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Welcome

Students throughout the state of Washington receive tutoring, extra classes, summer programs, and other interventions with the help of funds from the Learning Assistance Program (LAP). The state of Washington invests several hundred million dollars per year in LAP to help students struggling to meet grade level standards. About 13 percent of students statewide are served by LAP. Unfortunately, in the past we saw highly variable outcomes in LAP. We did not collect data on effective interventions. Historically, districts could offer any type of support. There was little or no collaboration among professionals across the state to promote what really works to help students within the program.

In 2013, the Legislature passed a bill (ESSB 5946), requiring the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to improve the LAP system and K–4 literacy outcomes. Now, OSPI annually convenes expert panels to identify the practices that best help students grow and succeed academically. Their work informs the Mathematics, English Language Arts (ELA), and Behavior Menu of Best Practices and Strategies. Each year, districts report on the academic growth of students receiving LAP services. Districts can either use the best practices from the menus, or provide data showing that their alternative practices are effective in achieving student growth. These provisions are detailed in RCW 28A.165 and RCW 28A.655.235.

The Legislature also passed a companion bill authorizing the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to identify evidence-based and research-based best practices for student interventions. OSPI and WSIPP annually collaborate on the development of the menus.

We know an opportunity gap exists among different student populations. Poverty is a striking example of a factor that can significantly disrupt a student’s learning environment. Students learning English as an additional language face the task of learning a new language and new academic content at the same time. Students who have, or are experiencing, trauma may exhibit behavioral anomalies that can interrupt their academic progress. Teachers are actively seeking ways to better support all students. Through the menus, the expert panels have identified best practices to reduce the opportunity gap among all students.

This report contains not only the menu of best practices, but also front matter describing Washington state’s literacy landscape and other initiatives designed to improve literacy skills for all students. It describes how a multi-tiered system of support is a foundation for success in a high-achieving educational system, and how assessment data and reporting serve to
Welcome

continuously improve the Learning Assistance Program. We have included a rich set of resources and references for those who wish to further explore the identified best practices.

We are starting to see the promise in this focused partnership between districts, OSPI, WSIPP, and the Legislature. This is the third year the ELA menu has been published, and each year the professionals who comprise the panel search the current literature for proven interventions to make improvements to the existing practices, and provide additional advice and support to teachers and school administrators who are implementing the Learning Assistance Program with their students.

Some students need more help to get them ready for career, college and life. Our job is to make sure schools provide innovation so that students get the help.

Randy Dorn, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

We thank you for your thoughtful read of this menu and for your ongoing commitment to serve students who need support the most.

The Learning Assistance Program Team
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
July 2016
Background and Philosophy

STRENGTHENING STUDENT EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

The Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes Act (ESSB 5946) passed the state Legislature in 2013. It required OSPI to convene an ELA panel of experts to develop a menu of best practices and strategies to help students who score below grade-level standard and are enrolled in the Learning Assistance Program. The same legislation also required the ELA panel of experts to develop a menu of best practices and strategies for K–4 ELA instruction. The 2013–14 ELA panel of experts and OSPI agreed many of the same strategies would be in both menus.

That’s why this 2016 ELA menu update targets two groups: LAP students in grades K–12, and all students in grades K–4. At the heart of the menu is a focus on accelerating student ELA performance. This menu highlights when a strategy is for K–4 ELA core instruction and when it is for ELA LAP. The practices align to WA ELA Standards, and they reflect the work of the National Reading Panel and the National Early Literacy Panel.

Under the law, districts must select a practice or strategy from the menu to serve LAP students in ELA. Districts must first focus their LAP program on K–4 reading. Additionally, schools with more than 40 percent of students not meeting 3rd grade ELA goals must also select a best practice or strategy to serve K–4 students. Districts have the option to select a practice or strategy from the ELA menu or they may use an alternative per OSPI guidelines.

In addition to the ELA menu, OSPI developed menus for math and behavior. These LAP menus are for students served by LAP in grades K–12. All three menus are updated annually on July 1.

To learn more about this process, please see LAP ELA Panel website.
LEARNING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
The Learning Assistance Program (LAP) offers supplemental services for K–12 students scoring below grade-level standard in English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. These supports focus on accelerating student growth so that students make progress towards grade level. These supports may include academic readiness skill development or behavior supports to address barriers preventing students from accessing core instruction. The intent is for LAP students to increase academic growth during the period of time they are provided services. LAP emphasizes research-based best practices designed to increase student achievement.

LAP K–4 Focus on Literacy
Districts must focus first on K–4 students struggling with reading or lacking the readiness skills needed for learning to read. The K–4 focus first on literacy does not mean that all LAP funds are to be used exclusively on K–4 literacy. OSPI guidelines allow that a district may meet the K–4 focus on literacy by ensuring that of the total number of students served by the LAP, approximately 50 percent are students enrolled in grades K–4 receiving ELA services. Districts are not capped at 50 percent. They may serve more students in K–4 ELA. Additionally, districts may serve less than 50 percent under specific OSPI Guidelines.

LAP Eligibility
Districts identify the students eligible for LAP by using multiple measures of assessment. These should include nationally normed assessments and/or state assessments to identify students scoring below grade level standards for ELA or math. Other options to measure student eligibility include: teacher-made assessments, teacher observations, teacher recommendations, and parent referrals. Credits earned, grade point average (GPA), discipline referrals, and absenteeism are also potential measures. Entrance and exit assessment data are used to measure student academic growth in ELA or math, regardless of whether the student receives LAP academic services or LAP behavior services. A student may receive LAP services for academic and behavior support or just behavior support.

Behavior Services
Districts may serve students struggling in ELA or math with behavior services. These services are available for students when the district believes addressing behavioral needs would improve students’ academic performance.

Prior to receiving LAP behavior services, students must have been identified, using multiple measures of performance, as scoring below standard for their grade level in either ELA or math. While additional indicators must be used to identify a student for behavior services, the impact of behavior services is measured by growth in ELA or math. The assumption is that the provision of behavior services should positively influence student academic outcomes.
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LAP-Allowable Activities

Allowable LAP activities are guided by state statute (RCW 28A.165). They must be aligned to a best practice from the menu or an approved district alternative. Districts must use data to inform program development and integrate effective best practices and strategies to support supplemental instruction/services that accelerate growth for students who struggle to meet academic and non-academic performance indicators.

Allowable activities may include extended learning time, extra support in the classroom, educator professional learning, family engagement, and purchase of specialized learning materials. Additional assistance for students identified in 8th grade to successfully transition into high school may be provided through LAP. Graduation assistance is an option for 11th and 12th grade students who are not on track to meet graduation requirements. Academic readiness and Readiness to Learn (RTL) are also LAP-allowable activities. These terms are often confused and are defined separately below.

Readiness to Learn – Up to Five Percent

Up to five percent of a district’s LAP funds may be used for RTL programs. The school board must approve in an open meeting any community-based organization or local agency that will offer RTL services before learning assistance program funds may be expended.

District Readiness to Learn (RTL) programs provide academic and non-academic supports for students at risk of not being successful in school. They may be offered in partnership with community-based organizations. The goal of RTL is to reduce barriers to learning, strengthen engagement, and ensure all students are able to attend school ready to learn.

Students do not need to have been identified as scoring below grade-level standard in math or ELA to participate in Readiness to Learn (RTL) programs. RTL programs are designed to serve students significantly at risk of not being successful in school. Each district determines the eligibility criteria for participation in RTL programs.

Academic Readiness

As part of the academic readiness component, schools use LAP funds to support students with necessary preparation skills needed to engage in math or ELA content. Readiness is applicable for all grades. However, LAP does pay particular attention to early grade classroom readiness skills. K–2 readiness includes early-literacy, early-numeracy, and classroom preparedness skills.
Emerging research is showing that building early numeracy skills is a strong predictor of future academic success.

The WaKIDS observation tool, GOLD™, identifies core skills in the social-emotional, physical, language, cognitive, literacy, and mathematics domains essential for being ready for kindergarten. The panels strongly emphasized social emotional, cognitive, numeracy, and language skills as being necessary for K–2 readiness. Each panel also recognized the importance of incorporating play into K–2 readiness activities.
WASHINGTON STATE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

The 2013 Legislature directed WSIPP to “prepare an inventory of evidence-based and research-based effective practices, activities and programs for use by school districts in the learning assistance program” (Senate Bill 5034, Section 610). The WSIPP Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices: Washington’s K–12 Learning Assistance Program classifies LAP strategies as evidence-based, research-based, or promising according to average effect sizes for identified interventions, a cost-benefit analysis, and other criteria. Both OSPI and WSIPP consider the two reports as companions. As such, OSPI and WSIPP coordinated their tasks to ensure that the reports’ content was consistent, while still adhering to the unique directives given to each agency.

Both agencies collaborated on identifying topics for consideration as best practices and strategies. WSIPP Research Associate Matt Lemon was a key participant in the expert panel sessions as a non-voting member. He provided research references to the panel members, and solicited panel member input regarding effective practices. The two agencies then followed different, complementary processes to identify and classify practices for inclusion in each report.

The identification of best practices and strategies in the OSPI report was informed by WSIPP’s findings and ultimately determined by the expert panel. OSPI included notations indicating whether the practices included in the menu are evidence-based or research-based, as determined by WSIPP. Additional practices and strategies are included in the menu as promising based on the research reviewed by the panel of experts.
MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a theory of action framework that structures services to help all students meet achievement goals. An MTSS framework includes multiple levels of instruction, assessment, and intervention designed to support the academic and non-academic needs of all students.

ALL students benefit from school-wide Tier I instruction and supports (such as teaching academic and behavioral expectations, career and technical competencies, and social emotional skills) to be prepared for career, college, and life.

SOME students can benefit from supplemental Tier II instruction and supports (such as a reading or math intervention or behavioral check-in). These students are identified as needing more intensive or accelerated academic, career, behavioral, and/or mental health interventions in addition to Tier I services.

A SMALL NUMBER of students can benefit from intensive Tier III instruction and supports (such as those provided through community partnerships and specialized programs to provide more intensive or accelerated academic, career, behavioral, and/or mental health supports). These students may need case management or accelerated instruction in addition to Tier I services.

Figure 1. Multi-Tiered System of Supports, from OSPI.
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Core Instruction and Tiered Supports
Within Multi-Tiered System of Supports, educators use data-informed practices to support student outcomes while also establishing and sustaining a positive school climate. An MTSS framework should be designed to promote collaboration among educators and professional learning across schools/districts. While the number of tiered levels of support outlined for any given MTSS model may vary, a three-tiered theory of action framework is standard. Within a three-tiered framework, **all** students receive Tier 1 instruction, **some** students receive Tier 2 services/support, and a **small number** of students receive Tier 3 services/support. Normally, Tier 3 services in an MTSS model are for both highly capable students and students who struggle to meet grade level expectations. For the purpose of the menus, Tier 3 will refer only to the supports and services addressing the needs of students who struggle to meet academic and non-academic learning goals.

- **All**
  Tier 1 is for all students and is designed to meet the needs of at least 80 percent of the student population. Differentiated instruction during core learning time is the first response for students who struggle to meet academic and non-academic goals.

- **Some**
  Tier 2 is for students who need additional support to meet academic and non-academic goals. A standard assessment plan and clear criteria are necessary for successfully entering and exiting students from Tier 2 interventions. Supports should be designed to quickly screen for and target students who need extra instruction or services to get back on track. This level typically addresses the needs of around 15 percent of a student population.

- **A small number**
  Tier 3 is for interventions that are individualized and intensive. Tier 3 interventions may take longer for students to meet learning goals. This level typically addresses the needs of about five percent of a student population.

An effective MTSS system is grounded in strong instruction that is designed to meet the educational needs of at least 80 percent of students. If more than 20 percent of students are not meeting education expectations, then core instructional design and strategies should be re-evaluated. When students are not meeting their learning goals in the general education classroom, school improvement teams meet to discuss the best approach to provide effective differentiated instruction in the core curricula and interventions through a systematic support framework.
Data-based Decision Making Teams

Decision-making within an MTSS framework is done with a systematic, comprehensive approach. This process includes decisions about: the development of the MTSS framework, the selection of assessments used to identify students, the design of an implementation plan, and evaluation of a school or district’s individual students’ needs. The decision-making team will make adjustments and improvements to the framework as students’ needs change, ultimately supporting both academic and non-academic success in the classroom. Teams should develop a feedback process to evaluate the effectiveness of their MTSS framework and implementation. Data-based decision making should be informed by measurable and relevant learning criteria to support student learning. Data-based outcomes should be used to guide decisions regarding instructional effectiveness, student responsiveness, and intervention adaptations or modifications.

MTSS levels assigned to students are fluid. Students may transition to different levels of support as their circumstances and needs change. Data-based progress monitoring of student academic achievement and social/emotional learning can indicate a need to shift students based on responses to interventions, supports, and emerging needs. Established protocols for data-based decision making will help identify when students need supplemental services, and when they have met exit criteria and no longer need additional targeted support. Data-based decision making in an MTSS framework should include the use of annual screening assessments to identify students. Districts/schools must determine which assessments to use to identify and monitor student progress.

Comprehensive System to Identify Students

A comprehensive assessment system includes universal screening, diagnostic assessment(s), formative assessment processes, and progress monitoring. For each of these components, it is important to ensure protocols are followed for all formal assessments, decision rules are in place for students not making satisfactory progress, and training is sufficiently delivered to instructional/data teams to support implementation of the comprehensive system. It is also important to recognize that different types of assessments are useful for different purposes. The key is to ensure the results of an assessment are used for the intended purpose and not extrapolated or misused otherwise. For example, confusion between universal screening and diagnostic assessment can lead to misuse of results from screening measures.

A comprehensive system for assessment should include:

**Universal screening tools**: These tools are used to identify all potentially at-risk students. By design, universal screeners tend to over identify students, meaning more students are identified as potentially at risk than are actually at risk in an attempt to not miss anyone who
might be at risk. Screeners are used in many different ways—in everyday life, before an eye exam, during oil changes for cars, or when checking blood pressure. Universal screening takes place at scheduled intervals and is followed by more targeted diagnostic assessment for students potentially at risk. Instructional decisions are not based on universal screeners. These screeners inform decision makers of whether or not a diagnostic assessment is necessary.

**Diagnostic assessment tools:** Diagnostic assessments identify the initial skill level for each student and can determine the need for supports, interventions, enrichments, and resources. Assessments are administered before instruction or after screening occurs to identify the appropriate instruction and/or intervention plan. Diagnostic assessments provide detailed information. A diagnostic assessment can help determine why a person’s temperature is high, why the indicator light went on in a car, or whether a full eye exam is needed. For example, in reading, a diagnostic test may measure a student’s ability to evaluate print, understand phonics, decode letters and sounds, recognize words, analyze word patterns and sounds, determine oral reading accuracy and fluency, and comprehend reading passages. Once the data from a diagnostic assessment are available, educators can determine what to teach and select appropriate interventions to address specific skill deficiencies.

**Formative assessment processes:** Formative assessment is not a single event, but rather is an ongoing process used to assess learning and adjust instruction. The formative assessment process is deliberate and provides actionable feedback to improve students’ learning. There are four attributes in the formative assessment process: 1) clarify intended learning; 2) elicit evidence; 3) interpret evidence; and 4) act on evidence.

**Progress monitoring tools:** Student performance and progress should be reviewed on a regular basis and in a systematic manner to identify students who are: making adequate progress, at some risk of failure if not provided extra assistance, or at high risk of failure if not provided specialized supports. Progress monitoring is used to determine if students are understanding the material being provided. It is useful in determining the next level of instruction or intervention to be used with individual students, a small group, or an entire class. While formative assessment is closely linked to the immediate learning that occurs during a lesson, progress monitoring assesses what the student understands as a result of the unit of instruction.

**Supplemental Supports and Services**
The Learning Assistance Program (LAP) primarily provides supplemental services to support core instruction. As a supplemental program, LAP supports students in Tier 2 and Tier 3, but does not replace core instruction. Students receiving targeted interventions must have full access to core instruction.
LAP serves eligible students who need additional academic support to accelerate student growth in English language arts and mathematics, or who need to develop K–2 readiness knowledge and skills to successfully meet standards in these core content areas. By focusing on acceleration, students served outside of core instruction should increase learning over a given period of time. However, the degree of content growth depends on the intensity and quality of the services.

LAP also serves students who could benefit from behavioral supports in order to improve academic and nonacademic student outcomes as well as reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom.

This menu provides information regarding evidence-based, research-based, and promising practices and strategies for supplemental supports/services.
CONTENT PHILOSOPHY (WA STATE LITERACY)

Vision of English Language Arts Education

Washington’s literacy teaching landscape is as diverse as our 295 public school districts. OSPI’s mission is to provide funding, resources, tools, data, and technical assistance that enable educators to ensure students succeed in our public schools, are prepared to access post-secondary training and education, and are equipped to thrive in their careers and lives. OSPI and statewide partners work to support literacy instruction by continually revising and improving the supports and systems available for educators to support building students’ literacy skills.

The Washington State Comprehensive Literacy Plan: Birth to Grade 12 (CLP), the Washington State Early Literacy Pathways (Early Literacy Pathways), and the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies are complementary WA state literacy resources. Together, these three resources provide the foundational building blocks of a Comprehensive Literacy System.

Washington’s definition of literacy was developed by the 2012 State Literacy Team, made up of experts and practitioners from across Washington. This definition of literacy, on page 2 of the Comprehensive Literacy Plan, defines literacy as an “on-going cognitive process that begins at birth. It involves the integration of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and critical thinking.” Literacy includes the knowledge that enables the speaker, writer, or reader to recognize and use language appropriate to a situation in an increasingly complex literate environment. Active literacy allows people to think, create, question, solve problems, and reflect in order to participate effectively in a democratic, multicultural society (CLP, 2012).

The Washington State K–12 ELA Learning Standards (ELA Standards) are built on an intentional progression of the skills and knowledge necessary for all students to be ready for careers, college, and life when they exit high school. These learning progressions provide a specific focus for each grade level. The ELA Standards lay the groundwork for literacy achievement and expand the skills students need across all grade levels.
The **English Language Proficiency Standards** (ELP Standards) were developed to provide a language bridge to move students learning English as an additional language toward full engagement and academic success while simultaneously addressing the increased rigor and language demands of the career- and college-ready standards. Learning English as an additional language goes hand-in-hand with Washington’s definition of literacy. The ELP Standards make it clear that learning English as an additional language encompasses more than just learning grammar and vocabulary. Instruction is grounded in speaking and listening, and it must focus on receptive, productive, and interactive learning modalities. Moreover, a greater emphasis on instruction in a student’s primary language will enhance cognitive processes.

OSPI and Regional Literacy Coordinators from across the state (including experts in K–4 literacy) representing the nine Educational Service Districts (ESDs) have jointly developed professional learning opportunities to strengthen WA state literacy outcomes. State literacy partners are poised to provide comprehensive and coherent opportunities grounded in the foundational literacy skills, key literacy shifts in the standards, differentiated instruction, the formative assessment process, assessment literacy, and student equity.

**Foundational Literacy Skills**

The ELA panel of experts believes WA state literacy educators must be well versed in the foundational literacy skills. Educator understanding of these skills is essential for the successful implementation of best practices and strategies in K–4 literacy classrooms and K–12 literacy interventions.

Each of the foundation skills can be an early predictor of later literacy success. For example, oral language skills help students develop reading and writing skills. As students enter kindergarten and progress through Grade 12, oral language skills are connected to gaps in reading and writing. These gaps can be the direct result of a weak foundation in oral language development.

For research on best practices for foundational literacy skills, please refer to the **ELA Menu: Appendix A**. This information should be used as a guide when designing literacy instruction and interventions.
ELA Classroom- and Student-Centered Practices

Best practices and strategies in classrooms are grounded in authentic, student-centered approaches that are essential to effective literacy instruction. Research demonstrates that a dynamic learning environment tailored to individual students’ needs is necessary to prepare students to be ready for the literacy demands of college and career. According to the ELA Standards, students who are college/career ready exhibit the following attributes (CCSS-ELA, p. 7).

These attributes, also referred to as Habits of Mind, are:

- Students demonstrate independence.
- Students build strong content knowledge.
- Students respond to the varying demands of audience, task, purpose, and discipline.
- Students comprehend as well as critique.
- Students value evidence.
- Students use technology and digital media strategically and capably.
- Students come to understand other perspectives and cultures.

Below are classroom- and student-centered teaching principles, practices, and strategies essential to the effective preparation of students for college and career expectations and literacy success.

Learning Environment

The learning environment should foster student academic growth. Beginning on the first day of school, the learning environment is established through expectations that are understood and accepted by students. Classroom expectations are practiced until they become classroom routines. Student-centered classrooms foster independence and aid in deep learning through evaluation and reflection. The climate of the classroom is the result of organizational and social norms. Organization is often dependent on the size of the classroom, furniture, and technology available. The arrangement must be functional for the teaching and learning needs of all students. Establishing areas for whole class instruction and small group work are essential to maximize student academic achievement. The social climate is established through interactions in the classroom: cooperative, competitive, and individually focused. The learning climate should be aligned to the learning goals. An effective learning environment is the result of effective teacher planning and implementation of classroom management strategies.
Differentiation for Social, Emotional, and Physiological Needs

From the physical environment to the social/emotional climate of the classroom, educators are tasked with meeting the diverse academic and emotional needs of their students. Educators understand that a student’s readiness is influenced by his/her prior learning success or failure, self-esteem, self-efficacy, cultural norms, experiences, attitudes, and habits of mind. Social and emotional well-being, part of the affective component, is directly linked to cognitive and academic development in children. By making connections and building relationships with students, educators create an environment of safety and trust, providing a sense of well-being. Four areas for differentiation are: (1) content (2) process (3) product (4) the learning environment.

Background Knowledge & Academic Literacies

Effective literacy instruction for struggling students requires educators to assess and identify students’ background knowledge. Background knowledge is the wide range of academic knowledge and personal experiences that each student brings to the classroom. Background knowledge is developed through interactions with experiences, texts, and through content that is taught. Research shows a correlation between background knowledge and academic achievement. By attending to students’ background knowledge, educators can be more precise in instruction and make material more relevant to students.

Research also indicates that information about students’ home language practices should inform academic literacy instruction in the classroom. Connecting students’ primary or home literacy practices with academic literacy practices is necessary for success in school and for eventual success in college and career. Similarly, literacy outcomes can be improved through student engagement in digital literacy and multi-literacies. Students’ use of technology to communicate, read, and write should be connected to their use of technology in the classroom as they develop their ELA skills.

Metacognitive Strategies, Growth Mindset, & Grit

Metacognition is the process of reflecting on how one thinks and learns. Research suggests that students who use metacognitive strategies while they read better comprehend the text. Successful readers may intuitively incorporate these strategies during reading. However, struggling readers benefit from explicit instruction in metacognitive strategies. Just as students need to engage in metacognitive strategies to meet academic goals, students need to develop non-cognitive skills that represent the “full range of behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs students demonstrate while engaging in the learning process” (Conley, 2013, p. 21). Non-cognitive skills include persistence with difficult tasks, setting goals, seeking help, and working with others. Grit and growth mindset are two new areas for research around non-cognitive skills. Grit is defined as resilience in the face of failure and perseverance for long-term goals. A growth
mindset is a key aspect of developing grit because with a growth mindset, students believe that effort can impact achievement. Having a growth mindset is “a key ingredient in successful learning because the individual believes that learning and success are associated with hard work, practice, and persistence” (Elish-Piper, 2014, p. 59). Both grit and mindset can and should be intentionally developed in students.
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ELA Smarter Balanced Assessment, LAP Eligibility, and LAP Student Data Reporting

Students in grades 3–8 and 11 take the Smarter Balanced Summative Assessments aligned to the Washington State English Language Arts K–12 K–1 Learning Standards. The state summative assessments determine students’ progress toward college and career readiness in English language arts. These summative assessments consist of two parts: a computer adaptive test and a performance task.

The learning outcomes are organized around four assessment claims and represent ELA skills that are relevant to 21st century college- and career-ready students.

The evidence of students’ progress toward college and career readiness is provided by student performance on the items and tasks in the four assessment categories, referred to as Claims: Reading, Writing, Listening, and Research.

Claim 1 – Reading - The student can read closely and analytically to comprehend a range of increasingly complex literary and informational texts.

Students should be exposed to a broad range of high quality, increasingly challenging literary and informational texts. Carefully selected texts should range across genres, cultures, and centuries to provide access to literary and cultural knowledge as well as familiarity with different text structures and elements. Instruction should promote careful examination of materials to help deepen the students’ ability to use evidence to support inferences, draw conclusions, provide evaluations, and make judgements. Whatever they are reading, students should be able to show a growing ability to make multiple connections, consider textual evidence, and become sensitive to inconsistencies, ambiguities, and poor reasoning.

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (pgs. 1–16) provides a three-part model for measuring text complexity, tools, and samples.

Smarter Balanced Content Specifications (pages 21–35) provides rationale, evidence, and targets for ELA/Literacy Claim #1.

Claim 2 – Writing - Students can produce effective and well-grounded writing for a range of purposes and audiences.

Students should have significant time devoted to producing numerous pieces of writing over short and extended time frames. Carefully selected instruction should promote writing as a way of offering and supporting opinions or arguments, demonstrating understanding of subjects, and conveying real and imagined experience and events. Skills such as the ability to plan, revise, edit, and publish, are applicable to many types of writing, and should result in argumentative, informative/explanatory and narrative text. Providing opportunities to clearly communicate
ideas to an external, sometimes unfamiliar, audience should be adapted as students accomplish a particular task and purpose. Through the use of language and vocabulary, students should be encouraged to advance the style of their writing. Students should also develop control over the conventions of Standard English grammar, usage, and mechanics as well as learn other ways to use language to convey meaning effectively.

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (pgs. 23–25) defines the three text types.

Smarter Balanced Content Specifications (pages 36–42) provides rationale, evidence, and targets for ELA/Literacy Claim #2.

Claim 3 – Speaking* and Listening-Students can employ effective speaking and listening skills for a range of purposes and audiences.

Students should develop a broad range of useful oral communication and interpersonal skills; they should have ample opportunities to participate in a variety of rich, structured conversations—as part of a whole class, in small groups, and with a partner. Collaborative working environments should encourage students to express and listen carefully to ideas, integrate information from various media sources, evaluate what they hear, and adapt speech to context, content, and task. In addition, students should contribute to meaningful conversations while providing accurate, relevant information; responding to and developing on what others have said; making comparisons and contrasts; and analyzing and synthesizing ideas appropriate to a particular topic.

* Currently, students are only assessed on listening, specifically interpreting, analyzing, and using information delivered verbally.

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (pgs. 26–35) identifies the role of speaking and listening in K–5 classrooms, the link between read-alouds and the reading-speaking-listening connection, the link between conventions, language and vocabulary, the progression of language skills, and acquiring vocabulary.

Smarter Balanced Content Specifications (pages 43–45) provides rationale, evidence, and targets for ELA/Literacy Claim #3.

Claim 4 – Research-Students can engage in research and inquiry to investigate topics, and to analyze, integrate, and present information.

Students should use inquiry and critical thinking to produce new insights, perspective, solutions, and products. Writing or presenting on a topic should require students to make connections from reading varied sources. Students should become adept at gathering, analyzing, and integrating information from various sources, evaluating and citing sources
accurately, and interpreting findings. Students should plan tasks, notice patterns, generate reasonable arguments and explanations, and respond analytically to sources.

Smarter Balanced Content Specifications (pages 46–48) provides rationale and targets for ELA/Literacy Claim #4.

Smarter Balanced Assessment System

The Smarter Balanced Assessment System consists of three major components: resources and supports to implement formative assessment processes, interim assessments, and summative assessments. This complete system consists of resources to support student learning, check student progress, and measure student achievement in grades 3–8 and high school.

The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium consists of multiple states working together to create and submit resources and to develop assessments. Over 4,700 educators across the consortium have developed and reviewed test items, established achievement levels, and contributed resources to the Digital Library.

The Digital Library provides educators with high-quality instructional and professional learning resources that are aligned to the Washington state ELA Standards. These resources were created by educators for educators and can help guide educators with implementation of formative assessment processes in the classroom.

Interim assessments are for students and can be taken at various intervals throughout the year. Interim assessments are available on the Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program (WCAP) portal.

Practice and training tests for the Smarter Balanced assessment are available online. The Smarter Balanced Practice and Training Tests are for students and educators as they prepare for the Smarter Balanced assessment.

The summative assessment is a computer adaptive test, meaning the questions a student receives are dependent upon a student’s correct or incorrect answers. Adaptive tests are tailored to each student individually; they provide scores that are more accurate than fixed-form assessments, and identify student mastery of skills.

If you are interested in receiving information about and/or participating in the work of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium with other Washington state educators, please sign up for ELA assessment updates at OSPI Email Updates.
Multiple Measures of Assessment for LAP

Students are identified as being eligible for LAP based on multiple measures or assessment. As identified earlier in the MTSS section of this report, establishing data-based decision-making protocols using a comprehensive system for assessment is important to identify and monitor students who need supplemental supports/services. The comprehensive system should include universal screening for all students, diagnostic assessments for students who are identified as potentially at risk, progress monitoring, and formative assessment processes.

Washington state is a local control state and does not make recommendations on which assessments schools and districts should use to honor the needs and expectations in a comprehensive assessment system. Thus, the following assessment tools and resources are available to support district/school as they select assessments to support decision-making processes:

- Universal Screening: The National Center on Response to Intervention provides a Screening Tools Chart
- Diagnostic Assessments: SEDL, an affiliate of the American Institute for Research, provides a Reading Assessment Database
- Formative Assessment Processes: Smarter Balanced comprehensive assessment system provides access to the Digital Library to participating states
- Progress Monitoring: The National Center on Intensive Intervention at American Institutes for Research provides Academic Progress monitoring GOM tool chart

Smarter Balanced Assessment & LAP Student Eligibility and Data Reporting

Districts/schools are not required to use the Smarter Balanced assessment system to determine student eligibility for LAP or to monitor student growth. If a district elects to use the Smarter Balanced assessment system for LAP student data reporting, all three Smarter Balanced assessment formats, summative, interim, or formative, can serve as one of the multiple measures to determine eligibility. However, when reporting growth for progress monitoring, OSPI only recommends using the summative assessment to derive growth. Specifically, OSPI recommends districts use the score earned from the spring of one year to the spring of the following year.

The Smarter Balanced summative assessment is a good option to monitor student growth for three reasons:

1. The vertical scale of the summative assessment allows for the determination of absolute growth;
2. The three months of non-instructional time is equivalent for students across districts and schools; and

3. This method could potentially capture growth acquired during summertime interventions.

The Interim Comprehensive Assessments (ICA) are limited at monitoring student growth because they do not assess the student’s knowledge before learning, and should not be used to provide a baseline for understanding how much learning has taken place post intervention. The ICA is most valuable when given later in the school year because it assesses content students should have acquired during the school year. Since the ICAs are a fixed form assessment and there is only one version of each grade level’s ICA in each subject, when given both as a pre- and post-assessment, students’ scores may be affected by students’ familiarity with the assessment, and limiting the scores’ utility for progress monitoring.

The Interim Assessment Blocks (IAB) are limited at monitoring student growth because they only have a three-level classification to report student data. This does not provide the detail needed to make determinations about student growth. It is always the case in testing that the more robust the test the more precise the information. When sampling from content, such is the case for the interim blocks, it is important to be very cautious about drawing conclusions about student knowledge. The IABs are also fixed-form assessments, and student familiarity with previous performance and the assessments are problematic for progress monitoring.
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The expert panel worked together with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to develop a comprehensive menu of best practices and strategies based on the most current evidence and rigorous research available. Panelists used the following WSIPP definitions for evidence-based, research-based, and promising practices.

**Evidence-based**
A program or practice that has been tested in heterogeneous or intended populations with multiple randomized, or statistically controlled evaluations, or both; or one large multiple site randomized, or statistically controlled evaluation, or both, where the weight of the evidence from a systemic review demonstrates sustained improvements in at least one outcome. Evidence-based also means a program or practice that can be implemented with a set of procedures to allow successful replication in Washington and, when possible, is determined to be cost-beneficial.

**Research-based**
A program or practice that has been tested with a single randomized, or statistically controlled evaluation, or both, demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes; or where the weight of the evidence from a systemic review supports sustained outcomes [. . .] but does not meet the full criteria for evidence-based.

**Promising**
A practice that, based on statistical analyses or a well-established theory of change, shows potential for meeting the evidence-based or research-based criteria.

The English language Arts menu lists practices and strategies that have been shown to support literacy improvement for students who struggle to meet academic benchmarks. It is important to note that the work of the expert panel was to identify proven general practices and strategies, not recommend specifically branded programs that might include those practices. Districts considering adoption of programs or curriculum are encouraged to review the materials for alignment to the WA State K–12 Learning Standards and best practices and strategies outline in this menu. Schools are also encouraged to use the IMET and EQUIP rubrics to vet alignment of materials. Any chosen program or curricula should be evaluated on an ongoing basis to ensure it effectively impacts student achievement.
Menu Organization

The Menus have been organized into four broad categories of interventions. Student-centered practices and strategies directly involve the student, like peer tutoring, double dosing, or summer book programs. Transition and readiness practices and strategies includes practices designed to get students ready to learn, move from middle to high school, or graduate from high school. Educator-focused practices and strategies include activities like targeted professional learning and training, frameworks for teaching literacy, or co-teaching. Family and community practices and strategies include activities like mentoring, family engagement, and P–4 community partners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA MENU AT A GLANCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-Centered Practices and Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before-After School Programs</td>
<td><em>Research-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Dosing</td>
<td><em>Evidence-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Book Programs</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School/Programs</td>
<td><em>Evidence-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring by an Adult</td>
<td><em>Evidence-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring by an Intervention Specialists</td>
<td><em>Evidence-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring by Peers</td>
<td><em>Research-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educator-Focused Practices and Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced Literacy</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Teaching</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teacher/EL Coaches</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teacher/Instructional Coaches</td>
<td><em>Evidence-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teacher/Literacy Coaches</td>
<td><em>Research-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Professional Learning</td>
<td><em>Evidence-based</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal Design for Learning</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition and Readiness Practices and Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Retrieval and Mastery of High School Standards</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Readiness: to Kindergarten</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Readiness: Grade 8</td>
<td><em>Promising</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Family and Community Practices and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Engagement</th>
<th>Promising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P–4 Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Promising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Student Mentors</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT-CENTERED PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Transition & Readiness

Student-Centered

Educator-Focused

Family & Community
Before-After School Programs

Before and after school programs are evidence-based. Research emphasizes the importance of high quality out of school time learning opportunities for children's academic success in school, as well as their health and wellbeing. *Out of School Time* (OST) programs can support and promote academics, socialization, sports, and safe environments for children before and after school, on Saturdays, and during scheduled school breaks. Programs that focus on emerging foundational literacy skills and on-going speaking, listening, writing, and reading skill development can significantly impact student learning outcomes.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Design fun learning opportunities that focus on literacy skill development, not merely provide homework help for students. For example, incorporating literacy enrichment activities that incorporate the arts, fitness, and technology can motivate student attendance and engagement while impacting literacy skill development.

- Provide targeted interventions before/after school for students who need additional literacy support and provide student transportation home from after school learning opportunities to ensure students will be able to participate.

- Identify programs within your community that celebrate the backgrounds and cultures of the families and children in your school. Partner with these programs to enroll students and to support literacy skill development.

- Design clubs/camps around literacy themes, author’s work, and/or games. Give the club a fun name or have students help name the club. The club could focus on poetry, song writing, singing, and/or reading. A karaoke club incorporates reading, speaking, and listening. Apples to Apples, Scrabble, and Bananagrams are just a few games to incorporate in-club opportunities. Offer clubs before and after school, on Saturdays, and during regularly scheduled school breaks.

- Design project-based learning opportunities for students. Projects incorporate and develop speaking, listening, reading, and writing, while also developing critical thinking and cooperative learning.

- Create project-based, computer-assisted credit retrieval programs for students in grades 11–12 to complete before and after school.

- Partner with district food service and/or child nutrition providers to provide breakfast, lunch, or snacks to students while LAP providers focuses on literacy skill development. Target shared reading experiences and foundational literacy skill development to support students with feed the body and the mind activities.
Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who struggle with reading, writing, speaking, and listening benefit from before- and after-school programs that target and offer opportunities for development in those areas.
- Cultural interests of students should be part of the design of the program.
- Activities should be age appropriate to engage students beyond the school day.
- Elementary school students need: program time to be consistent throughout the school year and time in program is aligned to student needs.
- Middle school students need: credible/trained staff and programs that are independent from school, yet family connected.
- High school students need: funding collaboration, planning/cooperation from stakeholders, set objectives, connections to community/career readiness, and leadership opportunities.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Consider students’ interests.
- Recruit district-level sponsorship.
- Provide an on-site coordinator.
- Establish sustainable funding.
- Partner with district food service and/or child nutrition providers to provide healthy snacks.
- Create a positive environment, dedicated to building connections with students.
- Provide training and technical assistance for staff.
- Establish goals with timelines for the program and students.
- Limit staff turnover.
- Align regular-day curriculum and assessment with hands on enrichment activities.
- Use individual/group data to target program design.
- Engage in on-going progress monitoring.
- Make connections with schools and school day teachers.
- Encourage community involvement.
Resources—Tools for Planning

- After School Alliance: [Literacy Brief] [Toolbox]
- Effective Out-of-School Time Programs: Reading Rockets
- Literacy in Afterschool Programs [SEDL Report]
- 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- School’s Out Washington

Supporting Research

Before- and after-school programs take all different shapes and forms. Some schools design and implement opportunities while others connect with external providers. Regardless of the program provider, Out of School Time (OST) opportunities can lead to positive outcomes for children and youth, as well as families, communities, and schools (Vandell, 2014).

AISR, the National Center for Time and Learning (NCTL), and UCLA’s Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access (IDEA) support more and better extended learning time recognized that low-income students generally do not have access to extended enrichment opportunities outside of the typical school day (Del Razo & Renée, 2013). The National Institute on Out-of-School Time (2009) reports: (1) Quality programs improve school attendance, engagement in learning, test scores, and grades; (2) high-risk students who participate regularly in programs benefit the most; (3) the frequency and duration of participation increase benefits.

Several ELT programs that occur after school are sponsored by community partners. These programs have many benefits to frequent students and families who participate regularly in after-school programs. Participation reduces stress for parents by knowing that their child is in a supervised activity after school, and it reduces juvenile crime and accidents (NIOST, 2009).

The design of before- and after-school programs are unique to the schools and communities they serve. One example of an after-school literacy program, co-exists with a free YMCA after-school program. This program is free to students and families because over 90 percent of the students qualify for the free and reduced lunch. Annual reports of student progress from 2001–2004 identify nearly 40 percent of participating students achieved more than one year’s growth on reading assessments. Student growth was connected to program attendance records. The primary design of the program focuses on one-on-one tutoring that targeted oral fluency and comprehension (Fleming, 2005).

Another example of a uniquely designed program used a project-based learning (PBL) model. Elementary, middle, and high school students participate in a minimum of four PBL assignments ranging from three to ten weeks throughout the year (Schwalm & Tylek, 2012). The use of PBL provides students with meaningful and authentic learning experiences. By selecting high-
interest projects, students are intrinsically motivated to participate in a variety of literacy activities involved in the project. Using PBL during additional after-school learning time helps enhance literacy skills and prepares students for college and career readiness by developing communication, critical thinking, problem solving, and collaboration skills (Schwalm & Tylek, 2012).

Recently, there has been much debate on the placement of core literacy standards in after-school programs. Opponents believe that after-school activities should be designed around enrichment, leadership, arts, sports, and civics (Marten, Hill, & Lawrence, 2014). However, the Robert Bowne Foundation in New York City has offered quarterly forums for over ten years to support the development of quality OST programs. Through their work, they have concluded that OST programs already support core literacy standards and they recommend more and better partnerships between OST programs and schools to develop systematic strategies (Marten, Hill, & Lawrence, 2014). Focusing on the CCSS-ELA Habits of Mind, OST programs can align the literacy skills necessary for students to be college and career ready while developing their individual skills in leadership, “problem-solving, perseverance, independence, and understanding other cultures” (Marten, Hill, & Lawrence, 2014).
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Double Dosing

Double dosing is research-based. Double dosing provides additional time during the school for targeted ELA intervention with a certified teacher. The intervention is closely aligned with the students’ identified literacy learning needs and the ELA Standards. In elementary schools, double dosing often occurs in a pull-out program or in lieu of other content time three to five days a week, while in middle school and high school, double dosing occurs during a designated class period five days a week. The content focus of double dosing should be the result of ongoing communication between the core classroom content teacher and the intervention specialist. All students in double dosing programs must have access to core instruction.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Identify what literacy skills are needed for students to accelerate learning and align materials and instruction to those needs. Review data regular to ensure the materials and strategies being use are working for each student.
- Establish routines to provide small group intervention for 10–15 minutes within the classroom during differentiated work time.
- Create an additional instructional block in the master schedule for targeted interventions, more practice, and advanced learning opportunities. Weekly or bi-weekly, educators identify students who need targeted interventions. The educator who had the most success with students on a particular literacy skill will provide re-teaching for the students most at need, thus pairing the most skilled educator with the students most at risk.
- Provide ongoing training for educators who lead double dosing opportunities for students and ensure collaboration time is scheduled regularly with core teacher. Often, the least skilled staff is place with the highest need students; therefore, ongoing training and support is necessary for educators who are working with students to accelerate literacy skills.
- Use computer-assisted literacy skill building programs to provide practice, to monitor student progress, and to communicate student progress with families.
- Provide independent and partner work time for speaking, listening, reading, and writing in double dosing classrooms. Students need additional time with books and for writing to improve literacy skills. Educators provide targeted coaching and support for partners.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who are reading below grade-level proficiency standards.
- Students identified as needing additional language development support, including students learning English as an additional language.
• Students in grades 3–12 who need to accelerated literacy growth to meet grade-level standards on state ELA assessments.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning
• Establish clear literacy goals and learning targets.
• Provide a positive learning environment for students.
• Design literacy instruction based on achievement data and progress monitoring to meet individual student needs.
• Provide consistent predictable structures and routines.
• Design literacy instruction that is systematic, allows time for student practice, and provides specific, individualized feedback to students.
• Partner with families and encourage students to participate in goal setting and process monitoring.
• Establish a literacy assessment plan that includes screening, diagnostic, and formative assessments to identify students and for progress monitoring.
• Establish a literacy plan that focuses on specific skills and strategies, and integrate the new skills with previous learning in an authentic context.
• Provide support for students learning English as an additional language in their home/primary language whenever feasible.
• Provide common time and an agreed-upon protocol for grade level and cross grade level team meetings to identify students who need additional literacy support throughout the school year.
• Establish common language and protocols for student-centered meetings and grade-level intervention teams.
• Use of cognitive tools such as graphic organizers, illustrations, concept maps, anchor charts, and pictures with students who struggle with literacy standards.
• Make collaborative instructional decisions (time imbedded in schedule) based on the data collected that includes both the classroom and intervention teacher.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Florida Center for Reading Research: Elements for Effective Reading Interventions
• Perspectives for a Diverse America: Literacy Passages, Tasks and Strategies
• Readworks.org
• ELA Shifts
• Essential components of RTI from the Center on Response to Intervention

Supporting Research
The academic focus during double dosing should be aligned to foundational literacy skills and the ELA Standards. Additionally, alignment to the English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards is necessary for students learning English as an additional language. Collaboration time among teachers is essential to develop clarity and coherence among the general education teachers and the staff members providing double dosing for students to meet ELA Standards. The intervention team (all the adults serving the student) should determine the instructional and assessment plans for each student to meet the instructional targets. The student’s ability to articulate the learning targets, along with ongoing progress monitoring and student self-assessment, will identify when these targets are met. Students should continue to receive services until they meet the learning targets identified for them by the instructional team.

In this model, students are identified as needing support and their responses to interventions are measured on a regular basis. All students are screened at the beginning and again during the middle of the year. Students who struggle with ELA Standards receive additional instruction three to five times a week for 20–40 minutes in small groups. Their progress is monitored at least once a month (Gersten et. al., 2009). The report found a strong level of evidence that “intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark” works for students performing below benchmark (Gersten, et. al., 2009, p. 6). The best use of double dosing time is to use proven instructional strategies with small groups of students.

Mazzolini & Morely (2006) describe the benefits an extra period for literacy instruction within the regular school day has on accelerating literacy skills for middle and high school students who are reading one or more years below grade level. By regularly using vocabulary activities, mini-lessons, read-alouds, and independent reading practice, students experienced growth in reading achievement and reported increased self-efficacy and motivation to read. Additional time for students who struggle with speaking, listening, writing, and reading within the school day will require a design shift for scheduling.
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Summer Book Programs

Summer book programs are a promising practice. Students can participate from any location during non-scheduled school time. Summer book programs provide students with a choice of reading materials and access to books at home.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Use LAP funds to support your summer program by providing new books for LAP students to borrow during the summer. Students select books to borrow and bring back to school in the fall. These books may be used to stock LAP classroom libraries so that independent practice in reading continues throughout the school year.
- Identify community partners to enrichment summer opportunities for students as an incentive for participating in summer reading activities. National and community partners can provide free books and other incentives for at-risk students.
- Partner with a local library to promote summer reading resources. Provide training opportunities for students and parents to use the library electronic resources to reserve books and search for e-books, audio books, magazines, and movies.
- Establish a summer literacy program that includes books and blogs. Blogging about summer books provides educators an opportunity to formatively assess student comprehension and interact with students. Teachers could be provided a summer teaching stipend to follow up and work with LAP students remotely/electronically during the summer.
- Design a K–2 program using numeracy and/or social-emotional development-themed books. Provide training for shared-reading opportunities and books for parents to borrow for the summer. Collect the books at the end of the summer during a summer book reading celebration.
- Establish a book mobile program and deliver books to low socio-economic areas. Seek community partners, grants, and volunteers to assist in the design and development of the program.
- Develop a system to mail a book to students every two weeks, and then have staff follow up with a phone call to each student to have a genuine conversation about what they liked about the book. Train staff members or volunteers (adults or high school students) to engage students in phone book talk conversations.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who struggle with reading and reluctant readers benefit greatly when given a choice of reading materials.
Students identified for free and reduced-lunch programs often have fewer books at home and gain added benefit with access to books.

Students learning English as an additional language benefit from a mix of leveled books and audiobooks for language development and comprehension.

All K–4 students benefit from multi-year summer book programs that start in kindergarten and continue for at least three years.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Provide multi-year programs designed to accelerate reading growth.
- Provide easy access to books for students and families.
- Allow students to self-select books to increase reading motivation.
- Seek grant funding to provide books for low-income, at-risk students.
- Engage families as partners.
- Use reading logs to measure progress toward goals (available online).
- Collaborate with community libraries.
- Provide external motivators to help with engagement (e.g., name in local paper or recognition by school board for amount of time spent reading over summer).
- Read out loud to primary students who are not independent readers.
- Provide guidance to students as they select books to ensure books are not too difficult.
- Encourage students to read a wide selection of genres.
- Create a schedule to open the school library during summer months.
- Provide families with meaningful strategies and resources that can be carried over and implemented at home, which ensures continuity of summer reading programs throughout the year, after the intervention has concluded.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- OSPI Summer Programs Presentation
- Cultivating Readers Family Guide for shared literacy activities. [English] [Spanish]
- Reading Rockets: Get Ready for Summer! Ideas for Teachers to Share with Families!
- Pizza Hut: Book It! National Reading Program
- Scholastic free app and grade-level resources Summer Reading Challenge
Supporting Research

Research shows that students who do not read in the summer can lose two to three months of reading development, whereas students who do read tend to gain a month of reading proficiency during the same amount of time (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2003). For decades, summer break has attributed to loss of reading comprehension skills and student academic outcomes in reading. From 1st to 5th grade, summer break can attribute to a loss of up to 1.5 grade levels (Whittingham & Rickman, 2015). Reading just five books over the summer can prevent summer learning loss (Heyns, 1978), and students who participate in multi-year programs show the greatest academic growth (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2013).

Summer book programs promote students’ reading during the days they are not in school. Multiple strategies are starting to emerge to provide students access to books and choice of materials. Some programs hand the books out to students at the end of the regular school year or mail books to students throughout the summer, while other programs have establish digital device checkouts with a multitude of books loaded on the device (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2013; Mitchell, 2016). Mobile book projects are also becoming more popular and the results of these projects are reducing summer reading loss and inspiring communities (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2013; Genay, 2015; Groff, S, 2015).

In a study by Allington et al. (2010), elementary students self-selected 12 books each spring for a voluntary summer reading program over three consecutive years. Students who received books in this study “reported more often engaging in voluntary summer reading and had significantly higher reading achievement than the control group...[T]he reading gains of students from the most economically disadvantaged families in the study were found to be larger, perhaps because these students have the most restricted access to books” (p. 422). When students identified for free and reduced-priced lunches participate in voluntary summer reading programs, their confidence increased in the classroom and their achievement scores were higher at the beginning and end of the following school year (Whittingham & Rickman, 2015).

In a 2008 summer book program study, 400 students in grades 3–5 displayed significant differences based on their research groups (Blazer, 2011). The research groups included: (1) students were not provided books, (2) students were provided books, (3) students were provided books and fluency scaffolding, and (4) students were provided books with fluency and comprehension scaffolding. The study resulted in significant differences in the no books and the books with fluency and comprehension scaffolding groups. Black, Hispanic, and low-income students enrolled in the book program study group with both oral fluency and comprehension scaffolding showed average gains of four months of academic growth over the course of three months (Blazer, 2011).
Research suggests the following strategies will help schools develop successful summer reading programs (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2013; Blazer, 2011, pgs. 8–9):

- Review oral reading and comprehension strategies at the end of the school year with students individually.
- Review oral reading and comprehension strategies at the end of the school year with both students and parents together.
- Teach parents how to scaffold oral and comprehension activities at home.
- Review book selection activities to ensure books are just right for the reader at the independent reading level.
- Send at least eight books (that match each student’s reading level) home for the summer.
- Open the school library on designated days.
- Establish a bookmobile program.
- Send families packets, postcards, and books at regular intervals.
- Send summer letters with scaffolding skills and reminders.

Research on the impact of digital devices to enhance literacy skills during summer break is still new. Early research has found that adolescents using e-readers have reported changes in attitudes and motivation toward reading, students preferred to read on the e-readers, and reluctant readers are incentivized by using e-readers (Mitchell, 2016). In an 11-week summer book program for 6th grade students, Nooks were preloaded with books and checked out to students who struggled to meet grade-level reading outcomes. Two findings stood out in this study: students regularly used and benefited from the imbedded tools in the e-reader, and the e-reader provided more opportunities for reading because of its portability and convenience. Students reported the dictionary as the most used tool because that it helped them understand the text and learn new words (Mitchell, 2016).

Many adolescent students prefer to read using a digital device, and teachers can motivate students by incorporating digital devices in reading and writing activities (Fink, 2012). With the added motivation, teachers can guide students to use their digital devices with academic intent to explore their interest and develop their reading, writing, speaking and listening skills with a variety of apps and websites. Multiple websites provide free magazines and grammar games that can enhance summer reading activities, and various apps have recording tools for speaking activities. For older students, digital devices are becoming more practical based on their daily
access to laptops, cell phones, and tablets; digital devices are also becoming more and more accessible to younger students (Fink, 2012).
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Summer School Programs

Summer school programs are evidence-based. These Out-of-School Time (OST) programs have the potential to accelerate the reading development of students who struggle to read and diminish summer reading loss. Summer programs extend the school year into the summer months and provide enriching opportunities to foster a love of reading and develop speaking, listening, and writing skills. Summer learning loss disproportionately affects low-income students. An academic summer program has the potential to minimize learning loss and result in achievement gains.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Create summer school programs that promote a balanced literacy model of reading and allow for student choice.
- Use LAP funds to purchase classroom libraries for summer school classrooms. These books can be re-distributed to LAP classroom libraries in the fall.
- Use a creative name to promote your summer school opportunity (e.g., Reading Playground, All about Bugs, or Sing! Dance! Play!). Invite community partners to participate in creating programs, naming, and highlighting their literacy talents.
- Combine literacy summer school programs with other content areas or enrichment opportunities such as Lego robotics, science, math, and/or theater to create excitement and engagement.
- Create a literacy summer camp and focus on a theme. Students can dig into a topic by reading about it, writing about it, and creating a product to share and tell about it. Students will be reading, writing, speaking, and listening throughout the camp, so it will be literacy-based and students will become experts in their camp topic. Provide options for different themes for students to choose from throughout the summer.
- Create a project-based, computer-assisted ELA credit retrieval summer program for grades 11–12 students.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students from families of poverty may have few or no books at home and will benefit from a summer literacy program.
- Students who are reluctant to read, are building reading skills, or are learning English as an additional language will benefit from engaging summer literacy opportunities.
- Students who are reading below grade-level proficiency standards.
- Students in grade 3–12 who are not meeting grade level standards on state ELA assessments.
Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Keep student/staff ratios small.
- Hire experienced staff.
- Provide differentiated instruction.
- Provide small group instruction and supports (three to five students).
- Allow for student choice and teach how to select just right books.
- Provide sustained time for independent reading.
- Support connection to core and school-year instructional strategies and content.
- Provide transportation.
- Partner with district food service and/or child nutrition providers to provide healthy snacks.
- Provide communication between the program and home, and encourage regular attendance.
- Encourage parents and families to read with their child daily and talk to their children about what they have read.
- Evaluate programs to ensure the summer program is effective at improving and sustaining student outcomes.
- Use observational data, youth, parent, and staff input, and student academic data to evaluate programs.
- Provide summer school opportunities over multiple summers.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide
- Reading Rockets: Get Ready for Summer! Ideas for Teachers to Share with Families!
- Reading Rockets, Colorin Colorado, and LD Online: Making Reading Relevant: Read, Learn, and Do! (K–3)
- Summer Start Academic Youth Development
- Every Child, Every Day by Richard Allington

Supporting Research

Research on summer reading loss dates back to the early 1900s (Blazer, 2011). Not only are students who live below the poverty line less likely to participate in summer activities like going to the museum, camp or zoo, they are also less likely to go to the library or bookstore. Summer
programs serve multiple purposes for students, families, educators, and communities. These programs are often designed to promote students who have failed or been retained, accelerate learning for struggling students, prevent future academic problems, improve student and parent attitudes towards school performance, and provide academic enrichment. Program design should include enrichment activities that are hands-on and foster students’ creativity (Blazer, 2011). Summer learning should also provide different experiences than those provided during the regular school year. Allington (2013) discusses the importance of providing high-quality summer literacy opportunities for students from families of poverty in order to close the reading achievement gap.

Attending school-based, camp, and community programs has been found to be beneficial to students. However, those in low-income household are less likely to participate in these summer enrichment activities (Blazer, 2011). Research indicates over half of the participants in summer programs are white. It further indicates that black (18 percent), Hispanic (14 percent), Asian (5 percent) and Native American (2 percent) students are poorly represented (Blazer, 2011, p. 4). The design of the summer program must appeal to the diversity of its students and families. Intensive summer intervention strategies such as small group or one-on-one teaching using an evidence-based curriculum can be delivered through well-designed summer programs. Tutoring, family involvement, and community outreach programs can extend into the summer months to provide services to students and families.

According to Duffy (2001), summer school programs have the potential to accelerate the reading development of students who struggle with reading. In this particular study by Duffy (2001) of 2nd-grade students in a summer school program, students improved in word identification, fluency, comprehension, perceptions of themselves as readers, attitudes toward reading, and instructional reading levels. This summer school program was designed and implemented according to the constructs of balanced literacy instruction—a short, explicit mini-lesson, independent reading, partner reading, shared reading and/or interactive read aloud, shared/interactive writing and independent writing. Also included was accelerated teaching and responsive teaching—small group guided reading, strategy groups, and conferring with students. Duffy (2001) warns though, that summer school, as a short-term intervention, should not be viewed as a quick fix for all students who struggle with reading. Some students will need ongoing literacy support during the school year to meet grade-level goals and to sustain their summer literacy learning.

Borman’s research indicates that summer learning may be the primary intervention through which educators can prevent the cumulative widening of the reading achievement gap (Borman, 2000, p. 24). Local schools and districts should use data to design, develop, and evaluate programs to serve different student groups, including students with disabilities at
various grade levels, multiple demographics, and students who are learning English as an additional language. Research conducted by Roderick, et al. (1999) demonstrates that participation in a summer program, in addition to the regular academic school year’s curriculum, provides students with at least a short-term gain in standardized test scores (Roderick, Bryk, Jacob, Easton, & Allensworth, 1999). More recently, Kindron & Lindsay (2014), through a meta-analytic review of the research, found that increased learning time programs had a positive effect on students’ literacy performance at the elementary school level, and it was especially beneficial for students performing below standard.
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Tutoring by an Adult

Adult tutoring is research-based. Adult tutors, when they receive specialized training in foundational literacy skills and the ELA Standards, are a strong supplement to a comprehensive literacy program. Carefully selected adult tutors can include teachers, intervention specialists, paraeducators, other classified personnel, and volunteers. Tutors can provide one-on-one targeted or small group instruction to meet the specific needs of students. All tutors should receive specialized training to meet students’ literacy needs.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Provide a framework for literacy tutors. The framework will provide a foundation for training, monitor student progress, and will reduce prep time for teachers.
- Provide targeted training for all tutors prior to working with students. Training for tutors should be on-going and aligned to the foundational skills targeted during scheduled tutoring time. Tutor training should also focus on delivery strategies like wait time, student observation, data collection, coaching, correction techniques, etc.
- Partner with local university education departments and/or ESDs to provide literacy foundational skills training for educators and tutors.
- Beginning readers (whether they are K–4, learning English as an additional language, or dyslexic) often need decoding monitoring and modeling. Adults trained in the foundational reading skills can work one-on-one or in small groups with students to improve student outcomes.
- Some readers are proficient decoders but struggle with vocabulary usage and comprehension. Adults trained in prompting techniques can support students with context clues and word morphology. Training in questioning strategies (such as recall, conceptualizing strategic thinking, and extended thinking) help students to improve comprehension.
- Students who struggle with writing often need content and organizational monitoring and modeling. Adults trained in development strategies (such as retell, categorization, and layering) as well as organization and text structure strategies (such as cause and effect, comparison/contrast, and problem and solution) help students to improve their writing.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who are reading below grade-level proficiency standards.
- Students identified as needing additional language development support, including students learning English as an additional language, who need more practice with oral
fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and literacy skill motivation.

- Students in grades 3–12 who need to accelerated literacy growth to meet grade level standards on state ELA assessments.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Select a scientifically research-based intervention model within a multi-tiered system of support that use individualized, diagnostic assessments to design appropriate developmental lessons for students.

- Provide a setting where distractions and disruptions do not interfere with productive engagement.

- Provide training for tutors that includes observation and correction techniques.

- Design and implement a highly structured program where knowledge is constructed from the integration of previously learned and newly acquired skill sets.

- Recognize that untrained tutors can have negative effects on learning.

- Schedule tutoring time that pairs students who have the greatest needs with the most skilled tutor.

- One-to-one and small group tutoring, consisting of three to six students.

- Effectiveness of outcomes determines group size.

- Provide extensive and ongoing training for all tutors

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Utah State Office of Education: Star Reading Tutoring

- Reading Rockets: Tutoring Strategies for the Primary Grades

- U.S. Department of Education—Tips for Reading Tutors

- Improving reading comprehension in Kindergarten through 3rd grade: A Practice Guide

- Short videos on reading: comprehension strategies, text structure, high-quality discussions, text selection, and motivation

Supporting Research

Research has consistently shown that students benefit from tutoring programs that are well-designed and include professional training and coaching centered on the best practices in literacy development (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009; Elbaum et al., 2000; Ritter et al., 2009; Shinn, Deno & Fuchs, 2002; Slavin et al., 2011).
Adult tutors must be familiar with concepts associated with the essential components of reading such as: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (Birsch, 2005; Erion & Ronka, 2014; Pittman & Dorel, 2014). For example, early literacy tutors should be trained to provide instruction with respect to alphabetic sounds (both consonants and vowels), blending letters, word recognition skills, and decoding unfamiliar words. Moreover, as students’ literacy skills develop, tutors must be well versed in strategies to enhance fluency, engage students in dialogue about reading and error correction processes, and support comprehension (Birsch, 2005; Pittman & Dorel, 2014). Both in and outside of the classroom, tutors can play an essential role in supporting literacy learning for students.

Tutoring as an intervention should be provided in addition to regularly scheduled core classroom instruction. Shorter sessions, multiple times a week, are more successful than longer sessions fewer times a week. The desired length of one-on-one tutoring should be 10–15 minutes, and multiple sessions should be at least three per week. The intensity and frequency of the session will allow the students who need more intensive instruction to become proficient in the relevant concept or topic (Allington, 2001; Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009).

Tutoring can be implemented via a pull-out model, wherein the student is removed from the classroom in order to receive extra support or instruction, or via a push-in model, wherein intervention is provided by an adult tutor within the classroom itself. All students must have access to core literacy instruction; therefore, all supplemental pull-out tutoring models must be provided outside core literacy instructional time.

Very limited research exists in support of the effectiveness of the push-in model of tutoring (Gelzheiser, Meyers, & Pruzek, 1992). Push-in tutoring generally is implemented one of two ways. In one approach, the tutor works with an individual or groups of students to help them better learn from the lesson the classroom teacher is giving to the whole class; in another common model, the tutor provides intensive re-teaching of targeted lessons (Shanahan, 2008). Both push-in and pull-out models of tutoring must be targeted and based on student learning data, and aligned carefully to curriculum used by the classroom teacher (Shanahan, 2008). Careful planning and communication between classroom teacher and tutor is key to the effectiveness of literacy tutoring interventions (Shanahan, 2008). A lack of coordination and communication between teacher and tutor has been found to be a common weakness of both the push-in and pull-out models (Allington, 1994; Davis & Wilson, 1999; Dawson, 2014).

Overall, interventions should be designed around evidence-based and reliable diagnostic assessments administered at the beginning of the school year and throughout the intervention program for progress monitoring. Well-designed tutoring programs can improve students’ literacy skills. From one-to-one instruction to small group instruction, tutors can accelerate
academic outcomes. Through carefully coordinated processes and multi-tiered system of supports, students who require more intensive literacy instruction will develop proficiency (Allington, 2001).
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Tutoring by an Interventionist/Specialist

Tutoring by a literacy interventionist/specialist is research-based. Highly trained literacy interventionists/specialists provide quality literacy instruction that support students who struggle with ELA Standards. Tutoring by an interventionists/specialist is supplemental to core literacy instruction and provides students additional learning time during the school day and during Out-of-School Time (OST) programs with a trained content expert.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Flex interventionists’ time to start the workday earlier or end after school in order to serve students outside the regular scheduled school day.
- Create an intervention/enrichment block within the master schedule to serve students who need additional literacy support. Ensure literacy interventionist works with students most at risk.
- Create opportunities for classroom teachers and interventionist to develop a push-in or pull-out model for targeted literacy intervention support.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who are reading below grade-level proficiency standards.
- Students identified as needing additional language development support, including students learning English as an additional language, who need more practice with oral fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and literacy skill motivation.
- Students in grade 3–12 who need to accelerated literacy growth to meet grade-level standards on state ELA assessments.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Select a scientifically research-based intervention model within a multi-tiered system of support that use individualized, diagnostic assessments to design appropriate developmental lessons for students.
- Ensure strategies and programs are evidence-based.
- Implement a highly structured program where knowledge is constructed from the integration of previously learned and newly acquired skill sets.
- Provide regular, structured opportunities to develop speaking, listening, writing, and reading skills.
- Build students’ literacy skills through explicit teaching and modeling of strategies.
• Provide a setting where distractions and disruptions do not interfere with productive engagement. Provide frequent opportunities for shared-reading experiences for students who struggle with literacy skills.

• Establish a continuation of communication with families.

• Adjust teaching to meet students’ needs based upon frequent diagnostic progress monitoring assessments.

• Schedule intervention time that pairs expert professionals with students who have the greatest needs.

• Provide frequent and ongoing-targeted professional learning for reading intervention specialists.

• Hire highly trained reading specialists to provide intervention to students struggling to read.

• One-to-one and small group tutoring, consisting of three (3) to six (6) students.

• Effectiveness of outcomes determines group size.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Improving reading comprehension in Kindergarten through 3rd grade: A Practice Guide
• Utah State Office of Education: Star Reading Tutoring
• Reading Rockets: Tutoring Strategies for the Primary Grades
• U.S. Department of Education—Tips for Reading Tutors
• Short videos on reading: comprehension strategies, text structure, high-quality discussions, text selection, and motivation

Supporting Research
Literacy interventionists/specialists working in one-on-one and small-group contexts supplemental to core literacy instruction must be highly trained and pursue continuing professional learning (Gordon, 2009). If the intent is to accelerate students’ literacy development sufficient to close the achievement gap, interventions must be planned such that the teachers who are experts on reading instruction deliver those lessons. Expecting less well-trained adults in the school to provide powerful instruction to the most difficult-to-teach students has little basis in theory or research. Good teaching is adaptive, and interventions require frequent modifications to groupings of students based upon regular progress monitoring results.
Literacy interventions should focus on the foundational reading skills that include phonemic awareness, oral language (oracy), alphabetic principle, phonological awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (Birsch, 2005; NELP, 2008). In addition to working directly with students, another role of interventionists/specialists should be to work with classroom teachers to identify text at the best reading level for students who struggle to access content area materials. Even as difficult texts are required for students to be college and career ready, it is necessary to have text at the appropriate reading level for students who struggle with reading to scaffold their learning. According to Allington (2001), students need to have access to [engaging] books throughout the day that are at the students’ independent reading level.

Procedures and routines within a predictable structure are crucial to intervention success; however, no two lessons will be identical because all students are different—even within small groups. Thus, interventionists/specialists need a deep knowledge of content, instructional pedagogy, and the concepts embedded in various practices in order to provide optimal services. Reading interventionists/specialists must be able to draw on their discipline-specific expertise to intentionally select the strategic actions that best match the needs of the specific reader and their learning goals. They must be able to teach for the transfer of skills and strategies necessary for successful classroom achievement.
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Tutoring by Peers

Peer tutoring is a research-based practice. It is a term that has been used to describe a wide array of tutoring arrangements, but most of the research on its success refers to students working in pairs to help one another learn material or practice academic task. Peer and cross-age tutoring are effective in developing literacy skills, while at the same time providing social benefits for tutors and the students they tutor. Peer and cross-age tutoring increase opportunities for immediate feedback and support during learning. Peer tutoring is more focused and intentional than peer collaboration or cooperative groups where students work together in small groups. Reciprocal peer tutoring allows the tutor and tutee to alternate roles to increase learning.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Recruit volunteer site coordinators to work with educators to develop structured peer tutoring routines. Provide regular training for peer tutors and provide guidance by designing an easy to follow template for tutors.
- Develop a training manual and/or anchor posters for peer tutors.
- Recruit volunteer peer tutors from local colleges, universities, and educator preparatory programs.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students in elementary, middle, and high school benefit from peer tutoring arrangements.
- Peer tutors and tutees benefit from peer tutoring arrangements.
- K–1 students benefit most from phonological awareness, decoding and fluency practices with focus on word level reading skills, word attack, word identification, and spelling activities.
- Students identified as needing additional language development support, including students learning English as an additional language, who need more practice with oral fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.
- Peer tutoring can be implemented in a small group settings or whole class configurations.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Train educators to implement peer-tutoring into teaching routines and structures.
- Peer tutoring will be most effective with purposeful planning and preparation.
• Provide training and coaching time to establish and review roles for peer tutors.
• Provide peer tutors with multiple opportunities to develop their skills as a tutor.
• Develop peer tutors to serve as partner in reading with story retelling, summarizing text (paragraph shrinking), and making predictions (prediction relay).
• Train peer tutors to respond with structured prompts and support when tutees are having difficulty.
• Train student tutors to model study skills, communication skills, work habits, questioning skills, and other helpful academic behaviors.
• Train adult supervisors to construct and monitor peer partnerships.
• Monitor student growth to ensure peer tutoring is meeting literacy goals.
• Provide students with a template for expectations and note taking.
• Provide practice time for both the tutor and the tutee.
• Establish routines for peer tutoring time three or more times per week.
• Ensure each partner is provided the same amount of time (e.g., five minutes) for reading out loud during partner reading.
• Provide 35 minutes three times a week for elementary students.
• Provide 35 minutes five times over the course of two weeks for high school students.
• Incorporate a motivation system for students to use during peer tutoring time.
• Older students benefit from rewards as a motivator.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Provided feedback—Austin’s Butterfly: Building Excellence in Student Work
• The Teaching Channel: ELL Peer-to-Peer Tutoring
• Kids as Reading Helpers: A Peer Tutor Training Manual

Supporting Research
According to Zeneli, Thurston, & Roseth (2016), peer tutoring is a form of cooperative learning and can be implemented through peer-assisted learning, reciprocal peer tutoring, and cross-age tutoring. In a meta-analysis, same-age reciprocal peer tutoring was identified as being to be the most beneficial arrangement for peer tutoring followed by cross-age fixed role peer tutoring (Zeneli, Thurston, & Roseth, 2016). Tutoring is a versatile practice and can occur in alternative programs, resource rooms, before-/after-school settings, during summer arrangements, and in general education classrooms (Bowman-Perrott, et. al., 2013).
Peer tutoring is effective across multiple demographics of students (Bowman-Perrott, et. al., 2013). The benefits of peer tutoring include improved social emotional outcomes (e.g. self-efficacy and confidence). Peer tutoring also improves student time on task and pacing, by providing students with timely feedback and more opportunities to respond/participate (Shenderovich, Thurston, & Miller, 2015; Bowman-Perrott, et. al., 2013). Fuchs & Fuchs (2005) have found that reading skills improve when students cooperatively work together using well-designed routines. Peer tutoring is especially effective at improving peer relationships, personal development, and motivation (Topping, 2008). Hattie notes research demonstrates that peer tutoring has numerous benefits for both the tutor and tutee (Hattie, 2009).

Peer-assisted learning is appropriate for all students and is often targeted at students in grades K—6 (What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). Students work together on literacy activities. Peer-assisted learning generally partners students based on literacy skill/ability levels (e.g., proficient students with non-proficient students) and students take on assigned roles of tutor or tutee (What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). When implementing peer tutoring arrangements, practitioners should combine organized structures, foundational skills in reading instruction, partner reading with story retelling, summarizing text (paragraph shrinking), making predictions (prediction relay), and group-reward contingencies to experience positive results (Gersten et al., 2007; Fantuzzo & Rohrbeck, 1992; What Works Clearinghouse, 2012).

Reciprocal peer tutoring (RPT) is an intervention strategy in which students alternate roles between the tutor and the tutee. RPT has a structured format where “students prompt, teach, monitor, evaluate, and encourage each other” (Fantuzzo, King, Heller, 1992, p. 332). RPT learning opportunities can be used to increase the learning time and opportunities within the classroom. This peer-tutoring model combines self-management methods, group reward possibilities, and promotes academic and social aptitude (Fantuzzo & Rohrbeck, 1992). Whenever RPT is used, keeping the group small is important. The lead teacher, or lead tutor, should determine the selection of tutoring groups based on the goal of the activities and the daily schedule (Gersten et. al., 2007; Fantuzzo & Rohrbeck, 1992).

Cross-age peer tutoring consists of older students, college/university students, and community volunteers who work with tutees; tutors are not certificated educators, but they are part of the tutees community (Shenderovich, Thurston, & Miller, 2015).

Research on peer tutoring in grades K—6 can be effective at improving student literacy outcomes. Based on Fuchs & Fuchs research and partnerships with the Center on Accelerated Student Learning (CASL), five conclusions can be drawn (2005):

1. Content for kindergartners and fluency building in 1st grade should be directed at younger students.
2. Teachers can implement peer tutoring in the classroom to impact reading instruction and skills.

3. Research supports positive and robust results in literacy outcomes for all students: low, middle, and high performers including students with special needs, English language learners, and free and reduced-priced lunch populations.

4. No one pedagogical best practices reaches 100 percent of students; therefore, 10–20 percent of students will need additional academic supports.

5. Narrowing the focus on specific skill development during peer tutoring is recommended.
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Balanced Literacy

Balanced Literacy is a promising practice. This framework integrates a variety of instructional approaches, including readers and writers workshop, to meet the needs of all students while providing meaningful literacy experiences to students. Its foundation includes explicit skill instruction balanced with supported independent practice. Balanced Literacy also relies on assessment-based planning to differentiate and individualize student literacy instruction. LAP funds used to support Balanced Literacy practices should be used to support students who struggle to with ELA Standards. LAP funds supporting students can include determining instructional support, differentiated instructional practices, and educator training to support the development of foundational literacy skills.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- A Balanced Literacy framework can be used to design core literacy instruction and/or literacy interventions during the school day (e.g., double dose of shared reading, strategy groups, or guided reading).

- A Balanced Literacy framework can be used to design before/after school literacy interventions and summer programs.

- A Balanced Literacy framework can provided a guide for targeted professional learning for educators who provide shared, guided, interactive, and independent opportunities for students (e.g., shared reading, guided reading, interactive writing, or independent word-study).

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students learning English as an additional language benefit from individualized linguistic, academic, and socio-emotional support.

- Special education students who are in a push-in or inclusion model benefit from individualized linguistic, academic, and socio-emotional support.

- Students in low performing demographics subgroups benefit from additional differentiation and individualized instruction.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Provide explicit instruction, within a gradual release of responsibility, to scaffold learning.

- Use assessments to know students individually as readers, writers, and users of language.
• Match instruction to the individual, not to a program.

• Provide ample opportunities and support for students to use and extend their instruction in functional reading and writing.

• Provide students with guided choices for reading and writing.

• Provide ample time each day for independent reading and writing.

• Build classrooms libraries.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Highline School District: Balanced Literacy Vision

• WRESA.org: What is Balanced Literacy?

• Janette M. Hughes: Balanced Literacy

• Reading and Writing Workshops

Supporting Research

The goal of Balanced Literacy is to gradually release control of learning, whereby responsibility is shifted from the teacher to the students. It includes all of the foundational speaking, listening, writing, and reading skills and incorporates multiple instructional approaches that include interactive, shared, guided, and independent practices. Students in Balanced Literacy classrooms participate regularly in word study practices that go beyond spelling and vocabulary development and include phonics, how words are made up, multiple meanings of words, and word origins.

Balanced Literacy provides the opportunity for classroom teachers to differentiate speaking, listening, reading, writing, and word study based on the needs of each student. When selecting and implementing Balanced Literacy, classroom teachers should be knowledgeable, or willing to learn, about the strengths of each student.

Setting up a classroom in a way that allows for whole group, small group, and individual instruction can be challenging, yet is essential in order to differentiate literacy instruction for each student. Classrooms tend to have an abundance of materials, books, and resources that have been purchased to meet the needs of students. However, Balanced Literacy is not a program or materials; instead, it is a framework of using assessment for learning and providing differentiated instruction that will make a difference in student outcomes. A single curriculum does not fit all students (Buly & Valencia, 2004). A balanced literacy approach meets the needs
of all students in a classroom through strong differentiation of core literacy instruction (Fitzgerald & Cunningham, 2002).

Balanced Literacy is deeply-rooted in the belief that teachers should be constantly aware of students' individual needs and progress. In order to be able to teach to the strengths and needs of each child, how educators teach and how educators set up the instructional framework is as important as what is taught. The use of various instructional techniques is intended to allow for differentiated literacy instruction to help children gain access to developmentally appropriate literacy knowledge and skills (Frey, et. al., 2005; Hoffman et al., 2000).

Teacher’s College Reading and Writing Project, under the guidance of Lucy Calkins, provides a research base for the various components of Balanced Literacy online (Calkins, n.d.). Fountas and Pinnell provide descriptions in a variety of publications, including When Readers Struggle: Teaching that Works (2009). Highline School District has summarized key components of their Balanced Literacy approach in the following way:

**Reading**

**Interactive Read Aloud:** Students become motivated, life-long learners, while discussing and interacting with each other around a complex text and experiencing a model of authentic skill and strategy application.

**Shared Reading:** Students engage in a close reading experience that provides all students access to grade level text and guided practice for reading and rereading with opportunities for students to discuss and interact.

**Guided Reading:** Students practice reading and thinking about text at their instructional level while receiving immediate feedback from the teacher.

**Independent Reading:** Students practice applying skills and strategies in independent-level texts while also developing self-directed and self-regulated reading behaviors.

**Writing**

**Interactive Writing:** Students, with a high level of teacher support, share the pen to do the writing, creating products that are well beyond their independent level of writing.

**Shared Writing:** Students and the teacher work collaboratively to compose a common piece of writing with the teacher acting as scribe, allowing students an opportunity to focus on language, writing features and style.

**Guided Writing:** Students try on a specific writing procedure, strategy, or skill with side-by-side coaching from the teacher.

**Independent Writing:** Students create, write, and engage in authentic and purposeful writing while taking ownership of both the process and the product.
### Instructional Approaches

**Gradual Release of Responsibility:** Students receive explicit instruction in literacy strategies followed by guided, collaborative, and independent practice with differentiated support.

**Mini-lesson:** Students are taught a specific strategy to support students in acquiring the necessary skills through explicit, direct instruction that includes teacher modeling and demonstration followed by students’ active engagement in applying the strategy.

**Conferring:** Students receive individualized feedback and instruction in one-on-one or small group conferences with the teacher.

**Partnerships:** Students engage in discourse to support one another, increase understanding, and develop independence.

---

**Balanced Literacy Component #1—Interactive Read Aloud**

In an Interactive read aloud, the teacher thinks aloud while reading a text and demonstrates use of comprehension skills and strategies. Students interact to co-construct meaning while authentically applying skills and strategies. This way the teacher can model strategies and literacy behaviors for students in materials and in ways that the students may not yet be accessing (Fisher, Flood, Lapp, & Frey, 2004).

**Balanced Literacy Component #2—Shared Reading/Writing**

Teacher and students engage in a collaborative close reading or writing experience that provides all students access to grade-level text and grade-level writing opportunities with opportunities for students to discuss and interact.

**Balanced Literacy Component #3—Direct and explicit instruction linked to guided practice**

Teacher and students engage in a very explicit and short mini-lesson taught to the whole class. All students should participate in mini-lessons that focus on a variety literacy foundational skills: standards aligned to reading, writing, word study; craft, speaking, listening, and critical thinking. Mini-lessons also focus on routines, strategies, procedures, and engagement activities that can create independence in a workshop. Procedural lessons are essential to allow the teacher to differentiate after the mini-lesson. Mini-lessons are based on a gradual release of responsibility and, through the use of a variety of materials, provide differentiated resources for these short, explicit lessons (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996; Pearson & Gallagher, 1983). In different fields of education (including special education and English Language Learner
gradual release has been labeled differently including (but not limited to) the following: *I do, we do, you do*; Read/Write To, Read/Write With, Read/Write by.

**Balanced Literacy Component #4–Independent Time to Read and Write**
Research evidence suggests that volume of reading is linked to attaining higher-order literacy proficiencies (Allington, 2012; Brozo, Brozo, Shiel, & Topping, 2008; Cipielewski & Stanovich, 1992). Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding (1988) found that the amount of time reading was the best predictor of reading achievement, including a child’s growth as a reader from the 2nd to the 5th grade. Cullinan (2000) reviewed the research on the effects of independent reading for the purpose of informing policy makers, curriculum developers, parents, teachers, and librarians about the importance of independent reading and programs that support it. She concluded that independent reading, defined as the reading students *choose* to do, supports learning and school achievement. Providing students with protected reading and writing time is necessary in order to support their growth in reading and writing.

**Balanced Literacy Component # 5–Word Study**
During word study, students become *word detectives* who engage in developmentally appropriate learning of how English is constructed and used. Through word study, students learn letters and the sounds they make, the structure of sentences, about root words, suffixes and prefixes, and how to derive meaning of words (Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 2015).
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Co-Teaching

Co-teaching is a promising practice. As a pedagogical strategy, co-teaching arrangements consist of two certified educational professionals in one classroom. As a partnership, co-teaching is designed to enhance access to core grade-level instruction for all students. Generally, co-teaching partnerships consist of a general education educator and a certified specialist.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Partner English Language specialist with grade-level or content-based teacher (K–12) to co-plan, co-teach, co-assess, and reflect on students’ literacy skills.
- Partner special education teacher with grade-level or content-based teacher to co-plan, co-teach, co-assess, and reflection on student literacy skills.
- Create a flexible design for educators to partner for the entire day or for a designated block of time during the day. Support a variety of arrangements of outside services such as pairing classroom teacher for literacy blocks with English Language specialist, speech and language therapist, media specialist, gifted and talented/highly capable teacher, or special education teacher.
- Partner first-year teacher with veteran teacher who can also mentor and support the new teacher as they co-plan, co-teach, co-assess, and reflect together.
- Provide two first-year co-teachers with a coach to mentor and support their co-teaching partnership by co-planning, co-teaching, co-assessing, and reflecting with them.
- Partner with literacy interventionists/specialists to push-in to provide additional ELA support.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students learning English as an additional language benefit from the additional linguistic, academic, and socio-emotional support.
- Students learning English as an additional language benefit from have the same arrangement throughout the day versus segmented hours throughout the day.
- Special education students who are in a push-in or inclusion model benefit from access to core literacy instruction.
- Students in low-performing demographics subgroups benefit from additional differentiation and support in literacy instruction.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Provide training on co-teaching model.
• Provide adequate planning time for co-teacher to plan together (co-teaching requires more planning than solo teaching).
• Establish collaborating norms and strategies.
• Require agreement and openness to participate.
• Establish systematic and periodic feedback and evaluation of the model.
• Develop strong co-teaching working relationships.
• Provide coaching, administrative support, and needed resources to co-teaching partners.
• Develop effective strategies to assess the effectiveness of the co-teaching partnership.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• University of Minnesota—What is Co-Teaching?
• 5 Models of Co-Teaching
• Co-Teach America

Supporting Research
Co-teaching originally started as a practice designed to provide students with disabilities access to grade-level core instruction by partnering a special education teacher with a general education teacher (Friend, 2016). Co-teaching can also be successful when partnering an English Language Specialist with general education teachers (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016). Co-teaching partnerships that include a teacher who specializes in and focuses on meeting the needs of students who struggle with ELA Standards can benefit student educational outcomes.

Villa, Thousand, and Nevin (2013) define co-teaching as “two or more people sharing responsibility for teaching all of the students assigned to a classroom.” While Friend (2014) provides a slightly different definition, defining the arrangement as being dependent on the characteristics of the students’ individual needs and the services provided. According to Friend, a co-teaching arrangement would include a general education teacher and an educator with specialization for students who struggle. Examples might include a special education teacher, an English language teacher, a speech and language therapist, a media specialist, or a teacher of gifted and talented/highly capable students.

The benefits of co-teaching reach further than student academic growth. As a result of co-teaching, educators who participate in this partnership tend to reflect more on individual instructional strengths and areas for improvement with their co-teaching partner, thus improving their educational practices (Chanmugam & Gerlach, 2013; Simmons & Magiera,
In addition, co-teaching improves instructional practices through its in-depth, all-inclusive, collaborative approach that improves teacher effectiveness (Chanmugam & Gerlach, 2013; Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016). Educator relationships are enhanced by bringing equal value to the individuality that each educator brings to the classroom (Friend, 2016).

Co-teaching partners can take six different approaches in the classroom (Friend, 2016; Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016):

1. **Station Teaching**: Each teacher works at a station while students rotate through teacher guided and independent areas. Each teacher will work with every student as students rotate through the stations.
2. **Parallel Teaching**: Working in two groups, teachers present instruction in different ways using different strategies.
3. **Alternative Teaching**: One teacher teaches whole group while the other teacher pulls small groups for re-teaching, pre-teaching, enrichment, etc.
4. **Teaming**: Teachers co-instruct the lesson together.
5. **One Teach, One Assist**: One teacher leads whole group instruction while the other moves around the room re-directing student behavior, re-explaining directions/concepts, and answering questions individually.
6. **One Teach, One Observe**: While one teacher leads whole group instruction, the other teacher collects observational and/or formative assessment data.

For students, the benefits of co-teaching re-emphasize students’ right to specially designed instruction, recognizing multiple instructional strategies are needed for all students to be successful. For students learning English as an additional language, co-teaching allows students to stay in the class with their native-speaking peers instead of being pulled out and segregated for language instruction (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016). Co-taught classrooms “aim to create a classroom culture of acceptance, in which learning variations and strategies to address those variations are the norm” (Friend, 2016, p. 21). Because of its positive results in achievement gains, most notably in language arts and reading, co-teaching is recommended at both the elementary and the secondary level (Simmons & Magiera, 2007).

Researchers have determined that co-teaching is a promising pedagogical strategy applicable to all students, with and without academic difficulties (Simmons & Magiera, 2007). Co-teaching, as defined above, is a viable model that will intensify instructional practices, provide access to core literacy instruction, and increase student achievement in ELA for all students. While this practice has been explored in the context of providing services for students identified for special education for over 30 years, a recent resurgence of interest has been the result of
current reform demands. Research supports that co-teaching improves instructional practices with its in-depth, all-inclusive, collaborative approach to improve teacher effectiveness (Chanmugam & Gerlach, 2013), and specially designed instruction can be embedded in every co-teaching approach (Friend, 2016).

Ongoing, long-term professional learning is necessary to enhance the effectiveness of coaching. “Simply placing two educators together in a classroom does not result in effective co-teaching” (Beninghof & Leensvaart, 2016, p. 71). Establishing a framework for co-planning can help teachers effectively come together as they co-plan, co-teach, and co-assess. For example, one co-planning framework includes three phases for instructional planning (Honigsfeld & Dove, 2016):

Phase 1: Pre-Planning is completed separately. Each educator reviews and plans for the learning targets and standards, possible content and language objectives, materials, resources, and learning tasks.

Phase 2: Collaborative Planning is done completely together. Co-teachers come together with their pre-planning ideas in an agreed-upon meeting (e.g., face-to-face, by phone, Skype, etc.). During this meeting, educators confirm targets, standards, objectives, etc., and they discuss how they will co-teach the lesson. They also identify challenging concepts and skills students will face.

Phase 3: Post-Planning is completed separately. After establishing roles and responsibilities, each teacher follows through on assigned tasks for the lesson (e.g., scaffolding activities, prepping stations, finding materials, etc.).

The roles of the teachers are shared and lessons are planned based upon the identified needs of the students. Co-teachers take on various roles, from partner teaching the same lesson to teaching the same lesson using different strategies.
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Consultant Teachers/Coaches: English Language (EL) Coaches

English language (EL) coaches are promising. EL coaches work with classroom teachers to maximize student learning and achievement for students learning English as an additional language. EL coaches can provide professional learning and coaching in literacy acceleration to meet ELA Standards and across content areas to support the language learning needs of students. EL coaches can work with educators to effectively impact student outcomes for LAP students who struggle with ELA Standards.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Establish an EL coaching model for your school/district. Identify how educators can identify areas for EL growth and receive individual/team coaching. Ask educators what support is needed and how they would like to learn, develop, and implement new skills and strategies. Establish criteria for reciprocal feedback between coaches and educators by designing a template with talking points for coaches and educators to ensure coaching is targeted and effective.

- Provide EL coaching for language proficiency standards across content areas, throughout the day (e.g., coach models use of strategy during literacy block, in science, in math).

- Use gradual release of responsibility model with EL strategies as coach models, co-teaches, and independently coaches educators.

- Coach co-plans with teachers as they implement literacy strategies and language objectives with content standards to target students language development needs.

- Ensure students have access to grade-level content. EL coaches can work with grade-level and content-based teachers to ensure K–12 students are supported across content areas.

- Establish a system for developing anchor charts across the building to assist students with sentence frames. Provide ongoing professional learning opportunities for educators to incorporate anchor charts in the classroom by modeling, co-teaching, observing, and providing feedback to educators.

- Provide opportunities for EL coaches to work with all educators (classroom teachers, paraeducators, and volunteers) to support students English language needs of students. Target strategies for whole group instruction, small group, and one-on-one intensive interventions.

Population Considerations—Educator Factors to Consider When Planning

- K–4 EL coaches can identify and assess language literacy needs for English Language Learners.
• K–12 EL coaches can pinpoint gaps in students’ language learning for students who are learning the English language.

• K–12 EL coaches can support developmentally appropriate instructional activities and model interventions for students learning the English language.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning
• Provide administrative support and guidance regarding the short and long-term planning of EL coaches.

• Ensure the work of the EL coach is aligned to the broader vision of the school and the multi-tiered supports in the building.

• Provide the foundation upon which the EL coach can improve, enhance, and develop teachers’ efficacy in both literacy and content-based instruction.

• Provide culturally familiar texts.

• Provide feedback to teachers through video reflection as they implement new strategies.

• Provide time to review, reflect and adjust techniques; and on agreement, share with staff as an example of successful implementation.

• Use videos as a tool for successful coaching.

• Avoid assigning the EL coach test administration tasks, as this reduces coaching time and opportunities to impact student growth.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• Characteristics of Effective Literacy Coaching

• Self-study Guide for Implementing Early Literacy Interventions

• Instructional Design Framework: Literacy Design Collaborative

• Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association, site for National Council of Professional Learning.

• Washington Education Association

Supporting Research: EL Coaches
Like other instructional coaches, EL coaches collaborate with classroom teachers to maximize student learning and achievement for students learning English as an additional language (EL). Over the past decade, EL students’ enrollment in Washington has increased. A unique pedagogy is necessary for teachers teaching EL students learning to read and write (Escamilla, 2007).
Specific details surrounding the general professional duties of coaching are outlined above in the section on *Instructional Coaches*. Moreover, EL coaches are also faced with a variety of unique demands that may not typically be encountered by content specific coaches. Examples of such demands include (but are not limited to):

- Designing instructional approaches within a framework of learning English as an additional language.
- Assessing students' language needs according to the English language proficiency standards.
- Focusing on students’ oral language development while simultaneously incorporating literacy skills.
- Identifying techniques for supporting students from varying language proficiency levels.
- Accommodating the needs of students from multiple linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
- Familiarizing themselves and staff with the student’s first language.
- Working with teachers from multiple content areas and grade levels.
- Finding resources for primary language support.
- Acting as “cultural brokers” between home and school interactions.

Stemming from these demands, EL coaches are best supported when provided with explicit professional learning opportunities that cater to their professional contexts (Burkins & Ritchie, 2007). Specific areas for EL coaching professional learning opportunities include:

- Explicit English Language (EL) instruction techniques.
- Effective language scaffolding methods.
- Language demands across content areas.
- Sheltering instruction.
- Family engagement strategies.
- Effective collaboration strategies to communicate with colleagues.
- Differentiated instruction techniques.
- How to create meaningful language opportunities.
- How to integrate primary language into instruction.
- How to build on EL students' funds of knowledge.
• How to analyze text for cultural teaching.

Effective EL coaching also involves working closely with school literacy coaches while being mindful of supporting ELs through linguistically and culturally appropriate ways. Of particular importance for EL coaches is helping classroom teachers draw on their students' cultural background and funds of knowledge and promoting the use of students’ primary language in learning activities (Escamilla, 2007). Many EL students understand more than they are able to express in English both orally and in writing; thus, “[c]oaches need to understand that reading comprehension for second language learners may mean that students understand more in English reading than they are able to discuss” (Escamilla, 2007). This understanding will help coaches work with teachers who fear that allowing students to speak in a language other than English will slow down the students English language learning. In fact, learning is enhanced when EL students are allowed to use both their first language and English in learning activities (Escamilla, 2007). EL coaches are instrumental in mentoring teachers who work with EL students.
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Consultant Teachers/Coaches: Instructional Coaches

Instructional coaches are evidence-based. Instructional coaches focus on personalized and team-centered professional learning that is often embedded during the school day. To increase student achievement, coaches support staff, identify leadership needs, and facilitate decision-making around instruction (e.g., instructional materials choices, data analysis/formative assessment, technology integration, instructional/pedagogical strategies). The goal is to increase educator instructional expertise and to effectively impact literacy outcomes for LAP students struggling to meet ELA Standards.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Provide data coaching by training staff, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), grade level teams, and/or individuals on how to use universal screeners, diagnostic assessments, formative assessment processes, and progress monitoring tools. Model, co-assess, and provide feedback as teachers assess students and use data for planning instruction.

- Facilitate new teacher and mentor meetings to establish trusting relationships, establish targeted goals, and provide on-going guidance and support.

- Support educators (classroom teachers, paraeducators, volunteers, etc.) through a push-in model. Coaches will observe, co-plan, co-teach, etc., to develop educator literacy skills and strategies.

- Establish a coaching model for your school/district. Identify how educators can safely identify areas for growth and receive individual/team coaching. Ask educators what instructional support is needed and determine which adult learning style will be effective to implement new instructional skills and strategies. Establish criteria for reciprocal feedback between coaches and educators by designing a template with talking points for coaches and educators to ensure coaching is targeted and effective.

- Establish coaching cycles, based on grade-level need, where an instructional coach models differentiation strategies in the classroom, then coaches educators to implement strategies through ongoing non-evaluative feedback as educators master strategies.

- Support PLCs in the process of identifying target professional learning needs for students who struggle with ELA Standards. Coaches lead data analysis processes, lead student progress monitoring, establish protocols for lesson design aligned to standards/claims, and incorporate formative assessment processes to identify individual needs of learners.
Population Considerations—Educator Factors to Consider When Planning

- K–12 coaches must be proficient in content standards.
- K–12 coaches must be proficient in research-based teaching strategies.
- K–12 coaches must be proficient in diagnostic assessments, progress monitoring and data analysis.
- K–12 coaches must be able to plan and model lessons with teachers.
- K–12 coaches must be able to plan and model differentiation with students.
- K–12 coaches must understand and apply appropriate principles of adult learning theory.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Build trust with staff through frequent communication and collaboration.
- Connect coaching to current practices and on-going content initiatives.
- Use gradual release of responsibility model with effective instructional strategies as coach models, co-teaches, and independently coaches teachers.
- Teach research-based strategies for identified needs of learners.
- Focus on student progress through data oriented teaching and learning.
- Provide feedback to teachers through lesson observation and video reflection as they teachers implement new strategies.
- Allow for review, reflection and adjusting techniques; and on agreement, share with staff as an example of successful implementation.
- Use videos and modeling as a tool for successful coaching.
- Establish evaluation criteria for evaluation of the coaching model.
- Monitor effectiveness of coaching program with assistance from school/district administration.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association, site for National Council of Professional Learning
- Self-study Guide for Implementing Early Literacy Interventions
- Achieve the Core: Understanding the ELA/Literacy Shifts
- Smarter Balanced Digital Library: Formative Assessment Process Modules
• Characteristics of Effective Literacy Coaching
• Instructional Design Framework: Literacy Design Collaborative

Supporting Research: Instructional Coaches

Instructional coaches may specifically target meeting the needs of students identified for LAP services by providing professional learning in instructional strategies and decision making. Coaching should be student and data centered with a direct link to improved literacy outcomes (Sweeney, 2010).

Coaching may be in a 1:1 setting with small groups or in larger cross-content groups. Coaching may include modeling best practice with students and classes, conducting learning walks, engaging in book studies, or other focused actions that reflect the data-driven needs for the learners in the building (Shanklin, 2006).

To ensure credibility with novice as well veteran teachers, instructional coaches should have demonstrated successful teaching histories (Blachowicz et al., 2005). Along with the requisite knowledge of standards, differentiated instructional practices, and assessments, an instructional coach must also have a deep understanding of the components of effective coaching (L'Allier et al., 2010; Shanklin, 2006). The knowledge, skills, and dispositions of coaching specifically for instructional coaches are strongly recommended (Biancarosa, 2010).

For strongest impact, coaches should be supported by the system. Building principals should intentionally structure the learning culture that support instructional coaching. Principals should closely monitor the roles of the instructional coaches to ensure the activities support teachers in improving their practice. “Studies suggest that coaching may need to be embedded in broader efforts to build professional knowledge if it is to be most useful” (Darling-Hammond, et al. 2009, p. 12).

Instructional coaches designated to support K–4 literacy outcomes should be proficient with the ELA Standards, instructional practices, programs, and assessments to the degree to which they can plan and model lessons with teachers (Biancarosa, 2010). Strong knowledge of foundational reading skills, a continuum of literacy learning, differentiation methods, and instructional strategies for acceleration are critical to support teachers working with students who struggle with to meet ELA outcomes.
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Consultant Teachers/Coaches: Literacy Coaches
Literacy coaches are evidence-based. These coaches specialize in literacy instruction and foundational literacy skills. Literacy coaches have depth of knowledge and training in literacy and are adept at identifying students at risk of not meeting literacy benchmarks. In order to support acceleration of student achievement in literacy, literacy coaches work 1:1 with a classroom teacher or with a team of teachers to target specific professional learning to meet the needs of LAP students.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning
- Develop literacy coaching cycles, with grade-level teams of teachers, for coaches to model and plan for implementation of research-based strategies for literacy acceleration (e.g., guided reading, shared reading, oral language development, etc.). Set collaborative goals for desired outcomes of the coaching cycles and review frequently to guide coaching decisions and measure effectiveness.
- Identify groups of students not proficient in ELA Standards; provide ongoing coaching for teachers of students needing specialized instruction in foundational literacy skills instruction.
- Regularly meet with staff, PLCs, grade-level teams, and/or individually to model use of literacy assessment tools: universal screeners, diagnostic assessments, formative assessment processes, and progress monitoring tools. Model, co-assess, and provide feedback as teachers assess students and use data to differentiate instruction.
- Establish a literacy-coaching model for your school/district. Identify how educators can safely identify literacy areas for growth and receive individual/team coaching. Ask educators what foundational literacy skills they need to develop as educators and implement a “push-in” coaching plan to model, co-teach, and observe new skills and strategies. Establish criteria for reciprocal feedback between coaches and educators by designing a template with talking points for coaches and educators to ensure literacy coaching is targeted and effective.
- Provide opportunities during the school day that allow for modeling and co-teaching with time for reflection and feedback.

Population Considerations—Educator Factors to Consider When Planning
- K–4 literacy coaches must be proficient in pedagogy and instruction to support early literacy skills development for students who struggle with ELA Standards.
- K–12 literacy coaches must be proficient in pedagogy and instruction for students who struggle with ELA Standards.
• K–12 literacy coaches must be proficient in using research-based teaching strategies for students who struggle with ELA Standards.

• K–12 literacy coaches must be proficient in using evidence and research-based diagnostic assessments, progress monitoring, data analysis, and gap analysis tools for students who struggle with ELA Standards.

• K–12 literacy coaches must be able to plan and model lessons with teachers for students who struggle with ELA Standards.

• K–12 literacy coaches must be able to plan and model interventions with students who struggle with ELA Standards.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

• Provide administrative support, guidance, and goals regarding the short and long-term planning of literacy coaches.

• Use gradual release of responsibility model with effective literacy instructional strategies as coach models, co-teaches, and independently coaches teachers.

• Define and develop a literacy coaching plan for the building.

• Ensure that work is aligned to the broader vision of the school and the multi-tiered supports in the building.

• Provide administrative support to set the foundation upon which the literacy coach can improve, enhance, and develop teachers’ efficacy in reading instruction.

• Connect coaching to current practices and on-going literacy initiatives.

• Build trust with staff by providing resources, instructional support, and demonstration of lessons.

• Provide frequent communication and collaboration opportunities for staff.

• Teach research-based strategies that are reproducible by teachers.

• Focus on student progress.

• Provide feedback to teachers through lesson observation and video reflection.

• Provide time to review, reflect and adjust techniques; and on agreement, share with staff as an example of successful implementation.

Resources—Tools for Planning

• Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association, site for National Council of Professional Learning
Supporting Research: Literacy Coaches

Student success in literacy improvement is dependent on teachers’ abilities to use strategies and interventions that meet the differentiated needs of all learners. The National Reading Panel (2000) describes this simply as a complex task that necessitates much professional training. Evidence supports literacy coaching increases student literacy success (Shanklin, 2006). The term literacy coach refers to one who has specialized knowledge/training in literacy instruction, which may encompass specific intervention with reading and/or writing instruction. The focus of work is to support acceleration of student achievement in literacy via working with the classroom teacher and collaborating with teams. The literacy coach should be available to work with all staff across content areas and experience levels. By creating a cohort of teachers from across the building, a learning community develops and teachers learn from each other (Shanklin, 2006).

According to the International Reading Association, “[Literacy] coaching is a powerful intervention with great potential; however, that potential will be unfulfilled if reading coaches do not have sufficient depth of knowledge and range of skills to perform adequately in the coaching role” (International Reading Association, 2004, p. 4). To have a positive impact on student achievement, literacy coaches will have deep training and experience in research and evidence-based literacy instruction, including intervention and assessment strategies. Additionally, literacy coaches will work with educators to impact outcomes for students struggling to meet ELA Standards. Literacy coaches are collaborative members of the larger faculty who work cohesively among staff to provide rich literacy support for students.

Like other coaches (e.g., EL and instructional) literacy coaches collaborate with educators to maximize student literacy learning and achievement. Data analysis of students’ learning outcomes guides coaching. Data comes in the form of formative, classroom-based, interim, and summative assessments (Shanklin, 2006). Specific details surrounding the general professional duties of coaching are outlined in the section on Instructional Coaches. Some of the demands of literacy coaches who specialize in meeting the needs of students who struggle with ELA Standards are similar to content-specific coaches. Literacy coaches must:
• Have specialized knowledge that goes beyond teaching reading; is best to have certification or advanced training in pedagogy for literacy.

• Build collaborative and trusting relationships that honor confidentiality and effective communication.

• Spend a majority of their time with educators observing, videotaping, modeling, conferencing, and co-teaching.

• Encourage and guide teachers to reflect on their instructional practices and evidence-based research (Shanklin, 2006).

• Support a core set of literacy activities that deepens understanding of literacy and foundational reading skills and teachers’ instructional practice.

• Set goals and direction of the literacy program and support the structural changes necessary for buildings/districts to achieve increased literacy outcomes (Shanklin, 2006; L'Allier, 2010).

Successful literacy coaches will ensure the school has a clear, site-based literacy plan that is linked to district growth goals. Literacy coaches ensure on-going, job-embedded professional learning is available to all educators who work with students who struggle with ELA Standards. Literacy coaches lead study groups, co-teaching, adult learning time, and guidance on Response to Intervention and/or multi-tiered system of supports to improve literacy instruction and learning. Literacy coaches are supportive not evaluative; they help guide teachers in reflection activities and identify areas for educator growth (Shanklin, 2006).
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Professional Learning Communities

Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are promising. PLCs capitalize on the positive effects of collaborative learning. It can be defined as a group of teachers, administrators, coaches, or school staff (or a combination of people in these roles) that meets on a regular, planned basis with the goal of collaboratively improving practices in the classroom and school, in order to support literacy outcomes for students who struggle with ELA Standards. PLCs funded with LAP funds must have a focus of supporting LAP students, which can include determining instructional supports, differentiated instructional practices, implementing an early warning system, and development of formative assessment processes to support student growth.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Create a PLC by grade level and/or content area (e.g., 2nd-grade teachers or 11th-grade ELA staff) with a focus on students who are not meeting literacy benchmarks. Be sure to include a specialist for special education and English Learners. Educators will identify the foundational literacy skills students need to improve to effectively support student literacy outcomes. PLCs will develop a learning plan for educators to acquire these skills to support students who struggle to ELA Standards.

- Use PLC time to focus on best practices and strategy implementation (e.g., foundational literacy skills, text complexity, working with tutors, etc.). Develop a learning plan and schedule walk-throughs for PLC members to observe colleagues implementing best practices to support students struggling to meet literacy benchmarks. Use PLC time to share self-reflections, discuss observations, and provide feedback on implementation practices.

- Design PLC focus around ELA target standard/claims, formative assessment processes, and student progress monitor, focusing on students not meeting ELA Standards.

- Develop a cross-disciplinary PLC using the common Literacy standards for ELA and History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects to support students who struggle with literacy across content areas.

- Use PLC time to perform action research on strategies and/or implementation practices to support students who struggle with ELA Standards.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Identify demographic and sub group populations who need additional support to meet ELA Standards.

- Recruit members for PLCs that reflect the specific needs of the population(s) identified.

- Incorporate culturally responsive instructional strategies to support learners who struggle with ELA Standards.
Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Provide professional learning early in the work day when adults are energetic.
- Create a collaborative culture: classroom, building, district, and region.
- Provide initial and ongoing training for all PLC participants.
- Establish a regular schedule for collaboration time with clear objectives to support students who struggle with literacy skills.
- Develop clear and shared: mission, vision, values, goals, and accountability.
- Design a vision focused on effectively impacting student literacy learning for all students/subgroups. Seek to turn actions and visions into effective practices.
- Be action oriented with a strong focus on bridging the learning-doing gap.
- Analyze data when goals for student outcomes are not met and seek to understand why.
- Analyze data when goals for student outcomes are met and seek to understand why.
- Use a continuous improvement model and evaluate it for effectiveness.
- Align with pre-existing structures such as Teacher/Principal Evaluation Program (TPEP), school improvement plans, and National Boards certification to effectively support students who struggle with ELA Standards.
- Document and celebrate the work of the PLC (for example, agendas, and minutes).

Resources—Tools for Planning

- All Things PLC
- Action Research in Education
- Self-study Guide for Implementing Early Literacy Interventions
- Smarter Balanced Digital Library: Formative Assessment Process Modules
- Achieve the Core: Understanding the ELA/Literacy Shifts
- Changing the Culture of Schools
- Repository of Articles: Networked Improvement Community
- Instructional Design Framework: Literacy Design Collaborative

Supporting Research

A large body of rigorous research suggests that the most effective professional learning should involve relationship building among teachers. While this research does not involve comparison-
group studies, evidence in support of PLCs is credible, large-scale, longitudinal, and empirical (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995; Hord, 1997; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). In fact, in Learning Forward’s (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009) recent review and analysis of the most credible research on effective professional learning, “collaboration” is one of four identified characteristics of the kind of professional learning that positively impacts student achievement. As the authors of the report write, “[a] number of large-scale studies have identified specific ways in which professional community-building can deepen teachers’ knowledge, build their skills, and improve instruction” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). The development and utilization of PLCs as a strategy for professional learning capitalizes on the positive effects of collaborative learning.

Shirley Hord (1997) provides a simple definition: “[p]rofessionals coming together in a group—a community—to learn.” As Richard DuFour (2008) suggests, however, effective PLCs must be developed and implemented based on clearly articulated shared goals for student achievement and school improvement. According to DuFour (2008), an effective PLC is more than just a given group of educators. As Killion and Crow (2011) note, “[l]earning communities apply a cycle of continuous improvement to engage in inquiry, action research, data analysis, planning, implementation, reflection, and evaluation.”

Jones et al., (2013) emphasizes the role of the school principal in facilitating PLCs, being an instructional leader, and facilitating a positive school learning culture. Blankstein (2010) suggests six essential principles for schools with PLCs:

- Common mission, vision, values and goals.
- Ensure achievement for all students.
- Collaborative teaming focused on teaching and learning.
- Using data to guide decision making and continuous improvement.
- Gaining active engagement from family and community.
- Building sustainable leadership capacity.

A PLC must work collaboratively as part of a coherent, comprehensive improvement plan, developed in response to an evaluation of student learning data, focused on a shared vision, and in the service of a clear set of goals for student achievement. When professionals form a collaborative learning community with an explicit shared focus on student achievement and school improvement goals, they purposefully engage in professional learning that has tremendous potential.
References


Hord, S. (1997). *Professional learning communities: What they are and why are they important?* Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Library.


Targeted Professional Learning

Targeted professional learning is evidence-based. When professional learning for educators is targeted, content-specific, and applicable to literacy skills and strategies that students need, then student literacy outcomes are effective. Targeted professional learning opportunities should be aligned to learning standards, instructional strategies, or data-informed decision making, and must be aligned to the needs of students served by LAP. Targeted professional learning is explicitly tied to student learning goals, student achievement, and school improvement.

The focus of targeted professional learning, when funded by LAP, should include instructional strategies, pedagogy, and literacy content that will support struggling students and their academic success. It is important to note that there are a lot of professional learning opportunities that can benefit all students, not just students who struggle. If the intent is to support LAP students, other forms of targeted professional learning that may benefit all students can be used.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Identify foundation literacy skills educators need to develop/improve. Seek professional learning opportunities through the local ESD or with a literacy coach well versed in these skills to target professional learning of staff.

- Provide a summer institute on foundational literacy skills and follow-up with facilitated on-going classroom observations of literacy strategies being implemented. Ensure participants are provided time to connect throughout the following school year. Have members participate in observational walk-throughs in teams of three to five to observe and provide feedback to improve teacher practices.

- Create a flipped professional learning summer camp. During afternoon workshops, educators (e.g., classroom teachers, paraeducators, volunteers, etc.) participate in workshops to implement foundational skills strategies for students who struggle with literacy standards. During morning summer program sessions, educators are observed and coached on implementation as they work with students one-on-one or in small groups. Schedule a new skill/strategy each week.

- Establish lesson study cycles that include bi-weekly or monthly sessions where teachers collaboratively plan lessons for accelerating reading with an identified group(s) of readers. Sessions could include professional learning on how to use data, how to differentiate and/or plan additional lessons for identified students, how to use specific literacy strategies, and how to set goals for learners and monitor their progress.
• Provide time for grade-level/content-based teams to work with a coach on lesson planning and observe each other teaching the lesson. Follow up with team feedback on observations and identify areas for continued improvement.

• Identify staff literacy development needs and target learning opportunities for all educators (e.g., classroom teachers, paraeducators, volunteers, etc.) working with students. For example, foundational literacy skills, K–2 readiness, or balanced literacy.

• Deliver targeted professional learning for grade-level or content-based teams, and then have teams cross-collaborate to identify common goals and strategies.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning
• K–4 students benefit from explicit instruction in foundational literacy skills.

• K–12 students who need additional support to meet ELA Standards.

• K–12 students learning English as an additional language in literacy classrooms and across content areas.

• Student subgroups who struggle with ELA Standards.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning
• Provide theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and classroom support as part of ongoing professional learning opportunities.

• Focus on specific data, literacy skills, or instructional strategies rather than a general approach.

• Design learning aligned with school improvement goals, student achievement data, and professional learning for the educator.

• Focus on modeling strategies for teachers and opportunities for hands-on professional learning that builds literacy skill development knowledge.

• Ensure collaboration within PLCs is focused, follows protocols, and monitored.

• Plan for professional learning that is ongoing and supports educators.

• Align professional learning plans to standards for professional learning to develop systemic, sustained, high-quality professional learning.

Resources Resources—Tools for Planning
• Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association, site for National Council of Professional Learning

• Smarter Balanced Digital Library: Formative Assessment Process Modules

• Achieve the Core: Understanding the ELA/Literacy Shifts
• Characteristics of Effective Literacy Coaching

• Instructional Design Framework: Literacy Design Collaborative

Supporting Research

Research is clear that highly effective teachers make a difference in student success and student achievement (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009). Therefore, it is worthwhile for schools and districts to invest in high-quality professional learning that strengthens educators’ knowledge of ELA content and pedagogy, and effectively impacts student literacy outcomes.

While professional learning opportunities are vital for teacher engagement and motivation for improvement, not all professional learning opportunities effectively impact student literacy outcomes equally. Research identifies targeted professional learning as producing the best results on student outcomes. According to the Washington State Institute on Public Policy report (Pennucci, et al, 2015) and Linda Darling-Hammond’s studies (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Yoon et al., 2007; Garet et al, 2001), professional learning is most effective when it is targeted, which involves expertise on behalf of educators. Targeted professional learning includes a focus on standards and goals specific to learners, data that informs instruction, and instructional strategies specific to the content.

The McREL Report (Snow-Renner & Lauer, 2005) states that providing professional learning that is long lasting, content-focused, and based on student and teacher performance data takes more time and effort to implement in comparison to less effective types of professional learning opportunities. In addition, Garet, et al. state (2001), “[a] professional development activity is more likely to be effective in improving teachers' knowledge and skills if it forms a coherent part of a wider set of opportunities for teacher learning and development” (p. 927). Thus, successful professional learning takes time and is part of a coherent and comprehensive plan to improve student and educator performance (Darling-Hammond, 2009).

Research also contends that to improve student achievement through professional learning, the work should be contextualized. Darling-Hammond explains that educator professional learning improves student achievement when it is focused on “the concrete, everyday challenges involved in teaching and learning specific to academic subject matter, rather than focusing on abstract educational principles or teaching methods taken out of context” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 10). In addition, professional learning needs to be sustained; that is provided as an ongoing, systemic process informed by evaluation of students, and the needs of teachers and schools. Research by Joyce and Showers (2002) supports the importance of ongoing, adult learning through a continuum in which participants learn from a presentation of theory, observe demonstrations, apply and receive feedback around a practice, and are ultimately provided with coaching or other classroom supports to self-evaluate according to learner-centered goals (Joyce, 2002). This model of transfer for adult learning and professional
learning identifies the importance of educators needing ongoing, professional learning that is relevant, job-embedded, and supported over time.

Drawn from research and evidence-based practices, Learning Forward’s Standards for Professional Learning (Learning Forward, 2011) aim to support a systemic and sustained professional learning system. Seven standards describe the characteristics of effective professional learning which may be used as a consumer guide for educators and school systems as they plan and prepare for high-quality, targeted professional learning. The Standards for Professional Learning (Learning Forward, 2011) encompass goals related to learning communities, leadership, data, resources, learning design, implementation, and outcomes. Such standards support schools and districts in their efforts of planning, facilitating, and evaluating the effectiveness of professional learning.

Below is a list of professional learning formats that support ongoing, targeted, data-driven, job-embedded professional learning for literacy improvement for educators targeting students who struggle with ELA Standards.

- **PLCs**: a group of educators that regularly meet to analyze data, collaborate on student achievement, and set goals for instruction.
- **Lesson study**: a professional learning practice that involves educators collaboratively planning lessons based on data and student needs, and observing evidence of student learning in action.
- **Facilitated observations**: may also be referred to as learning walks or instructional rounds whereby a group of educators participate in classroom observations based on a problem of practice or focus related to the instructional core (the students, the teacher, the task).
- **Ongoing workshops or coursework**: workshops/courses based on an identified content need; coursework is ongoing and over time.
- **Online networks**: a professional group focused on specific content that strengthens professional expertise.
- **Targeted literacy coaching**: literacy coaching that involves modeling, working with assessments, observation and feedback, co-planning, and conferencing makes a difference in reading and writing achievement (Elish-Piper and L’Allier, 2011).
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Universal Design for Learning

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a promising practice. UDL provides a framework for teaching ELA because it provides educators with tools and resources to differentiate lessons to maximize learning for all students. Universal means that learning opportunities meet the needs of every student. The what, why, and how of learning are enhanced by instruction that is designed to enhance student engagement. The UDL framework focuses on the goal of learning and identifies barriers students may face in meeting these goals. LAP can fund UDL implementation cost and professional learning to support LAP students struggling to meet ELA Standards.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Use the UDL framework to strengthen core literacy practices and supplemental literacy support to individualize learning for students who struggle in literacy.
- Provide opportunities for educators to use the UDL frameworks to develop individualized instruction with students who struggle with ELA Standards.
- Provide professional learning opportunities to help guide educators implementing UDL.
- Seek consultant/coaching services to plan and implement UDL informed environments to be supportive of all learners within inclusive settings.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students learning English as an additional language and students with disabilities benefit from individualized instruction and UDL practices.
- Students who struggle with literacy benefit from having options in a UDL framework.
- Students who are challenged to stay engaged in the classroom benefit from having a multitude of ways by which they can interact with the literacy content in the classroom.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Represent information and content in different ways.
- Differentiate the action and expression that a student can convey what they know.
- Stimulate engagement by connecting with student interest.
- Respect the diversity in the classroom from the beginning by varying the content presented.
- Use evidence-based strategies that positively impact classroom goals, methods, materials, and assessments for the students.
- Use varied approaches to curriculum development, instruction, and assessment across the classrooms.
• Provide student choice.

Resources: Tools for Planning

• About Universal Design for Learning [Video: UDL at a Glance]

• UDL Series—Free online professional learning

• Tools, resources, and examples of how to establish universally accessible curriculum is available through the National Center on Universal Design for Learning

• Capacity building, case stories, and free learning tools are available from CAST (Center for Applied Special Technology)

• OSPI Educational Technology program also contains links and information regarding Universal Design for Learning

Supporting Research

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) provides a framework for instructional design, processes, and assessment to provide each student an opportunity to both learn and to show what he/she has learned (Maryland State Department of Education, 2011). UDL includes tools and strategies to reduce barriers in educational settings in order to enhance the accessibility and equity of access for all students. This helps educators "create curricula that meet the needs of all learners from the start" (CAST, 2011, pp. 3–4).

Based in the neurosciences and researchers understanding of how the brain learns, UDL is based on three principles that focus on the what, why, and how of learning (Dalton & Proctor, 2007). These principles provide learners with multiple means of representation and options to acquire new information, multiple means of action and expression to demonstrate what they have learned, and multiple means of engagement to provide increased motivation by appealing to the learners’ interests with appropriate challenges (Maryland State Department of Education, 2011). The three dimensions of UDL provide educators with a way to rethink and transform classrooms to support learning for all students (Haley-Mize & Reeves, 2013). For example, rethinking representation might include using videos, websites, graphic organizers, or pictures. Students should have a variety of options to show what they know. For literacy activities, this could include orally, kinesthetically, in writing, through pictures, etc. (Haley-Mize & Reeves, 2013). Goal setting, self-assessment, and progress monitoring and reflection provide students with self-regulation opportunities and support student motivation (Haley-Mize & Reeves, 2013).
Classrooms are made up of a diverse set of individuals with a variety of skills, abilities, knowledge, and interests. To enhance learning and engagement, it is critical for educators to produce content, instruction, and assessments in a way that addresses the uniqueness of every student. UDL is an approach to curriculum development that promotes multiple means of representation, expression, and engagement in the classroom (Rose & Meyer, 2000). UDL can be applied to emergent and developing literacy activities (Haley-Mize & Reeves, 2013). Researchers discussing UDL like Harac (2004) have shared that "...with the right materials, technology, and training, teachers can make all lessons flexible enough to benefit every student-including those considered disabled" (p.1). Katz (2015) found that in classrooms using the UDL framework, students increased engagement, peer interactions, student autonomy, and inclusivity for the classrooms. UDL research continues to garner evidence and support as a beneficial framework for planning by educators of all grades to enhance educational gains for all students (Baldiris Navarro et al, 2016; Katz, 2013 & 2015: Spooner et al., 2007; Strobel et al., 2007).
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TRANSITION AND READINESS PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Transition & Readiness

Student-Centered

Educator-Focused

Family & Community
Credit Retrieval and Successful Mastery of High School Standards
Credit retrieval is a promising practice. Students may be at risk of not graduating because of not earning credit in courses due to unsatisfactory grades and/or insufficient attendance. Other students graduate, but then need to immediately enroll in remedial community college courses before starting regular freshman level work. Credit retrieval, or credit recovery, allows students to retake ELA courses, stay in school and graduate on time. Credit retrieval programs may be offered in a variety of formats and times such as online, face-to-face, and through a blended-learning approach. Credit retrieval programs allow students to retake coursework for which credit was not earned.

LAP funding can be allocated for these programs targeting 11th and 12th-grade students at risk of not graduating or meeting state standards on the high school assessments. It is important that these specialized ELA programs provide innovative structures that are rigorous (targeting ELA speaking, listening, reading, and/or writing), develop a growth mindset, and focus on college and career readiness.

Program Possibilities: Ideas to Consider When Planning
- Use LAP funds to support during, after, and/or summer school programs for ELA credit retrieval. Funds can be used to cover teacher salaries, teacher prep time, paraeducator support, reading and other instructional materials, and applicable professional learning opportunities.
- Offer a 4th-year transition course to support 11th-grade ELA students who have not yet met standard on the assessments, but do intend to enroll in post-secondary training after college. These students need extra ELA support in high school before starting college level coursework. They would benefit from a 4th year of coursework to shore up their ELA skills before graduation. For successful post-high school transitions, courses may include Bridge to College or AVID.
- Provide ELA online course work and/or blended learning opportunities, which may be more appealing or accessible for particular students.
- Create an alternative to whole class instruction and activities. Assess and think about what barriers caused students not to receive ELA credit. Design and deliver instruction that meets similar learning course objectives while accounting for previous learning barriers.
- Develop an ELA project-based learning program. Project-based learning has projects central to the curriculum, are focused on a question or problem, require students to investigate, are student-driven, and are authentic. Whereas some students find the
student-centered nature of project-based learning to be motivational, others find it a barrier to learning.

- Create a project-based, computer assisted ELA credit retrieval program for 11th and 12th-grade students. Out-of-School Time (OST) credit retrieval can be available for students before/after school and/or during the summer.

Population Considerations: Student Factors to Consider When Planning
- Services are only for 11th and 12th-grade ELA students.
- Identify barriers for students by analyzing school achievement data, as well as demographic, IEP, and 504 data to determine possible barriers to earning ELA credit.
- Students learning English as an additional language may need ELA support to meet graduation requirements.

Implementation Success Factors: Options to Consider When Planning
- Identify and support high school students early when they are at risk of not graduating.
- Provide rolling enrollment in ELA credit retrieval courses.
- Provide counseling and tutoring services for students in ELA credit retrieval courses.
- For courses which are graduation specific (such as Algebra, Geometry, American History, Biology), use previous course objectives to ensure rigor.
- For courses which are not graduation specific (such as English, third year of math, electives), design objectives with an emphasis on student choice and on building skill deficits.
- Provide dual credit options (i.e., American History and ELA credit using speaking, listening, writing, and reading standards).
- Students who have struggled to earn ELA credit often benefit when given content format choices (such as print, video, audio, etc.).
- Develop pre- and post-testing to ensure students can demonstrate mastery of the ELA skills learned in the previous attempt to pass the course, and allow students to complete coursework not yet mastered.
- Create a systematic structure for online and blended programs.

Resources: Tools for Planning
- OSPI Open Educational Resources
- Bridge to College Transition Course–4th year transition course
- Advancement Via Individual Determination
Supporting Research

Credit retrieval, or credit recovery, is a LAP allowable service under RCW 28A.320.190. Credit retrieval refers to alternative ways for 11th and 12th-grade students to earn high school credit toward graduation after a student has completed a course and not earned credit on the initial attempt. Credit retrieval is a promising practice because it provides a time during and outside school for additional learning opportunities (D’Agustino, 2013). These opportunities may better suit students who struggle with regular attendance, essential literacy skill deficits, are learning English as an additional language, need additional time and support to complete ELA coursework, have specific learning disabilities (such as dyslexia, dysgraphia, and ADD/ADHD—sometimes undiagnosed), or are disconnected from school. Credit retrieval programs are often used to keep students in school and on track for graduation (Watson and Gemin, 2008).

Credit retrieval programs may be designed in a variety of formats.

- One possible credit retrieval format is to implement an online program. As Franco and Patel (2011) note, “Key features of success for high school students in virtual learning programs are the development of self-regulative strategies and the ability to guide their own learning.” Unfortunately, other students “engaged in online programs have not sufficiently developed these attributes, making it more difficult for them to be successful” (p. 18).

- Another possible credit retrieval format is to present material via alternative whole-class instruction. Here the design often differs from the classroom design where the student previously did not earn credit. Some design changes which have been implemented with an attention to increasing student credit retrieval success are providing smaller class sizes, different curriculum (than what was previously taught), and essential skills development. The use of different instructional material that is more appropriate for the target population provides students a second chance to engage with the content and improve their chances for achieving success. By using pre- and post-assessments to measure growth and attainment of the relevant standards, both students and teachers can feel more confident that essential skills are being developed. Struggling students benefit from smaller class sizes as they receive more individualized attention from the teacher and support in areas of skill deficit (Malloy et al, 2010).

- Not surprisingly, some educators have blended online and traditional classroom instruction with some success. It stands to reason that if some credit retrieval students struggle because they lack regulatory controls, then having a highly qualified educator available to develop and implement instruction (as well as offer individual tutoring) would increase student success. As Watson and Gemin (2008) have explained, “The blended approach is important because it provides expanded student support and face-
to-face contact. The online component—whether fully online or blended—provides 21st century skills to a group of students who often have less than average exposure to computers and technology” (p. 15).

- A fourth possible credit retrieval format is to implement a project-based learning approach. True project-based learning has five components including projects that 1) “are central, not peripheral to the curriculum,” 2) “are focused on questions or problems that “drive” students to encounter,” 3) “involve students in a constructive investigation,” 4) “are student-driven to some significant degree,” and “are realistic, not school-like” (Thomas, March 2000). In a study of two British schools (Boaler, 1998), one school described as “traditional” in its “teacher-directed, didactic” instruction and the other school described as “project-based” in its student-directed, “open-ended project” instruction, “Students at the project-based school performed as well as or better than students at the traditional school on items that required rote knowledge of mathematical concepts.” Also of significance “[s]tudents at the project-based school outperformed students at the traditional school on the conceptual questions as well as on a number of applied (conceptual) problems developed” (Thomas, March 2000).

It is important to note that although project-based learning may be successfully used as a credit retrieval model, certain drawbacks should be taken into consideration. Project-based learning proponents often cite the student-directed nature of project-based learning as a motivational factor for students who struggle, although motivation has proven to be more complex than this observation would suggest. In a study examining students who performed poorly in traditional classrooms (Rosenfield and Rosenfield, 1998), the students, who “exhibited high scores on inventory scales for applied, discovery (as measured by the 4-MAT learning style inventory), technical, and/or confluent processing (as measured by 21 the LCI learning style inventory),” did well with project-based learning. Students who “scored high on the fact-oriented scale of the 4-MAT” did poorly with project-based learning (Thomas, March 2000).

In Marx et al. (1997), researchers noted five barriers to implementing effective project-based learning:

1. Time—because projects often take longer than anticipated.
2. Classroom management—because so many students are doing different activities at the same time.
3. Control—because some teachers are not comfortable with students learning outside teachers’ areas of expertise.
4. Technology—because teachers sometimes have difficulty incorporating technology.
5. Assessment—because teachers sometimes have difficulty deciding what constitutes credit-worthy projects (Thomas, March 2000).

Nearly 35 percent of Washington state high school graduates enrolling in post-secondary in the immediate fall after graduation take at least one remedial course (ERDC, 2016). Students assigned to remedial courses are less likely to earn their post-secondary degree or credential (Vandal, 2010). High school transition courses may provide opportunities for high school students to shore up their math and ELA skills prior to graduation and bypass remediation. These courses have their best success when targeted towards students who intend to pursue college and are close to, but have not, quite demonstrated mastery of high school math proficiency on assessments. Professional learning for the participating high school faculty on the specific transition curriculum is another key factor for success (Barnett, 2016).
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Transition Readiness: Pre-Kindergarten to Kindergarten

Transition readiness is a promising practice. School transitions occur at specific times in the academic life of students. These moments represent key physical, emotional, and social changes that affect all students as they move from one school setting to the next. Communities, schools, families, and teachers can support a successful student transition by providing support services for all stakeholders. One of the most critical transition points is often the most overlooked: pre-kindergarten (or preschool) to full-time kindergarten. Kindergarten readiness requires a special lens regarding best practices to ensure our most vulnerable students achieve success.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Provide opportunities for families to visit elementary schools before children begin kindergarten by inviting families to participate in school events, to tour schools, to attend library time, to eat lunch at school, and to play with kindergarten children at recess.

- Develop summer transition programs that focus on incoming kindergarten children who may not have attended a preschool program and focus on allowing them to become familiar with teachers, buildings, classrooms, and routines.

- Establish a program that allows preschool teachers and kindergarten teachers to create a transition plan with a focus on sharing student data, creating curriculum, and supporting strategies for transitioning students.

- Create an outreach program that promotes early kindergarten registration, conducts needs assessments with preschool families, finds and connects families with resources, and provides a safety net of support for the first several months a child attends kindergarten.

- Cultivate a peer connection program that arranges for preschool children and kindergarten children to meet, play, and connect (this can be done within a classroom or outside of class at a community event).

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students and families who are new to the school system.

- Students and families who are learning English as an additional language.

- Students and families who qualify for free and reduced-priced lunch.

- Students and families who participated in head start pre-school programs.

- Students and families who may struggle with emotional and/or social issues that may hinder a successful transition.
Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Establish protocols for collecting data from pre-school programs to support early intervention.
- Promote academic readiness and emerging literacy skills families can practice at home.
- Provide families tools and support to be advocates for their children.
- Use coaches to support literacy practices.
- Provide funds to purchase support materials for age-level readiness practices.
- Provide time and funding for preschool and kindergarten teachers to collaborate.
- Provide time and resources to promote ongoing connections among children, families, preschools centers, and elementary schools.

Identify a coordinator to oversee program, connect with families/early childhood centers, and monitor progress

- Train elementary teachers on understanding the norms, practices, and procedures of preschool education.
- Tailor services to the cultural, linguistic, and learning needs of individuals and their families.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Help for Principals Seeking to Locate Child Care Providers Near Their Schools
- Washington State Early Learning and Development Guidelines Birth Through Third Grade (2012, PDF)
- Department of Early Learning Kindergarten Checklist (PDF)
- “Love, Talk, Play”
- The Early Childhood Community School Linkages Project (2009)
- The Ecological and Dynamic Model of Transition (2000)

Supporting Research

As students transition into the Washington state education system, they are leaving their familiar environments to enter one that is often different and confusing. This demands the understanding and patience of adults as children adapt emotionally, behaviorally and academically (National Center on Parent, Family and Community Engagement, 2013).

The first critical educational transition point students and families experience is kindergarten. Kindergarten readiness is crucial for young students and families. Research suggests that a shift
in thinking may be in order. Rather than focusing on just a child’s readiness for kindergarten, the focus should be on the “child, family and school readiness” (Geiser, Horwitz & Gerstein, 2013, p. 3) with the intention of improving the connections among the three.

This shift in thinking can lead to new practices as we redefine what a successful transition process looks like for students, families, and schools. Building capacity for students, families, and schools, including pre-school and other types of prekindergarten experiences along with the elementary schools, is essential. Involving parents in a meaningful manner at any point when a student may face additional challenges is important. “Parents gain confidence from helping their children adjust to new schools when schools or teachers reach out to inform and engage parents and children in activities to smooth the transition (Van Voorhis et all, 2013, p. 117).

Kindergarten students in particular need additional support and care when transitioning as changing learning environments present new challenges: new academic expectations, different school structures, and new social interactions with peers and adults. By providing transition-based family involvement services, schools can prepare all stakeholders for the inevitable changes to these young students’ learning environment. Services that incorporate the guiding principles below and the program components outlined in this document will minimize loss learning time, increase student and family confidence, and start the new experience off on a positive note. The approach is “menu-driven and designed to be flexibly applied across a wide range of needs and strengths” (Sayre & Pianta, 2000, p. 2).

Key guiding principles should be in place as a framework kindergarten transition success (Sayre & Pianta, 2000, p. 2).

- Foster collaborative relationship building among educators, families, and students.
- Promote continuity between preschool and kindergarten systems.
- Focus on family strengths to develop school support.
- Focus on the individual needs of the student.

Two prominent and successful kindergarten transition programs are the Early Childhood Community School Linkages Project and The Ecological and Dynamic Model of Transition. The first transition program was designed to “support low-income communities with a strong community school platform to make a deliberate effort to improve the quality and continuity of practice across early childhood and community school settings” (Geiser, Horwitz & Gerstein, 2013, p. 2). The second transition program closely follows the guiding principles listed above and serves as a guide for reflection on current practices regarding transitions and as a foundation upon which to change or improve upon those practices.
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Transition Readiness: Grade 8 to High School

Grade 8 transition readiness is a promising practice. ELA transition readiness opportunities refer to programs intended to support successful literacy transitions from 8th grade ELA to high school English. Students identified for support might lack one or more of the following: motivation, self-efficacy, speaking, listening, reading, writing, and/or foundational literacy skills. Transition readiness for 8th-grade students must provide engaging content and effective literacy instruction. For the purpose of LAP, Grade 8 transition programs begin in 8th grade and may continue in the summer and through 9th grade. In some cases, when over one-third of the incoming freshman students experience one or more early warning indicators (excessive absenteeism, failing a course in the first quarter, or receiving a suspension), LAP funds may be used for school-wide transition programs.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Create an 8th-grade student mentor system where each student is assigned a high school peer mentor. Mentor/mentee activities are scheduled monthly over the course of the school year. Opportunities are scheduled for mentor/mentees to connect over the summer and during the beginning of the 9th grade school year.

- Put a student monitoring system in place that tracks 8th-grade students’ progress to identify students at the beginning of the school year. Invite students to club activities and provide ongoing transition support throughout the school year and continue club activities to support students in 9th grade.

- Design 8th-grade course that focuses on the skills and habits of mind needed to be successful in a high school environment. A study skills program like Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) may be particularly effective for this population, in addition to a focus on developing a growth mindset.

- Design and implement a summer academy for 8th-grade students at the end of school year. This program should introduce students to the expectations regarding academics, activities, school culture, and the habits of success needed for high school. Provide check-in activities to support students in 9th grade.

- Some middle schools may identify a significant portion of their students for transition services based on early warning systems or based on the experience of prior 8th graders who have transitioned to 9th grade. For example, a district would be concerned if over a third of a middle school’s 8th graders, upon entering the 9th grade, were identified with one of the following indicators: failing Algebra I in the first quarter, missing more than 10 days of school in the first quarter, or a suspension in the first quarter. In these situations, consider school-wide transition programs such as freshman academies,
authentic learning experiences, and intentional integration of mathematics within other content areas.

- Design a 9th-grade transition readiness academy to support LAP students identified in Grade 8.

Population Considerations—Educator Factors to Consider When Planning

- 8th-grade students who are at risk of dropping out due to poor foundational literacy skills.
- 8th-grade students learning English as an additional language and need more support to meet grade level ELA Standards.
- 8th-grade students who qualify for free- and reduced-priced lunch and need more support to meet grade level ELA Standards.
- 8th-grade students who struggle with ELA Standards due to various factors: basic needs, family outreach, academic interventions, social and emotional support, etc.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Design transition interventions with models that accelerate learning.
- Design highly engaging interventions to develop student literacy self-efficacy.
- Incorporate practices that address non-cognitive factors and support development of the habits of mind possessed by successful literacy students.
- Design interventions that are led by engaging, experienced staff.
- Provide educators time to support programs.
- Train mentors (teacher and student).

Resources—Tools for Planning

- A Practitioner’s Guide to Implementing Early Warning Systems
- OSPI Career and Guidance Washington
- Supporting Transitions from Middle to High School
- Ninth Grade Counts Guides
- Academic Youth Development [Factsheet]
- College Spark Washington
- Advancement Via Individual Determination [AVID]
Supporting Research

A cornerstone of improving high school graduation rates is that schools and districts put early warning systems in place. Dropping out of high school is not a single act. Instead, most students offer early clues in middle school: absenteeism, behavior incidents, and failure of an English or math course (Bruce, 2011). Schools and districts monitoring for these clues are able to intervene early with high school transition opportunities.

The 9th-grade year has often been looked upon as a time when students will either make it or not. Students who make it often struggle with the increased pressure to do well and graduate. The ones who do not make it battle with motivation and self-esteem, along with the misery of failure. Even though this year is critical, the “failure rate in ninth grade remains higher than the rate in any other grade level” (Bottoms, 2008). To alleviate these issues before they even begin, districts and schools should consider having a robust Grade 8 transition readiness plan in place.

Students identified for a transition-to-high-school program might lack one or more of the following: motivation, self-efficacy, and mathematics skills, and conceptual mathematical understanding. A transitional program, therefore, needs to be able to engage all students in productive ways with meaningful mathematics. Traditional remedial classes are not effective in supporting successful transitions; instead, transition interventions that effectively prepare students for high school operate on a model of accelerated learning growth (Herlihy, 2007). The intervention should address not only ELA content but also increase student engagement, encourage academic discourse, develop a growth mindset, and reward academic risk-taking.

In most cases, a well-designed transition program for LAP-eligible students can be a successful intervention strategy. In instances where a school has over one-third of their 9th-grade students at-risk for failure, LAP funds can be used for a school-wide transition program. School-wide transition programs have also been successful at improving student performance and decreasing dropout rates for all students. One model, freshman academies, provides focused support for 9th-grade students. The academies group students and intentionally provide academic and social supports including team teaching, student advisories and diagnostic assessment to monitor student progress (Kennelly & Monrad, 2007).

According to The Ninth Grade Challenge by S. Habeeb, “teacher teams [core content teachers who share the same students throughout the day] are the most effective model for easing the transition to high school and preparing freshmen for success” (p. 20). While many schools can use this type of model, it is important to note that others may struggle with the demands of incoming freshmen; therefore, whatever model used must include support that is flexible, positive, goal-oriented, efficacious, and empowering (Habeeb, 2013). Traditional remedial classes are not effective in supporting successful transitions; instead, transition interventions
that effectively prepare students for high school operate on a model of accelerated learning (Herlihy, 2007).

According to Breakthrough Collaborative (2011), results from a Chicago school study with over 115,000 participants revealed that, “almost one quarter of students in the top quartile of their eighth grade were off track by the end of ninth grade” (Breakthrough Collaborative, 2011). Furthermore, failure to graduate high school is strongly associated with failure in 9th-grade courses. “Research shows that between 70 and 80 percent of students who fail in the first year will not graduate from high school (Breakthrough Collaborative, 2011).

Some might wonder, why is this transition so challenging for students? The complex answer revolves around increased academic pressure and expectations; larger, more diverse student populations; and less individualized support and connections with teachers.

So, the question remains, what can be done? Two respected research-based organizations lay out plans that show promise in easing the difficult transition from middle school to high school. The Breakthrough Collaborative offers summer and year-long programs to students who are motivated, but may lack the resources to persevere through high school. Some of their implementation suggestions are outlined below.

First, it is recommended that 8th-grade students and their families must be informed about high school course expectations, and they must be taught the tools needed to create their four-year plan. Students must then be monitored as they progress through their plan. This can be accomplished through a teacher-advisor system, student mentor/mentee system, learning communities, or specific 9th-grade courses designed to focus on the habits and skills needed for successful high school completion.

Next, students and their families must be educated about the high school culture. This means students must be informed ahead of time about increased academic challenges, changes in the social environment and the differences in teaching and learning. This can be done through summer programs and/or through spring programs that organize high school visits for middle school students, information nights that focus on alleviating transitions worries, and strong mentor programs pairing high school students with middle school students.

Students need to be explicitly taught the skills and behaviors needed for high school success. 9th grade-specific courses are a great place to house the teaching of problem-solving skills, behavior expectations, time management and organizational skills, and self-advocacy. These skills can also be addressed through a mentor/mentee program.

Finally, teachers can be one of the best advocates for incoming 9th-grade students. Teacher advisory programs have success in creating lasting relationships between student and teacher.
When teachers establish authentic, trusting relationships with students, they fail fewer classes (Breakthrough Collaborative, 2011).

The Southern Regional Education Board has published widespread research on the middle to high school transition. Gene Bottoms, a senior vice president for the SREB, has published extensively on this topic. He outlines several conditions that should be in place to ensure the best results.

Early orientation is key and must be started before high school begins and continued well into the 9th-grade year. Schools can organize 9th-grade students into academies with dedicated teachers who are willing to patiently teach the skills students need. These academies should be small and intimate so trusting relationships can flourish. Teachers should have common planning time to establish and maintain consistency.

Specialized 9th-grade courses with specific, high standards; skill and behavior guidance; and counselor support can also play a significant role in successful transitions. These courses should be standards-based with an eye toward teaching college and career ready skills. A project-based approach can be successful as long as committed educators have the time, the resources, and the desire to collaborate on the curriculum.

Guidance and support are critical and can be delivered via an adult mentor/advisor for incoming 9th graders. These caring adults should involve the student’s family and help the student set long-term goals for college and beyond. Finally, for schools that already have transition programs in place, Bottoms recommends asking specific questions of the program to determine if a redesign might be needed (Bottoms, 2008).

- What percentage of 9th-grade students is performing below grade-level?
- What percentage of 9th-grade students practice acceptable study skills, read and comprehends text and know how to complete challenging work?
- Are all 9th-grade students linked to a caring adult or an adult/student mentor?
- How many 9th-grade students are failing more than one class?
- What percentage of 9th-grade students is still enrolled in school for their senior year?
- What percentage of students are placed into remedial courses in college?

The answer to these questions could indicate that a redesign might be needed. Whatever tactic is chosen to help incoming 9th graders be successful should be rooted in results—reduced failure rates, improved achievement, and increased graduation rates. If schools are dedicated to designing and implementing successful transition programs, the reaped rewards will be
visible in the statistics, and more importantly, in the attitude, motivation, and accomplishment of the students.
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FAMILY AND COMMUNITY PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Transition & Readiness

Student-Centered

Educator-Focused

Family & Community
Family Engagement

Family engagement is a promising practice. Family literacy support on emerging reading and literacy strategies can help students improve listening, speaking, writing, and reading skills as they progress through the early elementary years. All families engage in social activities to support the development of language and communication. These activities lay the foundation for literacy development in school and life. The more parents and caregivers understand their role as literacy developers, the more successful they can be at preparing their children to develop strong foundational literacy skills, and help students improve these skills.

Family engagement involves collaboration between families and schools towards increasing student success. Family engagement strategies can involve outreach, direct involvement, and a variety of other activities. Family engagement can occur during the regular school day and within the school building or outside of school, within families’ homes or within the community.

Program Possibilities: Ideas to Consider when Planning

- Ask families to join the school improvement planning process, and have a voice in the LAP ELA and K–4 ELA decisions as they are made at the school, planning committees, and other events that support the school functioning.

- Support a space within the school, maybe in the library, or a small conference room, where families are welcome to convene before, after, and during school when needed. In addition to creating community, literacy development workshops can be offered to parents. Experienced participants can mentor new participants, families can plan social events, and families can lead groups and provide translations around their languages and areas of expertise to help all families feel welcome at school.

- Create reading time in the first 10 minutes of every school day where families are invited to come into the classrooms and read with their children and their classmates.

- Establish a bi-weekly/monthly literacy lunch. Invite families to join their student and model-shared reading experiences for all students and families, and send families home with tips to provide shared reading at home.

- Plan monthly literacy nights for each grade level. Target foundational literacy skills and activities families can continue to work on at home. Show families how to play games, sing songs, incorporate movement, and food into literacy skill building.

- Create literacy games for students to play at home. Families can support skill development by repetitively playing the games.
• Implement a poem or song a week program. Students practice the poem/song in class, and share the poem/song at home each day. Provide families a template to practice the poem/song.

• Create a book-a-week program for students and families to read a book a week together at home. Implement at-home reading practices in early grades and continuing the practice through high school.

• Use technology to support communication. Take a photo with each student on the first day of school and text/email it to families. Within the first few weeks of school, and then bi-weekly thereafter, send positive visual updates on students engaging in literacy activities.

• Use social media to provide families with links and resources to online videos for shared reading experiences, foundational literacy skill development, games, and apps for families to participate in literacy development activities at home. Older students can take photos of their assignments, notes from the teacher, etc., and text them directly to parents during class.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning
• Family involvement in schools starts to decrease as early as grade 3.

• K–4 family literacy support results in students being more likely to complete high school and go on to college.

• Families who are learning English as an additional language.

• Families who qualify for free and reduced-priced lunch programs.

• K–12 students who struggle with reading benefit from being read to and being listened to when reading.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning
• Create a family friendly school learning community.

• Design home talk activities and talking points for parents to promote oral language.

• Design activities and games for students to take home and play with their families.

• Establish home reading expectations and guidance for parents.

• Establish multiple opportunities for students to read the same book.

• Communicate and get feedback from families electronically—e.g., the district’s website, Moodle site, schoolnotes.com, remind.com, Survey Monkey, etc.
• Advertise events through multiple modalities: emails, social media, phone messages, and postcards.

• Establish a positive relationship with families during the first few weeks of school.

• Hire a family/community liaison to explicitly connect and communicate with families about the resources available within the community.

• Design support for families around reading skills, homework, monitoring student progress, and conversations about school and learning.

• Send resources home with students in each child’s home language so that parents understand the message and are made aware of the resources given.

• Provide interpreters at school events to support all families.

• Give families enough time to include after-school or weekend activities into their family schedule, as attendance is affected by events that are spur-of-the-moment.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• US Department of Education Capacity Building Framework with Resources
• A Dual Capacity-Building Framework for Family-School Partnerships
• A Child Becomes a Reader Kindergarten through Grade 3
• Parent Power: Build the Bridge to Success
• OSPI Family Engagement Resource List, Updated March 2014
• PTA National Standards for Family-School Partnerships Assessment [Guide]
• Teachers Involve Parents in Schoolwork [TIPS]

Supporting Research
Schools must recognize that many best practices for supporting family engagement are those that occur outside the walls of the school and the school day. These practices will ultimately support increased student achievement (Flamboyan Foundation, 2011). Literacy skills for struggling students can be reinforced at home. Hosting family literacy workshops is one way to guide parents in literacy activities such as shared reading, working on fluency, and how to use electronic resources to enhance literacy skills at home (Mort, 2014). Family workshops can increase literacy dialogue at home by modeling literate behaviors (Mort, 2014). Family nights can also introduce parents to school resources, how to provide homework help, and other ways to support the school curriculum at home, each of which can greatly benefit student literacy achievement through family support (Waldener, 2004; Blazer, 2011; St. Clair et al., 2012).
Intervention activities that students can practice at home should be the same activities students are working on in the classroom (Mort, 2014). This ensures students are familiar with the tasks and can go home and successfully practice the literacy skill with their families. For example, students experience valuable practice time and build literacy confidence when they take home books they have already read with success in the classroom. Word games are another effective strategy to increase student engagement in word activities at home. Students learn how to play the game in class, and then they take the game home and teach their family how to play. By designing games and establishing at-home literacy routines for students, educators can help families create positive literacy experiences outside of school (Mort, 2014).

It is important to establish family academic supports early to have a long-lasting effect on student reading achievement. For example, a family literacy program for migrant kindergarten families showed significant academic gains for students at the end of 1st grade, as well as at the end of 5th and 6th grades (St. Clair et al., 2012). This culturally sensitive program provided family workshops with an adult educator to support student literacy development at home. Additionally, families were provided with materials to support literacy learning at home: letter and word identification games, books, and electronic talking books. By teaching migrant families how to support their student’s language skills, schools can establish a positive collaborative effort with families that will result in increased language and literacy development at home (St. Clair et al., 2012).
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P–4 Community Partnerships

Establishing community partnerships is a research-based practice. Community involvement and partnership not only yield positive results in upper grades, it also has a strong correlation to positive student outcomes for younger children. While there may be different local structures and compositions of community partnerships, many of these components are foundational to the success of this intervention practice to support literacy development. P–4 community partnerships funded with LAP funds must have a focus of supporting LAP students.

Program Possibilities

- Enhance library and community center partnerships by hosting cross-staff and volunteer activities. Invite library staff to lead activities (e.g., shared reading, book talks, how to access digital resources, etc.) during literacy night activities. Plan grade-level events onsite at the library.

- Invite families and community partners to share cultural traditions through oral storytelling, poetry, songs, and crafts during monthly literacy events.

- Develop partnerships for discounted and/or free admission fees one day a month with local children’s museums, zoos, etc., for students and families enrolled at your school. Students will have the opportunity to participate in multiple speaking and listening activities. These experiences build background knowledge for reading comprehension and provide ideas for writing topics.

- Grow strong wrap-around support for children by building decision-making teams of community partners, families, and school personnel to support working together.

- Partner with community organizations to provide a network of support for students and families to develop foundational literacy skills in the community.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students and families learning English as an additional language benefit from the additional linguistic, academic, and socio-emotional support provided by community partners.

- Students who struggle with ELA Standards benefit from additional literacy support from community partnerships.

- Students who qualify for free and reduced-priced lunch programs benefit from community support and resources that support literacy.

- Students in elementary school literacy intervention programs benefit from building and sustaining community partnerships.
Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning

- Focus on working with community and parents versus seeking involvement only.
- Establish goals for short-term actions and activities.
- Establish long-term goals and work trajectory.
- Establish a measurement point in the school year to evaluate the work and processes.
- Use individual/group data to target program design.
- Identify school staff to be stable and ongoing leads throughout multiple years.
- Partner with local healthcare leaders.
- Identify (where possible) family/community lead for a school year.
- Identify student assessment communication protocols to share information with parents.
- Apply for community grants and establish sustainable funding.

Resources—Tools for Planning

- Community in Schools Washington Model
- Build Initiative: Community Development Toolkit
- Washington Reading Corps
- ReadingPartners.org [Video]

Supporting Research

Community involvement in schools is a long-standing indicator of a school’s success across the country. The goal is to engage community involvement, and grow a partnership in which the school and community members work together to create action and to support children (Ferlazzo, 2011). The most successful partnerships are developed between schools, communities, and families (Jacobson & Blank, 2015). How these partnerships develop is important. Merely engaging family and communities in superficial activities will not improve students’ experiences in the same way as developing deep, authentic, and sustainable collaborative partnerships (Ferlazzo, 2011).

Some community-based programs are established and sustained at individual school sites. While other community-based programs span across districts. What this looks like might be different for different schools and communities. Generally, community-based partnerships can be categorized into three types of programs (NEA, 2011):
1. Community and family programs include community organizations, community residents, and families.

2. Family engagement-focused programs.

3. Wrap-around programs that promote social and health services.

Community-based organizations provide structures and offset costs to implement programs. Across Washington, schools are implementing community-based partnerships with various community organizations. The Washington Reading Corps is a statewide service program committed to improving early literacy and reading outcomes. Reading Corps members serve in schools to provide tutoring and to build capacity for schools to benefit from additional community volunteer involvement. Members also focus on strategies to enhance family engagement in literacy activities. Several Washington schools work with Page Ahead. This community-based partner supports family engagement strategies, summer book programs, and early learning centers as they prepare students for kindergarten readiness.

Community-based partners focus on family engagement and they approach family engagement programs strategically. Family involvement coordinators, parent teacher organizations, and parent school community teams coordinate and support family engagement in schools/districts. Unlike traditional family involvement activities where schools: send home fliers telling parents what to do, offer parenting classes, refer students to local tutoring programs, seek parent approval for compliance, and hold annual Fun Nights (NEA, 2011). Community-focused schools focus on family engagement. They seek input from families and community members, and they listen to the input. Community-based partners and schools take a shared ownership approach to family engagement and school improvement (NEA, 2011).

Community-based wrap-around supports reduce barriers to learning by establishing purposeful partnerships between community organizations and schools (Blank & Villarreal, 2015). Social and health services are provided resulting in improved student attendance and learning outcomes (NEA 2011, Jacobson & Blank, 2015). Support services may include connecting families to foodbanks and programs that support basic nutrition and shelter needs. Health, eye, dental, and social/emotional services also support student achievement in the classroom. Whenever possible, providing space within the school or within walking distance from the school allows families the opportunity to access wraparound supports. Schools/districts may use case managers and/or family and community advocates to support community-based wraparound services.

Building a strong communication structure is vital to establishing strong P–4 community partnerships. The tone of communications outreach can directly influence the strength of relationships. Effective communication and relationship building starts with listening (Ferlazzo,
Encouraging a system that fosters structures so parents and communities not only receive information but can also provide feedback and express concerns is a strong first step (NEA, 2011; Ferlazzo, 2011).

Ideas to build communication structures can cross a range of methods and approaches. Choosing what makes the most sense for the needs of the local community is key. Taking stock of which methods have the highest impact (e.g., weekly email or monthly mailed report, quarterly meetings or bimonthly town halls, etc.) can help teams make efficient choices for maximum impact and efficacy. Regardless of methods, reciprocal communication built on trust is the most effective (Ferlazzo, 2011; NEA, 2011).
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Community-Based Student Mentors

Community-based student mentoring is research-based. It is defined as a positive relationship between a non-parental adult (or older youth) to a younger child or youth. Community-based mentoring usually takes place outside the school day with longer sessions and strong mentor-mentee relationships built over time. The structure of the mentoring experience requires goal setting and may include a variety of social, cultural, and academic activities. Community-based student mentors can support literacy development for students who struggle with ELA Standards. Community partnerships funded with LAP funds must have a focus of supporting LAP students.

Practice Possibilities—Ideas to Consider When Planning

- Identify possible community connections to support literacy and create a mentor program pairing a non-parental adult to a younger child or youth, provide training for mentor and mentee, develop guidelines for meetings/outings, and create tools for reflection and feedback on the program goals.

- Identify students who might benefit from a community-based mentor to support literacy, do a needs assessment with individual students to gather information to help find the community mentor, set up meetings/events with the students’ needs/interest as the foundation, and gather feedback and reflection on program goals.

- Connect with local libraries, faith-based organizations, and community youth outreach programs to find, train and use adult non-parental mentors who will then connect with identified students who would benefit from a mentor-mentee relationship.

- Partner with Boys and Girls Club and provide transportation after school to support literacy mentoring programs.

Population Considerations—Student Factors to Consider When Planning

- Students who struggle with ELA Standards.

- Students who struggle with ELA graduation requirements.

- Students who are learning English as an additional language benefit from connecting with native English speakers.

- Students with specific needs: single-parent homes, families in poverty, students who struggle emotionally, socially, and academically and are struggling to meet ELA Standards.

- Students who come from stressed and busy households and are struggling to meet ELA Standards.
• Students who may need a positive adult role model (for various reasons) and are struggling to meet ELA Standards.

Implementation Success Factors—Options to Consider When Planning
• Activities should be developmentally appropriate and focus on developing speaking, listening, writing, and reading skills.
• Seek parent permission and involve parents in creating goals and activities.
• Provide mentors and mentees regular opportunities to meet and to participate in shared activities over an extended period of time.
• Encourage mentors and mentees to set goals and consistently revisit and adjust goals.
• Screen mentors and identify students who may benefit from the program.
• Identify the characteristics desired in mentors and actively seek out mentors who will commit to the program.
• Provide training for mentors and mentees.
• Monitor and gather feedback on the program to ensure it remains effective.
• Use a mentor coordinator who schedules activities, communicates with families, and recruits/trains/supports mentors and mentees.

Resources—Tools for Planning
• The ABCs of School-Based Mentoring
• Impact Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education’s Student Mentoring Program
• National Mentoring Partnership
• Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
• United Way of America
• Community Partner Toolkits

Supporting Research
Mentoring programs may be broadly categorized as school-based or community-based. In school-based mentoring, mentors typically meet with mentees one-on-one during or after the school day and engage in both academic and nonacademic activities. Community-based mentoring occurs outside of the school context. Community-based mentoring sessions are typically longer than school-based mentoring activities. In addition, community-based mentor-mentee relationships often are longer in duration than school-based matches (Herrera, 2011).
Mentoring experiences can take many forms. The structure of the mentoring experience is often influenced by the goals of the mentoring program and may include a variety of social, cultural, and academic activities. Mentors and mentees may spend time studying and going to local events, but may also spend time navigating issues for the mentee such as problems with time management, conflicts with a teacher, relationship issues, or family problems (Larose et al., 2010). The types of activities may vary based on the age and needs of the mentee. “In late adolescents, activities focused on personal and professional identity, autonomy, time and relationship management, and skills development are believed to meet the needs shared by many young people. Mentoring program managers must ensure that the objectives of their programs and the nature of the activities in these programs strongly reflect the developmental needs of their clientele” (Larose et al., 2010, p. 138).

School-based and community-based mentoring has been found to have a positive effect on student academic outcomes. In a study of mostly middle school African American male students, researchers found an Afrocentric mentoring program to be effective in fostering academic achievement and success in the participating mentees (Gordon et al., 2009). In a five-month Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring program, mentees experienced modest short-term academic gains (Herrera et al., 2011).

Other important benefits include: improved self-esteem levels, better relationships with other adults, more clarity in both academics and future college and career outlook (Community Tool Box, 2015). Community mentoring programs offer innovative options for both mentor and mentees by building partnerships that may lead to valuable life skills. Mentor programs can break down stereotypes, promote teamwork, and help create a culture of community diversity.

Research shows that to build lasting and effective community mentoring programs, specific factors must be considered. Community partners must be identified and approached to determine commitment level, willingness to contribute financially, and ability to assist in finding and training mentors. Next, youth recipients of mentoring need to be approached and connected with the “best fit” mentor. This step is critical to the success of not only the mentor/mentee relationship, but also the program as a whole. These relationships take hard work, open minds, flexibility, and a promise to communicate and problem solve as a team (The Community Toolbox, 2016).

Trust is the final factor when building a lasting community mentoring program. Trust among the stakeholders; trust between the mentor and mentee; and trust in the process. Young people often have trust issues with adult authorities; therefore, mentors need to be sensitive to this possibility and be willing to build the relationship slowly. Open communication, consistency, and positive encouragement are key to building trust while also promoting responsible feelings and actions.
The above elements combined with the principles of mentoring outlined in *The Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring* will ensure a quality program that will instill confidence in the youth who are served. These principles (listed below) should be the foundation upon which any fruitful program is built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>Recruit mentors and mentees by relaying a realistic description of the program's elements and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Screen mentors and mentees to determine commitment, time, and personal characteristics needed to form a lasting relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training must focus on ensuring that prospective mentors, mentees, and their parents or guardians have the basic knowledge, attitudes, and skills needed to build a safe and effective relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching</td>
<td>Matching helps create appropriate mentoring relationships by using strategies most likely to increase the odds that the relationship will be safe and effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Support</td>
<td>Monitoring and support is critical to mentoring as relationships develop and need to be adjusted to changing needs. Support may also include additional training when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Closure is a normal stage in a mentoring relationship and mentors and mentees should be able to prepare for closure and reflect upon their experience with the relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These principles are the pillars of community-based mentoring programs that will impact students academically, emotionally, and socially.
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BACKGROUND, RESEARCH, AND IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY

The ELA menu was created to guide schools and districts as they develop supports and services for students who struggle with literacy achievement. It is critical to ensure best practices are used to design intensive intervention plans for struggling students. These plans need to be implemented with fidelity because even proven practices, when poorly implemented, can fail to raise student educational outcomes.

Often, the word *fidelity* is viewed negatively; however, the LAP team encourages approaching fidelity in a similar manner as integrity or commitment. Implementation fidelity is about delivering an intervention as it was intended to be delivered according to the implementation team’s plan.

The panel of experts recognizes that there are a number of steps that must be taken to ensure that the practices within the menus are implemented with fidelity across the state. Using implementation science is optional. This information is provided as a resource for buildings and districts.

Active Versus Passive Implementation

New practices are implemented at the district/building level each year. Some are implemented with success, while others are not. All too often, promising innovations and practices are abandoned after just a year or two because the expected results were not actualized, and the best practice was viewed as ineffective. But, was the practice ineffective or was implementation ineffective?

As schools/districts select practices from the menu, the implementation plan and the degree to which the plan is delivered are key to successfully achieving the desired student outcomes. Active implementation is the direct result of action driven teams, purposeful planning, and systematic improvement cycles.
Figure 1 displays both passive and active implementation. When passive implementation occurs, it takes approximately 17 years to accomplish minimal results (14 percent). Whereas with active implementation, teams can move toward full implementation (with 80 percent effectiveness) in three years.

### Implementation Science

Implementation science provides a framework to support the implementation of best practices in education. Implementation science values local conditions and context-specific issues with the assumption that one size will not fit all. Full implementation of best practices takes purposeful planning and time. Implementation science includes a systematic process to ensure full implementation is actualized. The frameworks include the what, how, and who to assist implementation teams with the process. The most effective implementation teams consist of decision makers and practitioners across the system to develop and review systematic improvement cycles.

The National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) focuses on active implementation. The Active Implementation Hub (AI Hub) is a free resource available to schools/districts who want to deepen their understanding of implementation science and the power of active implementation. Modules on the AI Hub provide an overview of active implementation and include implementation drivers, teams, stages, improvement cycles, usable interventions, and fidelity checklists.

### Plan, Do, Study, Act

The *Plan, Do, Study, Act* approach in implementation and improvement science, and the *Plan, Do, Check, Act* approach in Lean organizations, are iterative improvement cycles that support active implementation. Iterative cycles are repetitive and use a trial and learning approach. In each cycle, implementation teams plan, provide the intervention, review the results, and identify areas for improvement. These teams review student outcomes and adult behaviors, specifically identifying if the intervention was delivered as intended by the plan, then teams identify specific actions to improve the plan.
With each improvement cycle, implementation teams learn what went well and what needs to be adjusted to deliver the intervention more effectively in order to benefit student outcomes. Over the course of three active improvement cycles, the effectiveness of an intervention generally reaches 80 percent effectiveness.

Each phase of the Plan, Do, Study, Act cycle guides implementation teams:

- **Plan**—Implementation teams identify purpose, desired outcomes, and success criteria for implementation. Teams identify data and progress monitoring tools that will be used to measure the success of the intervention, who is responsible for collecting data, and when data will be collected and reviewed. Teams will identify challenges that may impact implementation (e.g., transportation, staffing, etc.) and specify how to move interventions forward.

- **Do**—Implementation teams execute the intended intervention plan. Educators complete intended outcomes according to the plan and collect data to ensure the intervention support was delivered.

- **Study**—Implementation teams reflect on the execution of the intended intervention plan. Teams review success criteria and outcomes. Reflective discussions include: what went well, what can be improved, and what unexpected barriers or surprises occurred.

- **Act**—Implementation teams apply learning to identify action steps to improve the process. Teams make targeted adjustments to the original plan to impact student outcomes. Implementation teams use these action steps to begin planning for the next cycle.

Improvement cycles vary in length. The improvement cycle may span across a single school year or for a specific amount of time (such as a quarter, trimester, or semester). Rapid improvement cycles generally range from 30–90 days. Implementation teams should discuss and determine which cycle is best to use with the intervention they are implementing.
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DISTRICT/BUILDING RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

AI Hub is a web-based resource that has been developed and maintained by the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices Center (SISEP) and NIRN at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Frank Porter Graham Child Development Institute. Implementation Science Modules & Lessons are available to assist implementation teams. The modules provide self-paced content, activities, and assessments that are designed to promote the knowledge and practice of implementation science and scaling-up, improving and expanding the impact of, best practices.

The Hexagon Tool

The Hexagon Tool can be used as a planning tool to evaluate evidence-based programs and practices during the Exploration Stage of Implementation.

See the Active Implementation Hub Resource Library
http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu

One tool within the AI Hub is the Hexagon Tool. The Hexagon Tool can help states, districts, and schools appropriately select evidence-based instructional, behavioral, and social-emotional interventions and prevention approaches by reviewing six broad factors in relation to the program or practice under consideration. NIRN developed the Hexagon Discussion and Analysis Tool for Implementation Teams to guide deeper discussions and address unique needs.

NIRN provides a glossary of terms for educators who are new to implementation science.

Figure 5. Used with permission from the National Implementation Research Network.
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is grounded in improvement science and has several resources to accelerate learning and address problems of practice. Improvement science, which is part of Implementation Science, is a systematic learning-by-doing approach. The Carnegie Foundation, like the National Implementation Research Network, highlights using Plan, Do, Study, Act for implementation. The Carnegie Foundation provides a variety of resources for facilitating improvements in education, including teacher effectiveness. Resources recommended by the panel of experts for optional use are the 90-day Cycle Handbook, the Six Core Principles of Improvement, and a glossary of improvement science terms.

### The Six Core Principles of Improvement
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Make the work problem-specific and user-centered.</td>
<td>Starting question: “What specifically is the problem we are trying to solve?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Variation in performance is the core problem to address.</td>
<td>Focus on what works, for whom, and under what set of conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. See the system that produces the current outcomes.</td>
<td>Explore and think about how local conditions shape work processes. Share your hypotheses for change with others to help clarify your goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We cannot improve at scale what we cannot measure.</td>
<td>Include measures of key outcomes and processes to track if the implemented change is an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Anchor practice improvement in disciplined inquiry.</td>
<td>Try to use rapid cycles of Plan, Do, Study, Act (PDSA) to learn and improve quickly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accelerate improvements through networked communities.</td>
<td>Find other partners and share what you learn in order to be more productive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Image used with permission from the Carnegie Foundation.
The ELA menu will be updated annually, no later than July 1, each calendar year. Interested stakeholders are invited to submit recommendations for intervention practices, along with related research references, for consideration by the expert panel for possible inclusion in subsequent menus. It is important to note that if new research emerges that disproves the effectiveness of a practice that has historically been included in this report, the practice may be removed and no longer allowed under LAP guidelines. Public comment forms are available on the project web page on OSPI’s website.
APPENDIX A: FOUNDATIONAL LITERACY SKILLS

Combining the findings from the National Reading Panel (2000), National Early Literacy Panel (2008) and National Council on Teacher Quality (2014) guidance on early literacy skills instruction and interventions is essential to our success to increase 4th-grade reading achievement scores. Each component is directly correlated with an early predictor of literacy success (NELP, 2008; NICHD, 2000). Deep understanding of essential foundational literacy skills must guide professionals as they plan and develop appropriate and engaging instruction and supplemental services for struggling students and for their teachers through professional learning opportunities (Pittman & Dorel, 2014; Strickland & Shanahan, 2004).

Appendix A of the ELA Standards provides additional information on the following areas: oral language, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, and fluency.

Oral Language

Research demonstrates that oral language ability impacts children’s success in learning to read, as well as overall academic success (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). “Oral language is the foundation of learning to read and write” (Roskos et al., 2009, pg. 1). The English oral language ability of children as they enter school varies widely and may be impacted by various cultural factors (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000; Crawford-Brooke, 2013). Some factors affecting English oral language development can include:

- Exposure to language and print
- Opportunities to expand their background experiences
- Opportunities for oral conversations

Early gaps in reading ability and language development that result from a weak foundation in English oral language can continue throughout a student’s academic experience (Crawford-Brooke, 2013; Fielding et al., 2007; Juel et al., 2003). However, lack of oral language exposure should not be interpreted as a learning disability. Proficiency in a language other than English is also powerful. Families should engage their children in the strongest language of the home, and schools should engage their students in the strongest language of the classroom.

Speaking a second language in the home is very beneficial to oral language and literacy development. Families should be encouraged to speak languages in which they are fully fluent to aid oral language development, especially vocabulary and concept understanding. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing are all important skills for learning. Therefore, children who have
had a wide variety of language experiences will bring a stronger, intuitive, knowledge of how language works.

Oral language is an integral part of learning to read and write (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002; Crawford-Brooke, 2013); literacy instruction must therefore incorporate a focus on oral language for all students. Beginning readers use their oral vocabulary to make sense of the words they see in print. Readers must know what most of the words mean before they can understand what they are reading. Because students’ vocabularies are an essential factor in student success in school and beyond (Beck & McKeown, 2007), students also need to be exposed to a wide variety of words and texts and to solid blocks of time for independent reading. One’s use of oral language enables students to learn not just in literacy but also in all areas (Munro, 2009).

According to Kirkland and Patterson (2005), the development of oral language may be facilitated through an authentic environment for students to engage in conversations and thoughtfully planned oral language activities. For example, classrooms should be print-rich and include student work. Print on the walls should be functional, instructional supports (e.g., anchor charts, visual word walls—with picture support), signs for routine activities, (e.g., marking lunch choices), and all should be accompanied by picture support. Time should be scheduled for routine opportunities for students to converse with each other, such as a ritual class meeting at the end of the day for students to discuss challenges and successes of the day, and book clubs throughout the day and across content areas. Thoughtfully planned oral language activities may include think-alouds where oral language is modeled, shared reading, reader’s theater, daily news, book clubs, turn and talk, and interactive read-alouds. “Teachers can no longer afford to squeeze a read-aloud book between lunchtime and bathroom break. Because reading aloud is so important to language development, we must systematically and explicitly plan for its use in the daily routine” (Kirkland & Patterson, 2005, p. 393).

For successful oral language implementation, the classroom environment must be supportive and nurturing. Specific time designated for listening and speaking activities must start in kindergarten or, even better, in preschool. Using the precise language of the content is important because development of language needs to be simultaneous with content learning.

Not only does attention to oral language help develop language and reading, it benefits writing. Students benefit from talking about what they are thinking and what they plan to write before attempting to write.

Phonological Awareness
Reading success in English, especially decoding, is connected to phonological awareness. Listening, rhyming, and identifying sounds in oral words or pictures are early literacy skills that
help develop successful readers of English (Sullivan-Dudzik, Gearns, & Leavell, 2007). Phonemic awareness can be stimulated through parent-child activities [such as] playing rhyming games and reading rhymes (Pressley & Allington, 2015).

The most advanced area of phonological awareness is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate individual sounds-phonemes—in spoken words, called phonemic awareness. With phonemic awareness comes the understanding of the idea that spoken words can be broken down into sounds. Before children learn to read print, they need to become aware of how the sounds in words work. They must understand that words are made up of speech sounds, (phonemes) the smallest parts of sound in a spoken word. Based on a simple view of reading, research suggests that two types of striving readers emerge—poor decoders and poor comprehenders. The group of poor decoders may not have strong skills in phonological awareness (Elwér, et al., 2013).

Equally important to understand is that phonemic awareness is not critical in all languages. For example, Spanish is taught by syllables, not by single sounds. Therefore, a student who reads and writes in Spanish may not demonstrate phonemic awareness in English, even though the student is a reader and writer (Hernandez, 2015).

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (pgs. 19–20) describes various aspects of phonological awareness and ends with a general progression of phonemic awareness development in grades K–2. Note that this progression refers to spoken language, not print.

All aspects of phonological awareness, including the sophisticated aspects of phonemic awareness refer to spoken language:

- Phoneme Identity (Spoken Language).
- Phoneme Isolation (Spoken Language).
- Phoneme Blending (Spoken Language).
- Phoneme Segmentation (Spoken Language).
- Phoneme Addition (Spoken Language).
- Phoneme Substitution (Spoken Language).
- Phoneme Deletion (Spoken Language).

Phonemic Awareness can be developed through spoken language activities:

- Identify and categorize sounds.
- Blend sounds to form words.
• Delete or add sounds to form new words.
• Substitute sounds to make new words.

Phonemic awareness instruction is usually taught in kindergarten and sometimes continued in 1st grade. Early readers can show they have phonemic awareness in several ways. The basics include:

• Recognizing which words in a set of oral words start with the same sound.
• Isolating and saying the first or last sound in a spoken word.
• Combining or blending the separate sounds in a spoken word in order to say the word.
• Breaking up or segmenting a spoken word into its separate sounds.
• Representing each phoneme when spelling (e.g., doktr for doctor).

Alphabet Knowledge (AK)
The NELP (2008) recognizes alphabet knowledge (AK) as an essential component in literacy and early predictor of literacy success. Jones & Reutzel (2012) identify AK as “an essential prerequisite for developing early reading proficiency” (p. 448). Studies have shown that the AK is a predictor in reading proficiency of multilingual students. AK is also thought to be a predictor of reading proficiency in students who are genetically at risk for dyslexia. (Jones & Reutzel, 2012, pp. 449).

Rather than based on research, AK instruction has been predominately based on what has traditionally been done. Teaching a-letter-a-week in sequential order of the alphabet has many disadvantages, and this method has been criticized when it takes 26 weeks to teach (Mort, 2014). Research has identified numerous factors that influence and can enhance AK instruction that are highly effective for all students. For example, research regarding the advantages of the letters in the student’s name, alphabetic order (at the beginning and the end of the alphabet), letter frequency, letter pronunciation, and consonant phoneme acquisition order, can inform AK instruction (Jones & Reutzel, 2012).

When students have AK, they develop the foundation for early decoding, spelling, and working toward comprehension (Jones & Reutzel, 2012; Strictland, D.S. & Shanahan, T., 2004). It is, however, essential to remember that saying a word correctly does not mean that one understands the word or concepts. Some students will be able to say words or decode words without understanding what they are reading (Riddle Buly & Valencia, 2002; Valencia & Riddle Buly, 2004). Riddle Buly and Valencia have identified various profiles of readers, which are important to consider when working with students, especially those adding English as an additional language. AK can be supported in a variety of ways at home such as letter puzzles,
reading to children, and talking about the book and the words and letters, alphabet games, alphabet songs, and carefully selected electronic programs. In addition, it is a common focus of children’s television shows, storybooks, and computerized applications (Pressley & Allington, 2015).

Suggested tips for instruction: (1) frequent, brief, explicit, and repetitive instruction, (2) letter-a-day instructional cycles, (3) 10/20 review cycles, (4) name, sound, upper/lower case, and text identification, (5) each pacing cycle has a different sequence, and (6) focus on difficult-to-learn letters in additional pacing cycles and reviews (Jones & Reutzel, 2012).

Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondences

Phonics comes from the term graphophonics, meaning the relationships between symbol and sound. When simply referred to as “phonics,” the definition can be muddled.

Appendix A of the ELA Standards refers to this area as phoneme-grapheme (or sound-symbol) correspondence, and is a more accurate label for this foundational area. Phoneme-Grapheme Correspondence defines the relationship between written letters and the spoken sounds that those letters represent. Conclusions from decades of research in reading related to grapheme-phoneme correspondence are summarized in the following set of recommendations:

- Teach every letter-sound correspondence explicitly. Research supporting this idea is simply overwhelming. Children who have been taught explicitly to decode words are far more likely to decode words successfully, in the early grades, than children who have had limited experiences.

- Teach high-frequency letter-sound relationships early. Successful materials tend to involve students in activities in which they can experience immediate and ongoing success. A successful grapheme-phoneme correspondence program gets children reading as soon as possible by teaching the highest frequency relationships early.

- Teach sound-blending explicitly. Students do not necessarily understand how to connect the phoneme-grapheme connections in unfamiliar words. Students with explicit teaching outperform those who have had little or no training.

- Teach high-frequency letter-sound relationships early. Successful materials tend to involve students in activities in which they can experience immediate and ongoing success. A successful grapheme-phoneme correspondence program gets children reading as soon as possible by teaching the highest frequency relationships early.

- Teach sound-blending explicitly. Students do not necessarily understand how to connect the phoneme-grapheme connections in unfamiliar words. Students with explicit teaching outperform those who have had little or no training.
• Teach students how to chunk words.

Appendix A of the ELA Standards (p. 22) provides three useful principles for chunking longer words into syllables:

1. VC-CV: Two or more consonants between two vowels.
   a. When syllables have two or more adjacent consonants between them, we divide between the consonants.
      i. The first syllable will be closed (with a short vowel).
      ii. sub-let, nap-kin, pen-ny, emp-ty

2. V-CV and VC-V: One consonant between two vowels.
   a. First, try dividing before the consonant.
      i. This makes the first syllable open and the vowel long.
      ii. This strategy will work 75 percent of the time with VCV syllable division.
      iii. e-ven ra-bies, de-cent ri-val
   b. If the word is not recognized, try dividing after the consonant.
      i. This makes the first syllable closed and the vowel sound short.
      ii. This strategy will work 25 percent of the time with VCV syllable division.
      iii. ev-er, rab-id, dec-ade, riv-er

3. Consonant blends usually stick together.
   a. Do not separate digraphs when using the first two principles for decoding.
      i. e-ther, spec-trum, se-quin

Fluency

Reading fluency is the ability to read with appropriate rate, expression, and accuracy. Allington (2006) describes fluency as “reading in phrases, with appropriate intonation and prosody—fluency is reading with expression” (p. 94). Rasinski defines fluency as the bridge between grapheme-phoneme relationships and comprehension. Reading with a lack of fluency is directly associated (correlated, but not causal) with lower reading comprehension. Rasinski (2002) suggests that fluent readers simply read more than those who struggle with reading because they are self-motivated and they read for pleasure (Rasinski, 2002), thus they get more practice with reading. Signs of reading disabilities begin with decoding and develop into slow, dysfluent, inaccurate reading (Kiuru et al., 2013). High-quality reading fluency instruction “lays the foundation for success in reading” (Rasinski & Zimmerman, 2013).

Although Classroom-based Measurements (CBMs) that measure words correct per minute (wcpcm) are commonly used, they have been identified as being problematic. Allington (2006) notes that practicing speed-reading of words and non-words to increase students’ wcpcm “does not improve text-reading performances (p. 95)” To be efficient readers, students must have many opportunities to practice appropriate intonation, prosody, and phrasing (Allington, 2001; Rasinski, 2006) and lots of opportunity to read text independently. Recent research shows that
wcpm in upper elementary grades and beyond has only a moderate correlation to comprehension, with a higher correlation as an accurate performance indicator for primary-aged students (Hunley, et al., 2013; Valencia, et al. 2010). However, it is important to understand that a correlation is simply a relationship; it does not show that fast reading creates stronger readers: what it does suggest is that strong readers are likely to read faster.

The misunderstanding of fluency has led to many educators focusing on speed and accuracy, since these are easily measured, without consideration of the other critical components of fluency described by Allington (2006), and cited above, as “reading in phrases, with appropriate intonation and prosody—fluency is reading with expression.” If speed and accuracy are used in isolation as a screening tool, it is imperative to understand that false negatives are likely to occur when calculating wcpm. What that means is that students who are actually at risk are not identified. Valencia, et al. (2010) report, “findings of under-identification parallel several other studies of screening accuracy using wcpm oral reading measures...rates ranged from 15 percent to as high as 47 percent, depending on the benchmark used” (p. 287). When students are screened for rate and accuracy, nearly half of the students identified receive the wrong intervention (Valencia, et al., 2010). This results as a misunderstanding of the purpose of a screening measure.

According to Allington (2001), “[w]e cannot get too carried away with a focus on reading rate” (p. 71). We must be careful not to lose sight of all the indicators of oral reading fluency: rate, accuracy, and prosody; or, as Dawn Chrstitiana, from Bellingham Public Schools, likes to say, “rate is not a teaching point.”

Fountas and Pinnell (2008) describe fluency in six dimensions, with descriptions and rubrics for each dimension:

1. Pausing—how the reader is guided by punctuation to reflect meaning.
2. Phrasing—how the reader groups words to reflect meaning.
3. Stress—how the reader emphasizes words to reflect meaning.
4. Intonation—how the reader uses expression to reflect meaning.
5. Rate—how the reader uses appropriate rate—not too fast and not too slow—to reflect meaning.
6. Integration—how the reader uses 1–5 together to reflect meaning.

Rasinski (2004) describes an analogy between reading aloud and giving a speech: the reader, like the speaker, uses the voice in a variety of tones, speeds, and expressions to capture the attention of the audience. “Speaking in appropriate phrases, emphasizing certain words, raising and lowering volume, and varying intonation help the listener understand what the speaker is
trying to communicate” (Rasinski, 2004, p. 2). Just like giving a speech, reading aloud is a performance task that can be intimidating for some students, especially those with anxiety, striving to read, and those who speak English as an additional language. Thus, oral fluency is important when reading to others, and may be an indicator of internal fluency. However, it is critical to remember that the purpose of fluent reading, as a developing reader, is that fluency in our heads assists us as readers to understand the author’s meaning. The goal is for students to read fluently and with meaning—it is an essential learning component for students to become proficient readers (Rasinski, 2002; Rasinski 2013).
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APPENDIX B: 2016 EXPERT PANEL

Christine Clausen, M.Ed. (2016) currently serves as Literacy Curriculum and Assessment Specialist for elementary schools and K–12 libraries in Everett Public Schools. She leads ongoing professional learning for literacy educators focusing on high-leverage instructional practices, early reading acceleration strategies, and supports reading specialists as literacy coaches in their schools. As part of her 28 years of service in education, Ms. Clausen has also functioned as a classroom teacher, Language Arts Specialist, and Reading Recovery teacher where she employed best practice literacy instruction and worked with struggling readers and writers. She has also served as a district Literacy Facilitator and Literacy Coordinator for elementary programs. Ms. Clausen earned a Master of Arts degree in Curriculum and Instruction (with a specialty in Reading) from Seattle University and received Program Administrator certification from Seattle Pacific University. Besides work in her local district, she has presented at WORD, WERA, and regional IRA conferences. Presently, she serves as Professional Learning Coach for the Washington Transforming Professional Learning project that supports transformative, systemic planning for professional learning with educators. Ms. Clausen has also served as a mentor/coach for the National Urban Alliance for Effective Education.

Cynthia Chaput, M.Ed. (2016) serves the Lake Grove Elementary community in Federal Way as the Dean of Students. She has worked in education for over 25 years serving as a teacher, instructional coach, literacy coach, interventionist, and program manager. Cindy received her BS in Broadcast Journalism, BA in Elementary Education, MA in Curriculum & Instruction, and is currently completing her doctorate dissertation at SPU in Education Administration. She is nationally board certified in literacy. Her experience is predominately working in schools that serve diverse, high needs, and Title I student populations. Her commitment to closing the achievement gap has been a focus in her presentations and speeches that she has given nationally and internationally.

Jeffrey Dunn, Ph.D. (2016) was named ESD 101 Regional Teacher of the year in 2014. He works as the Secondary LAP Coordinator in the Deer Park School District where he directs regular school day and summer school project-based, credit retrieval programs; coordinates the school’s career counseling advisory program; and works with students, parents, and teachers toward the goal of high school graduation for all. To this end, he started using standards-based grading 20 years ago and works with OSPI in the initial development of the Washington’s Collection of Evidence Alternative Assessment System. Because he is dyslexic and has an autistic child, he is particularly sensitive to the needs of cognitively unique students. Globally, Jeffrey believes in Paulo Freire’s theory that great teachers should first be model students—exemplifying the courtesy, ethics, creativity, and determination, they hope to cultivate in their students. Jeffrey has taught English for 38 years and has earned a Ph.D. in English Literature and Culture Studies at the University of Pittsburgh.
Justin Young, Ph.D. (2015-2016) has taught ELA and researched issues in literacy at both the K–12 and college levels. He is faculty in the English department at Eastern Washington University, where he directs the writing program and writing center. Justin’s research focuses on reading and writing instruction across the P-16 continuum. He has published articles on the Common Core and college writing instruction, and is currently at work on a chapter to be included in the forthcoming book, What is College Reading? Exploring Reading in Every Discipline.

Leilani Thomas, M.Ed. (2016) has been in education for over 30 years. Starting her career as a bilinguist kindergarten teacher moving through the educational system serving many different ages including students in third, fourth, high school English, algebra, special education P-12, and university preservice and graduate programs. She taught in Paraguay SA and in the bush of Alaska. She also was a reading coach as part of the original Washington Reading Core. The last nine years she has served her district as the Executive Director, overseeing Title 1A, LAP, Special Education, Gifted, Assessment and Teaching/Learning. Leilani earned her M.Ed. at Western Washington University.

Liisa Moilanen Potts M.Ed. (2016) currently serves as the ELA Director for EdReports.org, a national nonprofit that works to support educators across the country with access to information about high quality instructional materials. Prior to this role, Liisa was the ELA Director for Teaching and Learning at OSPI. She has been an adjunct ELA instructor at Green River Community College since 2007. Liisa sits on the boards of the Puget Sound Writing Project (western Washington), Write, and Teach (CA) and is a National Writing Project Fellow. Liisa holds a Bachelor’s degree from the University of Washington and a Master’s degree from the University of Iowa.

Linda Wert, M.Ed. (2014-2016) earned a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work and a Master’s Degree in Applied Psychology from Eastern Washington University. She holds general and special education teaching certification jointly from Central, Eastern, and Washington State Universities. She also received a school counseling certificate from Eastern Washington University, Reading Recovery certification from Seattle University and Comprehensive Literacy and Intervention District Coach Certification from the Center for Literacy at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. She has also been trained by the State of Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in dyslexia and the training modules developed for professional development in intervention best practices. She is currently completing dissertation work for a PhD. In Reading from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock under the Chairmanship of Dr. Linda Dorn. Ms. Wert has been in the field of education for 28 years in multiple capacities within special and general education including teaching, literacy coaching, and intervention for struggling learners. She is currently the district coordinator for K–6 intervention in English and Language Arts for Spokane Public schools in Spokane, Washington.
Lori Inman, M.Ed. (2016) is a Secondary ELA Content Specialist in the Mead School District, where she has taught grades 10-12 and served in many leadership capacities for the past 22 years. Currently, Lori trains teachers from around the region in understanding and applying the Washington State Standards along with training on the Smarter Balanced Assessment. She has served on multiple state-level committees including: WASL range-finding, item writing, and scoring; COE task development and assistant scoring director; and multiple standard setting and SBA committees. In her capacity as a district, local and state level leader, she has impacted literacy through teacher trainings on best practices in reading and writing. Literacy is her passion, and she works diligently toward ensuring that all students have the skills necessary for future success in college and career. Lori graduated magna cum laude from Eastern Washington State University where she also earned her M.Ed. in literacy. In 2010, Lori earned her administrative credentials through Washington State University to further support her leadership work across the state.

Matt Lemon, MPA (2014-2016) conducts applied policy research for the state Legislature with a focus in education. His work in K–12 policy includes studies of innovative schools in Washington and the Learning Assistance Program, which provides academic support to struggling students. His work in higher education has examined a scholarship program for foster youth (Passport to College Promise) and the Washington State Need Grant for low-income undergraduate students. In addition to his research, Matt is a member of the K–12 Data Governance group that oversees the development and implementation of an education data system in Washington State. Matt graduated magna cum laude from Western Washington University with a BA in political science and received a M.P.A. from The Evergreen State College.

Marsha Riddle Buly, Ph.D. (2016) is a Past-President of Washington Association for Bilingual Education (WABE), is the author of NCTE’s English Language Learners in Literacy Workshops. She is co-recipient of the Literacy Research Association’s (LRA) 2015 P. David Pearson scholarly influence award for her work identifying varying profiles of striving readers, including those adding English as an additional language. Marsha is a literacy professor at Western Washington University and “on loan” as a ½ time district Literacy/ELL support TOSA to Bellingham School District. She is an agency GLAD trainer with Bellingham Schools and WWU, and the Director of the PESB funded Future Bilingual Teacher Fellows Alternative Certification (FBTF) program between WWU and Highline Schools.

Molly Branson Thayer, EdD (2016) is the Director of Quality Youth Development at CQEL, at the University of Washington’s College of Education. Molly’s career in education over the last 25 years has focused on improving the quality of education and experiences for children birth through 18. Early on, this included teaching in urban public schools in both Chicago and San Francisco, and 10 years as the Director of Literacy at the University of Chicago. Throughout her
career, Molly has had the opportunity to work with school networks and districts nationally to implement high quality prek–12 literacy instruction, develop educational tools that inform evidenced-based instruction, contribute to research that promotes high-quality educational experiences, and lead systemic efforts to improve education. While at the University of Chicago, Molly co-founded UChicago Impact. Molly earned a Bachelor’s Degree in American Studies from the University of Minnesota, a Master’s Degree in Education from San Francisco State University, and a Doctorate Degree in Reading and Language from National Louis University.

Teri Ann Barlow, M.Ed. (2016) earned her undergraduate degrees from Lakehead University and Simon Fraser University (both in Canada) and her Master’s Degree from City University (Seattle, WA). She taught English Language Arts and Social Studies for seven years in a variety of alternative secondary education programs with the Burnaby and Renton School Districts before becoming the literacy specialist and reading teacher at Renton High School in 2006. She continues to be involved in numerous building, district, and state initiatives relating to literacy in the content areas, English Language Arts instruction, and school improvement efforts.

Theresa Kendall, M.Ed. (2016) is the Categorical Programs/K–4 Literacy Administrator in the West Valley School District (Spokane WA). Her path to public education came later in her career. After attaining a BA in Business Management at EWU, Theresa worked in the private sector within the computer industry. Her love for education and her belief in the role passionate teachers play came as she realized she was spending more time volunteering at her children’s school than was typical. Theresa graduated a few years later with a degree in Child/Human Development, endorsed in Elementary Education and Reading K–12. She further explored the power of teaching & learning by completing her Masters in Teaching Mathematics, National Board Certification in Literacy, and Administrative/Principal credential. With 20+ years in education at various capacities, classroom teacher, reading specialist, building administrator, and Categorical Programs, she always keeps at the center of her work, the power of the classroom teacher and the great importance of meeting the needs of all learners.

Todd E. Johnson, EdD (2015-2016) is the Director of the Center for Research & Data Analysis for Capital Region ESD 113 in Tumwater, Washington. In this role, he supports staff, teachers, school and district leaders in implementing emerging, evidence-based, and scientifically based research into local, regional, and statewide practices. Prior to being the Director of Research and Data Analysis at ESD 113, he was an Assistant Professor in Educational Psychology at Washington State University in Pullman, Washington. Dr. Johnson received his Doctoral Degree from Auburn University in Educational Psychology with a specialization in Research and Evaluation. He received his Master’s Degree from the University of Northern Colorado in Rehabilitation Counseling with an emphasis in Vocational Evaluation.
Wendy Blocher, M.Ed. (2016) received her BA in Elementary Education at Wheaton College in 1999 and her Master’s in Education in Curriculum and Instruction in 2006. She is the Learning Assistance Program Facilitator for the Renton School District. Wendy started her career teaching for Chicago Public Schools. After moving to Washington, Wendy taught 6th grade ELA for 13 years and Reading Intervention for 3 years, successfully closing the achievement gap for at-risk learners before becoming the LAP Facilitator in 2012. She has been directly involved with the district’s transition to Balanced Literacy and recent elementary reading adoption. Wendy provides professional development and coaching to 29 elementary reading specialists. Additionally, she helps provide student-focused data analysis, program implementation, and supports building and district RTI structures. This includes tracking district data to monitor program and student growth. She has developed and coordinated the district’s reading summer program the past two years.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Dunn</td>
<td>Deer Park School District</td>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>2016</td>
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<td>Concrete School District</td>
<td>Special Programs Director</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liisa Potts</td>
<td>EdReports.org</td>
<td>ELA Director</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Wert</td>
<td>Spokane School District</td>
<td>Coordinator of Special Programs</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Inman</td>
<td>Mead School District</td>
<td>Secondary ELA Content Specialist</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha Riddle Buly</td>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Lemon</td>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP)</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>2014-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Jacobsen</td>
<td>White River School District</td>
<td>Curriculum Director</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molly Branson Thayer</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Director of Quality Youth Development</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Duffey</td>
<td>Wenatchee School District</td>
<td>Director of State and Federal Programs</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Pottle</td>
<td>Bellingham School District</td>
<td>ELA Coach</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Dibble</td>
<td>Yakima School District</td>
<td>Assessment Specialist</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Chow</td>
<td>Tacoma School District</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Howard II</td>
<td>Garfield High School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Lyon</td>
<td>Lawton Elementary</td>
<td>Elementary Teacher</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Kendall</td>
<td>West Valley School District</td>
<td>Categorical Programs/K–4 Literacy Administrator</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Johnson</td>
<td>ESD 113</td>
<td>Director, Center for Research and Data</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Blocher</td>
<td>Renton School District</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program Facilitator</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OSPI Staff, National Advisors, and Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aira Jackson</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, K–12 ELA</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Ripley</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>K–12 Literacy Specialist, Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Thierry</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, LAP ELA and Research</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Vaughn</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, LAP Math and Research</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Cobb</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Policy Research and State Transformation Specialist</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Gallagher</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Learning and Teaching Mathematics</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Hert</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Fixsen</td>
<td>National Implementation Research Network</td>
<td>Co-Director</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Came</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Student Information</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie Grunenfelder</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Guidance Counseling and Navigation 101</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Pauley</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Special Programs and Federal Accountability</td>
<td>2014, 2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Williamson</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Student Support</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Malagon</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Migrant Bilingual</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jami Peterson</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>2014, 2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jess Lewis</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, Behavior and Discipline</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Vavrus</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Johnston Nelson</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>EL Trainer and Consultant</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bresko</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor Special Education</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordyn Green</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Data Analyst, Student Information</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Lynch</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, Behavior and Discipline</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith Mosby</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Student and School Success Reading Instruction, Assessment, and Implementation</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Chace</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Young</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, LAP ELA and Research</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathe Taylor</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevan Saunders</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberlee Cusick</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Secretary Senior, LAP</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaWonda Smith</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, Title I/LAP and Consolidated Program Reviews</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liisa Moilanen Potts</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Literacy and Professional Learning Integration</td>
<td>2014, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Flores</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Manager, Accountability and Research</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mea Moore</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Migrant Bilingual</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kamil</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula Moore</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Title I/LAP and Consolidated Program Reviews</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porsche Everson</td>
<td>Relevant Strategies</td>
<td>President and Project Facilitator</td>
<td>2014, 2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Hart</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Professional Learning Integration and State Implementation Specialist</td>
<td>2015, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Munson</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley O’Dell</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>ELA Assessment Specialist</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Iwaszuk</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor and State Transformation Specialist</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D: LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Active Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Alphabet Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVID</td>
<td>Advancement Via Individual Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Center for Applied Special Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSS</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBMs</td>
<td>Classroom-Based Measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Literacy Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLD</td>
<td>Digital Learning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>English Learners (Learning English as an additional language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP</td>
<td>English Language Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Educational Service Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSB</td>
<td>Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAB</td>
<td>Interim Assessment Blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>Interim Comprehensive Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Individualized Education Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSS</td>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTM</td>
<td>National Council of Teachers of Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELP</td>
<td>National Early Literacy Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIRN</td>
<td>National Implementation Research Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST</td>
<td>Out of School Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDSA</td>
<td>Plan, Do, Study, Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>Professional Learning Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCW</td>
<td>Revised Code of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI</td>
<td>Response to Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTL</td>
<td>Readiness to Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SISEP</td>
<td>State Implementation and Scaling up of Evidence-based Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPEP</td>
<td>Washington State Teacher/Principal Evaluation Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDL</td>
<td>Universal Design for Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSIPP</td>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at (360) 725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at www.k12.wa.us/sseo. This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at (888) 595-3276, TTY (360) 664-3631.