many years, we have detailed a personalized approach for classrooms. It is highlighted in a set of continuing education modules focused on *Personalizing Learning and Addressing Barriers to Learning*. See <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/personalize.pdf>

## Enhancing the Learning Supports Component

As a Carnegie task force on education stated some time ago:

*School systems are not responsible for meeting every need of their students. But when the need directly affects learning, the school must meet the challenge.*

Everyone recognizes that a variety of barriers can interfere with learning and teaching. Too often, the tendency is to think about such barriers as located inside the individual (e.g., a deficit view of students, a deficit view of teachers and school administrators). The reality, of course, is that quite often factors interfering with good outcomes in schools are contextual and systemic.

Denoting factors that can be barriers to learning and teaching in no way is meant as an excuse for poor school performance. Indeed, doing so simply underscores common sense. *While schools and districts are moving to high-quality, rigorous, grade-level instruction, their success often will depend on addressing barriers to learning and teaching, including their ability to re-engage disconnected students.*

Given the nature and scope of the many factors interfering with schools achieving their mission, there is a growing movement focused on developing a unified and comprehensive learning supports component. (See the next article in this e-journal/newsletter.)

Establishing such a component at a school involves four overlapping phases (i.e., creating readiness, initial implementation, institutionalization, and ongoing evolution/creative renewal). The following are seven steps principals and school staff can get started with right away:

- ***Create Readiness and School Site Commitment.*** Work with key stakeholders to build commitment to unifying student and learning supports into a Learning Supports Component (i.e., a component that systematically and comprehensively enables learning by addressing barriers to learning and teaching). Clarify why the component is essential and ensure that the commitment to its development is fully and realistically integrated into school improvement and other strategic operational planning. Keep in mind that building readiness and commitment is an ongoing process.
- ***Appoint a Lead for System Development.*** Assign an administrative-level *Learning Supports Lead* to begin development of the component (e.g., an assistant principal, a student support staff member). Be sure the leader's job description is revised to reflect the new responsibilities and accountabilities; provide appropriate personnel development. Be sure this leader is at administrative planning and decision making tables and component development is a regular part of the agenda.
- ***Establish a Development Team to Work with the Administrative Lead.*** Assign key staff to a component development team (i.e., a *Learning Supports Leadership Team*) to work with the leader to clarify, analyze, identify priorities, recommend resource redeployment, and establish and guide workgroups for developing each facet of the component over a period of several years.

- ***Conduct Indepth and Ongoing Analyses to Determine Gaps, Priorities, and Resource Deployment.*** Build on initial listings of current personnel and activities by doing an indepth and structured mapping of all resources the school currently uses to address barriers to learning and teaching. Then, (a) do a gap analysis with respect to available needs assessments, (b) identify immediate priorities for moving forward with improvement and system development, and (c) recommend (re)deployment of resources to meet priorities in a cost-effective manner. Be certain the decisions are reflected in all school improvement plans.
- ***Form and Facilitate Needed Workgroups.*** Elicit volunteers for workgroups and provide them with relevant professional development and support for pursuing the work. While the component development team will guide and support movement forward in establishing a comprehensive system of learning supports, the work requires the efforts of smaller workgroups to carry out specific tasks.
- ***Provide Ongoing Professional and Other Stakeholder Development.*** Include a focus on a comprehensive system of learning supports in all planning for continuous learning at the school. Provide on-the-job opportunities and special times for such learning. Delineate what those assigned to develop the component need to learn over time; ensure all others (teachers, student support staff, other staff and volunteers, community stakeholders) are included in learning about how best to address barriers to learning and teaching.
- ***Use Formative Evaluation to Support Progress.*** Ensure that a formative evaluation process is established. Such a process should encompass data on and analyses of all facets of planning and implementation related to developing a comprehensive system of learning supports. Moreover, the process should be designed to provide guidance and support to foster progress. This means monitoring all factors that facilitate and hinder progress and then ensuring actions are taken to deal with interfering factors and to enhance facilitation. As significant progress is made in developing the system, the monitoring can expand to evaluate the impact on student outcomes that are direct indicators of the effectiveness of learning supports (e.g., increased attendance, reduced misbehavior, improved learning).

### **Enhancing the Governance and Management Component**

*This component remains a minefield.* Issues of privatization and control are inextricably tied to political and economic considerations. Such factors have shaped the dominant policies for practice and accountability that are pushing the instructional component in many public schools to a narrow and test-driven curriculum and that keep learning supports marginalized.

Despite all this, schools and districts can immediately do the following:

- ***Rethink their governance and management efforts in terms of a three-component framework.***
- ***Include all three components as part of school improvement and strategic planning.***
- ***Avoid treating major innovations as yet another project or pilot.***
- ***Ensure that capacity building is strategically planned at every school in ways that systemically implement and sustain whole school development.***

## Whole School, Whole Community

Given available findings, the consensus is that schools are more effective and caring places when they have family engagement and are an integral and positive part of the community. State and local education agencies all over the country have recognized the importance of school, family, and community collaboration. The aim is to sustain formal connections and strong engagement over time.

The frequent calls for enhancing parent and community engagement with schools, however, often are not accompanied by effective action. This undercuts efforts to focus on whole student and whole school development.

*Promoting full development and well-being of students, families, and schools calls for effective collaboration with the community.* An optimal approach involves formally blending together resources of at least one school – and sometimes a group of schools or an entire school district – with local family and community resources. And, the range of community resources is not limited to agencies and organizations. Families are the core resources in a community; other resources encompass individuals, businesses, community-based organizations, postsecondary institutions, religious and civic groups, programs at parks and libraries, and any other facilities that can be used for recreation, learning, enrichment, and support. Strong family-school-community connections are critical in impoverished communities where schools often are the largest pieces of public real estate and also may be the single largest employer.

*While it is relatively simple to make informal links to accomplish specific tasks (e.g., linking with a few service agencies or after school program providers), it is much more difficult to establish major long-term collaborative partnerships.* Bringing together stakeholders is not the same as establishing an effective collaboration for developing and evolving formal and institutionalized sharing of a wide spectrum of responsibilities and resources. While relationships frequently are referred to as partnerships, too often this is a premature characterization. Some don't even constitute a meaningful collaboration. Developing partnerships involves more than articulating a complementary vision, it requires significant policy, accountability, and systemic changes that are codified in formalized contract-like agreements.

*Schools that pursue comprehensive school, family, and community collaboration represent a promising direction for strengthening students, families, schools, and neighborhoods.* Collaboration enables improving and expanding interventions to enhance learning and healthy development and address barriers to learning and teaching. Building such collaboration requires stakeholder readiness and relentless commitment, an enlightened vision, creative leadership, and new and multifaceted roles for professionals who work in schools and communities, as well as for family and other community members who are willing to make the commitment.

**Tyack and Cuban**  
describe school reform  
as *Tinkering toward Utopia*



In this age of social media, it seems  
more like *Twittering toward Utopia*.



**Whole Student,  
Whole School,  
Whole Community:  
Emergent Qualities**

The ideals that are proposed for public education must be understood as emergent qualities. Great teachers, whole students, world-class outcomes, increasingly positive school climates, community schools, etc. etc. all will only emerge from attending to and providing adequate support for a myriad of whole school and whole community every day capacity building.

It is not enough to say we want to educate the total child, ensure equity of opportunity for all students, reduce the achievement gap, increase graduation rates, have safe and drug free schools, turn all schools into community schools, and all the other ideals set forth for public education. It's good for society to have high aspirations for public education. It's not fair, however, to demand that the staff at a school be accountable for achieving those aspirations without ensuring they have sufficient economic and political support to make it so. Whatever one's agenda for transforming schools, complex systemic changes are involved and require comprehensive intervention strategies. As the 2002 mission statement of the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) stated so well

“It is not enough to say that all children can learn or that no child will be left behind; the work involves . . . *achieving the vision of an American education system that enables all children to succeed in school, work, and life.*”

For guidance in moving forward with whole school development, see the following Center resources:

- > *Personalizing Learning and Addressing Barriers to Learning*  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/personalizeI.pdf>
- > *Engaging and Re-engaging Students and Families*  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/engageI.pdf>
- > *RTI and Classroom & Schoolwide Learning Supports*  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/dbsimple2.asp?primary=2311&number=9897>
- > *Toward Next Steps in School Improvement: Addressing Barriers to Learning and Teaching*  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/systemic/towardnextstep.pdf>
- > *Fostering School, Family, and Community Involvement.*  
[http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/publications/44\\_guide\\_7\\_fostering\\_school\\_family\\_and\\_community\\_involvement.pdf](http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/publications/44_guide_7_fostering_school_family_and_community_involvement.pdf)

## **NEW DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENT AND LEARNING SUPPORTS: *Moving Forward***

One of the primary goals of our Center at UCLA is to move student and learning supports in new directions and out of the margins with respect to school improvement policy and practice. We emphasize that this can best be achieved by developing a unified and comprehensive system of learning supports to more effectively address barriers to learning and teaching and re-engage disconnected students (e.g., a system that significantly increases equity of opportunity, reduces absenteeism, and counters student and teacher dropouts).

We think two direct ways to stimulate discussion about all this is to (1) stress the pressing need for common core standards for learning supports and (2) encourage SEAs, LEAs, and schools to take a careful look at how their websites communicate to stakeholders about the efforts to address barriers to learning and teaching and re-engage disconnected students.

### ***Initiative for Common Core Standards for Learning Supports***

The pressing need for common core standards for learning supports calls for immediate action. Therefore, we have expanded our new directions initiative to encompass development of Common Core State Standards for Learning Supports. We are working with others across the country to develop *Common Core Standards for a Learning Supports Component*.

In August we sent out a request for input on prototypes for standards and related indicators and have heard from a critical mass of respondents. The group includes superintendents, principals, teachers, support staff, community agency staff, professors, and more. The initial input and available research and pioneering efforts in several states and districts have been synthesized. A refined document has been prepared and now is offered as a rationale and proposed set of Common Core Standards for a Learning Supports Component, with related quality indicators appended.\*

The work is intended to ensure that the nature and scope of a unified and comprehensive system of learning supports is understood and to guide adoption of such a system. As the proposed standards and indicators underscore, a learning supports component coalesces and systematizes what is common in all student and learning supports and provides a base upon which the needs of specific student subgroups, the contributions of various professional specialties and specific programs, and the unique considerations of localities can be built.

**At this time, we are seeking further refinements and indications of endorsement.  
Send input to [Ltaylor@ucla.edu](mailto:Ltaylor@ucla.edu)**

\*The Executive Summary is appended to this issue of the Center's e-journal/newsletter. For more on the initiative and to access the Full Document, go to the following URL  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/comcorannounce.pdf>



### *Analyzing How Well SEA, LEA, and School Websites Present Learning Supports*

Given that websites are a major window into the operation of SEAs, LEAs, and schools, it seems important in this time of increased public scrutiny for everyone to review and explore how to improve student and learning supports and enhance the way the work is presented on their websites.

On most websites, our analysis show that student and learning supports are not conceived and presented as a unified and comprehensive system. Rather, the picture that emerges is that of a highly fragmented and disconnected set of programs and services.

Thus, we have suggested that everyone take a look at their websites. And, as an aid, we have developed and are widely circulating a website prototype for a learning supports system. See <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/lweb.htm>

(Note: This prototype has been added to the Center's Rebuilding Toolkit <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/summit2002/resourceaids.htm> )

We are reaching out to make this a hot topic, so please share this as widely as you can.

At this time, we are asking everyone the following:

*Can you direct us to any websites that are good examples of a unified and comprehensive system approach to student and learning supports? (Please provide URLs)*

*What recommendations do you have for us about how to stimulate SEAs, LEAs, and schools to review their websites and think about working toward developing a unified and comprehensive system approach for addressing barriers to learning and teaching and re-engaging disconnected students?*

Take a few minutes to respond with an email to: [Ltaylor@ucla.edu](mailto:Ltaylor@ucla.edu)



## Center News



### New Resources

>**Mental Health in Schools: Moving in New Directions.** In *Contemporary School Psychology*, 16, 9-18.  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/contschpsych.pdf>

>**Addressing trauma and other barriers to learning and teaching: Developing a comprehensive system of intervention.**  
 In *Supporting and Educating Traumatized Students: A Guide for School-Based Professionals*. E. Rossen & R. Hull (Eds), New York: Oxford University Press.

>**Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) and Schools: Outline Focused on Key Questions and Concerns**  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/adhd-outline.pdf>

>**Common Core Standards for Learning Supports: Looking for Feedback from All Concerned about Equity of Opportunity**  
 (blog). *The Intersection*. Hunt Institute.  
<http://www.huntintersection.com/2012/09/26/common-core-standards-for-learning-supports-looking-for-feedback-from-all-concerned-about-equity-of-opportunity/>

>**Moving School Improvement Policy and Practice Forward: Context for Common Core Standards for a Unified, Comprehensive, & Systemic Learning Supports Component**  
 (Power Point)  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/powerpoint/lscocomre.ppt>

The Center for Mental Health in Schools operates under the auspices of the School Mental Health Project in the Dept. of Psychology, UCLA.

#### Center Staff:

*Howard Adelman, Co-Director*  
*Linda Taylor, Co-Director*  
*Perry Nelson, Coordinator*  
 . . . and a host of graduate and undergraduate students

### LINKS TO:

>**Upcoming initiatives, conferences, workshops**  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/upconf.htm>

>**Calls for proposals, presentations, papers**  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/upcall.htm>

>**Training and job opportunities**  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/job.htm>

>**Upcoming and archived webcasts and other professional development opportunities**  
<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/webcast.htm>

**Note:** These links are on our homepage for easy access. (<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu>) Each is updated regularly. If you would like to add information to these, send to [ltaylor@ucla.edu](mailto:ltaylor@ucla.edu)

### Want resources? Technical assistance?

Use our website: <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu>  
 or contact us – E-mail: [smhp@ucla.edu](mailto:smhp@ucla.edu)  
 Ph: (310) 825-3634

Write: Center for Mental Health in Schools,  
 Dept. of Psychology, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA  
 90095-1563

If you're not directly receiving this Quarterly e-journal/newsletter, our monthly electronic newsletter (ENEWS), or our weekly *Practitioners' Community of Practice Interchange*, send your E-mail address to [smhp@ucla.edu](mailto:smhp@ucla.edu)

For the latest Center resources and activities, see <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu> - click on *What's New*

During recess the new elementary school counselor noticed a girl standing by herself on one side of a playing field while the rest of the kids enjoyed a game of soccer at the other.

Are you O.K.. she asked the girl.

Yes, replied the girl.

Then why are you standing here all alone? the counselor asked.

Greatly exasperated, the girl replied, *Because I'm the goalie!*

## Executive Summary

### Common Core Standards for a Learning Supports Component\*

**F**or Common Core State Standards for curriculum to succeed, schools must have good teaching. And they also must have a unified and comprehensive system for addressing barriers to learning and teaching.

This calls for a shift in school improvement policy and practice to a three component approach. Such an approach expands the current primary emphasis on (1) instruction (including curriculum and teaching) and (2) governance and management; it adds a third primary and essential component to focus directly on (3) addressing barriers to learning and teaching. All three components are primary and essential facets of what must take place at schools every day, and efforts to revamp schools cannot afford to marginalize any of them.

For purposes of developing standards, learning supports are defined as the resources, strategies, and practices that provide physical, social, emotional, and intellectual supports to enable all students to have an equal opportunity for success at school by directly addressing barriers to learning and teaching, including re-engaging disconnected students. Learning supports are designed to *enable* learning by addressing external and internal factors that interfere with students engaging effectively with instruction. A learning supports component coalesces and systematizes what is common in all student and learning supports and provides a base upon which the needs of specific student subgroups, the contributions of various professional specialties and specific programs, and the unique considerations of localities can be built. The work must (a) play out effectively in classrooms and school-wide, (b) connect effectively with district programs (e.g., federally funded programs), and (c) outreach to the surrounding community to fill gaps and collaborate in addressing overlapping concerns.

### Learning Supports Enhance Equity of Opportunity

Development of a unified and comprehensive learning supports component at every school is needed to enhance equity of opportunity for the many students who, at some time or another, bring problems with them that affect their learning and often interfere with the teacher's efforts to teach. The need is especially evident in geographic areas where a large proportion of students experience the restricted opportunities associated with poverty and low income, difficult and diverse family circumstances, high rates of mobility, lack of English language skills, violent neighborhoods, problems related to substance abuse, inadequate health care, and lack of enrichment opportunities. And, of course, problems are exacerbated as youngsters internalize the frustrations of confronting barriers and the debilitating effects of performing poorly at school. In some locales, the reality often is that over 50% of students are not succeeding. And, in most schools in these locales, teachers are poorly supported in addressing the problems in a potent manner.

\*Full document online at <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/commcore.pdf>

## About the Proposed Learning Supports Standards

Establishing common core standards for a *system* of learning supports is essential for strengthening safety net supports for children and adolescents. It involves revamping and revitalizing existing student and learning supports and making them an integral rather than marginalized component of school improvement.

The proposed standards are conceived in terms of a school level component and extend to cover collaboration among families of schools with a view to enhancing effectiveness and economies of scale. School-based standards can readily be adapted for adoption by district, regional, and state educational agencies.

The standards are intended to guide development of student and learning supports into a unified and comprehensive component at every school. They will also provide the foundation for improving standards related to specific subgroups of student and school support staff (e.g., school counselors, psychologists, social workers, nurses, special educators, office staff, school resource officers, bus drivers) and standards related to specific subgroups of students (e.g., those with special needs).

Development of core learning supports standards in no way minimizes the importance of core curriculum and teaching standards. A standards-based learning supports component at a school provides fundamental supports for teachers with respect to students who are not benefitting appropriately from offers of good instruction.

With respect to federal policy, widespread appreciation of Common Core Standards for Learning Supports may offer the best chance to influence reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in ways that are needed to transform schools so that many more students can experience equity of opportunity for success at school. With respect to ESEA, the need is to (1) generate a policy shift to a three component framework for transforming schools, (2) unify current fragmented student and learning supports into a comprehensive system of learning supports, (3) rework operational infrastructure at all levels of school agency to support development of the system, and (4) ensure support for the essential systemic changes and for sustainability.

As highlighted on the following page, the document details standards formulated with respect to five areas of concern that confront schools developing a unified and comprehensive system of learning supports. Appended to the document are quality indicators for each standard.

**At this time, we are seeking further refinements and indications of endorsement.**

Send input to [Ltaylor@ucla.edu](mailto:Ltaylor@ucla.edu)

## Common Core Standards for a Learning Supports Component

### Area 1. Framing and Delineating Intervention Functions

**Standard 1.** Establishment of an overall unifying intervention framework for a comprehensive, multifaceted, and cohesive component for addressing barriers to learning and teaching, including re-engaging disconnected students.

**Standard 1 addendum:** Specific standards for the content arenas of a learning supports component

- >**Standard 1a.** Continuous enhancement of regular CLASSROOM STRATEGIES to enable learning
- >**Standard 1b.** Continuous enhancement of programs and systems for a full range of TRANSITION SUPPORTS
- >**Standard 1c.** Continuous enhancement of programs and systems to increase and strengthen HOME AND SCHOOL CONNECTIONS
- >**Standard 1d.** Continuous enhancement of programs and systems for responding to, and where feasible, preventing school and personal CRISES AND TRAUMA
- >**Standard 1e.** Continuous enhancement of programs and systems to increase and strengthen COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND SUPPORT
- >**Standard 1f.** Continuous enhancement of programs and systems to facilitate student and family access to effective services and SPECIAL ASSISTANCE on campus and in the community as needed

### Area 2. Reworking Operational Infrastructure

**Standard 2.** Establishment of an integrated operational infrastructure for the ongoing planning and development of the learning supports component.

### Area 3: Enhancing Resource Use

**Standard 3.** Appropriate resource use and allocation for developing, maintaining, and evolving the component.

### Area 4: Continuous Capacity Building

**Standard 4.** Capacity building for developing, maintaining, and evolving the component.

### Area 5: Continuous Evaluation And Appropriate Accountability

**Standard 5.** Formative and summative evaluation and accountability are fully integrated into all planning and implementation of the component.