Improvement Science and Its Use in Educational Settings to Improve Literacy Outcomes

Dr. Jacqueline Hawkins

In recent years, educators and policymakers have increasingly turned to **Improvement Science** as a structured, research-based method for advancing educational outcomes, particularly in foundational areas such as literacy. Unlike traditional reform models, which often emphasize top-down initiatives, Improvement Science offers a disciplined, inquiry-driven approach to problem-solving that engages educators in iterative testing and learning. Pioneered in education by Anthony S. Bryk and colleagues through the work of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Improvement Science has proven particularly powerful in addressing complex challenges in elementary literacy instruction. The rationale for using Improvement Science in education, definitions of its six core principles, and highlights of its impact on literacy outcomes are provided next.

Rationale for Using Improvement Science in Education

The rationale for applying Improvement Science in educational settings stems from the persistent variation in student outcomes across schools and classrooms. While many schools adopt evidence-based reading programs, implementation often varies widely, leading to inconsistent results. Improvement Science offers a way to bridge the gap between theory and practice by focusing on local contexts, understanding systemic interactions, and building educators' capacity to learn from failure. As Bryk et al. (2015) argue in *Learning to Improve*, school systems must become learning organizations that "learn fast, fail fast, and improve quickly." This pragmatic orientation is particularly useful in literacy, where interventions must often be tailored to students' diverse linguistic and developmental needs.

The Six Pillars of Improvement Science

At the heart of Improvement Science are six core principles that guide inquiry and action:

1. **Make the work problem-specific and user-centered**: Begin with a clear, specific problem rooted in the experiences of students, educators, and campus leaders. Focus on the priority rather than all things as once.

2. **Focus on variation in performance**: Seek to understand why outcomes vary across settings and for different student groups. Begin to understand that the same intervention may not work in the same way across settings, students, or the varied capacity of the teachers who deliver them.

3. **See the system that produces the current outcomes**: Investigate the broader system—including instructional routines, policies, and resources—that shapes results. Do not be afraid to take away components in a system that may not be working.

4. **Improve through disciplined inquiry**: Use Plan-Do-Study-Act (PDSA) cycles to test changes on a small scale, learn quickly, and adapt interventions. This framework provides a working cycle that can be followed step-by-step through various documented iterations.

5. **Measure outcomes to inform improvement**: Use real-time data to guide decisions and assess whether changes produce desired effects. Measures often include student outcomes but may also look at efficiency of implementation, time to deliver results, and impact on morale.

6. **Anchor improvement in networked communities**: Collaborate with peers across contexts to accelerate learning and share what works. Build a network on a campus or within a grade level to meet the needs of the students. A focus on a specific

outcome, at least in the initial phases, may help networks to both acclimate to the task at hand and see their success in the PDSA cycle.

Together, these principles establish a framework for continuous, context-sensitive improvement rather than one-size-fits-all solutions. Since no two campuses are the same, freeing the network to differentiate their work to the needs of the students (rather than comparing processes and adjusting to one particular *standard*) is likely to drive improvement. And, if the network does not possess the bandwidth to respond to the needs of the students, additional expertise can be sourced or built as part of future PDSA cycles.

Demonstrated Impact in Literacy Outcomes

Improvement Science has been successfully applied in numerous educational settings to improve reading achievement in elementary schools. For example, the **Literacy Collaborative Networked Improvement Community** (NIC), supported by the Carnegie Foundation, brought together districts across the U.S. to address the problem of students not meeting grade-level reading benchmarks by third grade. Using iterative PDSA cycles, participating schools tested changes in instructional practices—such as improving guided reading group structures, adjusting phonics instruction, and enhancing formative assessment strategies.

Over time, the NIC documented measurable improvements. Schools reported increased rates of students meeting or exceeding reading benchmarks, with particular gains among students from historically marginalized backgrounds. Crucially, educators became more adept at using classroom data to inform instruction, and they felt greater ownership over the change process. As Bryk et al. (2015) emphasize, this localized, teacher-driven approach fosters both effectiveness and sustainability.

Conclusion

      Improvement Science provides a rigorous yet flexible framework for addressing the persistent challenge of improving literacy outcomes in elementary schools. Its emphasis on user-centered problem definition, systems thinking, and continuous learning through small tests of change makes it well-suited to the complex, dynamic environments of classrooms. Grounded in the six core principles articulated by Bryk and his colleagues, this methodology not only helps educators improve reading instruction but also builds their capacity to sustain improvement over time. As schools strive to ensure that every child becomes a confident reader, Improvement Science offers both a pathway and a practice for achieving that goal.

References

Bryk, A. S., Gomez, L. M., Grunow, A., & LeMahieu, P. G. (2015). *Learning to improve: How America's schools can get better at getting better*. Harvard Education Press.

      Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (n.d.). Improvement Science