May 31, 2019

Dear Superintendent,

Thank you for submitting the Mansfield City School District 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:
- There is a crosswalk showing how the RAP is connected to a variety of plans created in the district over time.
- Plan provides for job-embedded PD by literacy coaches.
- Plan addresses alignment of curriculum to the Simple View of Reading to improve tier 1 instruction across the district.

This plan will benefit from:
- Include community stakeholders in the development and implementation of plan.
- Provide decision rules for matching students to or exit students from interventions.
- Strengthen the plan by including a root cause analysis to support the provided learner performance data.

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.

Sincerely,

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

25 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
education.ohio.gov

(877) 644-6338
For people who are deaf or hard of hearing,
please call Relay Ohio first at 711.

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

DISTRICT NAME:	Mansfield City Schools
DISTRICT IRN:	044297
DISTRICT ADDRESS:	856 W. Cook Road Mansfield, OH 44907
PLAN COMPLETION DATE:	December 31, 2017 **Revised:** February 22, 2018 December 31, 2018
LEAD WRITERS:	<u>2017</u> Stephen Rizzo, Holly Christie, Melinda Newman, Kimberly Johnson, Jill Danison, Lori Brumenshenkel, Teresa Fruth, Jan Weithman, Pat Gordon, Martin Linder <u>2018</u> Stephen Rizzo, Holly Christie, Melinda Newman, Jill Danison, Teresa Fruth, Soni Crist, Pat Gordon, Wendy Wilging, Amy Walker

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

CONTENTS

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

SUMMARY AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mansfield City Schools is committed to the improvement of literacy instruction across the district. This Reading Achievement Plan was created with the guidance of the district's Ohio Improvement Process goals, in order to maintain the current focus on literacy improvement within the district. Many stakeholders were involved in the development and support of this document including: 1) District Leadership Team Members, 2) District Leadership Core Team, 3) State Support Team 7, 4) K-3 Grade-level representation from each primary building. In addition, the plan was shared with the K-2 staff at an all-staff district Professional Development day in December to gather input and feedback. The finished plan will be shared with the District's Curriculum

Advisory Committee as well as all staff members through staff meetings and electronic communications. This Reading Achievement Plan will be monitored by both the District Leadership Team and the Reading Achievement Advisory Team by reviewing student literacy achievement data on a monthly basis.

SECTION 1, PART A: LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERSHIP

Name	Title/Role	Location	Email
Scott Musser	Director of Career Technical Education	Mansfield Senior High School	musser.scott@mansfieldschools.org
Andrea Moyer	Principal	Malabar Intermediate	mover.andrea@mansfieldschools.org
Teresa Fruth	Teacher-Reading Recovery & Teacher Leader	Sherman Elementary	fruth.teresa@mansfieldschools.org
Kevin Stone	Teacher-3rd	Sherman Elementary	stone.kevin@mansfieldschools.org
Heather Kushner	Intervention Specialist	Mansfield Senior High School	kushner.heather@mansfieldschools.org
Milton Fulson	Principal	Mansfield Senior High School	fulson.milton@mansfieldschools.org
Jonathan Burras	Director of Special Education	Central Office	burras.jonathan@mansfieldschools.org
Martin Linder	Director of School Improvement	Central Office	linder.martin@mansfieldschools.org
Pam Ashley-Mink	Para-professional	Malabar	ashleyminck.pam@mansfieldschools.org
Brad Strong	Teacher -5th (Math & Science)	Malabar	strong.brad@mansfieldschools.org
Amanda Clawson	Teacher - Mathematics	Mansfield Senior High School	clawson.amanda@mansfieldschools.org
Brian Garverick	Superintendent	Central Office	garverick.brian@mansfieldschools.org
April Luedy	Teacher - 2nd	Woodland	luedy.april@mansfieldschools.org
Melinda Newman	Teacher-3rd / Literacy Coach	Prospect	newman.melinda@mansfieldschools.org
Sheryl Weber	Board of Education	Central Office	weber.sheryl@mansfieldschools.org

Continued

Mansfield City Schools
Reading Achievement Plan

Name	Title/Role	Location	Email
Raymel Early	Teacher-1st	Springmill STEM	early.raymel@mansfieldschools.org
Pam Jones	Counselor	Mansfield Senior High School	jones.pam@mansfieldschools.org
Laura Mora	Teacher- 6-8 Science and Spanish	Spanish Immersion	mora.laura@mansfieldschools.org
Stephen Rizzo	Chief Academic Officer	Central Office	rizzo.stephen@mansfieldschools.org
Angie Wolboldt	Teacher-7&8 Math / Math Teacher Leader	Mansfield Middle School	wolboldt.angie@mansfieldschools.org

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

In the fall of 2015, the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) conducted a district review of Mansfield City Schools. The district review report was released in February of 2016.   The district's three-year improvement plan was updated with the recommendations provided and submitted to ODE in the Fall of 2017. This three-year plan is currently being implemented by the district and includes literacy action steps and tasks.

A follow-up review was conducted by the Ohio Department of Education in May of 2017. The follow-up review report was released in November of 2017.

The Reading Achievement plan is based on and aligned with the district's continuous improvement plan.

An advisory team was formed in the winter of 2017 with membership from the District Leadership Team and additional members from the targeted elementary schools within the district. This team met with members of State Support Team 7 to review the components and requirements of the Reading Achievement Plan. Three work days were scheduled outside of the regularly scheduled meetings with this team and the Early Literacy Specialist from State Support Team 7 to develop the plan. Additional work sessions were held with small groups to analyze data and refine the plan.

The Reading Achievement Plan was reviewed with the District Leadership Core Team and the Student Achievement subgroup of the District Leadership Team during the December meetings.

Additional input was collected from K-2 teachers at the December 20017 district-wide professional development day. Third-grade teachers will have the same opportunity during the second semester.

The plan will be communicated to the district's Curriculum Advisory Committee and all elementary staff in January of 2017 through staff meetings and electronic communications.

The District Leadership Team, with the support of the reading achievement advisory team, will monitor the plan and student achievement data related to literacy during its monthly meetings.

The plan will be updated annually as needed and / or required.

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

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

Mansfield City Schools is committed to improving literacy instruction across the district. The crosswalk below shows the language from various plans that are aligned to improving literacy.

MCS OIP 2016-2019

GOAL TARGET AREA: STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

GOAL 2: By 2019, MCS will earn 80 Performance Index points, improve Value added grades to a C or better and each subgroup earns 70 AMO points on the Building and District Report Cards through the use of high impact, evidence-based instruction throughout the district.

STRATEGY 2: The district will provide professional development and support to educators around high impact, evidence-based instructional practices with the expectations that all educators incorporate the practices throughout daily lessons.

MCS Action Step 1, Reading Achievement Plan Goal 1:

Assemble a team of administrators and teachers across all grade levels to develop a curriculum for grades preK-12 that is aligned to Ohio's Learning Standards.

MCS Action Step 2, Reading Achievement Plan Goal 2:

Develop and implement a formative and benchmark assessment process at all levels, with emphasis at the middle school and high school levels.

MCS Action Step 3, Reading Achievement Plan Goal 3:

Develop a process to collect and analyze student performance data to assess the impact of all tiered student support programs provided by the district.

MCS Action Step 4, Reading Achievement Plan Goal 4:

Provide all students with the required foundational skills in literacy, mathematics, science, and social studies to be prepared for rigorous high school studies.

MCS Action Step 5, Reading Achievement Plan Goal 5:

Implement a balanced literacy approach to teaching the English Language Arts standards in grades K-8.

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

Mansfield City Schools is required to create a Reading Achievement Plan based on the following criteria:

1. The district received a grade of "D" or "F" on the K-3 Literacy Improvement Measure;

K-3 Literacy Grade		
2015-2016:	**2016-2017**	**2017-2018**
F	D	D

and

2. Fewer than 60 percent of the district's students scored proficient or higher on the state's grade 3 English language arts test.

Third Grade ELA Proficiency Percentage		
2015-2016:	**2016-2017**	**2017-2018**
37.6%	36.8%	30.8%

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

Additional analysis of relevant student performance data related to literacy is provided below.

----Data from Tier I - Classroom Instruction----

Kindergarten Analysis

Reading

- At the beginning of the 2015-2016 school year, 55.3% of Kindergarten students were at or above the KRA (language and literacy) skills.
- At the beginning of the 2016-2017 school year, of Kindergarten students, 51.8% were at or about the KRA (language and literacy) skills.
- At the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year, of Kindergarten students, 56.0% were at or about the KRA (language and literacy) skills.
- At the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 71% of Kindergarten students were at or above the reading level expectations based on Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Kit.
- At the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 65% of Kindergarten students were at or above the reading level expectations based on Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Kit.
- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 52% of Kindergarten students were at or above the reading level expectations based on Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Kit.

Writing

- At the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 70% of Kindergarten students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 70% of Kindergarten students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 63% of Kindergarten students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- The 2015-2016 Local Report Card shows that 60.9% of students who were not on track in Kindergarten improved to On-Track in 1st grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic.
- he 2016-2017 Local Report Card shows that 57.8% of students who were not on track in Kindergarten improved to On-Track in 1st grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic.

Trend Statement: The data collection of Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment from 2015-2016 to the 2016-2017 shows a decline of 6% of students reading at or above a level C. This decline continues from 2016-17 data by 13% in 2017-2018. In writing, the percentage shows a decline by 7% from 2016-17 to 2017-2018..

First Grade Analysis

Reading

- At the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 61% of First Grade students were at or above the reading level expectations.
- At the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 38% of First Grade students were at or above the reading level expectations.
- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 31% of First Grade students were at or above the reading level expectations.

Writing

- At the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 61% of First Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 51% of First Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2017-2018 school year, 66% of First Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- The 2015-2016 Local Report Card shows that 15.8% of students who were not on track in first grade improved to On-Track in 2nd grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic.
- The 2016-2017 Local Report Card shows that 36.4% of students who were not on track in first grade improved to On-Track in 2nd grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic.

Trend Statement: The data collection of Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment from 2015-2016 to the 2016-2017 shows a decline of 23%. However the Mansfield City Schools F&P Benchmark expected instructional level at the end of the 2015-2016 school year was level I and the Mansfield City Schools F&P Benchmark expected instructional level at the end of the 2016-2017 school year was level J. The results of 2017-18 end of year reading benchmark scores shows the amount of students on track continuing to decline.

Second Grade Analysis

Reading

- At the end of the 2015-16 school year, 56% of second-grade students were at or above the reading level expectation of Level M.
- At the end of the 2016-17 school year, 45% of second-grade students were at or above the reading level expectation of Level M.
- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 50% of second-grade students were at or above the reading level expectation of Level M.

Writing

- At the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 47% of Second Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 50% of Second Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 48% of Second Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- The 2015-2016 Local Report Card shows that 41.0% of students who were not on track in second grade improved to On-Track in 3rd grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic.
- The 2016-2017 Local Report Card shows that 34.4% of students who were not on track in second grade improved to On-Track in 3rd grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic.

Trend Statement: Based on the three-year data, the reading level expectation of Level M has declined by 11% from 2015-16 to the 2016-17 school year. The adjustment of the kindergarten and first-grade reading level expectations during 2016-17 may have helped to improve 2nd grade to increase by 5% from 45% to 50%.

Third Grade Analysis

Reading

- In 2015-2016, 37.6% of third-grade students scored proficient or above on the AIR ELA assessment. (Advanced 9.2%, Accelerated 9.2%, Proficient 19.1%, Basic 26.1%, Limited 36.3%) The district's lowest-performing subgroups on the third grade ELA assessment in 2016 were: Students with a Disability (17.6%); African-American (15.9%); and Economically Disadvantaged (31.3%).
- In 2016-2017, 36.8% of third-grade students scored proficient or above on the AIR ELA assessment. (Advanced 10.4%, Accelerated 10.8%, Proficient 15.6%, Basic 22.9%, Limited 40.3%) The district's lowest-performing subgroups on the third grade ELA assessment in 2017 were Students with a Disability (16.7%), Hispanic (16.7%), African-American (23.9%), and Economically Disadvantaged (28.5%)
- At the end of the 2015-16 school year, 53% of third-grade students were at or above the reading level expectation of Level P.
- At the end of the 2016-17 school year, 59% of third-grade students were at or above the reading level expectation of Level P.
- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 54% of the third-grade students were at or above the reading level expectation of Level P.
- The 2015-2016 Local Report Card shows that 7.1% of students who were not on track in third grade improved to On-Track in 3rd grade as measured by the state reading diagnostic and end of year test.
- The 2016-2017 Local Report Card shows that 2.9% of students who were not on track in second grade improved to On-Track in 3rd grade measured by the state reading diagnostic and end of year test.
- The 2017-2018 Local Report Card shows that 32.8% of students who were not on track in second grade improved to On-Track in 3rd grade measured by the state reading diagnostic and end of year test.
- In 2015-2016, 81.6% of the district's third-grade students met the Third Grade Reading Guarantee Promotion Score, whereas 18.4% did not.   15.3% were exempt.
- In 2016-2017, 77.3% of the district's third-grade students met the Third Grade Reading Guarantee Promotion Score, whereas 22. 7% did not.   15.6% were exempt.
- In 2017-2018, 79.7% of the district's third-grade students met the Third Grade Reading Guarantee Promotion Score, whereas 20.3% did not.   17.6% were exempt.

Writing

- At the end of the 2015-2016 school year, 60% of Third Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.
- At the end of the 2016-2017 school year, 55% of Third Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.

- At the end of the 2017-18 school year, 38% of Third Grade students were at or above the writing level expectations based on the Ohio Writing Diagnostic Rubric.

Trend Statement: The overall performance of third-grade students on both district and state assessments over the last three years has shown a decrease. Less than 54% of students are on track as measured by the F&P benchmark and less than 40% of students are scoring Proficient on the state English Language Arts Assessment. A significant percentage of students are not meeting required performance levels.

-----Data from Tier II Interventions----

Leveled Literacy Intervention Analysis

Kindergarten

At the end of the school year, the Compliance Team compiles data on students receiving Leveled Literacy Intervention.

In Kindergarten letter identification, Hearing Recording Sounds in Words, and Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark instructional level is used to determine growth.

- In 2015-2016, 80 Kindergarten students from Sherman, Woodland, and Prospect received Leveled Literacy Intervention. In letter identification, 66 students (94%) met the set expectation of 49 known letters or higher. On Hearing Recording Sounds in Words, 55 students (76%) met the expectation of 21 recorded sounds or higher. On Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark 46 students (64%) read an instructional level of C or higher.
- In 2016-2017, 94 Kindergarten students from Sherman, Woodland, and Prospect received Leveled Literacy Intervention. In letter identification, 80 students (90%) met the set expectation of 49 known letters or higher. On Hearing Recording Sounds in Words, 62 students (70%) met the expectation of 21 recorded sounds or higher. On Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark 42 students (49%) read an instructional level of C or higher.

Trend Statement: More students received Leveled Literacy Intervention in Kindergarten by 14. However, there seems to be a drop in the number of students meeting expectations in all three tasks.

First Grade

First Grade students receiving Leveled Literacy Intervention are measured by the text level growth as well as meeting the benchmark expectation of level I. In First Grade average yearly growth is seven levels.

- In 2015-2016, 58 first grade students received Leveled Literacy Intervention. At the end of the school year, 14 students (25%) were at a level I or higher. Of those 68 students served one student made a 1 level gain, two made a 2 level gain, seven made a 3 level gain, eleven made a 4 level gain, eleven made a 5 level gain, seven made a 6 level gain and two made a 7 level gain.
- In 2016-2017, 68 first grade students received Leveled Literacy Intervention. At the end of the school year, 14 students (24%) were at a level I or higher. Of those 58 students served four students made a 1 level gain, three made a 2 level gain, three made a 3 level gain, seven made a 4 level gain, twelve made a 5 level gain, ten made a 6 level gain and three made a 7 level gain.

Trend Statement: More students received Leveled Literacy Intervention in First Grade in 2016-2017 than in 2015-2016 by 10. Results seem to be distributed about the same across the number levels of growth. However, there were more students in 2016-2017 that only made one or two levels of gain.

Second Grade

Second Grade students receiving Leveled Literacy Intervention are measured by the text level growth as well as meeting the benchmark expectation of level M. Second grade average yearly growth is 5 levels.

- In 2015-2016, 71 second grade students received Leveled Literacy Intervention. At the end of the school year, benchmark results were available for 63 students. Of those 63 students, 8 students (13%) were at a level M or higher. Nine students made a 2 level gain, thirteen made a 3 level gain, fourteen made a 4 level gain, eleven made a 5 level gain, four made a 6 level gain, three made a 7 level gain, and one made an 8 level gain. Nineteen students (30%) made the average yearly growth of 5 levels or more.
- In 2016-2017, 56 second grade students received Leveled Literacy Intervention. At the end of the school year, benchmark results were only available for 52 students. Of those 52 students, 4 students (8%) were at a level M or higher. Six students made a 2 level gain, thirteen made a 3 level gain, sixteen made a 4 level gain, five made a 5 level gain, three made a 6 level gain, three made a 7 level gain, and one made an 8 level gain. Twelve students (23%) made the average yearly growth of 5 levels or more.

Trend Statement: Fewer students received Leveled Literacy Intervention in Second Grade in 2016-2017 than in 2015-2016 by 15. Results seem to be distributed about the same across the number levels of growth, but with a small shift of more students in 2016-2017 making only a four-level gain and not a five-level gain as in 2015-2016.

Third Grade

Third Grade students receiving Leveled Literacy Intervention are measured by the text level growth as well as meeting the benchmark expectation of level P. Third grade average yearly growth is 3 levels.

- In 2015-2016, 51 third grade students received Leveled Literacy Intervention. At the end of the school year, benchmark results were available for 48 students. Of those 48 students, 4 students (8%) were at a level P or higher. Two students made a 1 level gain, nine students made a 2 level gain, fourteen made a 3 level gain, seventeen made a 4 level gain, one made a 5 level gain, and one made a 6 level gain.
- In 2016-2017, 44 third grade students received Leveled Literacy Intervention. At the end of the school year, benchmark results were only available for 38 students. Of those 38 students, no students were at a level P or higher. One student made a 1 level gain, eight students made a 2 level gain, nine made a 3 level gain, nine made a 4 level gain, eight made a 5 level gain, and one made a 6 level gain.

Trend Statement: Fewer students received Leveled Literacy Intervention in Third Grade in 2016-2017 than in 2015-2016 by 8. Results seem to show a higher percentage of students making a 3 or more level gain in 2016-2017. However, fewer students made it to the benchmark expectation at the end of the year.

-----Data from Tier III Interventions----

Reading Recovery Analysis

Reading Recovery is a short-term reading intervention for the lowest first-grade students. Reading Recovery is being implemented at Sherman, Woodland, and Prospect. The lowest first-grade students are assessed using the six literacy tasks of the Observation Survey (OS) developed by Marie Clay, and Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT-R3). The lowest 30% to 40% of first grade students are assessed at the beginning of the year, at the end of their programs (maximum of 20 weeks), and at the end of the year. Assessment results at the end of the students' programs determine one of two things. One is if the student is "Discontinued", meaning he is back to the average in the classroom and has average stanines on all six Observation Survey tasks. The second result is dependent if the student had a full 20-week program or less than 20 weeks. If it was a full 20-week program and the student has lower stanines and is not back to the average of the class then he is considered "Recommended", meaning recommended for further small group intervention or long-term intervention. When the program is less than 20 weeks and the student has lower stanines and is not back to the average of the class then it is considered an "Incomplete" program, meaning there were not enough weeks to accelerate the child back to the average of the class. This happens with students started mid-year and the school year

ends before 20 weeks are completed. Two other categories in which data is collected is the number of students

who move during their programs and "None of the Above". "None of the Above" means programs were ended for a variety of reasons: teacher on medical or maternity leave, the student was sent back to Kindergarten, the student was placed in special education or special circumstances approved by the Teacher Leader.

- In 2015-2016, 80 students were taught by 8 trained Reading Recovery teachers and 2 teacher leaders. Each building was at or close to full implementation at 31 to 35% of the total first-grade population. "Full Implementation" means any student who needs Reading Recovery, determined by the assessment results (and stanines), were able to get a Reading Recovery program. One building that was at 31% implementation had some students who needed Reading Recovery but did not receive a program. Seventy-five students (94%) had free or reduced lunch. Twenty-five (31%) were black. Twelve students (15%) "Discontinued" from Reading Recovery. Twenty-eight students (35%) were "Recommended", thirty (37%) were "Incomplete, three students (4%) moved, and seven students (9%) were "None of the Above".
- In 2016-2017, 89 students were taught by 8 trained and 2 in-training Reading Recovery teachers and 1 teacher leader. Each building was at full implementation at 33 to 42% of the total first-grade population. Eighty-two students (92%) had free or reduced lunch. Thirty-one (35%) were black. Nineteen students (21%) "Discontinued" from Reading Recovery. Twenty-seven students (30%) were "Recommended", thirty (34%) were "Incomplete, six students (7%) moved, and seven students (8%) were "None of the Above".
- In 2017-2018, 49 students were taught by 6 trained Reading Recovery teachers and 1 teacher leader. Two buildings were close to full implementation at 24% to 29% of the total first grade population. One building was under implemented at 12% due to one trained Reading Recovery teacher being out for medical reasons. Forty-seven students (96%) had free or reduced lunch. Three students (6%) "Discontinued" from Reading Recovery. Twenty-two students (45%) were "Recommended", nineteen (39%) were "Incomplete, three students (6%) moved, and two students (4%) were "None of the Above".

Trend Statement: Reading Recovery moved to full implementation from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017, but then dropped back implementation in two buildings with one building being under implemented in 2017-2018. There was an increase in the number of students served in Reading Recovery in 2016-2017 but then a sharp decline in students served in 2017-2018. There was a 6% increase in the number of "Discontinued" students from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017. However the "Discounting" rate from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018 dropped from 21% to 6%. Some of the factors contributing to this drop included fewer students served with the drop in implementation rates across the district and students entering Reading Recovery with lower stanine scores on the Observation Survey. There has been a slight decrease in the number of students "Recommended" or with "Incomplete" programs from 2015-2016 to 2016-2017. However those numbers increased in 2017-2018. In

2016-2017 we did see a slight increase (3%) in the number of students who moved during their program, but the percentage stayed consistent from 2016-2017 to 2017-2018.

**Based on the analysis above recommendations for each grade level were generated by the Reading Advisory Team and will be reviewed by the District Leadership Team. These recommendations are listed in the appendix.

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

The following risk factors have been identified:

- Poverty: The district-wide poverty rate continues to increase. In 2016-2017, 79.4% of our students were economically disadvantaged.
- Mobility: 21.9% of all students moved into or out of the district, which impacts the consistency of instruction.
- Social-Emotional/Trauma: Our students face many challenges and we have formed partnerships to address non-academic barriers. (i.e. Catalyst and Silver Linings Group.)
- Administrative Turnover: Over the last ten years the administrative structure and staffing have changed frequently. The 2017-18 school year includes four out of five new building administrators.   A lack of consistency has impeded progress.
- Leadership Gap: The district was without a Curriculum Director for nearly 8 years.
- Financial Struggles: The district was placed in fiscal emergency and exited fiscal emergency in December of 2016.
- Staff Reductions: Reductions in force and building closures have taken place every three years over the last decade.
- Staff change due to retirements, staff resignations, and the establishment of "magnet" schools: Some staff has been moved to new positions based on student mobility and building/district need. Staff members have had to learn new grade level standards.
- Percentage of Students with A Disability: 25.1% of students in the district have a disability. Students on an IEP have a mobility rate of 26.8%.
- Implementation of Literacy Collaborative and Coaching: Over the last 5 years coaching has been inconsistent and the coaching staff has turned over as well. Only one of the five Literacy Coaches has been in place for five years or more.
- Student Chronic absenteeism: The chronic absenteeism rate is 15.7%.
- Summer Loss-Many students fall behind in their reading level and return to school 2 or more levels below where they ended in May.

- Lack of Preschool: Many of our students do not attend preschool and come to Kindergarten with the skills they need to be successful.

Risk Factors Continued:

- Staff Attendance: The staff attendance rate is approximately 92%.
- Percentage of Residents with a High School Diploma: 87% of adults in Richland County has earned a high school diploma.
- Percentage of Residents with a College Degree: Only 16% percent of adults in Richland County have earned a bachelor degree or higher.
- Drug Addiction: Richland County has been identified with high rates of opiate addiction.
- Homeless Students: More than 300 students in the district are identified as homeless.

Mansfield City Schools' District Mission Statement

All students will be well educated and academically prepared for personal success in life, for their chosen careers, for lifelong learning, and for contributing positively to their local, national, and global communities.

Mansfield City Schools' Theme

Every Student, Every Day

Mansfield City Schools believes that each child has the right to a literate life. Being literate enriches one's life and opportunities. We believe the ability to read fluently and comprehend deepens when students engage in authentic and purposeful reading, talking and writing about texts across many instructional contexts.

If we know that most children need expert teaching to become literate, it is the responsibility of every teacher to provide effective instruction.

The district has adopted the Literacy Collaborative comprehensive school reform model which is designed to improve the reading, writing, and language skills of elementary and middle-level children.

The Literacy Collaborative incorporates all of the elements of effective schools to support improved literacy instruction and student achievement through:

- Providing an evidence-based instructional model
- Creating in-school and in-district leadership
- Establishing long-term site-based development
- Helping schools monitor the progress of every student

The district has identified evidence-based safety nets to serve students who are at risk and have fallen behind in their literacy learning. (i.e. Reading Recovery and Leveled Literacy Intervention)

SECTION 5: MEASURABLE LEARNER PERFORMANCE GOALS

Mansfield City Schools' Ohio Improvement Plan – Implementation & Monitoring

2016-2019

GOAL 2: By 2019, MCS will earn 80 Performance Index points, improve Value added grades to a C or better and each subgroup earns 70 AMO points on the Building and District Report Cards through the use of high impact, evidence-based instruction throughout the district.

	2015-2016 BASELINE MEASURE	2016-2017 PROGRESS MEASURE	2017-2018 PROGRESS MEASURE
Performance Index	67.6 (D)	72.2 (D)	69.3 (D)
Value Added ● Overall ● Gifted ● Lowest 20% ● Students w/Disabilities	F F F F	F F F F	F F F F
Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) on the Building and District Report Cards	ELA = 35.9 --------------------- AMO = 13.% (F)	ELA = 40.3 ---------------------- AMO = 14.6% (F)	ELA = 72.7 ---------------------- AMO = 56.7 (F)

The following local measure will be added:

- By 2019, 60% of K-3 students will be On Track as measured by the spring benchmark assessment.
- By 2019, 85% of students will make one year's growth as measured by the benchmark assessment system.

Third-grade specific goals:

- By 2019, 55% of students will score Proficient on the state reading assessment.
- By 2019, 85% of third-grade students will meet the Third Grade Reading Guarantee Promotion score.

Goal # _1_ Action Map

Goal Statement: Assemble a team of administrators and teachers across all grade levels to develop a curriculum for grades preK-12 that is aligned to Ohio's Learning Standards. (OIP Student Achievement Action Step#1)

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: Collaboration and Learning Communities, Instructional Coherence (creating a culture of reflective practice that fuels growth and collaboration, fosters capacity building, encourages collective responsibility, nurtures a focused, cohesive direction that benefits everyone (Fullen and Quinn, 2016).

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Component	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Curriculum and Instruction #1	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Curriculum and Instruction #1	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Curriculum and Instruction #1
Timeline	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Lead Person(s)	Director of Curriculum, Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee	Director of Curriculum, Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee	Director of Curriculum, Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee
Resources Needed	Time, Professional Development, Funds to support development, Technology Support, Tool to Post	Time, Professional Development, Funds to support development, Technology Support, Tool to Post	Time, Professional Development, Funds to support development, Technology Support, Tool to Post

Specifics of Implementation	~ Create a template for pacing guides that can be used district-wide across all grade levels and subjects. ~ Develop Curriculum Guides for: ELA and targeted subjects	~ Develop and refine and Curriculum Guides for: Math and targeted subjects Add: ~ Transition to revised state ELA standards ~ Collect feedback over the course of the on the updated curriculum guides and revise as needed ~ Utilize AIR Test Blueprints to ensure assessed Standards are taught before the spring assessments ~ Integrate reading and writing across the curriculum with emphasis on vocabulary development and comprehension at all grades.	~ Prepare for updated assessments based on revised ELA standards Add: ~ Refine curriculum pacing guides for ELA as needed.
Measure of Success	Meeting Minutes from selected teams, Curriculum Advisory Committee Minutes, Completed Curriculum Guides, Materials Adoption Cycle, Budget	Meeting Minutes from selected teams, Curriculum Advisory Committee Minutes, Completed Curriculum Guides, Materials Adoption Cycle, Budget	Meeting Minutes from selected teams, Curriculum Advisory Committee Minutes, Completed Curriculum Guides, Materials Adoption Cycle, Budget

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

Check-in/Review Date	May 2017	May 2018	May 2019

Goal # 2   Action Map

Goal Statement: Develop and implement a formative and benchmark assessment process at all grades/levels. (OIP Student Achievement Action Step#2)

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: Formative Assessment: Teachers must continuously observe and assess reading behaviors to identify areas of difficulty and tailor instruction for individuals, groups and whole classes (Bell and Dolainsik 2012; Institute of Education Sciences [IES] 2016; National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE], 2013)

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Component	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Assessment and the Use of Data #1	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Assessment and the Use of Data #1	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Assessment and the Use of Data #1
Timeline	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Lead Person(s)	Director of Curriculum, Administrators and Teachers	Director of Curriculum, Administrators and Teachers	Director of Curriculum, Administrators and Teachers
Resources Needed	Time, Professional Development, Funds to support the purchase and training , Technology Support, Electronic Tool	Time, Professional Development, Funds to support the purchase and training , Technology Support, Electronic Tool	Time, Professional Development, Funds to support the purchase and training , Technology Support, Electronic Tool

Specifics of Implementation	~ Create a district assessment advisory team for grades 7-12, similar to the process currently in place for kindergarten through sixth grade, to coordinate the development of these assessments. ~ Work with the building leadership teams to develop the schedule and framework for teacher teams to create, administer, and review common assessments within their respective departments. ~ Construct a plan to provide professional development on the implementation of formative instructional practices at all levels, with emphasis at the middle and high schools. ~ Identify and implement an electronic tool to assist with the development and administration of student assessments (i.e. STAR 360 for grades 7-12)	~ Continue to work with the building leadership teams to revise common assessments within their respective departments. ~ Implement professional development on formative instructional practices at all levels, with emphasis at the middle and high schools. Add: ~ Research, evaluate, and pilot an electronic tool for all grades. (i.e. Mastery Connect) ~ Utilize the AIR Rubrics to assess writing in all tested grades. ~ Develop an AIR modified rubric to assess writing in grades K-2. ~ Collect and analyze the following additional benchmarking data at TBTs: Fluency, Comprehension (Within-Beyond-About the text), and Self Corrections.	~ Use a balanced system of formative and benchmark assessments to make decisions based on timely common assessment data, to differentiate instructional practices, and implement intervention strategies that impact academic growth of all students. Add: ~ Continue and extend Mastery Connect assessment tool Pilot to grades 2 through 6. ~ Pilot ESGI assessment tool in grades K & 1. ~ Refine writing prompts and AIR aligned rubrics as needed. ~ Implement NWEA Map Testing in grades K-10 (Reading Diagnostic, TGRG Alternative, Gifted Screening 2 & 6, Student Growth)

	~ Research, evaluate, and determine the feasibility of implementing an electronic tool for all grades.		
Measure of Success	Assessment Timeline, Assessments, Student Results/Reports	Assessment Timeline, Assessments, Student Results/Reports	Assessment Timeline, Assessments, Student Results/Reports
Check-in/Review Date	May 2017	May 2018	May 2019

Goal # 3 Action Map

Goal Statement: Develop a process to collect and analyze student performance data to assess the impact of all tiered student support programs provided by the district. (OIP Student Achievement Action Step#3)

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: Data Analysis and Responsive Teaching: Teachers must carefully assess and monitor reading behaviors to (a) identify areas of strength and difficulty and (b) differentiate instruction to meet areas of challenge (Bell and Dlainski 2012; Institute of Education Sciences [IES] 2010; IES 2016; National Council of Teachers of English [NCTE] 2013).

	Action Step 1	**Action Step 2**	**Action Step 3**
Implementation Component	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Student Supports #1	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Student Supports #1	ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Student Supports #1
Timeline	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Lead Person(s)	District Directors, Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee, District and Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams	District Directors, Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee, District and Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams	District Directors, Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee, District and Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams
Resources Needed	Time, Performance Data, Budgets, Program Evaluation Tool.	Time, Performance Data, Budgets, Program Evaluation Tool.	Time, Performance Data, Budgets, Program Evaluation Tool.
Specifics of Implementation	~ Identify current programs	~ Frequently adjust tiered systems of support based on data analyses to meet the	~ Make immediate, data-based decisions about the implementation and

	~ Develop criteria to evaluate existing programs ~ Identify strengths and challenges in the level of implementation and effectiveness of all support programs related to student achievement through surveys, observations, interviews, etc.	predetermined objectives and academic needs of students. Add ~ Pilot a formative assessment generator and digital data warehouse	delivery of tiered systems of support. Add ~ Implement and use a formative assessment generator and digital data warehouse to determine flexible groupings based on student needs
Measure of Success	List of Current Programs, Evaluation Criteria / Tools, Program Review Documents, Cycle for reviewing programs	List of Current Programs, Evaluation Criteria / Tools, Program Review Documents, Cycle for reviewing programs	List of Current Programs, Evaluation Criteria / Tools, Program Review Documents, Cycle for reviewing programs
Check-in/Review Date	May 2017	May 2018	May 2019

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

Goal # 4 Action Map

Goal Statement: Assemble a team of administrators and teachers across all grade levels to develop a curriculum for grades preK-12 that is aligned to Ohio's Learning Standards. (OIP Student Achievement Action Step#1)

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: Collaboration and Learning Communities, Instructional Coherence: creating a culture of reflective practice that fuels growth and collaboration, fosters capacity building, encourages collective responsibility, nurtures a focused, cohesive direction that benefits everyone (Fullen and Quinn, 2016).

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Component	(Emphasis on middle school students) ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Student Supports #2	(Emphasis on middle school students) ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Student Supports #2	(Emphasis on middle school students) ODE Recommendation 2/17/2016 Student Supports #2
Timeline	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Lead Person(s)	Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee, District and Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams	Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee, District and Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams	Targeted Administrators and Teachers, Curriculum Advisory Committee, District and Building Leadership Teams, Teacher Based Teams
Resources Needed	Program Materials, Funding, Staffing	Program Materials, Funding, Staffing	Program Materials, Funding, Staffing

Specifics of Implementation	~ Evaluate the need to offer additional instructional programs beyond the normal academic day and year aimed at helping students in all grades master foundational skills. ~ Evaluate the need to provide students in grades 7 and 8 with further instruction during the summer to meet high school readiness standards. ~ Research and implement specific practices to improve graduation rates.	~ Train principals to lead instruction and promote student achievement in low performing schools. ~ Provide training for teachers on how to align their classroom assignments and assessments to career and college-ready standards as well as analyze data to improve instruction and student learning. ~ Continue to implement identified practices to improve graduation rates.	~ Engage students in learning, monitor their academic performance as they transition to between grades / levels, and provide supports and interventions so as to ultimately improve graduation rates.
Measure of Success	Professional Development Plan for Literacy, Staffing	Professional Development Plan for Literacy, Staffing	Professional Development Plan for Literacy, Staffing
Check-in/Review Date	May 2017	May 2018	May 2019

MANSFIELD CITY SCHOOLS
READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

Goal # _5_ Action Map

Goal Statement: Implement a comprehensive literacy approach to teaching the English Language Arts standards in grades K-8. (OIP Student Achievement Action Step#5)

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: Align to State Plan: Successful school systems have emerged by eliminating incoherence, mismatched goals and nurture a focused, cohesive direction that benefits everyone (Fullen and Quinn, 2016).

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Component	District Literacy Initiative	District Literacy Initiative	District Literacy Initiative
Timeline	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Lead Person(s)	District Directors, Administrators, Literacy Coaches, District Literacy Team, Teachers	District Directors, Administrators, Literacy Coaches, District Literacy Team, Teachers	District Directors, Administrators, Literacy Coaches, District Literacy Team, Teachers
Resources Needed	Funds to support implementation,Literacy Coaches, Funds to update and Professional Development	Funds to support implementation,Literacy Coaches, Funds to update and Professional Development	Funds to support implementation,Literacy Coaches, Funds to update and Professional Development
Specifics of Implementation	~ Continue to develop best practices in literacy instruction in collaboration with Literacy Collaborative at The Ohio State University ~ Extend the Literacy Collaborative	~Fully implement the Literacy Collaborative Framework for grades K - 8. ~ Implement required professional development for all staff per Literacy	~Fully implement the Literacy Collaborative Framework for grades K - 8. ~ Implement required professional development for all staff

	Framework into grades 7&8. ~ Implement literacy professional development for all staff per Literacy Collaborative Guidelines. ~ Train new coaches as needed. ~ Evaluate the district implementation and make program recommendations. ~ Train new administrators through the Literacy Collaborative Principal's Academy. ~ Identify gaps in instructional resources. ~ Provide job embedded professional development through trained literacy coaches	Collaborative Guidelines. ~ Train new coaches as needed. ~ Provide job embedded professional development through trained literacy coaches. ~ Train new administrators through the Literacy Collaborative Principal's Academy. ~ Implement new / updated resources to support balanced literacy instruction. ~ Identify curriculum gaps as new revised state standards are implemented.	per Literacy Collaborative Guidelines. ~ Train new coaches as needed. ~ Provide job embedded professional development through trained literacy coaches. ~ Train new administrators through the Literacy Collaborative Principal's Academy. Add: ~ Train Intervention Specialists in grades K-6 on Orton Gillingham
Measure of Success	Professional Development Plan for Literacy, Staffing	Professional Development Plan for Literacy, Staffing	Professional Development Plan for Literacy, Staffing
Check-in/Review Date	May 2017	May 2018	May 2019

Goal # 6 Action Map

Goal Statement: Develop and implement a process that can be used across the district for the selection and replacement of curriculum materials.   (OIP Student Achievement Action Step#7)

Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies: Align to ODE Guidelines

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Implementation Component	District Need	District Need	District Need
Timeline	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Lead Person(s)	Directors, Superintendent, Treasurer, Curriculum Advisory Committee, Teachers	Directors, Superintendent, Treasurer, Curriculum Advisory Committee, Teachers	Directors, Superintendent, Treasurer, Curriculum Advisory Committee, Teachers
Resources Needed	Documented Process	Documented Process Add: ~ Funding	Documented Process Add: ~ Funding
Specifics of Implementation	~ Develop and articulate a philosophy for the selection of curriculum materials based on current research. ~ Evaluate the current curricular materials and alignment to state standards.	~ Implement the Selection and Replacement Cycle for Curriculum Materials Add: ~ Focus: Evaluate and replace materials for 9-12 ELA	~ Implement the Selection and Replacement Cycle for Curriculum Materials Add: ~ Focus: Evaluate and replace materials for K-3 ELA

	~ Develop a selection and replacement cycle for curriculum materials. ~ Establish a budgeting process	~ Identify and add materials for K-8 literacy gaps. ~ Implement Digital Literacy instructors and Keyboarding without Tears K-5 to develop on-line testing skills ~ Implement Handwriting Without Tears K-5	
Measure of Success	Completed Process, Replacement Schedule, Budget	Completed Process, Replacement Schedule, Budget	Completed Process, Replacement Schedule, Budget
Check-in/Review Date	May 2017	May 2018	May 2019

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

Progress toward learner performance goals (Section 5) will be monitored, measured and reported in the following ways:

Goal: #1	
Evidence Collected:	K-3 ELA Curriculum Guides
Specific Time:	Revised by Semester & Reviewed Yearly
By Whom:	K-3 ELA Teachers, Literacy Coaches, Curriculum Committee, Director of School Improvement, Director of Student Support Services, and Chief Academic Officer

Goal: #1	
Evidence Collected:	ELA Professional Development Agendas and Literacy Coaches Coaching Logs
Specific Time:	PD Provided Monthly & Evidence Reviewed Quarterly
By Whom:	Building Literacy Coaches and Chief Academic Officer

Goal: #2	
Evidence Collected:	Utilize the Online Formative Assessment Generator to collect data and drive 5-step process work in ELA TBTs
Specific Time:	Use Monthly & Monitored Quarterly
By Whom:	ELA Teachers, Building Principals, Literacy Coaches, Director of School Improvement, Director of Student Support Services, and Chief Academic Officers

Goal: #2	
Evidence Collected:	Collection and Analysis of F & P Benchmark data containing Instructional Reading level, Self-Correction Rate, Fluency, and Comprehension Scores (Within, Beyond, About The Text)
Specific Time:	Administered Fall, Winter, and Spring and BLT, DLT Analyzed Fall Winter Spring
By Whom:	DLT, BLT, ELA Teachers, Building Principals, Literacy Coaches, Director of School Improvement, Director of Student Support Services, and Chief Academic Officers

Goal: #3	
Evidence Collected:	Fidelity of Implementation Tools (Using Tools created by the Literacy Collaborative) to verify the implementation of the Literacy Collaborative framework across Tiers 1-3
Specific Time:	Annually
By Whom:	Building Principals, Literacy Consultants, Director of School Improvement, Director of Student Support Services, and Chief Academic Officers

The district has adopted the Literacy Collaborative comprehensive school reform model which is designed to improve the reading, writing, and language skills of elementary and middle-level children.

The district has identified evidence-based safety nets to serve students who are at risk and have fallen behind in their literacy learning. (i.e. Reading Recovery and Leveled Literacy Intervention)

SECTION 8, PART A: STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT LEARNERS

A description of the instructional strategies that will be used to support students is provided below.

---Tier I---

Phonemic Awareness:
Within the balanced literacy framework, phonemic awareness is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Writing, Shared Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, Guided Reading, direct phonological instruction, Writing Workshop. The Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (grades K–2) provides four assessments of phonemic awareness: Initial Sounds, Blending Words, Segmenting Words, and Rhyming. Kindergarten and first-grade teachers will use these assessment results to inform phonemic awareness instruction, which involves manipulating sounds in speech and working with rhymes, words, syllables, and onsets and rimes.

The following phonemic awareness standards will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Foundational Skills: Standards 2 and 3
(See Appendices)

Phonics:
Teachers will use information from the assessments to target phonics and spelling instruction by using the Phonics and Word Study continuum. Concepts are organized along a continuum of difficulty, with one principle building on another. Daily phonics lessons may be planned to provide systematic steps in learning letter-sound relationships (consonants, vowels, digraphs, and blends) as well as spelling patterns (phonograms). Within the balanced literacy framework, phonemic awareness is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Writing, Shared Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, Guided Reading, direct phonological instruction, Writing Workshop.

The following phonemic awareness standards will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Foundational Skills: Standards 2 and 3
(See Appendices)

Fluency:
The balanced literacy framework includes a six-dimension fluency assessment that will help teachers be more specific in their teaching of phrasing, pausing, appropriate word stress, intonation, reading rate, and integration. Integration involves the way the reader consistently and evenly orchestrates pausing, phrasing, stress, intonation, and rate. Within the balanced literacy framework, fluency is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Read Aloud, Interactive Writing, Shared Reading, Guided Reading, direct phonological instruction, Writing Workshop.

The following fluency standard will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Foundational Skills: Standard 4
(See Appendices)

Vocabulary:
Information from the Vocabulary Assessments, using The Continuum of Literacy
Learning, will guide instruction in several areas, including interactive read aloud, phonics and word study, and guided reading. Through conversations with "expert others," children expand their ability to use language and solve problems. Within the balanced literacy framework, vocabulary is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Read Aloud, Shared Reading, Guided Reading, student conferencing, word study, word sorts.

The following vocabulary standard will be taught and assessed:
-Language Skills: Standard 4
(See Appendices)

Comprehension:
Teachers will teach for and develop comprehension by focusing on:
1. Thinking within the text, which involves the extent to which the student has decoded the words, searched for and used information, and reached a literal understanding of the fiction or nonfiction text.
2. Thinking beyond the text, which involves making inferences; synthesizing new information; making connections with content knowledge, background experiences, and other texts; and making predictions.3. Thinking about the text, which involves analyzing the text for aspects of the writer's craft or critiquing the quality or objectivity of the text. Within the balanced literacy framework, comprehension is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Read Aloud, Literature Discussion, Shared Reading, Guided Reading.

The following comprehension standard will be taught and assessed:

-Reading Informational Texts

-Reading Literary Texts

(See Appendices)

---Tier II---

The Literacy Collaborative Framework allows for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students that are struggling within the classroom and/or on a reading improvement monitoring plan.

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is a short-term, supplementary, small-group literacy intervention designed to help struggling readers achieve grade-level competency. The intervention provides explicit instruction in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, oral language skills, and writing. LLI helps teachers match students with texts of progressing difficulty and deliver systematic lessons targeted to a student's reading ability. Students on a reading improvement and monitoring plan are a top priority for receiving this small group intervention. (What Works Clearinghouse, 2017)

What Works Clearinghouse has reported that Leveled Literacy Instruction (LLI) had positive effects on general reading achievement, potentially positive effects on reading fluency, and no discernible effects on alphabetics for beginning readers. (What Works Clearinghouse, 2017)

---Tier III---

1. Reading Recovery is provided to targeted first-grade students.

Reading Recovery® is a short-term tutoring intervention that provides one-on-one tutoring to first-grade students who are struggling in reading and writing and/or are on reading improvement and monitoring plans. The goals of Reading Recovery® include promoting literacy skills, reducing the number of students who are struggling to read, and preventing long-term reading difficulties. Reading Recovery®supplements classroom teaching with tutoring sessions, generally conducted as pull-out sessions during the school day. Tutoring is delivered by trained Reading Recovery teachers in daily 30-minute sessions over the course of 12–20 weeks (What Works Clearinghouse, 2013).

What Works Clearinghouse has stated that Reading Recovery® was found to have positive effects on general reading achievement and potentially positive effects on alphabetics, reading fluency, and comprehension for beginning readers (What Works Clearinghouse, 2013).

2. Individual Education Plan (IEP) Implementation by Intervention Specialist

Intervention specialists use specially designed instruction to implement the IEP literacy goals in the areas of phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, phonics, and comprehension. Several intervention specialists have been trained and utilize procedures from Literacy Lessons designed for students on IEPs (Reading Recovery theory and practices).

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

---Tier I---

Tier 1

The proposed actions below improve upon current strategies and protocols utilized over the two prior consecutive school years:

1. **Monitor adult implementation of literacy instruction and implementation of the Literacy Collaborative Framework.**

   In order to ensure fidelity, principals, literacy coaches, and building leadership teams will consistently monitor progress using the Fidelity of Implementation Rubric. This has been used consistently the last two years across schools.

   Benefit: It is critical that the Literacy Collaborative Framework be implemented with fidelity and high expectations.When an instructional gap is identified, a plan of action will be put in place and staff needs will be addressed through ongoing professional development.

2. **Provide instructional coaching in literacy to all preK-3 ELA staff.**

   Coaching gaps currently exist in three of the four buildings. These gaps developed while the district was in fiscal emergency and have seriously affected the implementation of our ELA improvement strategy over the last two years. To rectify this gap, instructional coaches will be trained and assigned in the buildings that currently do not have them. (i.e. Sherman K-2, Springmill Stem K-1, Sherman and Prospect- 3rd)

   Benefit: Instructional coaching can lead to increased student achievement in literacy by improving instructional practices across the district.

3. **Continue to improve the effectiveness of Teacher Based Teams and Building Leadership Teams through the Ohio Improvement Process.**

   Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) and Teacher Based Teams (TBTs) will use literacy data more consistently to monitor student progress, identify intervention needs, adjust the allocation of resources,

and determine grade-levels in need of more coaching support. Implementing the five step process with fidelity across the district was a recommendation from the ODE district review. A Director of School Improvement is now in place to work with BLTs and TBTs.

Literacy Coaches will also provide monthly coaching logs to the building administrator in order to monitor progress.

Benefit: When the district implements the Ohio Improvement Process at the district, building and teacher levels, this can encourage ownership for student academic success throughout the district. In this collaborative environment, the district staff can work to ensure improved learning for the students that they serve.

4. **Fill gaps in instructional materials and ensure English Language Arts standards are taught systematically.**

Teacher and student ELA materials in the district have not been updated in more than eight years. The district is currently evaluating reading materials that are based on state standards and aligned to the Continuum of Literacy. This model incorporates the Simple View of Reading and includes the Five Components of Reading (Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension). It is our goal to implement new instructional materials for literacy using both grant and general funds. This will support our work on improving Tier I classroom instruction in a more systematic way.

Benefit: With increased consistency in language and more systematic teaching of literacy among our teachers, the expectation is that student achievement will increase with the goal of less students needing intensive, reading interventions such as Leveled Literacy Instruction and Reading Recovery. In the two prior years, more interventions have been offered to help classroom teachers increase reading achievement. The current strategy places more emphasis on the child's classroom instruction. Emphasis would be placed on the Guided Reading program and a Phonics program which includes phonics, spelling, and word study.

---Tier 2---

The Literacy Collaborative Framework allows for differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students that are struggling within the classroom.

Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is implemented by Reading Recovery (RR) trained teachers at two of the primary buildings to ensure the effectiveness of the intervention. One school, Sherman, has two LLI teachers trained in RR and one that is receiving support from a Literacy Coordinator working with the district. The Student Support Specialist at Springmill is also receiving extra support from the Literacy Coordinator. Three times a year, the Student Support Specialists in the district attend Professional Development and network

together.

Tier 2 Recommendations:
~ Student progress for at-risk students needs further study to determine if alternative reading strategies need to be implemented.
~ Additional training needs to be planned for Student Support Specialists that have not been trained in Leveled Literacy Intervention
~ Student Support Specialists should attend all Teacher Based Teams (TBT) for the grade level they support.
~ Student Support Specialists need to work collaboratively with school administration and classroom teachers in order to ensure the effectiveness of the intervention and student achievement.
~ The Fidelity of LLI Implementation tool can be used by administrators or Student Support Specialists as a self-evaluation tool.
~ Student Support Specialists will collaborate with teachers using the Online Formative Assessment Generator to determine additional interventions for Tier II.

---Tier 3---

General Education: Reading Recovery

An overall district implementation rate was 23% for the 2017-2018 school year. The following implementation rates are in place at each school for 2017-2018: Prospect 25% Woodland 16% Sherman 21% Springmill STEM 0% (Currently no trained Reading Recovery teachers)

Reading Recovery teachers complete a running record on the previous lesson new book each day. The running record is analyzed and used to plan the next day's lesson, and is used to chart growth. Teachers are required to keep records of reading vocabulary and writing vocabulary growth for each child. They also record observational notes on lesson records to plan lessons and show growth over time.

Reading Recovery teachers submit student data into the International Data Evaluation Center to be compiled into building and district reports. Building report meetings are conducted each year with the building principal(s), Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, Reading Recovery teachers, and possibly Literacy Coach and/or classroom teachers to discuss results and set goals for the year.

Based on the Reading Recovery Standards and Guidelines, Reading Recovery teachers are required to participate in a six semester hour training course over their first year and to participate in six half-day professional development sessions throughout the year every year after that, include lessons taught behind

the glass with follow-up discussions. Teachers are also required school visits from the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader.

Due to the drop in the "Discontinuing" rate from 21% in 2016-2017 to 6% in 2017-2018 additional professional development sessions with behind-the-glass sessions are scheduled for the Reading Recovery teachers. Dr. James Schnug, a Reading Recovery Trainer from The Ohio State University, will be assisting in some planned school visits and professional development sessions. Student progress will be monitored weekly by the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader along with more focused school visits throughout the year.

Students with a Disability: Individual Education Plan (IEP) Implementation by Intervention Specialist

Intervention Specialist use Ohio Department of Education approved literacy specially designed instruction in order for students to master their literacy IEP goals. MCS has district representatives K-12 to ensure the IEPs have evidence-based strategies in the specially designed instructions section of the IEP.

The state Systemic Improvement Plan is designed to ensure that the district complies with IEP requirements.

In addition, Intervention Specialists will be trained in Literacy Lessons and/or Orton Gillingham.

- Literacy Lesson is an intervention designed to reach young children in special education or ESL settings who are struggling with beginning reading and writing but are not eligible for Reading Recovery. Intervention Specialists are trained to use Reading Recovery instructional procedures to design individual lessons for their students with the goal of accelerating their literacy learning.
- Orton Gillingham is a multi-sensory and sequential instructional approach to teaching reading. The rules and patterns of decoding and encoding are explicitly taught.

SECTION 8, PART C: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

---Tier 1 ---
Professional Development is site-based, ongoing at each K-3 building in the district.
~ Woodland: For the 2017-18 school year the PD is focused around the reading process and the determining appropriate instructional levels of support. A second focus was an analysis of standard based writing. (Opinion Writing) For the 2018-19 school year, PD will continue to focus on writing.
~ Prospect: For the 2017-18 school year, there is currently a Year One training program in place (40 hours) for new/untrained staff members. This includes all contexts of the balanced literacy framework. For the staff members that have at least 2 years (60 hours) of training, they are doing 10 hours of professional

development in the form of a book study and classroom observations.   For the 2018-19 school year, PD will focus on writing.

~ Sherman: For the 2017-18 school staff are focusing on using the information from Running Records to analyze and drive instruction. For the 2018-19 school staff are focusing on reviewing the Literacy Framework with an emphasis on Guided Reading. K/1 teachers are also reviewing HRSIW data and refining interactive writing.

~ Springmill STEM: For the 2017-18 school year, the staff is focusing on informational writing in the area of science. For the 2018-19 school year, the school staff is focusing on the using the growth mindset and writing across the curriculum.

Future professional learning opportunities will include responsive teaching; analyzing running records to guide instruction, administration, and analysis of the Developmental Spelling Assessment (grades 1-3) and Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (grades K-2), and writing about reading.

The district can also train Kindergarten through second-grade teachers in the Early Literacy coursework being developed by The Ohio State University Reading Recovery Training Site that will be piloted in 2018-2019.

---Tier 2 ---

As stated above, future professional learning opportunities will include responsive teaching is needed for students that are not making adequate progress.

Professional Development
~ Woodland: Continued Professional Development and networking with other Student Support Specialists three times a year.
~ Prospect: Continued Professional Development and networking with other Student Support Specialists three times a year.
~ Sherman: Continued Professional Development and networking with other Student Support Specialists three times a year. Student Support Specialists not trained in LLI will receive training.
~ Springmill STEM: Continued Professional Development and networking with other Student Support Specialists three times a year. Student Support Specialists not trained in LLI will receive training.

---Tier 3 ---

Reading Recovery teachers are required to participate in a six semester hour training course the over their first year and to participate in six half-day continuing professional development sessions throughout the year

every year after that include lessons taught behind the glass with follow-up discussions. Teachers are also required school visits from the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader.

In 2018-2019 additional professional development will be provided by the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader with some assistance from Dr. James Schnug, a Reading Recovery Trainer from The Ohio State University. Additional professional development and support will be provided through:

~Additional behind-the-glass sessions with follow-up discussions

~Focused and increased number of school visits throughout the school year

~Weekly student monitoring provided by the Reading Recovery Teacher Leader

Recommendations:
~ Based on needs shown by data, a teacher should be trained at Springmill STEM in Reading Recovery.
~ Intervention Specialists need to participate in district-suggested literacy professional development including Literacy Collaborative and should have opportunities to be coached by the Literacy Coach.

~Intervention Specialist can be trained in Literacy Lessons, a training offered through Reading Recovery.
~ Intervention Specialists should participate in TBTs at their students' grade levels.
~ Train intervention specialists in the Early Literacy coursework being developed by The Ohio State University Reading Recovery Training Site to be piloted in 2018-2019.

Please refer to additional Short Term and Long Term Recommendations in the appendices.

Appendices

The district has developed a grade level assessment timeline for grades K-3. The following assessments are required for all K-3 students in English Language Arts:

Grade-level Assessments

Grade K: Kindergarten uses letter identification to assess phonics. Letter identification is given in August, October, December, March, and May. The KRA assesses phonemic awareness, phonics, and comprehension. It is given in September and October. Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words (HRSIW) is given in January and April to assess students in phonics and phonemic awareness. Kindergarten teachers give Fountas and Pinnell's Benchmark Assessment System in December and May. NWEA Map will be given in Winter and Spring.

Grade 1: Reading Diagnostic Screener is given in September. The Reading Screener assesses phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension. Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark-3 times per year, in September, December, and May. (Instructional level), Writing Assessment
The Observation Survey is given to the lowest 40 to 50 percent of the first-grade population up to three times a year: beginning, mid-year, and end of the year. NWEA Map will be given in Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Grade 2: Reading Diagnostic Screener, F&P Benchmark-3 times per year (Instructional Level), Running Records-2 times per year, Writing Assessment. NWEA Map will be given in Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Grade 3: Reading Diagnostic-Screener, F&P Benchmark-3 times per year - Instructional Level, AIR ELA State Assessment, Writing Assessment. NWEA Map will be given in Fall and Winter.

Description & Purpose of Assessments:
~ The state Diagnostic Reading Screener and Kindergarten Readiness Assessment measures beginning of year skills and is used to determine if students in grades 1-3 are On Track or Not on Track. Students that require further assessment are assessed using the F&P Benchmark System. Students that are Not on Track and below grade level expectations on the benchmark are placed on a Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plan.
~ The F&P Benchmark Assessment System is used in grades K-3. A benchmark is a standard against which to measure something. In Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark System 1, the standard is set by the benchmark books a student reads aloud and talks about during the assessment conference. These books have been written edited and extensively field tested to ensure that they reflect the characteristics of text and the demands of texts on the reader at each specific Fountas and Pinnell level. The benchmark identifies each child's instructional and independent reading levels according to the F&P Text Level Gradient™, A–Z and documents

their progress through one-on-one formative and summative assessments. The benchmark provides each child's strengths and needs in processing a text.

 ~ Running Records - To identify the instructional reading level and to provide information about children's strengths and needs in processing a text.

~ Hearing & Recording Sounds in Words-Using predetermined sentences with 37 identified phonemes in kindergarten and first grade to 1) find out children's ability to analyze words they hear and/or say 2) find out how children record the sounds they hear on paper.

~ Writing Assessment - A writing sample is formally assessed four times per year. The state writing diagnostic was used up through the 2016-2017 school year. Beginning with the 2017 2018 school year, the district will use a modified rubric that is based on the American Institutes for Research (AIR) Writing Rubrics. The rubric describes the score point characteristics across three domains: Purpose, Focus, and Organization; Evidence and Elaboration; Conventions of Standard English.

~ Letter Identification - To determine children's knowledge of letter names, speed in recognizing letters, and letter confusions. (Both F&P and Observation Survey)

The Eight components of Guided Reading align with the key tenets of the Common Core of the State Standards:

1. Complex, high-level reading comprehension is the goal of guided reading instruction.

2. Guided reading centers on a sequence of high-quality text that supports individual progress on a scale of spiraling

text difficulty.

3. Guided reading lessons increase the volume of independent reading that students do: goal always is confident, capable independent readers.

4. Guided reading provides explicit instruction in accurate fluent reading.

5. Guided reading lessons provide daily opportunities to expand academic vocabulary through reading, writing, conversations, and explicit instruction.

6. Guided reading lessons include teaching that expands student's ability to apply the concepts of print, phonological awareness, access to rich vocabulary, and accurate, fluent reading to the processing of print.

7. Guided reading lessons invite students to write about reading.

8. Guided reading lessons create engagement and motivation for reading.

In addition, an important key feature of the Common Core State Standards is to provide students with a grade-by-grade Staircase of increasing text complexity and steady growth of comprehension. This text level gradient process is assessed through the use of an individually administered running record using specific, consistent benchmark text of fiction and non-fiction. An accurate running record assessment included questioning of student comprehension followed by an analysis of miscues and student performance.

Tier I Instruction

Using the guidelines provided by a balanced literacy evidenced-based approach, the following strategies will be used by staff:

Phonemic Awareness:

The Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (grades K–2) provides four assessments of phonemic awareness: Initial Sounds, Blending Words, Segmenting Words, and Rhyming. Phonemic awareness is one of the best predictors of how well children will learn to read. Research supports phonemic awareness instruction as an essential foundation for learning to read and has been found to be very effective in preventing reading difficulties.(National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000b), p. 2–11). Kindergarten and first-grade teachers will want to use these assessment results to inform phonemic awareness instruction, which involves manipulating sounds in speech and working with rhymes, words, syllables, and onsets and rimes. Initially, this is done without letters, but after children have learned the task of hearing, identifying, segmenting, and blending phonemes in words, they can work with sounds and letters together. (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017).

Within the balanced literacy framework, phonemic awareness is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Writing, Shared Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, Guided Reading, direct phonological instruction, Writing Workshop.

The following phonemic awareness standards will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Foundational Skills: Standards 2 and 3

Phonics:

 Including the phonemic awareness, high-frequency word, and letter name tests, the F&P System 1 (grades K–2) includes 22 Phonics and Word Analysis Assessments; System 2 (grades 3–8) includes 18. These assessments focus on key areas such as a wide variety of letter-sound relationships (vowels, consonants, letter clusters, phonograms), word patterns, and elements of word structure. Also included is an innovative Word Features Test for each grade level, which provides a measure of the kinds of words children are able to decode (for example, short and long vowel sounds, phonogram patterns, prefixes and suffixes, multisyllabic words). Some assessments are individual and some can be used with groups of students. These assessments have been successfully used since 2002 as part of the Phonics and Word Study Lessons and are based on the phonological and orthographic systems of the English language. (Pinnell & Fountas, 2002a, 2002b, 2003, 2004). Research supports systematic phonics instruction as more effective than non-systematic instruction or

no instruction. (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn (2001), p. 13). The information from these assessments will help teachers target phonics and spelling instruction by using the Phonics and Word Study continuum. Concepts are organized along a continuum of difficulty, with one principle building on another. Daily phonics lessons may be planned to provide systematic steps in learning letter-sound relationships (consonants, vowels, digraphs, and blends) as well as spelling patterns (phonograms). Within each thirty minute lesson, ten minutes is allocated to phonemic awareness/discrimination and phonics. (Fountas & Pinnell, 2017).

Within the balanced literacy framework, phonics is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Writing, Shared Reading, Guided Reading, direct phonological instruction, Writing Workshop.

The following phonics standards will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Foundational Skills: Standard 2
-Language: Standard 1

Fluency:

In addition to the basic evaluation of fluency included in the text reading assessment, the F&P System includes a six-dimension fluency assessment that will help teachers be more specific in their teaching of phrasing, pausing, appropriate word stress, intonation, reading rate, and integration. Integration involves the way the reader consistently and evenly orchestrates pausing, phrasing, stress, intonation, and rate. The reader moves smoothly from one word to another, from one phrase to another, and from one sentence to another, incorporating pauses that are just long enough to perform their function. (Pinnell & Fountas, 2007). Fluency is given close attention in the F&P systems because fluency is critical for reading comprehension: "Fluent readers are able to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression. Fluency is one of several critical factors necessary for reading comprehension" but "is often neglected in the classroom." (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000a), p. 11) At benchmark reading levels A and B, children are just gaining control of voice-to-print matching, so fluency is not assessed. In all levels beyond B, fluency is assessed either with the standard four-point scale or with the six-dimension scale because "fluency is not a stage of development at which readers can read all words quickly and easily. Fluency changes depending on what readers are reading, their familiarity with the words, and the amount of their practice with reading text." (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn (2001), p. 23.) Both scales are based on a scale developed for and published by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). ("A recent large-scale study by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found that 44% of a representative sample of the nation's fourth graders were low in fluency. The study also found a close relationship between fluency and reading comprehension. Students who score lower on measures of fluency also scored lower on measures of comprehension, suggesting that fluency is a neglected reading skill in many

American classrooms, affecting many students' reading comprehension." (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn (2001). p. 23, citing Pinnell, G.S., Pikulski, J.J., Wixson, K.K., Campbell, J.R., Gough, R.B., & Beatty, A.S. (1995). This study found a strong relationship between reading fluency and reading comprehension, agreeing with the National Reading Panel that "if text is read in a laborious and inefficient manner, it will be difficult for the child to remember what has been read and to relate the ideas expressed in the text to his or her background knowledge." (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000a), p. 11.)

Within the balanced literacy framework, fluency is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Read Aloud, Interactive Writing, Shared Reading, Guided Reading, direct phonological instruction, Writing Workshop.

The following fluency standard will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Foundational Skills: Standard 4

Vocabulary:

System 1 (grades K–2) includes 39 Vocabulary Assessments. The first 11 focus on concept words, synonyms, antonyms, and homophones. The next 27 provide an innovative Vocabulary in Context test for each level (A to L)—fiction and nonfiction. This assessment provides information about the reader's ability to derive the meaning of words from contextual information. System 2 (grades 3–8) includes 40 Vocabulary Assessments, adding homographs, Greek and Latin word roots, and analogies, as well as two Vocabulary in Context tests for every text level L to Z. Information from the Vocabulary Assessments, using The Continuum of Literacy Learning, can guide instruction in several areas, including interactive read aloud, phonics and word study, and guided reading. Through conversations with "expert others," children expand their ability to use language and solve problems. (Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA; Harvard University Press.) This process is especially important for children who are struggling with the reading process, including English language learners.

Within the balanced literacy framework, vocabulary is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Read Aloud, Shared Reading, Guided Reading, student conferencing, word study, word sorts.

The following vocabulary standard will be taught and assessed:
-Language Skills: Standard 4

Comprehension:

The comprehension score is differentiated by the kind of thinking the student exhibits; for example, the score for the following:

1. Thinking within the text involves the extent to which the student has decoded the words, searched for and used information, and reached a literal understanding of the fiction or nonfiction text.

2. Thinking beyond the text involves making inferences; synthesizing new information; making connections with content knowledge, background experiences, and other texts; and making predictions.

3. Thinking about the text involves analyzing the text for aspects of the writer's craft or critiquing the quality or objectivity of the text. The teacher can look at these scores for an individual student over time or profile the whole class and small groups to see where the instructional emphasis should be. Then, using The Continuum of Literacy Learning for several different areas (for example,

Guided Reading, Interactive Read Aloud, Writing About Reading), teachers can provide specific and systematic instruction on comprehension. Research supports instruction in specific comprehension strategies as a means of helping children gain the meaning of

Texts. (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn (2001), p. 49.) Conversations about books are also very important in helping children learn new words and concepts, which they must relate to prior knowledge and experience. (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn, (2001), p. 35.) Moreover, the talk is centered on literary texts, giving students opportunities to use the new words and new language structures that they encounter in the books they are reading. (Snow, Burns, & Griffin (1998).)

Within the balanced literacy framework, comprehension is explicitly taught in the following instructional contexts: Interactive Read Aloud, Literature Discussion, Shared Reading, Guided Reading.

The following comprehension standard will be taught and assessed:
-Reading Informational Texts
-Reading Literary Texts

References

-Armbruster, B. B., Lehr, F., & Osborn, J. (2001). Put Reading First: The Research
Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read: Kindergarten through Grade 1.
Jessup, MD: National Institute for Literacy.
-Clay, M.M. (2001). Change Over Time in Children's Literacy Development. Portsmouth,
NH: Heinemann.
-Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (1996). Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All
Children. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2001). Guiding Readers and Writers, Grades 3–6: Teaching Comprehension, Genre, and Content Literacy. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2006). Leveled Books, K–8: Matching Texts to Readers for Effective Teaching. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Fountas, I.C., & Pinnell, G.S. (2006). Teaching for Comprehending and Fluency, K–8: Thinking, Talking and Writing about Reading. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-National Center on Education and the Economy and the University of Pittsburgh. (1999). Reading and Writing Grade by Grade: Primary Literacy Standards for Kindergarten through Third Grade.

-National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000a). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and its Implications for Reading Instruction. Summary. Washington, DC: National Institutes of Health.

-National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000b). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications

-Pinnell, G.S., & Fountas, I.C. (2002a). Phonics Lessons, Grade K: Letters, Words, and How They Work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Pinnell, G.S., & Fountas, I.C. (2002b). Phonics Lessons, Grade 1: Letters, Words, and How They Work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Pinnell, G.S., & Fountas, I.C. (2003). Phonics Lessons, Grade 2: Letters, Words, and How They Work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Pinnell, G.S., & Fountas, I.C. (2004). Word Study Lessons, Grade 3: Letters, Words, and How They Work. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Pinnell, G.S., & Fountas, I.C. (2007). The Continuum of Literacy Learning, Grades K–8: Behaviors and Understandings to Notice, Teach, and Support. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

-Pinnell, G.S., Pikulski, J.J., Wixson, K.K., Campbell J.R., Gough, R.B., & Beatty, A.S. (1995). Listening to Children Read Aloud: Data from NAEP's Integrated Reading Performance Record (IRPR) at Grade 4. Report No. 23-FR-04. Prepared by Educational Testing Service under contract with the National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

-Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S., & Griffin, P. (1998). Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

-Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA:

Harvard University Press.

The following recommendations were generated by the Reading Advisory Team during the data analysis in winter of 2017 and will be reviewed by the District Leadership Team:

Kindergarten
Short-Term Recommendation: Use data to target small group intervention to meet the needs of students not on track.
Long-Term Recommendation: Work with Literacy Coaches to improve Tier 1 instruction in literacy. The district should explore ways to increase the percentage of students that attend preschool.

First Grade
Short-Term Recommendation: Ensure a consistent reading level expectation is established and communicated for the end of first grade to be able to compare data from one year to the next. The data collected from the F&P Benchmark Assessment needs to be broken down to determine specific strengths and needs in each area: accuracy, self-correction rates, fluency, and comprehension (within, beyond, and about the text). This will help to assess the areas of decoding (phonics and phonemic awareness), fluency and comprehension.
Long-Term Recommendation: In order to assess phonics and phonemic awareness in first grade, students need to be assessed using Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words from the Observation Survey at the beginning of the year and mid-year. In addition, students who are at-risk will be administered the Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words by the Reading Recovery teachers at the end of the year. Per the requirements of Literacy Collaborative, the Developmental Spelling Assessment should be given at the middle and end of the year.
In order to assess word fluency teachers will assess the 100 high-frequency words at the beginning and the end of the year.

Second Grade
Short-Term Recommendation: Our district will provide Professional Development at the building level around analyzing Running Records to inform teacher instruction to have the greatest impact on student achievement. Also, looking closely at Running Records during our TBT and BLT meetings will help us analyze the current data to inform us about our progress.
Long-Term Recommendation: Determine a common standardized assessment to address the 5 Components of Reading and to identify Talented and Gifted students. In order to assess phonics and phonemic awareness in second grade, students need to be assessed using Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words from Diane Deford, adjusted for the second-grade level at the beginning of the year and mid-year. In addition, students who are at-risk will be administered the second grade Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words by the Student Support Specialist or the classroom teachers at the end of the year.

Third Grade

Short-Term Recommendation: Third-grade teachers should ensure that the tested standards are covered prior to the spring testing. The AIR Writing Rubrics should be used to evaluate writing over the course of the year and student assessment results from quarterly writing samples. Improving the use of short-cycle assessments will be piloted the second semester.

Long-Term Recommendation: A literacy coach is not currently in place to support third-grade teachers across the district in improving instruction using the Literacy Collaborative Framework.   Woodland Elementary is able to have a primary literacy coach cross trained during the 2017-2018 school year. Additional professional development is needed to support new teachers at the third-grade level. Third-grade curriculum guides should incorporate the standards identified in the AIR Test Blueprint.

Intervention

Short-Term Recommendation: Continue professional development for all trained Reading Recovery teachers with lessons taught behind-the -glass and study sessions. Plan focus sessions on how to accelerate literacy growth and working with students making slow progress. Another recommendation is for the Reading Recovery teachers to work collaboratively with first-grade teachers to accelerate the progress of shared students and provide support and share knowledge of working with students making slow progress in literacy.

Long-Term Recommendation: Continue to track implementation rates to ensure full implementation in all buildings. Review building and district site each year to determine strengths and needs across the district. Plan professional development, including behind-the-glass sessions and school visits from the Teacher Leader, to meet the building and district needs. Invite classroom teachers to view Behind the Glass lessons involving their students.

Increase collaboration of classroom teachers and student support specialists through the TBT process.

Other Recommendations:

~ Investigate replacing the ODE Reading Diagnostics for K-3 that are currently being used to meet the TGRG.

~ Evaluate, select, and implement an assessment to meet the Gifted Testing Requirement at K-2 and 3-6 Grade Bands.

~ Investigate replacing the current Alternative Assessment for TGRG (Terra Nova)

~ Consider implementing growth measures in K-3.

~ Conduct focus groups to gain additional teacher input on the Reading Achievement Plan.

Additional recommendations were collected and compiled from K-2 and 3rd-grade teacher focus groups.