



A publication of the Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL
December 2011

Beyond Adoption—Implementing Rigorous College- and Career-Readiness Standards

Introduction

Preparing our future citizens for postsecondary education and careers that span a continuum of sophistication is not a new topic in education. However, the rapid changes in technology and increased competition from industrialized nations have changed the landscape and meaning of college and career readiness. As part of a strategy to better prepare students, since 2005, 31 states have implemented college- and career-readiness standards (CCRS), with 20 states also requiring that students complete high school graduation requirements that will make them college and career ready (Howard & Madison-Harris, 2011). This briefing paper provides details on the meaning of college- and career-readiness standards, effective implementation of these standards, next steps in the implementation process, and progress being made by state departments of education (SDEs) in the southeast region toward this crucial objective.

Procedures

To identify literature for studies on implementation, SECC staff conducted searches of EBSCO's Academic Search Elite database, ERIC, and online search engines (i.e., Google, Google Scholar, Bing, and Yahoo). They used combinations of terms that included "college and career readiness culture," "fostering a college and career ready culture," "improving college and career readiness," "academic achievement, academic performance, and rigorous coursework," "college readiness benchmarks," "educational/career aspirations," "policies and practices to increase readiness," "reducing number of students needing remedial coursework," "statewide college- and career-ready goals," "aligning state high school standards and assessments," "measuring student readiness for college and career," "requiring students to complete a college- and career-ready curriculum," "college- and career-ready assessment system," "aligning high school graduation requirements with college and workplace expectations," "state college and career readiness initiatives," "statewide higher education placement/readiness standards," and "college and career readiness standards."

Limitations

This briefing paper includes the following limitations:

- Most of the literature reviewed involved case studies, not randomized control trials.
- Due to the abbreviated length of this document, a limited number of research sources are cited.

Inclusion of programs, processes, or models within this paper does not in any way imply endorsement by SEDL.

Summary

The five states served by SECC are among many that have adopted standards to ensure that students are prepared to succeed in college and the workplace. Of increasing importance are these states' efforts to go beyond adoption to implementation of college- and career-readiness standards.

Key Points

- Findings from the literature suggest that implementation should be a well-defined, coordinated change system.
- Most of the state plans for implementation of CCRS encompass a comparative analysis of the Common Core State Standards and state-based standards, professional development for educators and administrators, and communication with various stakeholder groups.



What Are College- And Career-Readiness Standards?

To better understand the role of such standards, it is vital to define what is meant by this readiness so that states develop not only standards but state policies that address the important factors. What is not readily recognized by the general public is that college and career readiness is more complex and multidimensional than meeting eligibility standards. Conley (2010) defines *college and career readiness* as “the level of preparation that a student needs to enroll and succeed in either credit-bearing courses at a postsecondary institution—without remediation—or in a high-quality certificate program that enables students to enter a career pathway with potential future advancement” (p. 21).

A problematic dichotomy of the typical high school is that the tradition of two tracks for two different types of students no longer holds. A challenge for the development of college- and career-readiness standards is the merger of college readiness and work readiness. The key, according to Conley (2010), is the development of a broad, foundational set of knowledge and skills that span both postsecondary education and work. Conley’s research resulted in a four-part conceptual model that includes

1. *Cognitive strategies* that include skills such as problem formulation, research, interpretation, and communication;
2. *Key content knowledge* that includes overarching academic skills such as writing and core academic subject knowledge;
3. *Academic behaviors* such as study skills, reflection, and commitment to improvement; and
4. *College knowledge* to understand postsecondary education as a system and a culture in order to gain admission to and navigate postsecondary institutions.

In examining this model, it is evident that in order to succeed, students must not only be academically prepared for postsecondary education but must also receive the advice, guidance, and support necessary to successfully prepare for the matriculation and completion of a two- or four-year degree, especially if no one in their immediate families has that experience (Tierney, Bailey, Constantine, Finkelstein, & Hurd, 2009). This preparation and transition necessitate that state college- and career-readiness policies ensure that the secondary and postsecondary systems collaborate to improve and align their efforts, not only for their mutual benefit but also for the eventual benefactors—students.

Since there are no national college and career standards, it is incumbent upon states to develop them. However, decision makers must take care to ensure that college and career standards serve a different purpose than high school graduation standards and distinguish themselves by emphasizing content knowledge as a means to an end. For those states that are still in the development stage, resources and assistance for the development of college- and career-readiness standards can be accessed through organizations such as the [Educational Policy Improvement Center](#).

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are K–12 standards that specify what content should be mastered by grade level. What is not readily transparent is that the CCSS also specify K–12 expectations for college and career readiness. The partnership of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), National Governors Association (NGA), and Achieve, Inc., was formed to develop a set of common standards, but this path first led to the development of K–12 learning progressions and college- and career-readiness standards in English/language arts (ELA) and mathematics in 2009. These were then integrated with content to constitute the final CCSS released in June 2010. In ELA, college and career readiness is addressed in the anchor standards for reading, writing, speaking/listening, and language. In mathematics, college and career readiness is addressed primarily through the eight Standards for Mathematical Practice and in the content objectives themselves, where standards that specify mathematics for college and career readiness are designated by the symbol (+).

The implementation of the CCSS should not happen in a vacuum but instead should be considered in the context of states’ broader college- and career-readiness reform agendas (Achieve, 2010). It is true that standards are only the beginning, but they constitute the foundation for the broader college- and career-readiness agenda. The majority of states have adopted the CCSS, and the inherent focus on college- and career-readiness adds additional weight to the importance of effective implementation, which is discussed below.

What does it mean to Implement?

“We cannot afford to continue dealing with . . . program implementation . . . in a cavalier fashion” (Gendreau, Goggin, & Smith, 1999, p. 185). Rather, systematic implementation practices are essential (Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005).



As a result of their synthesis of research literature on implementation, Fixsen, et al. (2005) developed a conceptual framework and a common lexicon. According to Fixsen and his colleagues, “implementation is synonymous with coordinated change at system, organization, program, and practice levels” (2005, p. vi). Additionally, they found that implementation appears to be most successful when

- Practitioners have coordinated training, are coached, and have frequent performance assessments;
- The system provides an infrastructure for training, skillful supervision and coaching, and regular, ongoing evaluations;
- Stakeholders are fully involved with the selection and evaluation of programs and practices; and
- State and federal agencies, policies, and regulations create an environment conducive to implementation and program operations.

These relevant implementation factors and processes appear to be common across disciplines (e.g., mental health, juvenile justice, education, child welfare).

“Those who set out to change schools and schooling are confronted with two enormous tasks. The first is to develop prototypes [or interventions]. The second involves large-scale replication. One without the other is insufficient. Yet considerably more attention is paid to developing and validating prototypes [or interventions] than to delineating and testing scale-up processes” (Taylor, Nelson, & Adelman, 1999, p. 322). Unfortunately, factors involved in successful implementations are not well understood, and “only when effective practices and programs are fully implemented should we expect positive outcomes” (Fixsen et al., 2005, p. 4).

Fixsen and his colleagues (2005, p. 4) described the literature review as being difficult due to the absence of a commonly used definition for the term implementation. They determined that implementation must be well defined and carefully evaluated with regard to its impact on children, families, and adults. Thus, for the purposes of their review, Fixsen, et al., (2005, p. 5) defined implementation as “a specified set of activities designed to put into practice an activity or program of known dimensions.” They further stated that implementation processes must be purposeful and described in such detail that independent observers can determine the presence and the strength of the specified set of activities related to the implementation. Implementation also consists of two sets of activities (intervention-level and implementation-level) and two sets of outcomes (intervention-outcomes and implementation-outcomes), with interventions meaning treatments or prevention efforts at the consumer or client level (Fixsen, et al., 2005).

Moving beyond adoption to implementing rigorous college- and career-readiness standards requires building the capacity or implementation infrastructure that will produce successful student outcomes (Blasé & Fixsen, 2010). Consequently, the literature on implementation research is clear on how to make full use of effective innovations by building a sound implementation infrastructure and effective implementation strategies with the ultimate goal of benefitting the students. According to the State Implementation & Scaling-up of Evidenced-Based Practices Center (UNC FPG Child Development Institute, n.d., SISEP), students benefit when they experience the evidence-based practices or programs with high fidelity. To achieve high fidelity, adult behavior needs to be supported during the change process.

Another conceptual framework that has strong implications for driving the implementation and change process is the [Concerns-Based Adoption Model \(CBAM\)](#). CBAM (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin, & Hall, 1987) provides tools and techniques to examine the components of an innovation, track the progress of implementation, report findings objectively, and design interventions or strategies that will move the implementation process forward. As in the Fixsen et al. (2005) implementation conceptual framework, a deeply rooted assumption of CBAM is that change is a process and not an event. CBAM also emphasizes that change is a personal experience—complete with frustrations, moments of joy, excitement, depression, discouragement, etc.

According to Hord et al. (1987), CBAM has three principal diagnostic dimensions that allow for check ups and feedback to teachers and administrators while also providing coaching and follow up to help them improve what they are doing. The three principal diagnostic dimensions of CBAM are Stages of Concern, Levels of Use, and Innovation Configurations.

Stages of Concern

The Stages of Concern look at the personal or human side of change and assess information about people’s attitudes, reactions, or feelings about a new program or practice (George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2006). The information learned through this process can



be used to identify and address teacher concerns associated with the implementation of an innovation or standards-based reform. See Table 1. Stages of Concern, for further details on this diagnostic dimension.

Stage	Description	Example
0	Unconcerned	"I am not concerned about it (the innovation)."
1	Informational	"I would like to know more about it."
2	Personal	"How will using it affect me?"
3	Management	"I seem to be spending all my time getting materials ready."
4	Consequence	"How is my use affecting kids?"
5	Collaboration	"I am concerned about relating what I am doing with what other instructors are doing."
6	Refocusing	"I have some ideas about something that would work even better."

Note. Adapted from *Taking Charge of Change*, by S. Hord, W. Rutherford, L. Huling-Austin, and G. Hall (Copyright 1987 by SEDL) and *Measuring Implementation in Schools: The Stages of Concern Questionnaire*, by A. George, G. Hall, and S. Stiegelbauer (Copyright 2006 by SEDL).

Levels of Use

One of the underlying assumptions of the Levels of Use (LoU) tool is that many problems that come with change have little to do with the innovation’s design or ineffectiveness, but rather the innovation is not used at its highest level from the start (Hall, Dirksen, & George, 2006). It is important to ensure that the innovation is actually being performed before the individual can assess the effectiveness of an innovation. The LoU tool measures eight distinct levels and utilizes an interview protocol to identify the extent to which an innovation is used (refer to Table 2. Levels of Use, for descriptions of the levels). The information from the LoU interviews serves as progress monitoring of the implementation as well as identifies and addresses problems teachers face in connecting a specific innovation or standards-based reform with their classroom practices.

Level	Description	Extent of Use
1	Orientation	The individual has acquired or is acquiring information about the innovation.
2	Preparation	The individual is preparing to use the innovation for the first time.
3	Mechanical Use	The user is focused on day-to-day use of the innovation and on mastering the tasks required to use the innovation.
4	Level 4A Routine	The user has stabilized the ongoing use of the innovation and is making few, if any, changes.
5	Level 4B Refinement	The user is refining the use of the innovation in order to increase the impact it has on students.
6	Integration	The user is combining efforts with colleagues in order to have a collective impact on students.
7	Renewal	The user seeks major modifications or alternatives to the current innovation in order to increase its effectiveness and maximize the impact it has on students.

Note. Adapted from *Measuring Implementation in Schools: Levels of Use* by G. Hall, D. Dirksen, and A. George. Copyright 2006 by SEDL.

Innovation Configurations

An Innovation Configuration, or IC, is a map made up of the innovation components and variations of the innovation from ideal, acceptable, to unacceptable (Hord, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & George, 2006). The IC is viewed as a versatile tool of the implementation



process with the basic premise of helping to ensure that everyone is focused on the same objectives. Utilizing innovation configurations helps to ensure that everyone is using an innovation in the same way and that they are using it appropriately.

Implementation of new programs or innovations is difficult. Consequently, while there are multiple systems, procedures, and opportunities to support high-fidelity implementation, “feedback loops are critical to keeping the evidenced-based program ‘on track’ amid continuing change” (Fixsen et al., 2007, p. 8). In order to implement change that will lead to better educational outcomes, an understanding of the change process itself is necessary as well as a sound implementation infrastructure and effective implementation strategies with the ultimate goal of leading to greater student achievement.

Strong leadership by state departments of education is required to move from the adoption of college- and career-readiness standards to full implementation in the classroom. In addition to considering the factors and recommendations discussed above, decision makers should be aware of a number of steps that may be beneficial to the process. They include developing a transition plan, comparing existing and new standards, providing professional development for staff, reviewing current assessment systems, coordinating the use of resources, and planning for updates to the college- and career-readiness standards.

Next Steps

Transition Plan

Implementing college- and career-readiness standards signals a system-wide change for education. SDEs need to develop a well thought out, detailed plan of implementation that includes dates and milestones (Achieve, 2010). This plan should be developed in collaboration with all stakeholders. Educators, families, and students will require support to understand, embrace, and transition to the new standards.

Comparative Analysis of Standards

Conducting an analysis comparing new college- and career-readiness standards or the CCSS with the current state standards is one of the first tasks to be addressed. This analysis includes identifying the following components (a) gaps between current standards and new standards, (b) overlaps of current and new standards, and (c) missing standards.

Standards Crosswalk

Developing a crosswalk document between the “old” and “new” standards is helpful to SDEs, districts, schools, teachers, administrators, families, and community members. This tool is used to clearly display the relationship between the standards, the changes required, and the areas to be addressed.

Instructional Support

The goal of college- and career-readiness standards is to support instruction that will lead to student postsecondary success. Aligning instruction to the standards will involve a comprehensive effort that may include revising and developing curriculum frameworks, designing standards-based rubrics, developing syllabi across multiple courses, modifying course requirements, creating and adopting new instructional materials, and designing sample lessons (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010a & 2010b; Achieve, 2010).

Community Engagement and Outreach

Systemic change in education is difficult without the support of the broader community. Engaging families, students, and community leaders in each phase of adoption, transition, and implementation will increase understanding and promote support for college- and career-readiness standards. Including stakeholders early in the process through membership in workgroups and advisory committees will facilitate engagement and support. Transparency in process and information is important to maintain and build trust, and focusing on student outcomes increases interest and support. In addition, ongoing information dissemination and feedback are important. Disseminating information may be facilitated by employing a variety of methods such as a dedicated Web site, social networking sites (i.e., Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube), blogs, e-mail lists, web-based surveys, letters, newsletters,



presentations, downloadable materials, newspapers, television, and radio. Forming strong partnerships with community and faith-based organizations will enhance understanding, encourage engagement, and promote support for this innovation.

Professional Development

New forms of instruction, accountability, and assessments will require new and extensive professional development (PD). SDEs may take the lead in developing and disseminating effective PD for administrators and teachers. Technology can play a crucial role in disseminating new PD in a cost-effective and efficient manner across multiple schools and school districts.

Formative Assessments

Formative assessments are embedded in the curriculum and provide meaningful feedback to the teacher and student in order to make adjustments in instruction. Developing high-quality formative assessments is critical to the successful implementation of college- and career-readiness standards.

Summative Assessments

States have, “a unique opportunity . . . to take a hard look at their current assessment systems and make the design- and policy-based decisions necessary to move to next-generation assessment systems” (Achieve, 2010). Strong assessments in lower grades and high school should indicate student progress toward graduation, college, and career. Refocusing assessments that are tied to college- and career-readiness standards requires developing test items that measure higher-order thinking.

Leveraging of Budgets

Conducting a budget analysis may be required to locate and direct funds to support the implementation of college- and career-readiness standards. SDEs may need to take a fresh view of existing resources to determine where they might be redirected to support this effort. Caution must be exercised to make sure that supplanting current funding is not an issue and that future funding is not put at risk (Achieve, 2010; Brown, Hess, Lautzenheiser, & Owen, 2011).

Collaboration Across States

The adoption of the Common Core State Standards provides the opportunity for states to join consortia and form partnerships with other SDEs to address the development of instructional materials, courses, professional development, and assessments. States have the power to work together to pool their expertise, experience, and resources to address the implementation of college- and career-readiness standards. These collaborations could result in positive outcomes such as pooling states’ purchasing power, adopting common frameworks of proficiency, and developing a shared test item bank (Achieve, 2010; Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010b).

Creation of New Pathways

Organizations such as the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (2010a) support the concept that SDEs should create additional pathways to college and career by starting in middle school, creating proficiency-based pathways that allow for alternative ways to achieve the standards, making articulation agreements with higher education, and expanding dual enrollment in college and career preparation programs.

Review of SDE Priorities and Organizations

State leadership is imperative to promote systemic improvement that ensures that college- and career-readiness standards are implemented with fidelity in the classroom. This may require that SDEs refocus their efforts and modify internal organizations to ensure that adequate resources are dedicated to supporting instruction that leads to student achievement of the standards and desired outcomes (Brown et al., 2011).



Sustained Effort and Focus

SDEs must plan for future efforts that focus on supporting college- and career-readiness standards development and revision, since standards may need to be revised and refined in the years to come. Only longitudinal data over time will provide the information to determine if desired outcomes are achieved, that is, an increasing number of students are completing college or entering a career without the need of remediation (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010a).

State Highlights

Alabama

In May and June 2010, specialists performed a preliminary correlation of the Common Core State Standards to the current Alabama ELA and mathematics standards. In July and August of the same year, Alabama reviewed the correlation and the Alabama Course of Study for ELA and mathematics using the Achieve Common Core Comparison Tool and wrote the first draft of grade or course standards to be added to the CCSS. Additionally, Alabama convened task forces to make recommendations, which included adoption of the CCSS with

- Professional development provided for teachers and administrators
- Curriculum and teaching guides developed and provided to staff
- The CCSS included in all pre-service teacher preparation programs
- Selected Alabama content added
- Adequate textbooks and other resources provided

By late August 2010, a finalized draft of standards was placed on the Alabama State Department of Education (ALSDE) Web site for public review and for submission to the state superintendent as a recommendation for revision. During Fall 2010, ALSDE conducted four regional presentations regarding the possible adoption of the CCSS across the state. The presentations concluded with a discussion of what instructional impact the adoption of the CCSS could mean to Alabama's students, parents, teachers, leaders, and college preparation programs. Alabama's state school board approved adoption of the CCSS on November 18, 2010. The above information was adapted from resources provided by the ALSDE at <http://www.alsde.edu/home/Default.aspx>

According to Steve McAliley at the ALSDE, new standards that include the CCSS will be implemented for K–12 mathematics in 2012–2013. K–12 English language arts standards are scheduled to be implemented in 2013–2014. Professional development in each subject is being done in phases: Phase I for ELA and mathematics for administrators was provided at a statewide conference in Summer 2011. Phase I PD for mathematics teachers was provided at the 11 in-service centers and at the statewide conference. Phase I for ELA teachers was scheduled to be provided via WebEx during Fall 2011 and at the 11 in-service centers and statewide conference in Summer 2012. Phase II sessions for mathematics teachers will be conducted during the 2011–2012 school year as webinars and face-to-face in Summer 2012. A timeline, including topics to be presented during each phase, is available at <http://www.alex.state.al.us/ccrs>

Georgia

Georgia joined with 44 other states and territories to develop a set of core standards for K–12 ELA and mathematics. Georgia educators have been at the table since the process began, and Georgia's Governor Sonny Perdue was selected by the National Governors Association to cochair the Common Core State Standards initiative. The CCSS integrate much of the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS), creating an opportunity to better prepare students for college and/or the 21st century workplace. When the development groups that the CCSSO and NGA pulled together began writing the ELA and mathematics standards, they built on the work of states that had already developed rigorous college- and career-readiness standards. Georgia was one of those states. Elements of the GPS are found throughout the CCSS. On June 2, 2010, the CCSS were released, and the Georgia State Board of Education adopted the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) on July 8, 2010. The CCGPS timeline includes:



- 2010–2011 communication and administrator training using GPS/CCSS crosswalks
- September 21, 2011, CCGPS orientation led by Dr. John Barge and department staff
- 2011–2012 teacher professional learning for CCGPS and resources supporting “Bridging the Gap” (transition for standards that shifted to different grade levels)
- January–May 2012 grade-by-grade teacher professional learning by way of Georgia Public Broadcasting
- 2012–2013 ELA and mathematics CCGPS Year 1 implementation (transition standards)
- 2013–2014 ELA and mathematics CCGPS Year 2 implementation (field test)
- 2014–2015 ELA and mathematics Year 3 implementation and common assessment

The new standards represent a logical next step from the GPS. Georgia teachers, principals, superintendents, and others will decide how the standards are to be met. By adopting the CCGPS, Georgia moves forward in giving teachers more refined tools to prepare students for work and college.

The above information was adapted from Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Academic Standards: Implementing the Georgia Performance Standards—Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (2010).

Louisiana

In July 2010, the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (BESE) adopted the Common Core State Standards with the aim of ensuring that students in Louisiana graduate from high school prepared to succeed in college or the workforce. While ELA and mathematics are the primary focus of the CCSS, the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) recently updated the state’s social studies standards as well. The new CCSS will be fully implemented in school year 2014–2015. Louisiana has developed an implementation plan to prepare students and teachers for the more rigorous standards and assessments. Highlights of the LDOE implementation plan include:

- Spring/Summer 2011 crosswalk documents to identify changes between the current standards and the CCSS were developed and shared
- Spring/Summer 2011 a General Awareness Webinar on the CCSS and Louisiana’s implementation plan was developed and presented
- 2011–2012 Development Year will include:
 - ◊ LDOE will develop a new Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum (LCC) to align with the CCSS for grades K–1;
 - ◊ The Transitional LCC will be developed for grades 2 and higher in ELA and mathematics;
 - ◊ LDOE will create LCC professional development workshops for K–1 and plan with districts for both the transitional and the new LCC to include 9 days of PD spread out over the year; and
 - ◊ Assessment resources will be revised to align with the transitional and new curriculum.
- 2012–2013 Transition Year 1 will include:
 - ◊ The new LCC aligned to the CCSS will be implemented in grades K–1, and the transitional LCC will be implemented in grades 2 and higher;
 - ◊ Transitional assessments will be administered, which include existing items that match both a CCSS and a Louisiana Grade Level Expectation (GLE) in the given grade;
 - ◊ New assessment items will be field-tested; and
 - ◊ LDOE will develop new LCC for grades 2–12 in ELA and mathematics and for all grades in science.
- 2013–2014 Transition Year 2 will include:
 - ◊ The new LCC aligned to ELA and mathematics in grades PreK–2 will be implemented;
 - ◊ The transitional LCC will continue in grades 3–12, with more new content being taught;
 - ◊ LCC professional development will continue; and
 - ◊ Transitional assessments will continue.



- 2014–2015 Full Implementation will include:
 - ◊ New LCC for all grades and subjects will be implemented, and the new assessments will be administered; and
 - ◊ The CCSS will replace the GLEs in ELA and mathematics, and new content standards for social studies and science will be in place for all grades.

The above information was adapted from Curriculum & Standards: Louisiana's Curriculum Standards (2010).

Mississippi

In March 2010, Mississippi conducted an alignment study of the draft of the Common Core State Standards and the Mississippi ELA and mathematics frameworks. Mississippi adopted the CCSS on August 20, 2010. During June through October of the same year, a second alignment analysis was done using the final CCSS and the Mississippi ELA and mathematics frameworks. Mississippi has gone through a series of steps to support the adoption and implementation of the CCSS, which include:

- Explore working with regional laboratories, technical assistance providers, and other groups;
- Revise/develop instructional materials such as suggested teaching strategies, resources, and assessment strategies;
- Meet with stakeholder groups to review the alignment study and determine courses for grades 9–12;
- Conduct regional awareness sessions;
- Provide webinars for various audiences; and
- Determine a plan for transitioning to the new standards and assessments.

The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) will begin the implementation process during the 2011–2012 school year. The MDE implementation timeline includes:

- Summer 2011 K–2 training
- Fall 2011 K–2 follow-up and grades 3–5 training
- Spring 2012 K–2 follow-up, grades 3–5 follow-up, and grades 6–8 training
- Summer 2012 grades 9–12 training
- Fall 2012 follow-up for grades 3–12
- Spring 2013 follow-up for grades 6–8
- Summer 2013 follow-up for grades 9–12

This implementation timeline was selected using participant feedback from overview sessions, which was highly in favor of beginning with K–2 as 2011–2012 kindergarten students will be the first 3rd graders to participate in the new CCSS assessments. Mississippi views implementation as a multiyear process of weaving the CCSS into the classroom instruction until the CCSS has replaced the Mississippi Curriculum Framework.

The information above was adapted from Mississippi Department of Education: Office of Curriculum and Instruction (n.d.).

South Carolina

In July 2010, South Carolina adopted the Common Core State Standards for ELA and mathematics. The state's commitment to the new standards ensures that South Carolina students will be prepared for 21st century jobs. This also gives schools across the state a better idea of how they are faring academically against other states, allowing South Carolina to measure progress in a more meaningful way. During Fall 2010, members of the content area work groups for ELA and mathematics were selected. Early in 2011, the content area work groups began meeting to develop Implementation Tool Kit resources and accompanying professional development. During Spring 2011, regional awareness sessions were conducted. During Summer 2011, video segments designed to support the understanding and implementation of the CCSS to be used as a component of PD were taped. The video segments



were scheduled to be made available to district implementation teams during Fall 2011. South Carolina's transition timeline for implementing the CCSS includes:

- 2009–2011 Adoption, communication, planning, and alignment
- 2011–2012 Transition and professional development
- 2012–2013 Transition and professional development
- 2013–2014 Begin implementation (bridge year for assessment purposes)
- 2014–2015 Full implementation including assessment aligned solely to the CCSS

South Carolina prepared two documents, the *Common Core Comparative Report* and the *South Carolina Common Core Update*. The comparative report provides information detailing South Carolina's efforts including the comparative review process, information about the rigor and alignment of the CCSS with the current South Carolina standards, national and state experts' perspectives of the quality of the CCSS, and findings and recommendations related to the adoption and implementation of the CCSS in South Carolina. The update outlines the state's next steps in implementing the CCSS.

The above information was adapted from various resources provided by the SCDE at <http://ed.sc.gov/agency/>

Conclusion

States served by the Southeast Comprehensive Center are progressing in their implementation efforts—comparing new and existing standards, revising/developing instructional materials and assessment strategies, planning professional development, communicating vital information to stakeholders, and more—with the ultimate goal of ensuring that the students they serve will be prepared for college, careers, and beyond.



References

Note. Open hyperlinks using Adobe Reader. If a hyperlink does not open after it is clicked, copy and paste the entire hyperlink into the Internet browser window to access the resource.

- Achieve. (2010). *On the road to implementation: Achieving the promise of the Common Core State Standards*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.achieve.org/files/FINAL-CCSSImplementationGuide.pdf>
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2010a). *Fewer, clearer, higher: Moving forward with consistent, rigorous standards for all*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/highschools/Documents/fewer-clearer-higher-standards.pdf>
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2010b). *What's next? The assessment challenges facing states*. Portland, OR: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.gatesfoundation.org/highschools/Documents/whats-next-assessment-challenges.pdf>
- Blasé, K., Duda, M., Naoom, S., Dyke, M., Sims, B., Fixsen, D., Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (n.d.). *Overview stages of implementation* [Video transcript]. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG, SISEP.
- Brown, C. G., Hess, F. M., Lautzenheiser, D. K., & Owen, I. (2011). *State education agencies as agents of change: What will it take for states to step up on education reform?* Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research and The Center for American Progress.
- Conley, D. T. (2010). *College and career ready: Helping all students succeed beyond high school*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231). Retrieved from <http://ctndisseminationlibrary.org/PDF/nirnmonograph.pdf>
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blasé, K. A., & Wallace, F. (2007). Implementation: The missing link between research and practice. *American Professional Society on the Abuse of Children (APSAC) Advisor*, 19, 4–11. Retrieved from http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/NIRN_brief_1_2009.pdf
- Fixsen, D. L., Blasé, K. A., Duda, M. A., Naoom, S. F., & Van Dyke, M. (2008). *Implementation and system change*. National Implementation Research Network. Retrieved from www.betterhighschools.org/docs/Fixen.ppt
- Fixsen, D. L., & Blasé, K. (2009). Implementation: The missing link between research and practice. *NIRN Implementation Brief #1*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG, National Implementation Research Network. Retrieved from http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/NIRN_brief_1_2009.pdf
- Georgia Department of Education. (2010). *Curriculum, instruction, and assessment academic standards: Implementing the Georgia performance standards. Common Core Georgia Performance Standards*.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Smith, P. (1999). The forgotten issue in effective treatment: Program implementation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 43(2), 180–187.
- George, A., Hall, G., & Stiegelbauer, S. (2006). *Measuring implementation in schools: The stages of concern questionnaire*. Austin, TX: SEDL.
- Hall, G., Dirksen, D., & George, A. (2006). *Measuring implementation in schools: Levels of use*. Austin, TX: SEDL.
- Hord, S., Rutherford, W., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. (1987). *Taking charge of change*. Austin, TX: SEDL.
- Hord, S., Stiegelbauer, S., Hall, G., & George, A. (2006). *Measuring implementation in schools: Innovation configurations*. Austin, TX: SEDL.
- Howard, B., & Madison-Harris, R. (2011, July). Increasing high school graduation rates and improving college enrollment for high-need students. *Southeast Comprehensive Center eBulletin*, 5(2). Austin, TX: SEDL. Retrieved from <http://secc.sedl.org/resources/newsletter/ebulletin/eBulletinv5n2.html>
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development (3rd ed.)*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2010). *Curriculum & standards: Louisiana's curriculum standards*.
- Mississippi Department of Education. (n.d.). *Office of curriculum and instruction*.



Rovins, M. (Producer), & Vimeo (Producer). (2010). *Blasé & Fixsen (SISEP)–TA & D Network Couch Sessions* [Video webcast]. Retrieved from <http://www.scalingup.org/> and <http://vimeo.com/user1998633>

Taylor, L., Nelson, P., & Adelman, H. (1999). Scaling up reforms across a school district. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 15(4), 303–325.

Tierney, W. G., Baily, T., Constantine, J., Finkelstein, N., & Hurd, N. F. (2009). *Helping students navigate the path to college: What high schools can do: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-4066). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/higher_ed_pg_091509.pdf

UNC FPG Child Development Institute. (n.d.). *State implementation & scaling-up of evidence-based practices. Drivers*. Chapell Hill, NC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.scalingup.org/drivers>

UNC FPG Child Development Institute. (n.d.). *State implementation & scaling-up of evidence-based practices. Improvement cycles*. Chapell Hill, NC: Author.

Briefing Papers are prepared to provide information to the departments of education of the states served by SEDL's comprehensive centers. They address topics on education issues related to the requirements and implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Wesley Hoover, PhD, SEDL President and CEO
 Vicki Dimock, PhD, SEDL Chief Program Officer
 Robin Jarvis, PhD, SECC Program Director
 Darlene Brown, PhD, SECC Project Director
 Dale Lewis, PhD, SECC Project Director
 Chris Times, MBA, SECC Communications Associate and Publication Editor

Briefing Paper Team: Camille Chapman, MEd, Program Associate; Ramona Chauvin, PhD, Program Associate; Concepcion Molina, EdD, Program Associate; Kathleen Theodore, MA, Program Associate; Chris Times, MBA, Communications Associate; and Sally Wade, EdD, Program Associate

Alabama State Liaison: Lou Meadows, EdD (lmeadows@sedl.org)
 Georgia State Liaison: Glenda Copeland, MA (gcopeland@sedl.org)
 Louisiana State Liaison: Robyn Madison-Harris, EdD (robyn.madison-harris@sedl.org)
 Mississippi State Liaison: Debra Meibbaum, MAT (dmeibbaum@sedl.org)
 South Carolina State Liaison: Beth Howard, EdD (beth.howard@sedl.org)

The Southeast Comprehensive Center is a project of SEDL
 SEDL Headquarters
 4700 Mueller Blvd.
 Austin, TX 78723
 800-476-6861
www.sedl.org

Southeast Comprehensive Center at SEDL
 3501 N. Causeway Blvd, Suite 700
 Metairie, LA 70002
 800-644-8671
secc.sedl.org

Copyright© 2011 by SEDL. SECC is one of 16 regional centers established by the U.S. Department of Education (ED). The primary goal of the regional centers is to build the capacity of the state education agencies and statewide systems of support to implement ESEA. Links to the other regional centers, the content centers, and ED may be found on the SECC Web site (secc.sedl.org). The contents of this publication were developed under a grant from ED. The contents do not, however, necessarily represent the policy of ED, and one should not assume endorsement by the federal government.