



March 22, 2024

Dear Superintendent King:

Thank you for submitting the The Intergenerational School Reading Achievement Plan. The Department appreciates your time and commitment in developing this comprehensive literacy plan. Ohio Governor Mike DeWine recently launched [ReadOhio](#), an exciting statewide effort to encourage improved literacy skills for all students, including the implementation of high-quality instructional materials and professional development aligned with the science of reading.

Your plan has been reviewed and is compliant with [Ohio Revised Code 3302.13](#). Below, the Department literacy experts have provided feedback highlighting the strengths of your plan and suggestions to bolster specific sections. Regional literacy specialists are available to support the implementation of your plan. Please reach out to your state support team or educational service center for implementation support.

**Strengths of the Reading Achievement Plan:**

- Beginning to utilize KRA and State Tests to identify areas of instructional need
- Recognize factors that can lead to low reading achievement, including factors within staff's control such as teaching methods and quality
- Teams are in place across multiple levels to support improvement efforts

**This plan will benefit from:**

- Plan would benefit from a more robust team of developers including superintendent, treasurer, board member, teachers, and/or families
- When updating a plan, carefully follow rubric for writing a Reading Achievement Plan. This will help to ensure that all necessary information is provided. It is also a good way to determine additional data points, strategies, and areas of improvement that the building/district can focus on to improve
- Goals should focus on adult implementation and student learning and be very narrow. A goal such as achieving 80% Skilled on OTES may be too broad and does not necessarily reflect specific adult actions that will lead to student learning
- Current curriculum is not on Ohio's approved curriculum list

The Reading Achievement Plan and this memo will be posted on the Department's [website](#). If The intergenerational School revises its Reading Achievement Plan and would like the revised plan to be posted to the Department's website, the request and the revised plan must be sent to [readingplans@education.ohio.gov](mailto:readingplans@education.ohio.gov). If you have any questions, please email

the same inbox.

On behalf of the Department of Education and Workforce and Director Dackin, thank you for all your efforts to increase literacy achievement for your students.

Sincerely,



Melissa Weber-Mayrer, Ph.D.  
Chief of Literacy  
Section for Literacy Achievement and Reading Success

# READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN

[Ohio law](#) requires each school district or community school that meets the following criteria, as reported on the past two consecutive report cards issued for that district or community school, to submit to the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce a Reading Achievement Plan by Dec. 31.

1. The district or community school received a performance rating of less than three stars on the Early Literacy measure.
2. 51 percent or less of the district's or community school's students scored proficient or higher on Ohio's State Test for grade 3 English language arts.

The recommended length for Reading Achievement Plans encompassing grades Kindergarten through grade 3 should be 25 pages. Comprehensive Pre-K through grade 12 Reading Achievement Plans are expected to be longer than 25 pages. Section headings in the template marked with an asterisk are required by state law.

**DISTRICT NAME: The Intergenerational School**

**DISTRICT IRN: 133215**

**DISTRICT ADDRESS: 11327 Shaker Blvd., Cleveland, Ohio 44104**

**PLAN COMPLETION DATE: Friday, December 8, 2023**

**LEAD WRITERS: Mario Clopton-Zymler, Ed.D.**

## OHIO'S LANGUAGE AND LITERACY VISION

Ohio Governor Mike DeWine recently announced the [ReadOhio initiative](#), an exciting statewide effort to encourage improved literacy skills for all ages that includes the implementation of curriculum aligned with the science of reading in Ohio's schools. The Governor also [released a video](#) to explain what the science of reading is and why it is important.

In addition, the Ohio Department of Education and Workforce developed the [ReadOhio toolkit](#) to guide school leaders, teachers and families in this important work. The toolkit is filled with resources including the [Shifting to the Science of Reading: A Discussion Guide for School and District Teams](#), professional learning tools and practices for schools as they prepare for the start of the new academic year.

As described in [Ohio's Plan to Raise Literacy Achievement](#), Ohio's vision is for all learners to acquire the knowledge and skills to become proficient readers. The Ohio Department of Education and Workforce and its partners view language and literacy acquisition and achievement as foundational knowledge that supports student success. To increase learner's language and literacy achievement, the Department is urging districts and schools to use evidence-based systems and high-quality instruction, select high-quality instructional materials and employ culturally responsive practices.

## CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE PRACTICE\*

***“Culturally Responsive Practice” means an approach that recognizes and encompasses students’ and educators’ lived experiences, cultures and linguistic capital to inform, support and ensure high-quality instruction. In a Culturally Responsive environment, educators have high expectations of all students, demonstrate positive attitudes toward student achievement, involve students in multiple phases of academic programming, and support the unique abilities and learning needs of each student.***

The Department encourages districts and schools to consider Culturally Responsive Practices as Reading Achievement Plans are developed.

Please see the Department's [Culturally Responsive Practice program page](#).

## SECTION 1: DISTRICT LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERSHIP, STAKEHOLDERS, DEVELOPMENT PROCESS AND PLAN FOR MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION\*

### SECTION 1, PART A: LEADERSHIP TEAM MEMBERSHIP AND STAKEHOLDERS\*

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

Name	Title/Role	Location	Email
Mario Clopton-Zymler	Principal	The Intergenerational School	mcloptonzymler@tisonline.org
Sydney Brewster	Title I Teacher	The Intergenerational School	sbrewster@tisonline.org
Matt Hejl	Title I Teacher	The Intergenerational School	mhejl@tisonline.org
Lisa Vahey	Lead Coach	The Intergenerational School	lvahey@tisonline.org
		The Intergenerational School	
		The Intergenerational School	
		The Intergenerational School	

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

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

**UNIVERSAL SCREENING AND TIERED INSTRUCTION**

This process is for all students who are not currently on an IEP or 504 Learning Plan. The RTI process begins with a Universal Screener. The Intergenerational School uses NWEA MAP Growth Assessments as the Universal Screener.

*\*Section headings marked with an asterisk are required by state law.*

- A. Each student will take the Reading and Math MAP Growth Assessments
1. Intervention Specialists will assure the appropriate student accommodations are made available to students who receive special education services
- B. Each TBT Team will analyze MAP results and place students in groups: meet with the Specialists to review Growth Reports in three groups:
- . Tier 1 Yellow (On Grade Level): Students who are at or above their grade Level RIT score up to 9 points will receive Tier 1 instruction.
    1. Tier 1.9 Yellow (Below Grade Level): Students who are 1-10 points below Grade Level RIT score will receive KPI Intervention (Yellow Tier 2) 2x per week for no more than 30 minutes per session from teacher. If Comprehension is the lowest Instructional Focus then the student gets 1x of GR with Specialists
    2. Tier 2 Orange/Tier 3 (Very Below Grade Level) Students who are 11-19 points or more below Grade Level RIT score and will receive KPI Intervention Orange 3x per week no more than 30 minutes (Red) 4x per week for no more than 30 minutes per session
    3. Enrichment: Green and Blue (Above Grade Level): Students who are more than 10 points above their grade level RIT score will or at Green on MAP Growth report will receive KPI Enrichment 2x per week

## DATA ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION TO INTERVENTION/ENRICHMENT

The Next Step in the process is to take the data from the universal screener, identify the deficit areas within the instructional areas for Reading or Math and identify the state standards that align with those deficit instructional areas. Then, assign interventions/enrichments in IXL that align with the instructional areas identified in the universal screener.

Teacher identifies the lowest deficit instructional area for Reading or Math

Teacher identifies 1 or 2 standards from the deficit instructional area for reading.

1. Generally you are viewing learning statements to Develop (this is defaulted)
2. Keep in mind that MAP gives you the deficit standards that match the grade level standard of the deficit. This may be standards that are at or below a students current rostered grade level. For example: the student below has a deficit standard OH.ELA-Literacy.RF.1.3a. OH = Ohio, ELA-Literacy = English Language Arts. RF = Reading Foundational Skills, 1 = Grade 1.3a Standard 3a

Teacher assigns skill in IXL program that aligns to the standards identified in Growth Report.

3. Go to IXL Learning Tab

4. Select Ohio State Standards
  1. Select the appropriate Grade Level and Subject Area (this may or may not be the student's rostered grade level)
  2. Assign the skills associated with that standard to the student (This [video](#) shows you how to assign an IXL skill, its the same process for assigning a state standard)
    1. Teacher or Specialist will work through the skills 2x a week for no more than 30 minutes in class.
      1. Teacher or Specialist works with the student 1:1 or in small group
      2. Teacher or Specialist provides incentives to the student for doing the work well

## PROGRESS MONITORING

After interventions and enrichments have been completed there must be a moment to progress monitor where the student is on the path to achieving mastery in the deficit instructional area.

5. After 4 sessions, Teacher or Specialist reports IXL Smart Score on [KPI Tracker](#). Mastery is 80% or higher. If a student reaches 80% on a skill, the Teacher or Specialist will assign the next skills the student needs to master based on the MAP identified deficit standard.

### **Special Education**

Students with Special Education Plans (IEPs or 504s with Learning Goals) will receive Tier 2 and 3 services through the Special Education Staff. Teachers are always responsible for all student Tier 1 instruction, including students who receive Special Services.

## SECTION 2: ALIGNMENT BETWEEN THE READING ACHIEVEMENT PLAN AND OVERALL IMPROVEMENT AND EQUITY EFFORTS\*

*Describe how the Reading Achievement Plan is aligned to and supports the overall continuous improvement and equity efforts of the district or community school. Districts and community schools established under Chapter 3314. of the Revised Code that are required to develop or modify a local equitable access plan, an improvement plan or implement improvement strategies as required by section 3302.04, 3302.10, 3301.0715(G) or another section of the Revised Code shall ensure the plan required by this section aligns with other improvement and equity efforts.*

The Reading Achievement Plan is aligned to our model strategic plan and school improvement plan.

Goal1: Every student will experience a high-quality developmental multi-age education in a social and emotionally safe environment centered on intergenerational learning opportunities.



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

### SECTION 4 PART A: RELEVANT LEARNER PERFORMANCE DATA\*

Insert **disaggregated** student performance data from sources that **must include**, but are not limited to:

- **The Kindergarten Readiness Assessment,**

2 students (12.5%) Demonstrating Readiness

5 students (31.3%) Approaching Readiness

9 students (56.3%) Emerging Readiness

- **Ohio's State Test for English language arts assessment for grades 3-8,**

3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Fall ELA OST:

- 14 students- 50% Limited,
- 8 students- 29% Basic,
- 4 students- **14% Proficient,**
- **2 students- 7% Advanced**

#### ELA OST Spring 2022-2023

Assessment Name	Test Group	Test Grade	Test Reason	Student Count	Average Score	Performance Distribution	Date Last Taken												
Grade 7 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	7	Spring 2023 (OST)	21	668	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>82%</td> <td>43%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>11</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	82%	43%	6%	Count	11	5	1	04/25/2023				
Percent	82%	43%	6%																
Count	11	5	1																
Grade 8 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	8	Spring 2023 (OST)	15	702	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>20%</td> <td>40%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>13%</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>3</td> <td>6</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	20%	40%	20%	13%	7%	Count	3	6	3	2	1	04/21/2023
Percent	20%	40%	20%	13%	7%														
Count	3	6	3	2	1														
Grade 6 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	6	Spring 2023 (OST)	22	703	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>18%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>32%</td> <td>6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>4</td> <td>7</td> <td>3</td> <td>7</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	18%	32%	14%	32%	6%	Count	4	7	3	7	1	04/13/2023
Percent	18%	32%	14%	32%	6%														
Count	4	7	3	7	1														
Grade 4 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	4	Spring 2023 (OST)	21	692	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>33%</td> <td>38%</td> <td>6%</td> <td>14%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>7</td> <td>8</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	33%	38%	6%	14%	10%	Count	7	8	1	3	2	04/12/2023
Percent	33%	38%	6%	14%	10%														
Count	7	8	1	3	2														
Grade 3 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	3	Spring 2023 (OST)	23	682	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>39%</td> <td>26%</td> <td>22%</td> <td>13%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>9</td> <td>6</td> <td>5</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	39%	26%	22%	13%	Count	9	6	5	3	04/12/2023		
Percent	39%	26%	22%	13%															
Count	9	6	5	3															
Grade 5 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	5	Spring 2023 (OST)	20	702	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>10%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>35%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>2</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	10%	35%	35%	10%	10%	Count	2	7	7	2	2	04/12/2023
Percent	10%	35%	35%	10%	10%														
Count	2	7	7	2	2														
Grade 3 English Language Arts	Ohio's State Tests	3	Fall 2022 (OST)	23	663	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Percent</td> <td>61%</td> <td>30%</td> <td>9%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Count</td> <td>14</td> <td>7</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table>	Percent	61%	30%	9%	Count	14	7	2	10/19/2022				
Percent	61%	30%	9%																
Count	14	7	2																

- ***K-3 Reading diagnostics (include subscores by grade level),***

*See attached.*

- ***The Ohio English Language Proficiency Assessment (OELPA)***

*Not applicable*

- ***The Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities and***

*Not applicable*

### SECTION 3 PART B: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO UNDERACHIEVEMENT IN READING\*

*Insert internal and external factors believed to contribute to low reading achievement in the school district or community school.*

#### Teaching Methods

- Ineffective instructional strategies or teaching methods may hinder students' reading progress.
- Lack of differentiation to meet the diverse learning needs of students.

#### Teacher Quality

- High teacher turnover has affected the quality of instruction.
- Some teachers are not credentialed with professional licenses and some lack experience to affect student outcomes.
- Insufficient training in literacy instruction strategies.

#### Student Engagement

- Lack of interest or motivation among students.
- Insufficient use of interactive and engaging reading materials.

#### Socioeconomic Status

- TIS is a Title School and many students face challenges such as limited access to books at home and fewer educational opportunities outside of school.

#### Health and Well-being

- Factors such as poor nutrition, health issues, or inadequate access to healthcare can affect a student's ability to focus and engage in learning, including reading.

## SECTION 4: MEASURABLE LEARNER PERFORMANCE GOALS AND ADULT IMPLEMENTATION GOALS\*

*Describe the measurable learner performance goals addressing learners' needs (Section 5) based on student performance goals by grade band (K-3) that the Reading Achievement Plan is designed to support progress toward. Also describe the measurable adult implementation goals based on the internal and external factor analysis by grade band (Kindergarten through grade 3). The plan may have an overarching goal, as well as subgoals such as grade-level goals). Goals should be strategic/specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic and time-bound. In addition, goals should be inclusive and equitable.*

Overarching Goal Addressing Learners' Needs: By the end of the academic year at least 50% of students will meet their NWEA MAP Reading diagnostic goal

Overarching Goal Addressing Adult Implementation: By the end of the school year, at least 80% of the adults will be rating Skilled on the OTES rubric for the categories of High-Quality Student Data, Use of Assessments, and Monitoring Student Progress

THE INTERGENERATIONAL SCHOOL has hired a reading specialist and education aides who will serve alongside our teachers in implementing interventions for students who are not meeting proficiency on OST and who are not meeting growth goals as identified on MAP assessment scores. The Reading specialists will focus on students who have Reading Improvement Monitoring Plans (RIMP)

THE INTERGENERATIONAL SCHOOL will analyze MAP assessment data and will train teachers on the use of the Learning Continuum and Quadrant Chart Student Growth Reports to inform decisions on instructional goals. We will also do teacher based team level analysis of Ohio State Test data to inform teaching and instruction for the remainder of the school year.

Based on MAP instructional areas students will receive additional intervention or enrichment in the suggested area of focus recommended by NWEA or in an area recommended by the teacher.

## SECTION 5: ACTION PLAN MAP(S) FOR ACTION STEPS\*

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

### Goal # \_\_\_ Action Map

Goal Statement: Overarching Goal Addressing Learners' Needs: By the end of the academic year at least 50% of students will meet their NWEA MAP Reading diagnostic goal

**Evidence-Based Strategy or Strategies:** THE INTERGENERATIONAL SCHOOL uses a workshop approach, which allows students to learn what they need to learn at a pace and with materials that match their needs. However, guided reading is the part of the reading workshop where a teacher individualizes their instruction to meet the needs of students. Guided Reading groups pull together students with similar needs and provide them with quick, targeted instruction that, along with extended time to practice independently and time to enjoy books with others, teaches them to read.

*Fountas and Pinnell Classroom Guided Reading* gives teachers both books and lessons to use with students. The research-based set of materials connect to the reading assessment already consistently used at THE INTERGENERATIONAL SCHOOL as part of our Benchmark assessments. Specifically, the lessons, taught in quick 12-minute sessions allow for plenty of independent practice and the opportunity for teachers to see more students on a regular basis and meet the individual needs of readers.

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
<b>Implementation Component</b>	<b>Implement Tier I instructional curriculum with fidelity and consistency.</b>	Implement coaching cycles for all Teachers	Utilize Winter MAP scores to recalibrate RTI process
Timeline	October 2023-May 2024	November-January 2024	February 2023- April 2024
Lead Person(s)	Principal	Coaching Team	Title Teachers
Resources Needed	Units of Study Curriculum Chart Paper NWEA MAP Data	Units of Study Curriculum Chart Paper NWEA MAP Data	RTI Data Tracker NWEA MAP Data

	Action Step 1	Action Step 2	Action Step 3
Specifics of Implementation (Professional development, training, coaching, system structures, implementation support and leadership structures)	PD Sessions on analyzing MAP Data Coaching Cycles TBT Meetings with Cluster Director leading student growth discussions	Coaching Cycles to be determined by the Lead Coach based on need and available resources	PD Sessions on analyzing MAP Data Coaching Cycles TBT Meetings with Cluster Director leading student growth discussions
Measure of Success	OTES Observations and Walkthroughs	Coaching Observational Notes	RTI Tracker
Description of Funding	General Funds	General Funds	General Funds
Check-in/Review Date	January 2024- Week 2 March 2024- Week 2 May 2024 Week 2	Bi-Weekly	Bi-weekly

## SECTION 6: PROCESS FOR MONITORING PROGRESS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN'S STRATEGIES.\*

*Describe the process for monitoring the progress and implementation of the plan's strategies.*

Monitoring the progress and implementation of the plan's strategies involves a comprehensive and collaborative approach. The key components include teacher-based team meetings, teacher evaluations led by the Principal, bi-weekly check-ins with the Title Teacher Team, and the use of the RTI tracker accessible through Google Classroom.

### Teacher-Based Team Meetings

Regular team meetings are scheduled weekly to discuss the progress and implementation of the strategies outlined in the plan. Teachers collaborate to share insights, successes, and challenges faced in the classroom. These meetings serve as a platform for brainstorming solutions and refining strategies to better meet the needs of students.

### Principal-led Teacher Evaluations

The Principal plays a crucial role in holding everyone accountable for the plan's success. During teacher evaluations, the Principal assesses individual teachers based on their contribution to the plan's implementation. This includes evaluating the effectiveness of instructional strategies, assessment, and monitoring student progress.

### Bi-weekly Check-ins with the Title Teacher Team

The Title Teacher Team, with its specialized focus, conducts bi-weekly check-ins with the Principal to assess the effectiveness of strategies related to Title programs. These sessions provide an opportunity for the team to share insights, discuss student performance, and make adjustments to interventions based on real-time data and observations.

### RTI Tracker in Google Classroom

An RTI tracker accessible through Google Drive serves as a centralized platform for data collection and analysis. Teachers, administrators, and relevant support staff have access to this tracker. Regular updates to the tracker ensure that all stakeholders are informed about the progress of individual students and the overall success of the plan.

### Data Analysis and Reflection

The data collected through the RTI tracker is analyzed collaboratively during team meetings and check-ins. This analysis informs decision-making, allowing adjustments to be made to the plan's strategies as needed. Regular reflection on the data ensures a dynamic and responsive approach to addressing the diverse needs of students.

### Communication Channels

Open lines of communication are established among all stakeholders. Teachers communicate with the Title Teacher Team, Principal, and other relevant parties to share updates, seek guidance, and provide insights into the plan's implementation. This collaborative communication ensures that everyone remains informed and engaged in the process.

### Professional Development Opportunities

As the plan progresses, professional development opportunities may be identified based on the insights gained from monitoring. These opportunities can be tailored to address specific challenges or enhance the implementation of effective strategies.

By integrating these monitoring processes, the educational community ensures a holistic and dynamic approach to the plan's success. Continuous collaboration, data-driven decision-making, and regular communication contribute to a supportive environment where everyone is actively engaged in the pursuit of improved student outcomes.

## SECTION 7: EXPECTATIONS AND SUPPORTS FOR LEARNERS AND SCHOOLS\*

### SECTION 7 PART A: STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT LEARNERS\*

*Describe the evidence-based strategies identified in Section 5 that will be used to meet specific learner needs and improve instruction. This must include a description of how these evidence-based strategies support learners on Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans (RIMPs).*

Fountas and Pinnell Classroom Guided Reading, combined with a workshop approach, can be powerful tools for meeting specific learner needs and enhancing instruction, especially for students on Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans (RIMPs). Here's how these evidence-based strategies can support learners and contribute to improved reading instruction:

Fountas and Pinnell Classroom Guided Reading:

Individualized Instruction:

Guided Reading allows for differentiated instruction tailored to each student's reading level. This is crucial for learners on RIMPs who may require personalized support to address specific skill gaps.

Targeted Assessment:

Fountas and Pinnell's approach involves continuous assessment to determine students' instructional levels and monitor progress. For students on RIMPs, ongoing assessment is vital to identify areas of improvement and adjust instruction accordingly.

Strategic Grouping:

Guided Reading groups are formed based on students' similar instructional needs. Learners on RIMPs can benefit from targeted, small-group instruction focused on addressing their specific challenges and accelerating their progress.

Explicit Instruction:

The Fountas and Pinnell approach emphasizes explicit teaching of reading strategies. This is essential for learners on RIMPs who may need additional support in developing foundational skills, comprehension strategies, or fluency.

Literacy Continuum:

Fountas and Pinnell provide a comprehensive Literacy Continuum that guides teachers in selecting appropriate texts and instructional strategies. This continuum can be particularly valuable for planning instruction that aligns with the diverse needs of students on RIMPs.

Workshop Approach:

Flexible Structure:

The workshop approach allows for flexibility in meeting diverse learner needs. It accommodates individual, small group, and whole-class instruction, providing opportunities for targeted support for students on RIMPs while also addressing the broader class needs.



#### Student Choice and Ownership:

The workshop model often incorporates elements of student choice, allowing learners to select texts that align with their interests and reading levels. This can enhance engagement and motivation, critical factors for students on RIMPs who may need additional encouragement.

#### Mini-Lessons:

Workshop models typically include brief, focused mini-lessons. These can be tailored to address specific skills or strategies identified in the RIMPs. Mini-lessons provide explicit instruction and practice opportunities for students to strengthen their reading abilities.

#### Formative Assessment:

The workshop approach integrates ongoing formative assessment, allowing teachers to gauge student progress and adjust instruction accordingly. This is especially valuable for learners on RIMPs, as it ensures that interventions are responsive and aligned with their evolving needs.

#### Collaborative Learning:

Workshops often involve collaborative learning experiences. For students on RIMPs, collaborative activities can provide peer support and additional opportunities for practice, contributing to a positive and supportive learning environment.

#### **Integration with Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans (RIMPs):**

##### Data-Driven Decision Making:

Both Fountas and Pinnell Guided Reading and the workshop approach rely on data to inform instruction. This aligns with the principles of RIMPs, ensuring that interventions are based on ongoing assessment and analysis of student performance.

##### Targeted Intervention:

The individualized and small-group nature of Fountas and Pinnell Guided Reading, along with the flexibility of the workshop approach, allows teachers to provide targeted interventions aligned with the specific goals outlined in the RIMPs.

##### Progress Monitoring:

The continuous assessment and monitoring components of both strategies facilitate regular progress checks. This is essential for students on RIMPs, as it allows for the timely adjustment of interventions based on their evolving needs.

##### Professional Collaboration:

Both strategies promote collaboration among educators. This collaborative approach ensures that teachers working with students on RIMPs have opportunities to share insights, discuss progress, and collectively problem-solve to enhance instruction.

In summary, the combination of Fountas and Pinnell Classroom Guided Reading and a workshop approach creates a dynamic and responsive instructional framework. These evidence-based strategies are well-suited to meet the diverse needs of learners, including

those on Reading Improvement and Monitoring Plans. The emphasis on differentiation, continuous assessment, and targeted instruction aligns with the principles of effective intervention and supports the goal of improving overall reading proficiency.

## SECTION 7 PART B: ENSURING EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPROVING UPON STRATEGIES (STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT ADULT IMPLEMENTATION)\*

*Describe how the district will ensure the proposed evidence-based strategies in Section 7, Part A will do the following:*

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

Ensuring the effectiveness, progress monitoring, and improvement of evidence-based strategies involves a systematic and data-driven approach. Here's how the school can address each of these aspects:

### **1. Ensuring Effectiveness:**

#### a. Professional Development:

Provide comprehensive professional development for teachers to ensure a deep understanding of Fountas and Pinnell Classroom Guided Reading and the workshop approach. This can include workshops, training sessions, and ongoing support.

#### b. Implementation Fidelity:

Emphasize fidelity to the selected strategies by ensuring that teachers implement them as intended. Regular observations, walkthroughs, and coaching sessions can help maintain consistency and effectiveness in the classroom.

#### c. Data-Informed Decision Making:

Foster a culture of data-driven decision-making. Encourage teachers to use assessment data to inform instructional decisions, identify areas of improvement, and tailor interventions based on individual student needs.

#### d. Regular Evaluation and Feedback:

Establish a system for regular evaluation and feedback on the effectiveness of the strategies. This can involve teacher reflections, peer reviews, and feedback from students to identify strengths and areas for improvement.

### **2. Showing Progress:**

#### a. Data Collection and Analysis:

Implement a robust system for data collection and analysis. Regularly collect and analyze student performance data, including pre- and post-assessment results, to track progress and identify areas that need attention.

**b. Progress Monitoring Tools:**

Utilize progress monitoring tools, such as formative assessments and benchmark assessments aligned with the chosen strategies, to track individual and group progress. Ensure that these tools provide actionable insights for teachers.

**c. Reporting Mechanisms:**

Establish clear reporting mechanisms to communicate progress to stakeholders, including parents, teachers, and administrators. Regularly share data and progress updates during meetings, conferences, or through accessible platforms.

**d. Goal Setting:**

Collaboratively set realistic and measurable goals aligned with the school's improvement plan. These goals should be specific to student achievement, and progress toward them should be regularly assessed and communicated.

**3. Improving Upon Prior Strategies:**

**a. Reflection on Past Practices:**

Facilitate reflective practices among teachers and administrators to evaluate the effectiveness of strategies employed in the past two years. Identify strengths, challenges, and lessons learned to inform improvements.

**b. Continuous Professional Development:**

Offer ongoing professional development opportunities to address identified areas of improvement. This may involve targeted training sessions, workshops, or collaborative learning communities focused on refining instructional practices.

**c. Actionable Feedback Mechanisms:**

Implement systems for collecting actionable feedback from teachers, students, and parents. Use this feedback to make informed adjustments to the strategies and address any challenges that may have arisen during implementation.

**d. Flexibility and Adaptability:**

Foster a culture of flexibility and adaptability. Encourage educators to be responsive to student needs and willing to adjust strategies based on ongoing assessment data and feedback.

**e. Collaborative Improvement Process:**

Establish a collaborative improvement process that involves all stakeholders. Regularly convene meetings to discuss progress, share insights, and collaboratively problem-solve to address challenges and refine strategies.

By combining these approaches, the TISI can create a dynamic and responsive system that not only ensures the effectiveness of evidence-based strategies but also facilitates continuous improvement over the two prior consecutive school years. The key is to

foster a culture of reflection, collaboration, and data-driven decision-making to support the ongoing enhancement of instructional practices.

## SECTION 7 PART C: STAFFING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN\*

*Insert a professional development plan that supports the evidence-based strategies proposed in the Reading Achievement Plan and clearly identifies the instructional staff involved in the professional development. Refer to the definition of professional development in the guidance document. Please indicate how the professional development activities are sustained, intensive, data-driven, and instructionally focused. Explain how the district is addressing Culturally Responsive Practice and the Science of Reading in the professional development plan.*

*See IG Professional Development Plan.*

## APPENDICES

*If necessary, please include a glossary of terms, data summary, key messages, description of program elements, etc.*



# Grade Report

## Grade 1

**Term:** Fall 2023-2024  
**District:** Intergenerational Cleveland  
**School:** The Intergenerational School

**Norms Reference Data:** 2020 Norms.  
**Weeks of Instruction:** 4 (Fall 2023)  
**Grouping:** None  
**Small Group Display:** No

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	23
Mean RIT Score	150.8
Standard Deviation	15.4
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	155.9
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	7

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	8	35%	8	35%	1	4%	2	9%	4	17%	147-151-154	15.4

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Growth: Reading K-2 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	23
Mean RIT Score	150.8
Standard Deviation	15.4
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	155.9
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	7

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading K-2 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	8	35%	8	35%	1	4%	2	9%	4	17%	147-151-154	15.4
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
<b>Language and Writing</b>	7	30%	7	30%	1	4%	4	17%	4	17%	149-152-156	16.1
<b>Literature and Informational</b>	13	57%	2	9%	2	9%	3	13%	3	13%	146-149-153	16.4
<b>Foundational Skills</b>	7	30%	5	22%	5	22%	1	4%	5	22%	149-153-156	16
<b>Vocabulary Use and Functions</b>	8	35%	4	17%	4	17%	4	17%	3	13%	145-149-153	18.7

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	18
Mean RIT Score	165.8
Standard Deviation	10.9
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	172.3
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	5

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	7	39%	3	17%	3	17%	5	28%	0	0%	163-166-168	10.9

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.



### Language Arts: Reading

Growth: Reading K-2 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	18
Mean RIT Score	165.8
Standard Deviation	10.9
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	172.3
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	5

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading K-2 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	7	39%	3	17%	3	17%	5	28%	0	0%	163-166-168	10.9
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
<b>Language and Writing</b>	5	28%	5	28%	3	17%	5	28%	0	0%	164-167-170	11.4
<b>Literature and Informational</b>	5	28%	5	28%	5	28%	2	11%	1	6%	162-165-168	12.7
<b>Foundational Skills</b>	7	39%	4	22%	6	33%	0	0%	1	6%	160-163-166	13.1
<b>Vocabulary Use and Functions</b>	5	28%	5	28%	3	17%	3	17%	2	11%	165-168-171	12.3

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	28
Mean RIT Score	178.2
Standard Deviation	16.6
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	186.6
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	9

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	10	36%	5	18%	9	32%	1	4%	3	11%	175-178-181	16.6

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Growth: Reading 2-5 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	28
Mean RIT Score	178.2
Standard Deviation	16.6
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	186.6
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	9

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading 2-5 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	10	36%	5	18%	9	32%	1	4%	3	11%	175-178-181	16.6
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use	10	36%	4	14%	9	32%	2	7%	3	11%	177-180-183	15.8
Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	10	36%	6	21%	6	21%	4	14%	2	7%	174-178-181	17.3
Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details	10	36%	7	25%	5	18%	4	14%	2	7%	174-178-182	22.2
Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details	10	36%	7	25%	6	21%	5	18%	0	0%	172-176-179	16.6
Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	11	39%	5	18%	5	18%	3	11%	4	14%	175-179-183	19.8

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	30
Mean RIT Score	187.2
Standard Deviation	16.5
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	196.7
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	10

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	12	40%	5	17%	8	27%	4	13%	1	3%	184-187-190	16.5

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Growth: Reading 2-5 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	30
Mean RIT Score	187.2
Standard Deviation	16.5
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	196.7
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	10

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading 2-5 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	12	40%	5	17%	8	27%	4	13%	1	3%	184-187-190	16.5
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
<b>Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use</b>	10	33%	7	23%	6	20%	5	17%	2	7%	183-186-190	21.1
<b>Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure</b>	10	33%	5	17%	6	20%	8	27%	1	3%	187-190-193	16.7
<b>Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details</b>	10	33%	6	20%	7	23%	6	20%	1	3%	185-189-192	17.8
<b>Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details</b>	14	47%	5	17%	5	17%	5	17%	1	3%	182-185-188	16.7
<b>Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure</b>	11	37%	6	20%	7	23%	5	17%	1	3%	182-186-190	19.5

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	25
Mean RIT Score	201
Standard Deviation	13.2
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	204.5
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	11

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	5	20%	5	20%	6	24%	8	32%	1	4%	198-201-204	13.2

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Growth: Reading 2-5 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	25
Mean RIT Score	201
Standard Deviation	13.2
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	204.5
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	11

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading 2-5 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	5	20%	5	20%	6	24%	8	32%	1	4%	198-201-204	13.2
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
<b>Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use</b>												
Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use	4	16%	8	32%	7	28%	4	16%	2	8%	199-201-204	12.7
<b>Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure</b>												
Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	8	32%	3	12%	3	12%	7	28%	4	16%	198-201-205	18.6
<b>Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details</b>												
Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details	7	28%	7	28%	4	16%	3	12%	4	16%	195-198-202	16.7
<b>Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details</b>												
Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details	4	16%	8	32%	7	28%	4	16%	2	8%	198-201-204	14.7
<b>Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure</b>												
Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	6	24%	4	16%	4	16%	7	28%	4	16%	200-203-206	14.8

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	21
Mean RIT Score	209.3
Standard Deviation	11.6
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	210.2
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	10

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	2	10%	8	38%	6	29%	3	14%	2	10%	207-209-212	11.6

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.



### Language Arts: Reading

#### Growth: Reading 6+ OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	21
Mean RIT Score	209.3
Standard Deviation	11.6
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	210.2
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	10

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading 6+ OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	2	10%	8	38%	6	29%	3	14%	2	10%	207-209-212	11.6
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use	1	5%	7	33%	3	14%	8	38%	2	10%	209-212-215	13.3
Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	3	14%	9	43%	4	19%	2	10%	3	14%	205-208-211	15.2
Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details	2	10%	6	29%	7	33%	4	19%	2	10%	206-208-210	10.4
Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details	5	24%	6	29%	5	24%	3	14%	2	10%	203-206-209	13.5
Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	3	14%	5	24%	5	24%	2	10%	6	29%	208-212-215	15.9

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.



# Grade Report

## Grade 7

**Term:** Fall 2023-2024  
**District:** Intergenerational Cleveland  
**School:** The Intergenerational School

**Norms Reference Data:** 2020 Norms.  
**Weeks of Instruction:** 4 (Fall 2023)  
**Grouping:** None  
**Small Group Display:** No

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	30
Mean RIT Score	212
Standard Deviation	11.9
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	214.2
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	14

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	5	17%	8	27%	5	17%	11	37%	1	3%	210-212-214	11.9

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

#### Growth: Reading 6+ OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	30
Mean RIT Score	212
Standard Deviation	11.9
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	214.2
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	14

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading 6+ OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	5	17%	8	27%	5	17%	11	37%	1	3%	210-212-214	11.9
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use	5	17%	10	33%	6	20%	8	27%	1	3%	208-210-213	13.3
Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	6	20%	9	30%	4	13%	9	30%	2	7%	208-211-214	15.1
Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details	5	17%	7	23%	8	27%	8	27%	2	7%	208-211-213	14.8
Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details	3	10%	11	37%	8	27%	7	23%	1	3%	209-211-214	13.1
Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	3	10%	4	13%	11	37%	6	20%	6	20%	215-217-220	13.4

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	23
Mean RIT Score	208.7
Standard Deviation	14.1
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	218
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	6

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	8	35%	7	30%	3	13%	5	22%	0	0%	206-209-212	14.1

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

#### Growth: Reading 6+ OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	23
Mean RIT Score	208.7
Standard Deviation	14.1
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	218
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	6

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading 6+ OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	8	35%	7	30%	3	13%	5	22%	0	0%	206-209-212	14.1
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
Vocabulary: Acquisition and Use	5	22%	8	35%	5	22%	2	9%	3	13%	209-212-216	16.7
Informational Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	8	35%	8	35%	3	13%	2	9%	2	9%	206-209-212	14.5
Literary Text: Key Ideas and Details	11	48%	3	13%	6	26%	3	13%	0	0%	203-206-210	15.1
Informational Text: Key Ideas and Details	9	39%	4	17%	5	22%	5	22%	0	0%	204-208-211	16.4
Literary Text: Language, Craft, and Structure	10	43%	2	9%	7	30%	3	13%	1	4%	204-207-211	17.4

#### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.



# Grade Report

## Grade K

**Term:** Fall 2023-2024  
**District:** Intergenerational Cleveland  
**School:** The Intergenerational School

**Norms Reference Data:** 2020 Norms.  
**Weeks of Instruction:** 4 (Fall 2023)  
**Grouping:** None  
**Small Group Display:** No

### Language Arts: Reading

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	17
Mean RIT Score	137.1
Standard Deviation	9.6
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	136.6
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	7

Overall Performance	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
Language Arts: Reading	1	6%	5	29%	7	41%	1	6%	3	18%	135-137-140	9.6

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.

### Language Arts: Reading

Growth: Reading K-2 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017

Summary	
Total Number of Students With Valid Growth Scores	17
Mean RIT Score	137.1
Standard Deviation	9.6
District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Students At or Above District Grade-Level Mean RIT	*
Grade-Level Mean RIT	136.6
Students At or Above Grade-Level Mean RIT	7

	Lo %ile < 21		LoAvg %ile 21-40		Avg %ile 41-60		HiAvg %ile 61-80		Hi %ile > 80		Mean RIT Score (+/- Smp Err)	Std Dev
	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%	count	%		
<b>Overall Performance</b>												
Growth: Reading K-2 OH 2017 / OH Learning Standards Language Arts: 2017	1	6%	5	29%	7	41%	1	6%	3	18%	135-137-140	9.6
<b>Instructional Area RIT Range</b>												
<b>Language and Writing</b>	2	12%	2	12%	7	41%	3	18%	3	18%	136-138-141	10.1
<b>Literature and Informational</b>	3	18%	2	12%	4	24%	5	29%	3	18%	136-139-142	11.3
<b>Foundational Skills</b>	6	35%	4	24%	4	24%	1	6%	2	12%	130-133-136	12.1
<b>Vocabulary Use and Functions</b>	1	6%	4	24%	6	35%	2	12%	4	24%	136-138-141	11.7

### Explanatory Notes

Tests shown in gray are excluded from summary statistics. Either the test occurred outside the testing window for a term, had an invalid score, or was a repeat test for a student within a term.

Test Invalidation Reasons: \*\*\*1 The test duration was too short to provide a valid result. \*\*\*2 The overall RIT score for this test is above the valid range. \*\*\*3 The overall RIT score for this test is below the valid range.

\*\*\*4 The standard error for this test is below acceptable limits. \*\*\*5 The standard error for this test is above acceptable limits. \*\*\*6 The test has been identified as invalid. \*\*\*7 High level of rapid guessing has invalidated test.

Due to statistical unreliability, summary data for groups of less than 10 are not shown.

\* This data is not available for reporting. Please refer to help and documentation for more information.

Lexile® is a trademark of MetaMetrics, Inc., and is registered in the United States and abroad.