May 5, 2020

Dear Superintendent,

Thank you for submitting the Maple Heights City Schools Reading Achievement Plan. The submitted plan is compliant with Ohio Administrative Code 3301-56-02. The Ohio Department of Education is committed to working with districts to raise student achievement in reading. Please find below feedback associated with the district's submitted Reading Achievement Plan.

Strengths of the Reading Achievement Plan:
- The school identified learning targets and outlined a plan to communicate expectations with building staff.
- The school outlined a plan to prioritize PBIS implementation in response to data indicating an increase in behavioral incidents distracting students from receiving instruction.

This plan will benefit from:
- Conducting a root cause analysis of learner performance data for use to determine areas for teacher professional development and student instruction.
- Using the data analysis to set goals and subgoals for Tier 1, 2 and 3 instruction.
- Outline a review process for curriculum and material selection that includes the identification of the five components of reading (See Ohio's literacy plan).

In January 2020, the Department published the revised version of *Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement*. This plan articulates a state literacy framework aimed at promoting proficiency in reading, writing and communication for all learners. It is driven by scientific research and encourages a professional movement toward implementing data-based, differentiated and evidence-based practices in all manners of educational settings. We encourage district and school teams to review the state plan and contact the Department or State Support Team for professional learning opportunities aimed at implementing this plan in districts and schools across Ohio.

The district's Reading Achievement Plan and this memo will be posted on the Ohio Department of Education's website. If the district revises the Reading Achievement Plan and would like the revised plan to be posted to the Department's website, the revised plan and this request must be sent to readingplans@education.ohio.gov.

Please note that House Bill 197 of the 133rd General Assembly contains emergency legislation regarding spring testing and state report cards. The Department is working on further guidance pertaining to FY20 Reading Achievement Plan requirements.

Sincerely,

Melissa Weber-Mayrer, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Approaches to Teaching and Professional Learning

25 South Front Street   (877) 644-6338
Columbus, Ohio 43215   For people who are deaf or hard of hearing,
education.ohio.gov   please call Relay Ohio first at 711.

READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

DISTRICT NAME: Maple Heights City Schools

DISTRICT IRN: 044305

DISTRICT ADDRESS: Maple Heights Board of Education 5740 Lawn Ave.
Maple Heights, Ohio 44137

PLAN COMPLETION DATE: December 2019

LEAD WRITERS: Dr. Carol Rami, Amy Berger, Susan Jaroscak, Markita Warren

IMPLEMENTATION START DATE:

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: DISTRICT LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERSHIP, DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND PLAN FOR MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION

SECTION 1: LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERSHIP

Insert a list of all leadership team members, roles and contact information. The Department encourages districts and community schools include team members from the early childhood providers that feed into the district or school.

Name	Title/Role	Location	Email
Dr. Carol Rami	Literacy Coach	Elementary Campus	Carol.Rami@mapleschools.com
Amy Berger	Reading Recovery Teacher	Lincoln Elementary	Amy.Berger@mapleschools.com
Markita Warren	Curriculum Coordinator	Board Office	Markita.Warren@mapleschools.com
Dawn Besteder	Principal	Lincoln Elementary	Dawn.Besteder@mapleschools.com
Dr. Valencia Thomas	Principal	Kennedy Elementary	Valencia.Thomas@mapleschools.com
Jennifer Lewis	School Psychologist	Elementary Campus	Jennifer.Lewis@mapleschools.com
Mauriza Allen	Intervention Specialist	Lincoln Elementary	Mauriza.Allen@mapleschools.com
Laura Netzband	2nd Grade Teacher	Kennedy Elementary	Laura.Netzband@mapleschools.com
Lisa Davies	3rd Grade Teacher	Kennedy Elementary	Lisa.Davies@mapleschools.com
Dr. Meghan Shelby	Dir. of Special Pupil Services	Board Office	Meghan.Shelby@mapleschools.com
Susan Jaroscak	Dir. of Curriculum & Instruction	Board Office	Susan.Jaroscak@mapleschools.com
Kiera Nay	Youth Branch Services Supervisor	Maple Hts. Public Library	knay@cuyahogalibrary.org

SECTION 1, PART B: DEVELOPING, MONITORING AND COMMUNICATING THE READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

Describe how the district leadership team developed the plan and how the team will monitor and communicate the plan.

Our Local Literacy Plan is based on the fact that, "Effective reading instruction is built on a foundation that recognizes that reading outcomes are determined by complex and multifaceted factors. A disruption of any of these factors increases the risk that reading will be delayed or impeded, a phenomenon particularly prevalent in impoverished urban and rural neighborhoods and among disadvantaged minority populations" (National Research Council, 1998, pp. 313-315).

The work of developing the Reading Achievement Plan for our district required intense, analytical, and honest scrutiny of our Tier I level- reading instruction. We used the Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy to support the development of the plan and we were able to uncover many inconsistencies in our program with respect to foundational reading skills. While we know that our instructors are highly qualified, we discovered that they were not all utilizing data in the same way. We also learned that we were not using our instructional block for reading as effectively as we can and that we were not intentional about the emphasis on explicit, systematic instruction in phonemic awareness and phonics. Therefore, all aspects of language and literacy instruction need to be supported in order for our students to be proficient readers.

We created a very effective team comprised of school psychologists, principals, a literacy specialist, a reading recovery teacher, an intervention specialist, and two central office administrators to develop our plan. This process of analyzing data as well as examining our assessment tools caused us to rethink assessment in the primary reading classes. We researched assessment tools that would more precisely measure our students' foundational reading skills as well as to provide meaningful interventions and progress monitoring. We know that many of our students enter kindergarten unprepared for reading success, but we were not pinpointing the areas in which students were lacking. We realized that we need to administer assessments that measure specific phonemic and phonological skills and that the data we obtain from these assessments will enable us to better design instruction to meet the needs of our students and to bring them to grade level before they reach third grade.

As a result of this plan we will immediately endeavor to administer assessments that measure foundational skills, establish a reading support team in each primary building, create instructional toolkits for phonemic awareness, recalibrate our work with phonics, inventory/update supplemental reading resources to support ourTier I instruction, increase parent engagement in the area of early literacy, and closely monitor the implementation fidelity of specific, evidenced-based instructional reading strategies.

We will communicate our plan to all stakeholders including the Board of Education, Superintendent, teachers, principals, and parents. At that time, we will also provide high quality, continuous professional development and support to our PreK-3 teachers. We are confident that our plan will provide us with consistent guidance as we improve our reading instruction for all students.

References and Resources

Literacy:

Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement; Ohio Department of Education website; ESSA; What Works

Clearinghouse; Marzano; Rasinski; Jan Richardson's Guided Reading Framework; Words Their

Words; Lucy Calkins Units of Study; Fountas and Pinnell, Heggerty

Data:

STAR: NWEA MAP; DIBELS; KRA; Third Grade State Reading Test; R-TFI; District CCIP; Ohio State Report Card

SECTION 2: ALIGNMENT BETWEEN THE READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN AND OVERALL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

Describe how the Reading Achievement Plan is aligned to and supports the overall continuous improvement efforts of the district or community school. Districts and community schools required to develop improvement plans or implement improvement strategies, as required by Ohio Revised Code 3302.04 and 3302.10 or any other section of the ORC, must ensure the Reading Achievement Plan is aligned with other improvement efforts.

As we designed our Reading Achievement Plan, we worked diligently to align goals, strategies, implementation, and measurement with the District Improvement Plan in the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP). Both plans encompass high quality professional development, improvement goals for Ohio State Testing in Reading and Math, as well as evidenced based assessment and instructional strategies.

Our Reading Achievement Plan (RAP) addresses both practices and supports across the "educational cascade" to ensure alignment of literacy efforts among individual classroom implementation, grade levels (Teacher Based Teams), schools (Building Leadership Teams), district (District Leadership Teams), family support, community, and state. The expectation is that all those who assist our learners will engage in the implementation of high-quality evidence based systems and instructional practices.

The Reading Achievement Plan is, therefore, based on the needs identified by the TBT, BLT, DLT, and

Literacy Committee after an examination of several years of data from the Ohio's Third Grade ELA test, STAR Reading, NWEA MAP assessments, DIBELS (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills), and Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA). In addition, the Local Literacy Plan reflects an analysis of the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (RTFI)which looks at four areas - teams, implementation, resources, and evaluation. The RTFI Tier I was administered to assess the implementation of a school-wide reading model at the elementary level. Using the data from the RTFI identifies the strengths and weaknesses in multi-tiered systems of supports (MTSS) and helps to create a framework for collecting and monitoring data to assess student progress toward reading goals for all students. Data collected from the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory from Fall 2018 and Fall 2019 support our Local Literacy Plan to improve our Tier I instruction, specifically the components of direct, explicit instruction. The Innovation Inventory was also used to guide our team's review of past and current instructional initiatives and provided a clear picture for making decisions on what was needed to support Tier I instruction.   All the combined data was used to identify actions that led to the development of a

School-wide Reading Model which addresses a continuum of reading needs across the student body and identified evidence-based practices that support the Big Idea of Reading. Through collaboration between the District Leadership Team, Building Leadership Teams, and Teacher Based Teams, and the district's involvement in the Ohio Improvement Process, teams will have shared responsibility for data-driven planning, implementation, and feedback on literacy core instruction and interventions.

We also have aligned the progress monitoring of our plan which involves K-3 assessment of classroom reading instruction through the TBTs, BLTs, and DLTs (OIP)   In grades k-3, our Teacher Based Grade Level Teams (TBTs) will follow the 5-

Step process to analyze reading data exclusively to improve instructional strategies and close achievement gaps. Our vertical alignment meetings for grades K-3 occur occasionally and, based on the data from our Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory from fall 2018, a goal to increase meetings between grade levels is in place. We find vertical teaming valuable by giving the opportunity to review the literacy plan together which fosters dialogue about how it impacts from one grade to the next. The Building Level Team meets on a consistent basis to review the grade level reading data in order to maintain a clear focus on nurturing literacy improvement. The District Leadership Team meets once a month to monitor building literacy data, look for areas of concern, and district literacy trends. The District Leadership team also supports training and coaching on evidence-based literacy practices, systems, and resources. Finally, our district has implemented a plan entitled 'No June Surprises' to use systematic and explicit instruction to support Tier I reading instruction. Our plan incorporates processes that ensure that we are implementing evidence-based instructional strategies, assessing both formatively and summatively and designing lessons to meet the needs of all our students. In addition, our ELA Assessment Committee provides support for the implementation of formative and summative

assessments by providing a formal process for administering the district assessments and for evaluating teacher-made standards-based assessments.

Additionally, the Simple View of Reading (SVR) was used to drive our literacy discourse and the decisions for the organization of our Local Literacy Plan. Our data analysis aligns with this logical model (Decoding (D) X Language Comprehension (LC) = Reading Comprehension (RC) and the five pillars of reading:

Decoding (Word-level reading

- phonemic awareness
- phonics X Language Comprehension
- fluency
- vocabulary
- comprehension = Reading

Comprehension

The predictions made by the Simple View of Reading have been confirmed many times over - children who are good at decoding isolated words (fast and accurate) and who are good at understanding spoken language are, on the whole, quite good at reading and understanding connected text. This supports our plan of reading improvement to focus on phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Furthermore, our plan will be monitored by the Reading A Plan Committee, the Reading Support Team,

Director of Curriculum, principals, literacy coaches, teacher leaders), District Leadership Team, Building Leadership Team, and Teacher Based Teams on a monthly basis. During TBT meetings, teacher bring their data for Five Step analysis to inform instruction. The BLT will monitor data and strategies from the TBTs, and the DLTs will monitor the progress of each building through reports by the BLT and representatives on the DLT. Our plan will be communicated to the stakeholders by the Local Literacy Committee members and the Reading Support Team during a Professional Development Day and specific

areas and data points will be discussed at staff meetings throughout the school year. Even though there is regular communication, based on the fall 2019 RTFI results (evaluation feature 1.22 and 1.23), more communication between systems is needed to monitor the health of the reading plan.

Other efforts that connect to our Reading Achievement Plan to improve reading achievement include family partnerships and community collaboration. Maple Heights City Schools continually create and explore opportunities to help families with supporting literacy at home. The district currently hosts Family Literacy Nights, student author nights, and summer reading events. Community collaboration includes yearly student and family school literacy activities sponsored by Cuyahoga Community College, also the 1-2-3 Read Program and Bookworm Club sponsored by the Maple Heights Public Library, and a summer reading partnership with the Cleveland Book Bank.

SECTION 3: WHY A READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN IS NEEDED IN OUR DISTRICT OR COMMUNITY SCHOOL

SECTION 3, PART A: ANALYSIS OF RELEVENT LEARNER PERFORMANCE DATA

Insert an analysis of relevant student performance data from sources that must include, but are not limited to, the English language arts assessment prescribed under ORC 3301.0710 (grades 3-8), the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment, reading diagnostics (required for grades K-3 under the Third Grade Reading Guarantee) and benchmark assessments, as applicable.

Maple Heights City Schools is committed to improving reading achievement for all students. This needs assessment focuses on learner performance and data and then on an analysis of additional factors which is believed to contribute to the underachievement in literacy in our district.

Data Summary

Comprehensive data analysis of the last two years' MAP data for 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 indicated weakness in foundational skills for kindergarteners and first graders, an inability for our second graders to read second grade text fluently, and a majority of third graders' inability to comprehend grade level literature and informational text.

This trend continues with an in-depth analysis of this year's KRA, the Kindergarten Reading Assessment) (Fall 2018) and MAP data for Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 indicated that students entering kindergarten are still lacking pre-kindergarten skills with 54% not on track. This percentage of those entering kindergarten has been consistent for the last few years.. More than 50% of the incoming kindergarteners (73%) and incoming first graders (57%) are still weak in foundational skills. The Innovation Inventory guided the decision to put Heggerty Phonemic Awareness framework into place to address this weakness. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that the implementation of this program had an impact on foundational skills with less incoming first graders at risk in this area (57% as opposed to 74% the year before).

The 2018-2019 data also indicated that the majority of the second and third grade students continue to be unable to comprehend grade level literature and informational text, The results for the Language, Craft, and Structure areas of both literature and informational text indicated that 58-74% of the students were not on track. It could be hypothesized that students are deficient in the Language Comprehension part of the Simple View of Reading and this may be the reason for the inability to comprehend at grade level. Based on this data, Units of Study were selected to support the students' reading skills in the areas of phonics, reading, and writing. The Units of Study help students become engaged, capable readers by encouraging them to read at their level and support them through small group instruction with their specific needs as a focus. Cunningham & Allington states, "All children benefit from large amounts of easy reading coupled with opportunities to read more difficult material" (1999).

Data collected from the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory from Fall 2018 supports our Local Literacy Plan to improve our Tier I instruction. The two greatest areas of need were implementation - feature 1.6 (total 30 -33%) and evaluation in the areas of monitoring and reporting (total 30%). For the second year), the R-TFI (Fall 2019) data supports the Reading Achievement Plan for Tier I instruction. Although gains were made in implementation (with the new Units of Study reading framework) and evaluation (with a new data person), work needs to continue to monitor the implementation of the new Units of Study reading framework. While we have adequate time, and grade level and school wide plans, implementation with fidelity (feature 1.9) continues to be a need (total 50%). This data also showed inconsistency with communication between systems and teams (feature 1.23) and a need for better reporting of the data on student performance (evaluation feature 1.27 (total 50%). Our goal is to develop a better communication plan for sharing data information between systems and teams including TBT, BLT, DLT, and RST.

Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA)				
Year	# of students Not On Track	% of students Not On Track	# of students On Track	% of students On Track
2015-2016	115/219	53	104/219	47
2016-2017	115/213	54	98/213	46
2018-2019	120/221	54	101/221	46

KRA Analysis

As the data above indicates, for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 Fall administration of the KRA, our incoming kindergarten students were not demonstrating readiness, meaning they needed significant support to be able to engage with kindergarten-level instruction.

This trend continues with the 2018 administration, as once again, our students entering kindergarten appear to have not been exposed to pre-kindergarten concepts as indicated by the 2018 KRA scores. This indicates that a majority of our students are not prepared for Kindergarten-level instruction and may be due to the fact that only 28.57% attended our preschool.

STAR						
2015-2016	Beginning		Middle		End	
Grade	% Not On Track	% On Track	% Not On Track	% On Track	% Not On Track	% On Track
Kindergarten	55	45	26	74	34	66
First	34	66	19	81	32	68
Second	60	40	44	56	51	49
Third	63	37	39	61	55	45
2016-2017	Beginning		Middle		End	
Grade	% Not On Track	% On Track	% Not On Track	% On Track	% Not On Track	% On Track
Kindergarten	82	18	54	46	14	86
First	63	37	35	65	31	69
Second	62	38	47	53	30	70
Third	57	43	44	56	41	59

STAR
STAR Analysis

STAR data for Kindergarten for the beginning of the year indicated, for both 2015-16 and 2016-17, that our Kindergarten students are at risk for not meeting Kindergarten grade level benchmarks. Fifty-five percent of the students in the Fall of 2015 and eighty-two of the students in the Fall of 2016 earned scores that placed them in the "Not on Track'" category. Gains were made at the end of both school years, with 66% on track at the end of 2016 and 86% on track at the end of 2017

At the beginning of Fall 2015, STAR data indicated that (34%) first graders were at risk for not meeting first grade benchmarks. For 2016, even more first graders (63%) were at risk for not meeting the grade level benchmarks for first grade. Very little growth was made by the end of 2016 for first grade as compared to the end of 2017, where students went from 37% on track to 9% on track.

Sixty percent of the second graders at the beginning of 2015 were unable to meet the "On Track" benchmark for the STAR assessment. For 2016, even more second graders – 62% - were at risk for not meeting the grade level benchmarks for second grade. There was only 9% growth at the end of 2016 and 32% increase in those on track for 2017

Third grade STAR scores for the beginning of 2015 indicated 63% incoming third graders were at risk for not passing the Third Grade Reading Guarantee. For 2016, our incoming third graders continued to be at risk for not passing the Third Grade Guarantee with 57% not meeting the benchmark.

NWEA MAP Foundational Skills											
FA 2017	**Print Concepts**				**Phonological Awareness**				**Phonics and Word Recognition**			
	Not On Track		**On Track**		**Not On Track**		**On Track**		**Not On Track**		**On Track**	
Student Data	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
K (Fall BM 133)	167/ 204	81	37/ 204	18	167/ 204	81	37/ 204	18	167/ 204	81	37/ 204	18
1 (Fall BM 153)	173/ 235	74	62/ 235	26	173/ 235	74	62/ 235	26	173/ 235	74	62/ 235	26

NWEA MAP 2017 (K-1)

Kindergarten students took the NWEA MAP assessment and 82% started the 2017 year at risk in foundational skills. First graders also started 2017 with 74% at risk for foundational skills.

At this point in Kindergarten, students should be able to hear, identify, and produce 30 letters and 3 sounds.

By the middle of the year, students should hear, identify, and produce 40 letters and 9 sounds.

NWEA MAP Foundational Skills
For first grade, this large majority of students at risk is a significant concern because foundational skills require readers to notice how letters represent sounds and gives readers a way to approach sounding out and reading new words. It helps readers understand that the letters in words are systematically represented by sounds. A contributing factor for these results may be the lack of a systematic, explicit phonemic program in place.

NWEA MAP Reading Skills												
FA 2017	**Literature**				**Informational**				**Vocabulary**			
	Not On Track		**On Track**		**Not On Track**		**On Track**		**Not On Track**		**On Track**	
Student Data	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
2 (Fall BM 166)	140/ 225	62	85/ 225	38	186/ 248	75	62/ 248	25	177/ 248	71	71/ 248	29
3 (Fall BM 179)	118/ 246	48	128/ 246	52	150/ 266	56	116/ 266	44	146/ 261	56	115/ 261	44

NWEA MAP 2017 (2-5)

Literature

The literature results of the Fall 2017 NWEA MAP indicated that only 38% of the second graders met the Fall benchmark for comprehending literature selections. The same results were evident for third grade at 52% meeting the Fall benchmark for literature. This is a concern since reading comprehension is critical to students' ability to deeply and actively glean meaning from the text. Reading comprehension is an important skill for acquiring vocabulary and language skills.

Informational Text

Comprehension of informational text on the Fall 2017 NWEA MAP indicated even lower percentages for second, third, fourth, and fifth grade students meeting the benchmark. Only 25% of the second graders, 44% of the third graders meeting the comprehension benchmark for informational text. This is a significant concern because comprehending nonfiction is critical for understanding the natural and social world of informational text.

Vocabulary

The results for the vocabulary section on the Fall 2017 MAP test had the lowest percentage of students meeting the benchmark with only 29% of the second graders, 44% of the third graders meeting the vocabulary benchmark.for acquisition and use. Vocabulary knowledge is critical to understanding a topic and both literature and informational texts.

Although the reading workshop framework and Marzano's 6 step vocabulary framework are in place, a closer look at the implementation with fidelity of these frameworks is necessary. It is possible that lack of effective Tier I instruction is contributing to these low results in comprehension and vocabulary.

NWEA MAP Reading Skills											
FA 2018	**Literature and Informational**				**Foundational Skills**				**Vocabulary Use and Functions**			
	Not On Track		**On Track**		**Not On Track**		**On Track**		**Not On Track**		**On Track**	
Student Data	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**	**#**	**%**
K	93	40	138	60	167	73	61	27	119	52	109	48
1	123	57	101	43	127	57	97	43	130	58	94	42

NWEA 2018 (K-1)

Literature and Informational Text
The Literature and Informational results of the Fall 2018-19 MAP indicated that 40% kindergarten students did not meet the benchmark to be proficient in these areas. Similar results in the areas of Literature and Informational for Fall 2018 demonstrated that 57% of the first grade students were not on track in these areas. Early reading skills for Kindergarten and first grade are essential for success in reading and these students are at risk. These students are demonstrating difficulty with reading comprehension and are lacking in either decoding or language comprehension based on the theoretical framework identified through the Simple View of Reading.

Foundational Skills
In the fall of 2018, 73% of the incoming Kindergarten students were at risk in foundational skills on the MAP test and for first grade 57% did not meet the benchmark. Past MAP results for 2017 have indicated similar findings: kindergarten at 82% and 74% of first grade not meeting the benchmark. Therefore, this deficient in foundational skills, especially for kindergarten, continues to be an area of need. Foundational skills are critical to early readers in order to approach sounding out words and reading new words. As identified on the Innovation Inventory, Heggerty's phonemic awareness program was put in place for K-2 students for the 2018-19 school year.

Vocabulary
The 2018 Map Vocabulary results for kindergarten indicate 52% and 58% of first graders were not on track with vocabulary acquisition and use. many factors may contribute to this lack of vocabulary skills, however, these results support the research on language skills that indicate students of poverty lack experience with language (Hart & Risley, 1995).

NWEA MAP Reading Skills																				
FA 2018	Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details				Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure				Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details				Informational Text: Language Craft and Structure				Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use			
	Not On Track		On Track		Not On Track		On Track		Not On Track		On Track		Not On Track		On Track		Not On Track		On Track	
Data	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2	168	70	88	30	151	63	88	37	176	74	63	26	175	73	64	27	178	74	61	26
3	151	56	116	44	166	63	101	37	169	64	98	36	172	64	95	36	161	60	106	40

2018 NWEA MAP Reading(2 -3)

Literary Text

The Fall 2018 MAP Literary results showed fifty percent or less of our second and third graders were on track with literacy text skills in key ideas and details. Second grade had the least amount on track with only 30% meeting the benchmark.

The Fall 2018 MAP literary results for Language, Craft, and Structure indicated even less students met the benchmark in these areas with only 42% or less of the students on track.

Informational Text

The fall 2018 MAP informational results showed that similar low percentages of students were on track in both Key Ideas and Details and for Language, Craft, and Structure. Forty two percent or less of the second and third graders met the benchmark for Informational text Key Ideas and details as well as 41% or less met the benchmark for language Craft and Structure. Second grade, once again, had the lowest percentage in both areas.

Vocabulary

The fall of 2018 MAP vocabulary results continue the trend that shows second and third grade students are at risk in acquisition and use. Only 43% or less of the second and third grade students met the vocabulary benchmark.

The literature and informational test results for second and third grade indicate that these students are at risk for understanding both literature text and especially comprehension of informational text. The results for the Language, Craft, and Structure areas of both literature and informational text indicated that 58-74% of the

students were not on track. It could be hypothesized that students are deficient in the Language Comprehension part of the Simple View of Reading and this may be the reason for the inability to comprehend at grade level.. Due to this trend in comprehension, Units of Study for Reading have been put into place for grades K-3. as indicated on the Innovation Inventory. Vocabulary continues to be an area of need for our students. A closer look at the tier I vocabulary instruction is needed.

DIBELS				
Fall 2017-2018 WCPM Benchmark	**Below (≤ 51)**		**At or Above (≥ 52)**	
Student Data	**# of students**	**% of students**	**# of students**	**% of students**
Grade 2	133/246	54	113/246	46

DIBELS

At the beginning of the 2017 school year, second graders were unable to quickly and accurately match sound to symbol and read words fluently since 54% were unable to meet the DIBELS Fall Oral Reading Fluency/Words Correct per Minute benchmark (WCPM).. It is critical for students to read fluently in order to comprehend at high levels. The automatic reading of words will help students' comprehension of both literature and informational text. As a response to this data, Rasinski's Fluency Development Lesson Protocol was put into place for grades K-3.

Ohio's Third Grade ELA Test (Fall)		
Year	**% Not on Track**	**% on Track**
2015-2016	33.4	66.7
2016-2017	39.4	60.6
2017-2018	47.4	52.6

OHIO STATE TESTING (Fall to Fall)

Results of Third Grade State ELA test indicated for 2015-16, 33.3 percent of the third graders and 39.4 percent of the third graders in 2016-17 did not meet the requirements for passing the Third Grade

Guarantee. For 2017-2018, 47.4 percent of the third graders once again did not meet the requirements for the Third Grade Guarantee. For the past three years the percentage of third graders not meeting the requirement has increased and it can be concluded that students are lacking literacy skills to demonstrate proficiency. These results continue to show a need for consistent, systematic, explicit literacy instruction.

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI)			
Year	**Winter 2018**	**Fall 2018**	**Fall 2019**
Tier I Overall	39-41%	75-80%	63%
Team	60%	70%	60%
Implementation	25-33%	75-83%	75%
Resources	50%	83-92%	75%
Evaluation	30%	75%	50%

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI)

R-TFI

Overall, our R-TFI data has improved from 2018 to 2019. The district has worked hard to establish School-wide teams with a wide representation of administrators, teachers, intervention specialists, and psychologists to effectively accomplish the work. From winter to fall 2018, an instructional plan was put into place along with professional development and support which resulted in growth in implementation. This instructional plan at each grade level included goals that aligned with the Big Ideas of Reading and the state standards. For the Fall of 2019, Units of Study for reading, writing, and phonics were put into place to support the instructional framework. Professional development opportunities were provided for supporting our instructional plan and school-wide reading model. An individual has been identified to assist in coordination of district and school-wide reading assessments. This individual coordinates data collection and monitors Teacher Based Teams' grade level assessments along with communicating data information to the Building Level Teams and District Level Teams. School Leadership Teams are well established; however, this is an area of focus to improve frequency of the School Leadership Team meetings, establish a better process for data decision making, and communicate more frequently with all stakeholders. R-TFI data shows Tier I is an area of need especially in implementation and evaluation. This supports our assessment data.

Data collected from the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory from Fall 2018 supports our Local Literacy Plan to improve our Tier I instruction. The two greatest areas of need are implementation (30 -33%) and evaluation (30%). For the second year), the R-TFI (Spring 2019) data supports the Local Literacy Plan for Tier I instruction. Although gains were made in implementation (with the new Units of Study reading framework) and evaluation (with a new data person), work needs to continue to monitor the implementation of the new Units of Study reading framework. While we have adequate time, and grade level and school wide plans, implementation with fidelity continues to be a need (50%). This data also showed a need to better communicate and report the data on student performance (evaluation - 50%).

SECTION 3, PART B: ANALYSIS OF FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO LOW READING ACHIEVEMENT

Insert an analysis of factors believed to contribute to low reading achievement in the school district or community school.

Our comprehensive needs assessment data continues to indicate a Tier I reading problem. There are a number of factors contributing to low reading achievement in the Maple City Schools.

1. Gaps in Curriculum/Data:

   Curriculum gaps contributed to insufficient literacy instruction. Analysis of the Fall 2017 MAP assessment showed only 18% of the kindergarten and first grade students were on track for phonemic awareness and phonics and, therefore, indicating a need for consistent, systematic, explicit phonemic awareness and phonics instruction. The fall 2018 results continued to show that 27% of kindergartners and 43% of our first graders were on track with foundational skills. Although there was improvement, these results indicate a lack of instructional focus on the decoding part of the Simple View of Reading. Addressing this instructional gap with Heggerty's Phonemic Awareness program and Phonics Units of Study will help to meet the foundational literacy needs of our students. In addition, Daily Reading Audit was completed and results indicated a need to implement our reading plan with fidelity five days a week. We will be monitoring this through fidelity walkthroughs. To effectively implement and close the gaps in curriculum, guidance from the literacy leaders will provide opportunity for professional development for the core reading components and on-going assessments.

2. Lack of Adult Implementation:

   Specific phonemic awareness and phonics instruction was not being implemented with fidelity as based on our MAP data and R-TFI results. Although a reading plan is in place as indicated in 1.9 on the R-TFI results, Heggerty and Phonics Units of Study were adopted to provide consistent, systematic, and explicit foundational literacy instruction. As also indicated by the RTFI results data 1.15, there is a need for professional development to support the implementation of the decoding (word leveling reading) from the Simple View of Reading. New

teacher turn-over and teacher absence has also contributed to the inadequate level of instruction. For the 2018-19 school year, there was a total of ten new teachers K-3. This included two new teachers for first grade, one for second grade, and one for third grade. Instruction is adversely affected by this turn-over due to novice teachers lacking in knowledge of district initiatives and teaching experience.

3. Home literacy contributes to students entering school at risk.

It is suspected that nothing is happening in the home environment to grow or support literacy:

- Data indicates 34% of kindergarten students "not on track" at the end of the school year (2015-16) entered first grade (2016-17) with 63% of the same students "not on track". This trend has continued with our kindergarten students entering first grade at risk but at a smaller percentage -33 % of kindergarteners "not on track" at the end of the school year (2018-19) entered first grade (2019-20) with 40% of the same students "not on track."
- Students language skills are linked to their economic backgrounds. The demographics of our student population include 99% that are economically disadvantaged. The average child from families of welfare had half as much experience with language per hour as a child in the working-class family, and less than one-third of a child in a professional family.
- Based on the parent sign-in sheets, there is poor parent turnout for literacy nights and reading activities and research shows low income parents are less likely to attend school functions or volunteer in their children's class (National Center for Education Statistics, 2005). Not because they care less about education but other factors such as working multiple jobs, unable to afford child care, transportation, etc. prevent them for attending.

4. Lack of Pre-school and readiness experience:
- KRA data results for the past two years indicate that our incoming kindergarten students are not ready to engage in kindergarten concepts with more than half of the students Not On Track - 53% 2015-16 and 54% 2016-17.
- Based on the 2017-2018 state report on Pre-school attendance, only 28.57% attended our pre-school as opposed to the state target of 52.3%.
- Based on this data, we conclude that early readiness experience is needed for our students to be prepared for the demands of the Kindergarten curriculum. Gorski makes reference to the importance of early learning opportunities since brain development during children's earliest years is critical and influences their rate of cognitive development. Therefore, early intervention is essential to eliminating the educational opportunity gap (Duncan, Magnuson, Kalik, & Ziol-Guest, 2012).

5. Attendance issues:
- Chronic absenteeism occurs at a higher rate in high-poverty schools (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). This appears to be true based on our attendance data. For the 2016-17 school year, 401 Kindergarten and first grade students were absent 4,897 days (an average of 12 days per student), 437 second and third grade students were absent 5,378 days (an average of 12 days per student. Students are missing approximately two to three weeks, on average, of literacy instruction. This trend continues with data from the 2018-2019 school year with kindergarten students absent 688 days (an average of 11.5 days per student), first grade students were missing 2,332 school days (an average of 12.3 days per student), second graders were absent 3,231 days (an average of 14.1 days per student), with third grade students were not present for 3,349 (an average of 13 days per student). Astoundingly, individual students were even missing up to 60 days a year. This absenteeism expands the achievement gap as these students continue to miss two to three weeks a year of consistent, systematic, and explicit literacy instruction. When students come back to school after an extended absence, they tend to lack understanding of basic concepts, content knowledge, and critical thinking skills (Walsh, 1999). Our DLT's recent partnership with Harvard University has put into place strategies to help eliminate this chronic problem. These strategies will be monitored through data collection. This data will then be reviewed by the BLT, DLT, and community stakeholders.

SECTION 4: LITERACY MISSION AND VISION STATEMENT(S)

Describe the district's or community school's literacy mission and/or vision statement. The Department's literacy vision is described in Section 4 of Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement.

In Maple Heights, our mission is to inspire all students to become proficient readers who have developed an appreciation for literacy.

Vision and Beliefs:

Our vision includes Ohio's belief that all learners be supported to make progress in their literacy acquisition. We believe that providing challenging, meaningful, and engaging evidenced based literacy instruction in every classroom, we will ensure that all students can read and comprehend on grade level. We will achieve this goal by implementing the following:

- * Monitoring Consistent, Systematic, and Explicit Literacy Instruction that addresses the Big 5 of Reading * Providing Systematic Intervention with Standardized Practices
- * Cultivating Literary Interest
- * Encouraging Parents to Read to their Children
- * Utilizing Consistent, Decisive, and Data-Based Decision-Making
- * Providing Intensive Intervention to Struggling Readers
- * Offering professional development, including coaching, to provide effective classroom instruction

Ohio's literacy vision is grounded in scientific research and evidence-based practices. Our Reading Achievement Plan goals include the five areas of literacy and the simple view of reading which are:

phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Using high-quality evidenced based systems and practices will serve as our lever for engaging all learners to improve literacy acquisition.

SECTION 5: MEASURABLE LEARNER PERFORMANCE GOALS

Describe the measurable learner performance goals addressing learners' needs (Section 3) that the Reading Achievement Plan is designed to support progress toward. The plan may have an overarching goal, as well as subgoals such as grade-level goals). Goals should be strategic/specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound. In addition, goals should be inclusive and equitable.

Overarching Goal: All students in grades K-3 will improve performance on the AIR/State Tests as well as local assessments by 10% each year as measured by the Ohio State Tests and NWEA MAP (Measures of Academic Progress).

Subgoals:

1. Third Grade Guarantee
    - Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding the third grade requirement standard for the third grade guarantee from 52.6% to 60% as measured on the Ohio Third Grade State Assessments.
2. Foundational Skills: Phonological Awareness/Phonics
    - Kindergarten: Increase the percentage of Kindergarten students meeting or exceeding targets for foundational skills/phonological awareness from 18% to 20% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.
    - First Grade: Increase the percentage of first students meeting or exceeding targets for foundational skills (print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics/word recognition) from 26% to 30% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.
3. Fluency:
    - Fluency: Second Grade: Increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for fluency from 46% to 51% by spring of 2020 as measured by DIBELS Spring Oral Reading Fluency/Words Correct per Minute Benchmark.
4. Comprehension:
    - Second Grade: increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for literature from 30% (key ideas and details) and 37% (language craft and structure) to 33% and 41% respectively, and for informational text from 26% (key ideas and details) and 27% (language craft and structure to 29% and 30% respectively as measured by the spring 2020 NWEA MAP Reading.
    - Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding targets for literature from 44% (key ideas and details) and 37% (language craft and structure) to 48% and 41% respectively, and for informational from 36% (key ideas and details) and 36% (language craft and structure to 40% for both as measured by the spring 2020 NWEA MAP Reading
5. Vocabulary
    - Second Grade: increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for vocabulary from 26% to 29% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.
    - Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding targets for vocabulary from 40% to 44% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.

SECTION 6: ACTION PLAN MAP(S)

Each action plan map describes how implementation of the Reading Achievement Plan will take place for each specific literacy goal the plan is designed to address. For goals specific for grades K-3, at least one action step in each map should address supports for students who have Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans.

Goal # 1 Action Map

Goal Statement: Third Grade Guarantee: Increase the percentage of students meeting or exceeding Third grade proficiency standards from 52.6% to 60% by spring of 2020 as measured by the Ohio State Assessment (AIR).

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: high quality professional development and Tier I systematic and purposeful instruction by using evidence based reading strategies to improve skills.

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Components	Schools will develop a School-wide Reading plan that outlines the components of a strong Tier I reading program.	School communication plan will be developed between the BLT and other school teams that are working to support the strong Tier I reading program and school and district priorities.	Schools have teaming structures to oversee intervention supports and fidelity of implementation of the reading plan and to engage in individualized intensive problem solving for students with reading difficulties.
Timeline	10/19 to 5/20	10/19 to 5/20	10/19 to 5/20
Lead Person(s)	The Local Literacy Plan committee will monitor the completed plan	K-3 Reading Support Team (RST) and committee will monitor the communication by feedback from teachers and school and central office administrators and staff.	Reading Support Team (RST) will monitor the implementation of the reading plan through monthly walk-throughs
Resources Needed	K-3 Reading Support Team responsibilities and utilize R-TFI to monitor implementation of the plan.	The communication plan includes a Guidance document to assist the principal and teachers in creating a 90-minutes reading block schedule. Guidance document for implementation of strong Tier I instruction. Strong Tier I grade level instructional plan template. Access to instructional coaching. Sub costs for teachers, grade level team leaders, and the RST to access PD.	Sub costs for teachers, grade level team leaders, and the RST to access PD. Guidance document for implementation of strong Tier I instructional template Grade level instructional plan template and worked example
Specifics of Implementation	Assign specific roles to the Building Reading Support Team. Building Reading Support Team completed fall RTFI, analyzed results and prioritized needs. Will complete a spring RTFI process.	Meeting with the school principals to monitor RST membership and to ensure staff selected has the support they need to meet the responsibilities. School-Wide Tier I Reading Plan and example of grade	Grade level meetings will occur in grades K-3 starting after the winter screening window Schools will install the components of a strong Tier I reading plan and instructional system to ensure students have access to effective and

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
	School leaders will ensure building leadership team members and teachers are equipped to adjust Tier I instruction based on NWEA data and the school-wide reading plan. K-3 Reading Support Teams will access high quality on-going professional learning in the Tier 1 components in the Units of Study and phonemic awareness.	level instructional plan will be communicated at staff meetings. Coaches modeling strong Tier I reading instruction.	researched-based reading practices.
Measure of Success	Fall 2019 and spring 2020 RTFI data. Student outcome: Ten percent growth on the NWEA 2019 fall to spring 2020 MAP data Adult outcomes:	Fall to spring R-TFI data Adult outcomes: Implementation of Units of Study with fidelity Full implementation of the 90 minute reading block and strong Tier I instruction.	R-TFI data monthly walk through data
Check-in/Review Date	Implementation of Units of Study with fidelity.	All use instructional plan template.	

Goal # 2 Action Map

Goal Statement: Foundational Skills: Increase the percentage of kindergarten students meeting or exceeding targets for phonological awareness from 18% to 20% by spring 2020 as measured by MAP Reading. Increase the percentage of first grade students meeting or exceeding targets for foundational skills from 26% to 30% by spring 2020 as measured by MAP Reading.

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: focused Tier 1 instruction in foundational reading skills and high quality professional development.

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Components	Kindergarten and first grade teachers will participate in on-going research-based language and literacy professional learning - targeting phonological awareness for kindergarten and print concepts, phonological awareness, and word recognition for first grade teachers with the Heggerty and Phonics Units of Study.	Grade level PA and phonics analysis: NWEA MAP PAST Heggerty I-Ready	Based on positive outcomes from the 2018-19 exploration of Heggerty and the Units of Study as well as results from the Innovation Inventory, Heggerty's Phonemic awareness framework and the Phonics Units of Study will be implemented 2019-20. RST will develop a teacher tool kit for phonological awareness. checklist developed by the RST. Fidelity of implementation using a walk-through

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Timeline	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020 school year
Lead Person(s)	RST - will monitor effectiveness of PD and the classroom implementation through walkthroughs and RFTI data.	Teachers - TBT meetings will analyze data monthly	RST will monitor the use of the toolkit and classroom implementation of Heggerty's PA framework and Phonics Units of Study through walkthroughs
Resources Needed	Teachers need access to the K-3 strong Tier 1 reading plan. Access to high quality professional development Exploration and administration of possible assessments for foundational skills such as PAST and Haggerty Substitute costs	Substitute costs (rotating subs)	Provide professional development for the 90 minute instructional block and materials, specifically, for Heggerty and Phonics Units of Study Funds to pay for training for research-based curriculum supplemental materials. Opportunity to develop a fidelity implementation checklist for walk-throughs. Substitute costs
Specifics of Implementation	Kindergarten and first grade teachers will acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities of Scientifically-Based Reading Research in foundational skills so they understand how to implement with fidelity these best practices.	Monthly grade level data analysis meetings will occur The Kindergarten and first grade level analysis meetings will drive the development of strong Tier 1 instructional plans based on the data analysis.	Teachers will access high-quality professional learning to teach foundational skills including phonological awareness, phonics, word recognition, and print concepts using the supplemental materials. Fidelity checklist will be shared with the teachers.
Measure of Success	2019-2020 school year evaluation data includes identification of all teachers participating in the research-based foundational skills PD Fall and spring RTFI data.	2019-2020 school year Instructional Plans to meet the needs of the students. Students show progress toward grade level mastery as measured by the PAST and MAP subskill assessments	2019-2020 school year Fidelity data - walk-through checklists Assessment data Fall and Spring RFTI data
Check-in/Review Date	Quarterly based district PD sessions	Monthly meetings	Monthly for fidelity checks, coaching

Goal # 3 Action Map

Goal Statement: Fluency: Second Grade: Increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for fluency from 46% to 51% by spring of 2020 as measured by DIBELS Spring Oral Reading Fluency/Words Correct Per Minute Benchmark.

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: focused Tier I evidenced based fluency instruction and high quality professional development.

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Components	Second grade teachers will participate in researched-based language and literacy professional learning that targets fluency.	Grade level data analysis: DIBELS Fluency rubric from the Reading Units of Study running records	Review and training/retraining of Rasinski's Fluency Development Lesson (FDL) along with the Synergistic Instructional curriculum resource. Fidelity of implementation following Rasinski's Fluency Protocol.
Timeline	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020
Lead Person(s)	RST will monitor PD and classroom implementation through walkthroughs	Teachers - TBT meetings will analyze data monthly Teachers: Running records will be analyzed quarterly	RST will hold PD sessions and monitor implementation through walkthroughs
Resources Needed	Teachers need access to strong Tier 1 K-3 reading plan. Access to research-based fluency professional development Substitute costs	Substitute costs (rotating subs)	Provide research-based professional development for fluency. Funds to pay for a trainer to teach research-based fluency practices. Substitute costs
Specifics of Implementation	Second grade teachers will acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities of Scientifically-Based Reading Research in fluency so they understand how to implement with fidelity these best practices.	Monthly grade level progress-monitoring data analysis meetings will occur. Meetings will result in the development of Grade Level instructional plans for fluency based on the data analysis (DIBELS and running records).	Teachers will access research-based professional development and implement with fidelity Rasinski's Fluency Development Lesson (FDL) and synergistic instructional curriculum resource materials.
Measure of Success	Module completion data - training evaluation data and includes teachers who participated in the research-based fluency PD	Analysis of fluency data. Instructional Plans based on the data analysis.	Training evaluation data Fidelity data - using Rasinski's protocol Assessment data

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Check-in/Review Date	Quarterly based on the district's PD sessions	Monthly meetings	Monthly fidelity checks, coaching

Goal # 4 Action Map

Goal Statement: Comprehension

Second Grade: increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for literature from 30% (key ideas and details) and 37% (language craft and structure) to 33% and 41% respectively, and for informational from 26% (key ideas and details) and 27% (language craft and structure to 29% and 30% as measured by the spring 2020 NWEA MAP Reading..

Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding targets for literature from 44% (key ideas and details) and 37 % (language craft and structure) to 48% and 41%, and for informational from 36% (key ideas and details) and 36% (language craft and structure to 40% for both as measured by the spring 2020 NWEA MAP Reading.

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: focused Tier I evidence based instruction for literary and informational comprehension reading skills and strategies with high quality professional development

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Components	Second and third grade teachers will participate in research-based language and literacy professional learning targeting comprehension.	Grade level data analysis: MAP I-Ready Reading Units of Study running records	Review research-based supplemental materials to support comprehension strategies. Fidelity of implementation of the Reading Units of Study. RST will develop an additional teacher tool kit for comprehension.
Timeline	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020
Lead Person(s)	RST - will monitor PD and classroom implementation through walkthroughs	Teachers - TBT meetings will analyze data monthly using bi-weekly assessments, running records and i-ready information	RST will develop the toolkit and monitor classroom implementation
Resources Needed	Teachers need access to the strong Tier 1 K-3 reading plan. Access to research-based professional development for Reading Units of Study • Substitute costs	• Substitute costs (rotating subs)	Provide professional development for 90 minute instructional block and materials for Reading Units of Study Reading Units of Study implemented with fidelity. Funds to pay for training research-based comprehension strategies. • Substitute costs
Specifics of Implementation	Second and third grade teachers will acquire	Monthly grade level data analysis meetings will occur	Teachers will access research-based professional learning in

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
	knowledge, skills, and abilities of evidence--based reading instruction so they understand how to implement with fidelity these best practices in comprehension.	Meetings will result in the development of strong Tier 1 comprehension grade level instructional plans based on the data analysis.	order to teach effective comprehension strategies and implement with fidelity the Reading Units of Study.
Measure of Success	Module completion data - Training evaluation data including identification of all teachers participating in the research-based comprehension skills PD.	Analysis of data. Instructional plans for comprehension based on the needs of the students.	Training evaluation data Fidelity data using RST walkthroughs
Check-in/Review Date	Quarterly based on the district's PD sessions	Monthly meetings	Monthly for fidelity checks, coaching

Goal # 5 Action Map

Goal Statement: Vocabulary

Second Grade: increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for vocabulary from 26% to 29% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.

Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding targets for vocabulary from 40% to 44% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: focused Tier I evidence based vocabulary instruction and high quality professional development.

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Components	Second and grade teachers will participate in research-based language and literacy professional learning targeting vocabulary. RST members will attend Anita Archer's explicit vocabulary PD and share the training with the teachers.	Grade level data analysis: MAP i-Ready	Review research-based supplemental materials to support vocabulary acquisition and use strategies. Fidelity of implementation of the Words Their Way framework (third grade) and the district's vocabulary guidelines and toolkit including Marzano's 6 steps. Explore other vocabulary frameworks for possible implementation. RST will develop a teacher tool kit for vocabulary.
Timeline	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020 school year	2019-2020 school year
Lead Person(s)	RST will monitor the	Teachers - TBT meetings will	RST will monitor

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
	effectiveness of the PD and classroom implementation through walkthroughs	analyze data on a monthly basis	implementation through walkthroughs
Resources Needed	Teachers need access to the strong Tier 1 Reading Plan. Access to research-based professional development. • Substitute costs.	• Substitute costs (rotating subs)	Provide research-based professional development for vocabulary. Funds to pay for a trainer to teach research-based vocabulary practices. Vocabulary instruction implemented with fidelity. • Substitute costs
Specifics of Implementation	Second, and third grade teachers will acquire knowledge, skills, and abilities of evidence-based vocabulary research so they understand how to implement with fidelity these best practices in vocabulary.	Monthly grade level data analysis meetings will occur Meetings will result in the development of strong Tier 1 vocabulary Grade Level instructional plans based on the data analysis.	Teachers will access research-based professional learning in order to teach effective vocabulary strategies. Teachers will implement Words Their Way (grade 3) and Marzano's vocabulary guidelines tool kit with fidelity.
Measure of Success	Module completion data - Training evaluation data including identification of all teachers participating in the research-based vocabulary skills PD.	Analysis of data. Instructional plans for vocabulary based on the needs of the students.	Training evaluation data Fidelity data using RST walkthroughs
Check-in/Review Date	Quarterly - based on the district's PD sessions	Monthly meetings	Monthly fidelity checks and coaching.

SECTION 7: PLAN FOR MONITORING PROGRESS TOWARD THE LEARNER PERFORMANCE GOAL(S)

Describe how progress toward learner performance goals (Section 5) will be monitored, measured and reported.

The following current modes of assessments will be reviewed to monitor, measure, and report student progress along with the first year using i-Ready and the possible implementation of PAST:

1. Tier 1 formative assessments based on the reading framework: Running Records, Bi-weekly assessments, i-Ready, and PAST.
2. Achievement, diagnostic test scores (fall, winter, spring): MAP, DIBELS, i-Ready, and Primary Spelling Inventory (PSI)
3. Reading Improvement Plans
4. Observations during fidelity walkthroughs.
5. Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI)

Progress monitoring provides a critical piece of data in determining effective Tier 1 instruction.

Formative assessment occurs between achievement benchmarks to prepare for student performance at the next benchmarking period. Diagnostic assessment provides school personnel with in-depth information about a student's strengths and weaknesses in key skill areas. It is critical that this data be analyzed and acted upon. We are exploring other assessment options such as PAST to support our identified need for Tier 1 phonological awareness assessment and instruction. I -Ready will be implemented January 2020 for gathering additional in-depth data.

Classroom teachers, Teacher Based Teams, Building Leadership Teams, District Leadership Team, and the Reading Support Team (RST) will be monitoring and communicating the results of our assessments and goals on a monthly basis.

FORMATIVE

I-Ready - connects assessment data to personalized digital learning and teacher led Tier I instruction.

Based on this assessment formative/diagnostic data for the reading standards covering the big five:

phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. Implementation of this diagnostic tool will begin January 2020.

Running Records - a tool for coding, scoring, and analyzing a child's reading behaviors. It provides a comprehensive picture of each reader's strengths, areas of need, and instructional reading level, so students can be grouped for small group reading instruction.

Bi-Weekly Assessments - teacher designed standards-based assessment that shows student growth on standards taught.

PAST - review and possible implementation of this comprehensive evaluation for phonological awareness

ACHIEVEMENT/DIAGNOSTIC

NWEA MAP - NWEA MAP measures what students know and informs what they are ready to learn next. MAP growth reveals how much growth has occurred between testing events. NWEA MAP is administered to students three times a year. Teachers and administrators will analysis the data to drive instruction in the classroom.

DIBELS- (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills) a set of procedures and measures for assessing the acquisition of early literacy skills including fluency. Second graders need to demonstrate growth in accurate and automatic word recognition. DIBELS will be administered two times a year to inform growth in meeting the Words Correct per Minutes/Oral Reading Fluency grade level benchmarks.

PSI - (Primary Spelling Inventory/Words Their Way) is given three times a year to kindergarten through third grade. The words in the spelling inventories are designed to demonstrate students' knowledge of key spelling features at the different stages of spelling development.

I-Ready - Based on this diagnostic assessment data for the reading standards covering the big five: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension shows what students already know and what skills they need to acquire. Implementation of this diagnostic tool will begin January 2020.

Reading Improvement Plan

RIMP - Reading Improvement Monitoring Plan - teachers will monitor their students' plans to provide systematic teaching of skills within the Tier 1 framework.

OBSERVATION

Administrators will ensure fidelity of implementation of the Tier 1 Reading Plan using the Fidelity Walk-through checklist.

R-TFI (Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory):

Baseline data for the R-TFI was collected October 2019 and will be administered once again in May. Progress toward our Tier I Local Literacy Plan goals will also be measured by the results of this inventory.

The Teacher-Based Teams (TBTs), will identify students in need of bi-weekly progress monitoring.

Furthermore, the TBTs will identify the specific areas in need of progress monitoring and the Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) as well as the Intervention Assistance Team (IAT) will ensure that progress monitoring is carried out with fidelity. Student benchmarking data will be made available to teachers at quarterly, grade-level meetings and progress monitoring will be available to teachers on an ongoing basis. Based on Tier 1 assessments and progress monitoring, students may receive skill-based interventions. Students will be monitored to discern skill acquisition through intervention assignments and i-Ready results.

In addition, the Reading Support Team (RST), will provide embedded professional development, support, as well as instructional/intervention strategies to colleagues. The RST will also monitor the fidelity of implementation monthly walk-throughs.

Facilitate Improvement

Students' progress will be evaluated on a monthly basis through the use of formative assessments (bi-weekly, i-ready, running records) at grade-level (TBT) meetings. During these meetings, data on student progress from i-ready tier i instruction, as well as appropriate interventions for RTI time and the possible need for more intensive services (i.e., tier 2 & 3 interventions, special education) will be discussed and acted upon. If more intense services are needed, a referral will be made to the Intervention Assistance Team (IAT).

Subgoal	How Monitored	Who Monitors	Completion	Communicated
Subgoal #1: Third Grade Guarantee – Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding the third grade proficiency standards from 52.6% to 60% as measured on the Ohio Third Grade State Assessments.	Formative Achievement/Diagnostic Observation	Teacher RST	Third Grade State Test March/April 2020	TBT/BLT/DLT/RST
Subgoal #2: **Foundational Skills** Kindergarten: Increase the percentage of Kindergarten students meeting or exceeding targets for foundational skills/phonological awareness from 18% to 20% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading. First Grade: Increase the percentage of first students meeting or exceeding targets for foundational skills (print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics/word recognition) from 26% to 30% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.	Formative Achievement/Diagnostic Observation	Teacher RST	May 2020 NWEA MAP	TBT/BLT/DLT/RST
Subgoal #3: Fluency: Second Grade: Increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for fluency from 46% to 51% by spring of 2020 as measured by DIBELS Spring Oral Reading Fluency/Words Correct per Minute Benchmark	Formative Achievement/Diagnostic Observation	Teacher RST	May 2020 DIBELS May 2020 Running Records	TBT/BLT/DLT/RST
Subgoal #4: **Comprehension:** Second grade Increase the percentage of second	Formative Achievement/Diagnostic	Teacher RST	May 2020 NWEA MAP	TBT/BLT/DLT/RST

Subgoal	How Monitored	Who Monitors	Completion	Communicated
grade students meeting or exceeding targets for literature from 30% and 37% to 33% and 41% and informational text from 26% and 27% to 29% and 30% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading. Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding targets for literature from 44% and 37% to 48% and informational text from 36% and 36% to 40% for both by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.	Observation			
Subgoal #5: Vocabulary Second Grade: Increase the percentage of second grade students meeting or exceeding targets for vocabulary from 26% to 29% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading. Third Grade: Increase the percentage of third grade students meeting or exceeding targets for vocabulary from 40% to 44% by spring 2020 as measured by NWEA MAP Reading.	Formative Achievement/Diagnostic Observation	Teacher RST	May 2020 NWEA MAP	TBT/BLT/DLT/RST

SECTION 8: EXPECTATIONS AND SUPPORTS FOR LEARNERS AND SCHOOLS

SECTION 8, PART A: STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT LEARNERS

Describe the evidence-based strategies identified in Section 6 that will be used to meet specific learner needs and improve instruction. This must include a description of how these evidence-based strategies support learners on Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans.

The data obtained from achievement/diagnostic testing and formative assessments including benchmarking and progress monitoring will be utilized to obtain valuable information about students' acquisition of foundational reading skills and potential gaps in knowledge to drive our Tier 1 instruction. Likewise, the information gleaned from these assessments will be applied to the district-wide intervention structure, allowing for the identification of the foremost needs of our students as well as the appropriate placement of students within interventions.

Additionally, students' progress will be evaluated on a monthly basis through the use of classroom formative assessments at grade-level (TBT) meetings.   During these meetings, data on student progress, i-ready information as well as appropriate interventions for RTI time and the possible need for more intensive services (i.e...., tier 2 & 3 interventions, special education) will be discussed and acted upon. This monthly data will be shared with the Building Leadership Teams (BLT) and the District Leadership Team (DLT).

Using the guidance provided for evidence-based direct instruction for early literacy (Ohio Department of Education of Education, 2005; National Early Literacy Panel, 2008) the following strategies will be systematically implemented into the Reading Achievement Plan.   The following scientifically, research-based components are included in our Tier 1, 90 minute reading block (K-3):. These components are foundational skills (phonological awareness, phonics, and word recognition), fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension based on the logic model of Simple View of Reading (decoding = language comprehension = reading comprehension).

1. Foundational Skills (phonological awareness, phonics, word recognition):
   - Heggerty Phonemic Awareness framework and Phonological tool kit
   - Phonics Units of Study
2. Fluency:
   - Rasinski's Fluency Development Lesson Protocol and Synergistic Instruction ● Reading Units of Study running records
3. Vocabulary:
   - Marzano's Vocabulary Steps
   - Maple Heights City School District's Vocabulary Guide and ToolKit - based on Marzano's Vocabulary Steps
   - Words Their Way (3rd grade)
4. Text Comprehension:
   - Reading Units of Study (Reading Workshop Framework):

     Mini-lesson

     Connection/Teaching point

     Teaching

     Active Engagement

     Link

   - Jan Richardson's The Next Step in Guided Reading (RTI Tier I small group)
   - Fountas and Pinnell Leveled books
   - Scholastic leveled books
   - i-Read

Foundational Skills:

Jan Richardson's Next Steps in Guided Reading

Jan Richardson, Ph.D., is a leading expert in guided reading, is a former K-12 teacher, Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, and reading specialist. Her program, Next Steps in Guided Reading, is a complete system for supporting guided reading and word work. Targeted lessons for reading growth include prompts for teaching, monitoring and reinforcing decoding and comprehension strategies, discussion starters, teaching points, phonics and word work including sound boxes, and making and sorting words. Seventeen studies found positive effects in teaching letter names and sounds and/or phonology outcomes. Elkonin boxes (sound boxes) have students attend to sounds in words and record those

sounds in sequence. When making words students learn how to use sounds to monitor for visual information during reading. The minimal changes from one word to the next force students to attend to the specific skill focus (e.g., mat-hat-cat-sat).

Evidence-based rating: IES What Works Clearinghouse - Strong Evidence

Heggerty Phonemic Awareness

Phonemic Awareness curriculum based on research that will enable students to acquire and master sound reading skills. Daily lessons include: letter naming, rhyming, onset fluency, blending, identifying final and or medial sounds, segmenting, adding phonemes, deleting phonemes, substituting phonemes, and language awareness. Phonemic awareness is critical for learning to read and write. Fifty scientific studies (National Reading Panel, 2000) documented the importance of instruction in phonemic awareness. Tier 1 classroom instruction that includes phonemic awareness training for a few minutes per day, several days per week, is an effective practice for future reading achievement. There is strong evidence that supports these instructional strategies.

Evidence-based rating: IES What Works Clearinghouse – Strong Evidence.

Phonics Units of Study

In 2000, the National Reading Panel released a report indicating that the sum of the research showed that explicitly teaching children the relationship between sounds and letters improved reading achievement. It was concluded that phonics lessons help kids become better readers. The Phonics Units of Study rely on this research and proven, research-based practices, drawing on the work of Cunningham, Fountas, Fry, Pinnell, Rasinski, Yopp and Yopp, and others and the sequence of these Units of Study in Phonics follows a pathway that is widely supported in this research. The Units of Study in Phonics promotes consistent, systematic, and explicit phonics instruction that transfers skills to inform reading and writing. These strategies are taught through a gradual release of responsibility in which the teacher first explains how to use the strategy (mini-lesson), then give students more and more independence in practicing and applying the strategy over time (application of skills). This framework follows the same schedule as the Reading and Writing Units of Study (reading and writing workshop). Each day's instruction time includes: Minilesson - connection, teaching, active engagement, and link; rug time - children work in partners or clubs; share; and extensions.

Evidence-based rating: IES What Works Clearinghouse: Strong Evidence

i-Ready

i- Reading provides differentiated literacy instruction for students of all abilities. This online program provides explicit, systematic, and personalized learning in all areas of literacy.

The strength of the evidence gathered means that i-Ready instruction meets the ESSA criteria to be considered an "evidence-based" program.

Evidence-based rating: What Works Clearinghouse – Tier I and II – Potentially Promising

Fluency:

Rasinski's Fluency Development Lesson Protocol

This program employs short reading passages: poems, stories segments, or other texts that students read and reread over a short period of ten. The lesson protocol includes 10 steps for improving fluency: students read a familiar passage from the previous lesson, a new short text is introduced and students read it two or three times, the nature and content of the passage is discussed, the passage is read chorally several times, students practice in pairs reading the passage three times, individuals and groups perform their reading for the class or other audiences, words are chosen from the text to add to the word bank or word wall, students engage in word study activities, students take a copy home to practice, students read the passage to a teacher or partner who check for fluency and accuracy. Two intervention practices, repeated reading and wide reading, are associated with gains in reading fluency (Connor, Alberto, Compton, & O'Connor, 2014). Fluency interventions that focus on repeated reading of texts, opportunities to practice reading in the classroom, and reading a range of texts generally improves students fluency and comprehension (Connor, Alberto, Compton, & O'Connor, 2014). There is moderate evidence that these strategies create opportunities for students to see themselves as successful readers as well as opportunities to collaborate with their peers. These collaborative opportunities may include grouping students to perform a scripted version of a story and pairing students to model fluent reading.

Evidence-based rating: IES What Works ClearingHouse – Moderate Evidence.

Vocabulary:

Marzano's Vocabulary Steps

Maple Heights City School District's Vocabulary Guide and Toolkit based on Marzano's Vocabulary Steps

Fifty studies involving this strategy have concluded that the strategy at every grade level, works better using all the steps, and the majority of studies indicate the process enhances student achievement. The Meta-Analysis Database of Instructional Strategies captures these findings from action research conducted by over 500 teachers on 22 instructional strategies.

1. Provide a description, explanation, or example of the new term.
2. Ask students to restate the description, explanation, or example in their own words.
3. Ask students to construct a picture, pictograph, or symbolic representation of the term.
4. Engage students periodically in activities that help them add to their knowledge of the terms in their vocabulary notebooks.
5. Periodically ask students to discuss the terms with one another.
6. Involve students periodically in games that enable them to play with terms

The National Reading Panel found that strategies in vocabulary growth need to include plenty of repetition or extended use of the new words (Nagy et al., 1987). The goal is to build an understanding of words and deeply engage students in thinking about the word meanings. The vocabulary summary (National Reading Panel, 2000) states that the most effective vocabulary instruction helps students gain deep understanding of word meanings, emphasizes the interconnections among words and word meanings and the connections of words to the students' own experiences; and provides abundant ongoing review and repetition such as the above strategies.

Evidence-based rating: Marzano research – Based on the meta-analysis these vocabulary strategies and the National Reading Panel report on vocabulary instruction showed these strategies to have positive effects.

Words Their Way (WTW)

Words Their Way uses a research-based developmental approach to word study that is student-centered and assessment driven. The goal of this approach is the progression of word knowledge, including the development of phonics, spelling, word recognition, and vocabulary. The purpose is to examine, manipulate, compare, and categorize words to reveal logic and consistencies within written language and to help students achieve mastery in recognizing, spelling, and defining specific words. Words Sorts is the main strategy used in Words Their Way. This strategy teaches students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words.

Evidence-based rating: IES What Works Clearinghouse – Strong Evidence

Comprehension:

Reading Units of Study

The Reader's Workshop is a framework for reading instruction that engages students in authentic texts. This framework is informed by research in all areas of literacy. Each lesson is divided into three parts – mini-lesson, application of skills, and reflection (response to reading). Reading Units of Study include 2 units of fiction and 2 units of informational text and as well as: mini-lessons, teaching points, conferences, and small group work for a comprehensive reading workshop curriculum. Direct explicit instruction is embedded in this framework with gradual release using modeling, guided practice, and application of skills. Hattie and Yates (2014) indicate that direct instruction has a high effect size of .59. Lessons focus on comprehension that cover essential strategies of predicting, monitoring, retelling, inferring, summarizing, questioning, and visualizing. Ten studies were identified that demonstrate that teaching reading comprehension strategies to primary grade students has positive effects on comprehension when measured by standardized tests. These strategies are taught through a gradual release of responsibility in which the teacher first explains how to use the strategy (mini-lesson), then give students more and more independence in practicing and applying the strategy over time (application of skills).

Evidence-based rating for teaching reading comprehension: IES What Works Clearinghouse: Strong Evidence

Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Books and Scholastic Leveled Books

These leveled books build students' capacity for reading fluently and engaging in opportunities to read and reread texts and discuss and deepen comprehension. Texts should be chosen with word recognition and comprehension difficulty appropriate for the students' reading ability and the instructional guided reading activity. Though the National Reading Panel does not recommend choosing texts that are too difficult, students should have opportunities to read somewhat challenging texts such as during shared reading time.

Evidence-based rating: IES What Works Clearinghouse – Minimal Evidence.

Jan Richardson's Next Steps in Guided Reading

Jan Richardson, Ph.D., is a leading expert in guided reading, is a former K-12 teacher, Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, and reading specialist. Her program, Next Steps in Guided Reading, is a complete system for supporting guided reading.   This small group lesson framework includes sight word review, introduce a new book, read and prompt, discuss and teach, teaching point, word study activity, and guided writing. The next day includes rereading of the text. Lessons focus on comprehension that cover essential strategies of predicting, monitoring, retelling, inferring, summarizing, questioning, and visualizing. Ten studies were identified that demonstrate that teaching reading comprehension strategies to primary grade students has positive effects on comprehension when measured by standardized tests.

Evidenced-based rating: Summary of evidence - ESSA - Tier 1 Strong Evidence

This guided reading framework is based on Reading Recovery which is also rated strong by What Works Clearinghouse.

On a daily basis, students will be provided with a structured 90 minute reading block (K-3) broken down into:

Reading Units of Study:

1. Mini-Lesson (20% - 25% of reading block)
   - Model Reading Strategy
   - Guided Practice (i.e...., Whole Group, Small Group)
2. Teaching
3. Link/ Self-Selected Reading (50%-60% of reading block)
   - Students' application of reading strategy
   - Conferencing
   - Guided Reading Groups (Jan Richardson's framework - students reading continuous text on their instructional level along with using work strategies)
4. Mid-workshop Teaching
5. Reflection (20%-25%)
   - sharing of reading responses
   - book sharing
   - checking for understanding

Reading instruction will be prescribed in the following manner for each individual grade:

Kindergarten Block (90 minutes):

- Read Aloud
- Direct Phonological Awareness and Phonics Instruction - Heggery and Phonics Units of Study
- Letter identification and fluency
- Sight Words (Snap/Dolch)
- Vocabulary
- Fluency - poems (Rasinski's Fluency Lesson Protocol)
- ReaddingUnits of Study Framework (reading continuous texts): mini lesson; guided practice; independent reading/application of strategy; reflection and response to reading
- Students work in literacy-based centers (listening, word work, writing) practicing previously learned skills while the teacher pulls a guided reading group

1st Grade Block (90 minutes):

- Read Aloud
- Direct Phonological Awareness and Phonics Instruction - Heggerty and Phonics Units of Study
- Letter identification and fluency
- Sight Words (Snap/Dolch)
- Vocabulary
- Fluency - poems (Rasinski's Fluency Lesson Protocol)
- Reading Units of Study Framework (reading continuous texts): mini-lesson; guided practice; independent reading/application of the new strategy; reflection and response to reading
- Students work in literacy-based centers (listening, word work, writing) practicing previously learned skills while the teacher pulls a guided reading group

2nd Grade Block (90 minutes):

- Read Aloud
- Direct Phonics Instruction - Phonics Units of Study
- Sight Words (Dolch)
- Fluency - poems (Rasinski's Fluency Lesson Protocol)
- Vocabulary
- Reading Units of Study framework (reading continuous text): mini-lesson; guided practice; independent reading/application of new reading strategy reflection and response to reading
- Students work in literacy-based centers (listening, word work, writing) practicing previously learned skills while the teacher pulls a group

3rd Grade Block (90 minutes)

- Read Aloud
- Direct Phonics Instruction - Words Their Way, Word Sorts
- Sight Words (Dolch)
- Fluency - poems (Rasinski's Fluency Lesson Protocol)
- Vocabulary - Words Their Way
- Reading Units of Study (reading continuous text): mini-lesson; guided practice; independent reading/application of new reading strategy reflection and response to reading
- Students work in literacy-based centers (listening, word work, writing) practicing previously learned skills while the teacher pulls a group

These evidenced-based instructional practices support specific student needs based on the Local Literacy Plan data which encompass all students including those with disabilities and those on Reading Improvement and

Monitoring Plans. According to Tim Rasinski and Nancy Padak (2004), Reading Workshop (Reading Units of Study) is a daily routine that focuses on individual needs of all students while keeping a cooperative, collaborative classroom environment. This type of environment and framework involve direct teaching and practice of skills necessary for reading, including phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension (Armbruster & Osborn, 2001). The Reading Workshop framework (Reading Units of Study) supports reading and writing abilities through a variety of instructional methods. Read alouds, shared reading and writing, guided reading and independent reading and writing, as well as fluency, vocabulary, and word work are all components included in this framework (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). The Reading Workshop framework uses each learner's needs to drive instruction (Carolan & Guinn, 2007).   Differentiating instruction is an important aspect of the Reading Workshop, therefore these instructional practices scaffold and support all students including those with reading difficulties. As part of Reading Workshop, teachers can support children's reading development in small groups. Guided Reading is one such setting, in which the teacher works with students who have similar reading needs. This meets the individual needs of all students including those on a Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plan.

Reading Workshop (Reading Units of Study) also involves choice, authenticity, and time and many researchers agree this encourages and enables all students to make a commitment to reading (Guthrie, 1996; Rasinski & Padak, 2004; Miller, 2002). Research also suggests fluency and the level at which children enjoy reading are related to engagement with materials that are interesting to them for extended periods of time (Smith, 1985). Providing choice enables teachers to make a more meaningful and authentic learning environment for their students (Combs, 2002). In fact, Miller (2002) has found that "when children understand that they share in the responsibility for their learning, when they have a say in the books they read, and when what they are asked to do has meaning, they are able to read for long stretches at a time." This key component allows all readers, even those with reading difficulties, to be successful.

These Tier I instructional practices support the needs of all students including those on Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans. In addition, students with reading difficulties will be monitored and more intense instruction may be implemented. Students on Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans may receive services with Leveled Literacy Intervention and Reading Recovery as part of their plan. Building on the needs of all students, we will be working on strengthening our Tier II and Tier III practices with Dr. Kim St. Martin beginning in January 2020. This work will assist in giving support to all students across the literacy development continuum from emergent to adolescent literacy.

SECTION 8, PART B: ENSURING EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPROVING UPON STRATEGIES

Describe how the district will ensure the proposed evidence-based strategies in Section 8, Part A will do the following:

1. *Be effective;*
2. *Show progress; and*
3. *Improve upon strategies utilized during the two prior consecutive school years.*

The Maple Heights City Schools support the identified evidence-based strategies for improving Early Literacy and commits to the implementation of a systemic method to evaluate the effectiveness of the Local Literacy Plan components and provide support for instructional design and delivery as well as exploring curriculum supplements to foster Early Literacy skills.

The practices detailed within the Reading Achievement Plan improve upon the strategies of previous years through the use of norm-referenced assessments, the implementation of a standardized set of progress monitoring tools, a research-based reading framework, systematic intervention practices, and a dedicated feedback loop aimed at improving instructional and intervention practices. Improving literacy skills in the Tier 1 classroom is a keystone to our goal to foster academic growth in reading. Monitoring of the implementation of best practices through achievement, diagnostic, and formative assessments along with Fidelity Walk-throughs will ensure that the research-based strategies in our Local Literacy Plan will occur.

In order to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of the Reading Achievement Plan, Maple Heights City Schools has identified dedicated teams of individuals at the district and building levels, who specialize in the acquisition, assessment, and instruction of early literacy skills.   As part of this Reading Achievement Plan, the Reading Support Team (RST) was created to further support and coach teachers and principals. Building principals will monitor the daily implementation of the Local Literacy Plan, RST will initiate the Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI) annually, and teachers will complete a Needs Assessment based on their professional development needs in reading instruction.

SECTION 8, PART C: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Insert a professional development plan that supports the evidence-based strategies proposed in the Reading Achievement Plan and clearly identifies the instructional staff involved in the professional development. Districts may choose to use the professional development template developed for the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Grant.

Professional Development will be implemented and sustained on a quarterly-basis to introduce and solidify implementation of classroom instruction. Professional Development will include the Five

Component Pillar areas (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension). Professional Development will be designed based on the analysis of the following data: scores from the R-TFI, TBT data, needs assessments, MAP, KRA, and state assessments.

After careful exploration of evidence--based curriculum and supplements , Maple Heights City Schools will provide the teachers with the necessary training to implement with fidelity these resources and provide the Reading Support Teams with the necessary training to execute, analyze, and interpret the benchmarking and progress monitoring assessments prior to the beginning of the 2019-2020 school year. Furthermore, Maple Heights City Schools will provide quarterly training to educators to improve Tier 1 reading instruction, allow for the interpretation of data, and use this data for explicit, direct reading instruction.

Due to this professional development training, teachers will be equipped to assist parents in understanding the development of early literacy skills.

VISION

Our vision is for all learners to acquire the knowledge and skills to read at grade level. Our goal is to promote the implementation of evidence-based systems and practices of reading instruction by giving teachers the tools they need thorough effective district professional development. Professional learning in literacy will focus on the Simple View of Reading which include the five areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension based on the research of the National Reading Panel.

S.M.A.R.T Goals:

- Foundational Skills: Phonological Awareness and Phonics
  - K - 2 teachers will participate in foundational skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.
- Fluency

- Second grade teachers will participate in fluency skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.
- Vocabulary
- Second and third grade teachers will participate in vocabulary skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.
- Comprehension
- Second and third grade teachers will participate in comprehension skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.

MODEL

Our PD model is based on Ohio Department of Education's Coaching Model which identifies two focuses of the coaching process: instructional coaching which is implemented at the classroom level and systems coaching which is implemented at the leadership team levels (BLT, DLT) including our Reading Support Team (RST).

ACTION PLAN OUTCOMES

Our outcomes include the fidelity of the implementation of the professional development as measured by the R-TFI and the Walk-through Checklist developed by the RST as well as student achievement as measured by the MAP NWEA Reading Test

Professional Development Plan

Template Part A

LEA/Early Childhood Provider or Consortium Lead Name: Maple Heights City Schools
IRN or ODE/ODJFS License Number: 044305
Professional Development Contact Name/Phone Email: Dr. Carol Rami and Amy Berger
Goal: Evidence-Based Practice or Intervention:

PD Description	Begin/End Dates	Sustained	Intensive	Collaborative	Job-Embedded	Data-Driven	Classroom-Focused
1. **Foundational Skills:** **Phonological Awareness and Phonics** K - 2 teachers will participate in foundational skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.	2019-2020 school year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. **Fluency** Second grade teachers will participate in fluency skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.	2019-2020 school year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. **Vocabulary** Second and third grade teachers will participate in vocabulary skills training to	2019-2020 school year	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

LEA/Early Childhood Provider or Consortium Lead Name: Maple Heights City Schools

IRN or ODE/ODJFS License Number: 044305

Professional Development Contact Name/Phone Email: Dr. Carol Rami and Amy Berger

Goal: Evidence-Based Practice or Intervention:

PD Description	Begin/End Dates	Sustained	Intensive	Collaborative	Job-Embedded	Data-Driven	Classroom-Focused
improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.							
4. Comprehension Second and third grade teachers will participate in comprehension skills training to improve their instructional skills and student outcomes by the spring of 2020. Improvement will be measured by the fall 2020 administration of the R-TFI.	2019-2020 school year	**Yes**	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Resources Required	Outcomes/Evaluation
1. Foundational Skills - Heggerty materials, Phonics Units of Study, Phonological Toolkit Facilitator Literacy Coaches Financial support substitutes	**1. Increase the amount of K-2 teachers implementing evidence-based phonological strategies and materials from 75% to 80% by fall 2020 as measured by the R-TFI, classroom observations, and walkthroughs**
2. Fluency - Rasinski's fluency materials and other evidenced based materials Facilitator Literacy Coaches Financial support substitutes	**2. Increase the amount of second grade teachers implementing evidence-based fluency strategies and materials from 75% to 80% by fall 2020 as measured by the R-TFI, classroom observations, and walkthroughs**
3. Vocabulary – Marzanzo's Vocabulary Steps Words Their Way Maple Heights Vocabulary Toolkit Facilitator	**3. Increase the amount of second and third grade teachers implementing evidence-based vocabulary strategies and materials from 75% to 80% by fall 2020 as measured by the R-TFI, classroom observations, and walkthroughs**

Resources Required	Outcomes/Evaluation
Literacy Coaches Financial support substitutes	
4. Comprehension – Reading Units of Study Facilitator Literacy Coaches Financial support substitutes	**4. Increase the amount of second and third grade teachers implementing evidence-based comprehension strategies and materials from 75% to 40% by fall 2020 as measured by the R-TFI, classroom observations, and walkthroughs**

Professional Development Plan Template

Part B

Provide a brief description of how the overall plan for professional development meets the six criteria as delineated by ESSA for high-quality professional learning.

Sustained: Taking place over an extended period; longer than one day or a one-time workshop.

Professional development will first be conducted by an expert facilitator such as an outside consultant, SST, ESC personnel, and\ local experts. The sustainability of the plan come from our internal OIP teams - DLT to BLT to TBT including the Reading Support Team. There are also continuing professional development days for all staff throughout the school year.

Intensive: Focused on a discreet concept, practice or program.

Our professional development focuses on K-3 literacy improvement designed to intensify the implementation of evidence-based strategies in the areas of phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension based on the logical model of the Simple View of Reading.

Collaborative: Involving multiple educators, educators and coaches, or a set of participants grappling with the same concept or practice and in which participants work together to achieve shared understanding.

Job-Embedded: A part of the ongoing, regular work of instruction and related to teaching and learning taking place in real time in the teaching and learning environment.

Teachers will have access to modeling, coaching, consulting, walkthroughs, and feed-back loops - all of which are job-embedded. The job-embedded support will continue from the Building Leadership level, District Level Leadership, Reading Support

Team, and the SST (State Support Team)

Data-Driven: Based upon and responsive to real-time information about the needs of participants and their students.

The professional development plan is based upon the needs identified through the R-TFI, and the analysis of the district data on student reading achievement from state tests, NWEA MAP, KRA, and DIBELS. This data supports the PD plan to increase effective implementation of evidenced-based reading practices at the Tier I level in the areas of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

Instructionally-Focused: Related to the practices taking place in the learning environment during the teaching process.

The data from R-TFI as well as student reading achievement data clearly identifies the need for evidenced-based practices to be implemented in the classroom. Therefore, all professional development is data driven and instructionally focused. Teachers will be given support in instructional strategies to improve phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

APPENDICES

You might include a glossary of terms, data summary, key messages, description of program elements, etc., as needed.