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Executive Summary

Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946 passed the state Legislature in 2013. It required the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to convene an English Language Arts (ELA) panel of experts to develop a menu of best practices and strategies to help low-achieving students in grades K–4 and K–12, served by the state’s Learning Assistance Program (LAP), to accelerate their ELA performance. Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes: Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts includes best practices for struggling students as well as connections to best practices for all students as aligned with the Common Core State Standards, the work of the National Reading Panel, and the National Early Literacy Panel.

In addition to the general education ELA requirements, the Legislature also tasked OSPI to convene panels of experts to develop menus of best practices and strategies in mathematics and reducing disruptive behavior for students served by LAP in grades K–12. Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes: Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts (ELA) was first published July 1, 2014. The Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for Mathematics and the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for Reducing Disruptive Behavior were published on July 1, 2015. All three menus are to be continuously reviewed and updated by July 1 each year.

The 2014 ELA panel of experts determined that the work required for ELA in sections 106 and 203 of 2013 ESSB 5946 (RCW 28A.655.235) should be combined as one menu. The panel of experts agreed that the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA would contain many, if not all, of the same practices and strategies for instruction of all students in grades K–4 and low-achieving students in grades K–12. Specific population considerations for students are included, when they apply, within each of the best practice and strategies sections.

State and federal initiatives have sought to increase achievement in literacy for children across the pre-K to Grade 12 since the early 2000s [e.g., Reading First (federal), Washington Reading Corps (state), and Striving Readers (federal)]. Since 1987, Washington state has provided supplemental funds (via Learning Assistance Program) to districts to provide support for struggling students in literacy. However, demonstrated outcomes have yielded uneven academic success across districts. The Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA identifies evidence and researched-based practices that will accelerate student growth in literacy for all students in the state.

The ELA panel of experts collaborated with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) in the development of the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA. As required in separate legislation, WSIPP provided a companion report, Inventory of

1 Also see Chapter 28A.165 RCW and WAC 392-162.
Evidence- and Research Based Practices: Washington’s K-12 Learning Assistance Program, which identifies research-based and evidence-based practices, strategies and programs that are shown to improve student outcomes. Many of the best practices and strategies identified for inclusion in the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA were also included in the WSIPP report. In addition, the WSIPP report identifies an average effect-size and a cost-benefit analysis for each intervention.
Background

*Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5956—Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes*

Washington’s 2013 Legislature passed **ESSB 5946** *(RCW 28A.655.235)* in the 2nd Special Legislative Session in June 2013. The overall bill sets forth a vision for improving educational support systems for every student in grades K–12. The first section of Part 1, *Learning to Read, Reading to Learn*, references the importance of collaborative partnerships essential to supporting students; using research- and evidence-based programs for all students, especially in the early years for grades K–4; and providing statewide models to support school districts in implementing a multi-tiered system of support. Part 2 of the bill, **Requiring the Learning Assistance Program to be Evidence-Based**, references LAP’s focus on evidence-based support for students struggling in reading (with primary emphasis on grades K–4), mathematics, and behavior across grades K–12. **Part 2. Requiring the Learning Assistance Program to be Evidence-Based, section** 203 tasks OSPI to convene “panel of experts” to develop menus of best practices and strategies for ELA (K–4 and K–12), mathematics (K–12), and behavior (K–12).

The **Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes: Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts** as published July 1, 2014, must be updated by July 1 every year, beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, districts must select a practice or strategy from the menu or may use a practice or strategy that is not on a state menu for two years initially. If the district is able to demonstrate improved outcomes for participating students over two school years at a level commensurate with the best practices and strategies on the state menu, the OSPI will approve use of the alternative practice or strategy by the district for one additional school year. Subsequent annual approval by OSPI to use the alternative practice or strategies is dependent on the district continuing to demonstrate increased improved outcomes for participating students.

By August 1st each year, school districts must report to OSPI:
- **a)** the amount of academic growth gained by students participating in the learning assistance program;
- **b)** the number of students who gain at least one year of academic growth; and
- **c)** the specific practices, activities, and programs used by each school building that received learning assistance program funding.

To ensure that school districts are meeting the requirements of this legislation, OSPI is tasked to analyze the reported data to determine which practices are most effective. OSPI is also tasked to review districts through the Consolidated Performance Review process to monitor school district fidelity in implementing best practices when using LAP funds.

**WSIPP Inventory of Evidence-Based and Research-Based Practices**

In addition to direction to OSPI per 2013 **ESSB 5946** *(RCW 28A.655.235)* the Legislature directed the 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 to be companion pieces. As such, OSPI and WSIPP coordinated their tasks to ensure that the content of both initial reports were consistent, while still adhering to the unique directives given to each agency.

Both agencies collaborated on identifying topics for consideration for best practices and strategies. WSIPP Assistant Director Annie Pennucci and Research Associate Matt Lemon were key participants in the expert panel sessions as non-voting members. They provided research references to the panel members and solicited panel member input regarding effective practices. The two agencies then followed different, complementary processes for identifying practices for the WSIPP’s Inventory of Evidence- and Research-Based Practices: Washington’s K–12 Learning Assistance Program for inclusion in the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA.

As noted above, WSIPP conducted a rigorous meta-analysis of each potential practice and identified evidence- and research-based practices for the inventory according to the average effect-size and a cost-benefit analysis of each practice. 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 notation indicating whether the practices included in the menu are evidence-based or research-based, as determined by the WSIPP research. Additional practices and strategies are included in the menu as “promising” based on the research reviewed by the panel of experts.

Washington State Literacy

*Learning to Read and Reading to Learn in Washington*

Due to local control, Washington’s literacy teaching landscape is as diverse as our 295 public school districts. Across the state, educators work diligently to provide support in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language for all children. OSPI and statewide partners work to support literacy instruction by continually revising and improving the supports and systems available for teachers to support building children’s strong literacy skills.

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.
The Washington State Comprehensive Literacy Plan: Birth to Grade 12 (CLP) expands the definition of literacy, integrating the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts, the English Language Proficiency Standards, and a multi-level instructional framework to guide core instruction and intervention supports for all students.

Washington's definition of literacy was developed by the State Literacy Team, made up of experts and practitioners from across Washington. This definition of literacy, on page two of the CLP, 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 also 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, multi-cultural society (CLP 2012).

The overarching goal of the CLP is grounded in state learning standards for all students, and is based on the foundation that literacy encompasses all developmental phases. We must address the different abilities and needs of children through instruction, assessment, and intervention in each student’s primary language. The CLP and its associated resources recognize student diversity by incorporating strategies that are relevant to cultural and linguistic differences, as well as different learning styles.

In July 2011, Washington adopted the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts (CCSS-ELA) to replace the state’s 2005 Reading, Writing, and Communication Learning Standards. The CCSS-ELA 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. The progressions for learning provide specific focus for each grade level. The standards lay the groundwork for new benchmarks for reading achievement that better fit the skills students need across all grade levels. There are three Key Shifts in English Language Arts to support students’ achieving the standards:

1. Using complex text and academic language for regular practice
2. Using evidence from the text to support reading, writing and speaking
3. Using content-rich nonfiction to build student knowledge

In December 2013, OSPI adopted new Washington State English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards. These standards were developed to address the increased rigor and language demands of the career- and college-ready standards, and they are aligned with the CCSS-ELA standards. According to A Call for Equity and Excellence for ELLs in Washington State, ELL students make up 10.5 percent of the student population in Washington, over 110,000 students are in the process of learning a new language while simultaneously engaging in content to meet rigorous grade-level standards. With the ELL specialist and content area teacher in mind, the ELP Standards provide the language bridge to move students toward full engagement and academic success.

The ELP Standards make it clear that language learning encompasses more than just learning grammar and vocabulary. It includes a focus on receptive, productive, and
interactive modalities for instruction of ELLs. With the new 2013 ELP Standards, English language development goes hand-in-hand with our state’s 2012 expanded definition of literacy as found in Washington’s CLP, identifying how a greater emphasis on instruction in student’s primary language will enhance cognitive processes.

With the adoption of the CCSS-ELA and associated ELP Standards as Washington K–12 Learning Standards and the refinement of the state’s CLP state literacy partners are poised to provide comprehensive and coherent professional learning for educators to better support accelerated learning outcomes for all students.

OSPI and literacy experts from across the state (including experts in K–4 literacy) in each of the nine Educational Service Districts (ESDs) have jointly developed professional learning opportunities (common across all regions) to support robust implementation of the CCSS-ELA and early literacy instruction. Funded via 2013 ESSB 5946 (RCW 28A.655.235) these opportunities provide targeted resources to each ESD region to improve K–4 ELA support for teachers and students. The work of these “regional literacy coordinators” is grounded in the standards (i.e. CCSS-ELA) and ELPs, and foundational research (e.g. CLP and Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA), and will serve as a strong support system for districts as they move forward to implement their local comprehensive literacy plans.

Evidence-based teaching practices for effective K–4 reading instruction includes: explicit instruction, modeling and scaffolding, dynamic and flexible grouping, increased reading time, discussion, and frequent oral and silent reading practice (Jones et al., 2012). Effective K–4 reading teachers must differentiate and adapt instruction according to multiple points of formative and interim student assessments, as well as carefully monitor student progress and reteach as necessary (Denton, 2009). The ultimate reading goal for all K–12 students is for each student to possess the skills to “comprehend texts across a range of types and disciplines” (CCSS-ELA).

**Classroom and Student-Centered Practices**

Best practices and strategies 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 CCSS-ELA, students who are college/career ready exhibit the following attributes (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 student-centered teaching principles, practices, and strategies essential to the effective preparation of students for college and career expectations and literacy success.

Learning Environment
A learning environment that fosters student academic growth starts on the first day of school and is established through expectations that are understood and accepted by students. These expectations are practiced until they become classroom routines (Marzano, 2003; Borich, 2011). Student-centered classrooms foster independence and assists in deep learning through evaluation and reflection (Marzano, 2010). 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 to meet the teaching and learning needs of all students. Establishing an area for whole class instruction and small group work are essential to maximize student academic achievement (Marzano 2003; Borsh, 2011). Decorating the classroom must focus on function; “[I]t is not your job to create a ‘pretty’ environment; it is your job to create a ‘learning’ environment” Marzano, 2003, p. 98). The social climate is established through interactions in the classroom. They can be cooperative, competitive, and individually focused. The learning climate needs to be aligned to the learning goals (Marzano, 2003; Borich, 2011). 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, teachers are tasked with meeting the diverse academic and emotional needs of their students. Educators must also “appreciate that readiness is profoundly influenced by an individual’s prior learning success or failure, self-esteem, sense of efficacy, cultural norms, social status within the class or group, life experience, dispositions and attitudes, and habits of mind”(Powell & Kusuma-Powell, 2011). Four areas for differentiation are: (1) content (2) process (3) product (4) the learning environment (Heacox, 2002). 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, teachers can create an environment of safety and trust, providing a sense of well-being.

Background Knowledge & Academic Literacies
Effective literacy instruction for struggling students requires that teachers assess and tap into students’ background knowledge. Teachers must also work to connect students’ primary or home literacy practices with the academic literacy practices required for success in school and for eventual success in college and career. Background knowledge can be understood as the wide range of academic knowledge and personal experiences that each
student brings to the classroom. As Fisher et al. (2012, p. 23) notes, “An individual’s background knowledge develops through interaction with people, places, experiences, Internet sources, texts, and content formally taught.” Numerous studies have demonstrated a correlation between background knowledge and academic achievement (Marzano, 2004). By attending to students’ background knowledge, teachers can be more precise in instruction and make material more relevant to students (Fisher et al., 2012). Additionally, research indicates that information about students’ home language practices should inform academic literacy instruction in the classroom. Similarly, literacy outcomes can be improved through student engagement in digital literacy and multi-literacies; students’ use of technology to read, write, and generally communicate in the home should be connected to their use of technology in the classroom as they develop their CCSS-ELA skills (Plowman et al., 2010).

**Metacognitive Strategies and Non-Cognitive Skills**

Metacognition is the process of reflecting on how one thinks and learns (Livingston, 2003). Research suggests that students who use metacognitive strategies while they read better comprehend the text. Successful readers may intuitively incorporate these strategies during reading, but struggling readers benefit from explicit instruction in metacognitive strategies (Eilers & Rogers, 2006; Boulware-Goode, et al., 2007). 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 (Conley, 2013). Grit and growth mindsets 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 (Perkins-Gough, 2013; Elish-Piper, 2014). 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.

**Multi-Tiered System of Support Framework (MTSS)**

MTSS is a term that is being used with increasing frequency across the country to define a proactive prevention framework that organizes district and building-level resources to accommodate all students via early identification of learning and behavior challenges. This early identification allows for timely intervention services for students who are at risk of not meeting grade-level benchmarks, and it identifies students in need of advanced academic services. A Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework is an integrated, multi-tiered system of instruction, assessment, and intervention designed to meet the academic achievement and behavioral needs of all students. Although not all MTSS structures use three tiers, it is easy to think of “All” (Core) students, “Some” (Supplemental) students and “Few” (Intensive) students.

An MTSS framework is an evidenced-based process that emphasizes data-based decision-making. The instruction, assessment, and intervention are delivered to students with
varying intensity based upon student need. As an Issue Brief from National Center for Learning Disabilities (n.d.) notes, “Research and current practices show that schools and districts engaging in aligning resources, promoting greater collaboration, and striving to serve students through a rigorous MTSS when they first struggle academically and behaviorally leads to gains in reading... scores for all students” (p. 1). Further, a meta-analytic study of four approaches to MTSS (Burns, et al., 2005) indicated that this kind of instructional framework has a positive effect on student achievement.

**Evidenced-Based Practices/Curriculum/Instructional Materials**
An effective MTSS system is grounded in starting with strong core instruction meeting the instructional needs of at least 80 percent of students. It is committed to establishing and sustaining a positive school climate.

**Data-Based Decision Making**
Decisions are based upon evidence. This includes decisions about individual students and how the MTSS is developed and implemented. There needs to be a feedback process developed that routinely reviews the effectiveness of MTSS.

**Comprehensive Assessment System**
A good MTSS includes strong initial core instruction with ongoing and frequent monitoring of student progress through a comprehensive assessment system. MTSS components include universal screening (benchmark assessments), progress monitoring, diagnostic assessments, and strong formative assessment processes. For each of these components, it is important that established protocols are followed for all formal assessments, that decision rules are in place for students not making satisfactory progress, and that instructional/data teams receive sufficient training to support for implementing all components of the process and associated assessments. This comprehensive assessment system to support literacy should include:

- Universal screening
- Regular progress monitoring
- Diagnostic assessments of the child's strengths and weaknesses
- Formative assessment processes
- As per the National Advisory Panel convened by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, formative assessment, “…is a deliberate process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides actionable feedback that is used to adjust ongoing teaching and learning strategies to improve students’ attainment of curricular learning targets/goals.” The formative assessment process should consist of four critical attributes that operate in a cyclical process: 1) clarification of intended learning; 2) elicitation of evidence; 3) interpretation of evidence; and 4) acting on evidence.

An effective MTSS is instrumental in the development of a systematic K-4 approach to supporting struggling readers. MTSS offers a framework for coordinating core and
supplemental instruction based on evidence-based practices to meet the needs of individual students struggling to learn to read.

Included in the CLP is a recommended multi-level plan for literacy instruction. This recommended model is aligned with the National Center on Response to Intervention and uses differentiated instruction with flexible grouping. The plan also includes specific district, school, and classrooms practices within the following components (CLP 2012, p. 26-33).

* **Core Program:** All students receive quality core instruction covering all areas of literacy development
* **Strategic Instruction:** Supplemental instruction in small groups in addition to Core instruction
* **Intensive Intervention:** Targeted intervention to help make breakthrough progress towards state content standards for students needing additional support

For successful implementation of MTSS, intervention(s) must be well defined and planned. The following acts as a guide for implementation: training for implementers, coaching for implementers, measure of fidelity (checklist), and use of fidelity data (in written report) for review of program(s).

“Fidelity of implementation” addresses the question of whether the intervention strategy was delivered as it was intended. The components of fidelity include intensity, duration, and frequency. Fidelity has been increasingly emphasized and is now viewed as an essential component to successful implementation of an initiative or program. Without attention to fidelity of implementation, “it cannot be determined whether the outcomes are attributable to the intervention, influences of unknown variables, or the failure to implement the intervention as designed” (Dumas et al., 2001). Additionally, there is increasingly clear evidence that interventions implemented with fidelity are associated with better outcomes (Durlak & DuPre, 2008).

**Content Acceleration**

The focus of LAP services must be content acceleration. Content acceleration is when the amount of learning is increased in a given time period. For example, over the course of a school year, students should show ten months of academic achievement growth with regular core instruction. By focusing on content acceleration, students served outside of core instruction through LAP services should perform beyond the expected ten months of growth. The amount of content acceleration will depend on the intensity and quality of the services. An increase in learning may refer to more learning at a given level of difficulty and/or learning at a higher level of difficulty (Levin, 1988). The goal of content acceleration is to bring students up to grade level
via a curriculum characterized by high expectations and objectives rather than “pull out” interventions (Levin, 1987).

Accelerated learning seeks to improve student achievement by providing enriched learning experiences via deeply engaging instruction, rather than slowing down instruction via a remediation model (Finnan & Chasin, 2007). In contrast to an approach focused on speed, Finnan & Swanson (2000) define accelerated learning as “learning that is of high intellectual quality; it is substantive, authentic, and relevant. Accelerated learning is continuous and connected; it is grounded in high standards. Accelerated learning occurs when students are active and responsible, involved in intellectual pursuits with other students, and turned on to learning” (p. 11).

Acceleration has a long history in gifted education, but evidence suggests positive outcomes for at-risk students as well (Finnan & Chasin, 2007).

As a strategy for improving the achievement of struggling learners, accelerated learning operates in contrast to remedial instruction. Henry Levin, founder of the Stanford Accelerated Schools Project, has found that remediation actually slows students’ academic progress. Levin’s research suggests that such intervention models reduce learning expectations and marginalize students: once students are assigned to remedial interventions, their learning slows and the achievement gap widens (Levin, 1987). Levin notes that the opposite needs to happen: “To close the achievement gap, disadvantaged students must learn at a faster rate than other children. ...[S]chooling interventions for the educationally disadvantaged must be based upon principles of accelerating their learning beyond their normal rate” (Levin, 1988, p. 3). In 1986, Dr. Levin founded the Accelerated Schools Project for economically disadvantaged students based on the principle that by “providing equal access to and deeper engagement with enriched learning experiences, schools could alter many students’ rate of learning” (Byrd & Finnan, 2003, p. 49).

Accelerated schools are most typically utilized at the elementary level to advance at-risk students to the academic mainstream by the end of elementary school (Byrd and Finnan, 2003; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991).

**Literacy Acceleration**

Research on defining and assessing the effectiveness of literacy acceleration parallels the literature on content acceleration. Ann Duffy (2001) defines literacy acceleration “as instruction that enables struggling readers to make rapid progress and read as well as or better than their peers not struggling in reading, as opposed to ‘remedial’ instruction which often slows down and decontextualizes instruction, resulting in struggling readers making little progress” (p. 3). Marie Clay (1993), echoing Levin, notes that the struggling reader has to make faster progress than her classmates in order to become an average-progress reader,
and suggests that "Acceleration is achieved as the child takes over the learning process and works independently, discovering new things for himself inside and outside the lessons" (p. 8-9).

Some approaches to literacy acceleration include one-on-one tutoring (Clay, 1993; Duffy, 2001), small-group interventions (Duffy, 2001), and summer interventions (Jacobsen et al., 2002). Each of these models can be deployed in remedial programs of literacy instruction; an accelerated literacy approach is distinguished by its insistence on a shared focus on reaching high standards via reflective instruction, enrichment, and engagement (Finnan & Chasin, 2007; Clay, 1991; Duffy, 2001).

Learning acceleration is particularly well suited to the K–4 classroom as it is most frequently utilized in order to get students up to standard before the end of elementary school (Levin, 1988). Accelerated learning strategies and standards for K–4 readers must be informed by the five core components of evidence-based literacy instruction (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). Moreover, as noted above, student engagement is a key to accelerated learning (Levin, 1988; Byrd & Finnan, 2003; Duffy 2000); unique practices and strategies that will effectively engage and motivate young children must be considered.

Acceleration strategies should focus on ways to increase intrinsic attractiveness of learning activities and extrinsic rewards for putting effort into learning (Levin, 1988). Reflective teaching and learning is essential. Accelerated learning “happens when teachers… learn alongside their students and engage in meaningful discussion and dialogue with them. They are reflective in their practice and care about all students” (Finnan and Chasin, 2007). Additionally, learning acceleration requires a shared commitment to high expectations and quality instruction (Levin, 1988; Duffy 2000). Finally, learning acceleration is ideally implemented as a systematic effort involving a unity of purpose that involves administrators, teachers, parents, and students “in pursuit of a common vision” (Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991).

Identification and Progress Monitoring of Struggling Students
A student is eligible for LAP services in ELA if he/she does not meet standard on multiple measures of literacy academic performance. Measures of literacy academic performance may include school- and district-developed assessments, teacher observation, standardized assessments, and state summative and interim assessments. The Smarter Balanced assessment (Washington’s state summative assessment) is one measure that schools may use to determine whether a student is in need of supplemental education services and eligible for LAP. Students should be identified for supplemental services in ELA based on performance on valid and reliable screening measures.

Norm-referenced standardized tests assess multiple skill strands and generally provide the most detailed information about student performance. However, assessments should be selected thoughtfully to align with the depth and complexity of the state assessment. Performance on a progress monitoring assessment should be predictive of student achievement on the state assessment.
Curriculum-based measurements (CBMs) may be valid and reliable measures for determining reading proficiency. CBMs can be scheduled frequently for progress monitoring purposes because they only take a few minutes to administer (Stormont, et al., 2012). Short assessments that focus on discrete skills may not reflect the range of expectations of the state assessment but may provide complementary data for a comprehensive assessment of a student’s skills. It is important to consider other reading data sources to triangulate assessment results. There is always the possibility that a screening measure may under-identify or over-identify students for services. The use of multiple assessments provides greater accuracy in identifying students who need support. This is of particular importance when schools have limited resources to serve struggling students (Stormont, et al., 2012).

The National Center for RTI website (http://rti4success.org) houses resources for identifying valid and reliable screening and progress monitoring tools as evaluated by a technical review committee.

It is important that the interventionist or classroom teacher use data to monitor progress and inform instruction. It is essential to have frequent ongoing data collection that is both reliable and valid to determine students’ progress. The frequency of the data collection should be weekly or bi-weekly for struggling students (Stormont, et al., 2012).
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Overview
The panel of experts collaborated over January-May 2015 to develop the following Best Practices and Strategies ELA Menu for all K-4 and K-12 struggling students. The front matter and Appendix A of this document identify the foundational elements for supporting students’ literacy success and should be used in conjunction with the Washington State Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP), the Washington State Learning Standards for English Language Arts (CCSS-ELA), and the Washington State English Language Proficiency Standards (ELP).

The Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes: Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts menu is based on the most current evidence and rigorous research available. Panelists concurred with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to use the following 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 Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts list practices and strategies that have been shown to support literacy improvements for struggling learners. Many of these strategies and practices are used in commercially available supplemental programs that districts may acquire and use. It is important to note that the work of the expert panel was to identify proven general practices and strategies, not specifically branded programs that might employ those practices. Districts contemplating acquisition or use of one or more branded programs are encouraged to determine if the strategies and practices included in the menu are utilized by the branded programs and positively impact student achievement.
Table 1 shows a summary of the practices that are proven to be effective in strengthening student educational outcomes as determined by the expert panel. Each practice is described in more detail later in the report.

**Table 1: Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Level of Evidence</th>
<th>Panel Opinion</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Mentoring</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coaches</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Coaches</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Development Coaches</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Teaching</strong></td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Learning Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Learning Time within the School Day</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before and After School Programs</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Book Program</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement at School</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement Outside of School</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition-Based Family Involvement</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Professional Learning</td>
<td>Evidence-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Level of Evidence</td>
<td>Panel Opinion</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services Under RCW 28A.320.190--Extended Learning Opportunities Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Retrieval</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Readiness</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tutoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Interventionist</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tutoring</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Tutoring</td>
<td>Research-based</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Partnerships
According to the Ohio Department of Education, the “definition of a community partnership includes every formal arrangement a school can make with an individual, association, private sector organization or public institution to provide a program, service or resource that will help support student achievement” (n.d., p. 2). Effective community engagement initiatives must be comprehensive, integrated, and developed to address the unique needs of the student population.

Community-Based Student Mentoring
Mentoring is defined as a positive relationship between a non-parental adult or older youth to a younger child or youth (Gordon et al., 2009). 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 middle school African American 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).

Population Considerations
- Activities should be developmentally appropriate (Larose et al., 2010).
- Elementary school-based mentor programs must seek parent permission, and parents should be informed of the goals of the program and possible activities (Ryan et al., 2002).
- All students K-12 can benefit from community partnerships.
**Implementation Success Factors**

- Provide mentors and mentees regular opportunities to meet and participate in shared activities over an extended period of time (Ryan et al., 2002, p. 134).
- Screen Mentors (Ryan et al., 2002)
- Provide Training for Mentors (Ryan et al., 2002)
- Utilize a mentor coordinator who coordinates activities, communicates with families, and recruits/trains/supports mentors (Ryan et al., 2002)
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**Consultant Teachers/Instructional Coaches**

In many of Washington’s 295 school districts, there exist staff members who support reading and literacy instruction for students in addition to the core classroom teacher. There is no standardized identifying title, classification, nor name for these educators; in fact, they may even be identified by different titles within a district (e.g., consultants, instructional coaches, literacy coaches, literacy specialists, literacy intervention specialists, and others). Knowing this, schools and districts are encouraged to align their reading “support staff” using the definitions outlined, rather than relying solely on the headings as they make choices around this section. For the purpose of this menu, “literacy coaches” and “English language development coaches” are categorized as types of instructional coaches as generally described in the following entry. Additionally, co-teaching is included in this section as a promising practice.
**Instructional Coaches**

Instructional coaches’ focus on personalized and team-centered professional learning that is often embedded in teachers’ normal school days. To increase student achievement, coaches support staff, identify leadership needs, and facilitate decision making around components of the school day (e.g., instructional materials choices, data analysis/formative assessment, technology integration, instructional/pedagogical strategies). Coaches may specifically target meeting the needs of students identified for LAP services. Coaching should be student and data centered with a direct link to improved achievement 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).

Instructional coaches should be proficient with Washington’s K–12 Learning standards for English language arts, 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 struggling students.

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 professional learning cultures that support instructional coaching. Principals should closely monitor the roles of the instructional coaches to ensure the activities support teachers in improving their practice. “[S]tudies 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).

**Population Considerations**

- K-4 coaches must be proficient in early literacy skills
- 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 interventions with students
**Implementation Success Factors**

- Provide administrative support
- Provide frequent communication and collaboration with the staff
- Build trust with the staff
- Elicit an effective coaching disposition
- Connect coaching to current practices and on-going literacy initiatives (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Teach strategies that are reproducible by volunteers, paraeducators, and teachers (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Focus on student progress through data oriented teaching and learning (Blachowicz et al., 2005; Shanklin, 2006)
- Provide feedback to teachers through video reflection as they implement new strategies;
- Allow for review, reflection and adjusting techniques; and on agreement, can be shared with staff as an example of successful implementation;
- Use videos as a tool in successful coaching (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
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**Literacy Coaches**

Student success in literacy improvement is dependent on teachers’ abilities to employ 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 teachers most of the time in order to impact the maximum number of children. Literacy coaches are collaborative members of the larger faculty who work cohesively among staff to provide rich support for struggling readers.

Like other instructional coaches, literacy coaches collaborate with classroom teachers to maximize student learning and achievement. Data analysis of student learning outcomes guides coaching. Data comes in the form of both formative, classroom-based, interim, and summative assessments (Shanklin, 2006). Specific details surrounding the general professional duties of coaching are outlined above in the section on “Instructional Coaches.” Some of the demands of literacy coaches are similar to content-specific coaches. Literacy coaches must:

- Have specialized knowledge that goes beyond teaching reading;
- Build collaborative and trusting relationships that honor confidentiality and effective communication;
- Spend a majority of their time with teachers 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. They will ensure on-going, job-embedded professional development is available to all teachers, and will often include teacher study groups, co-teaching, adult learning time, and guidance in Response to Intervention efforts to improve literacy instruction and learning. Coaches are supportive not evaluative; they help guide teachers in reflection activities and identify areas for growth (Shanklin, 2006).
Population Considerations

- K-4 literacy coaches must be proficient in pedagogy and instruction to support early literacy skills development
- K-12 literacy coaches must be proficient in pedagogy and instruction to support student learning of Washington state standards for ELA (CCSS-ELA)
- K-12 literacy coaches must be proficient research-based teaching strategies
- K-12 literacy coaches must be proficient in using evidence- and research-based diagnostic assessments, progress monitoring, data analysis, and gap analysis tools
- K-12 literacy coaches must be able to plan and model lessons with teachers
- K-12 literacy coaches must be able to plan and model interventions with students

Implementation Success Factors

- Provide administrative support, guidance, and goals regarding the short- and long-term planning of literacy coaches (Shanklin, 2006)
- Define and develop a literacy coaching plan for the building (Shanklin, 2006)
- 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 (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Build trust with staff
- Provide frequent communication and collaboration opportunities for staff
- Teach strategies that are reproducible by volunteers, paraeducators and teachers (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Focus on student progress (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Provide feedback to teachers through video reflection as they implement new strategies (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Provide time to review, reflect and adjust techniques; and on agreement, share with staff as an example of successful implementation (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
- Use videos as a tool in successful coaching (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
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English Language Development Coaches

Like other instructional coaches, English language development (ELD) coaches collaborate with classroom teachers to maximize student learning and achievement for English language learners (ELL). Over the past decade, ELL students’ enrollment in Washington has increased. A unique pedagogy is necessary for teachers teaching ELL 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, ELD 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 second language acquisition processes.
- 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, ELD coaches are best supported when provided with explicit professional development opportunities that cater to their professional contexts (Burkins & Ritchie, 2007). Specific areas for ELD coaching professional development include:

- Explicit English Language Learner (ELL) instruction techniques (Hill & Flynn, 2006)
- Effective language scaffolding methods (Gibbons, 2002)
- Language demands across content areas (Egbert & Ernst-Slavit, 2010)
- Sheltering instruction for increased comprehension (Echevarria et al., 2012; Hanan, 2009)
- Family engagement strategies (Auerbach, 2012)
- Effective collaboration strategies to communicate with colleagues (West, 2012)
Differentiated instruction techniques (Bean & Isler, 2008)
How to create meaningful language opportunities (Freeman & Freeman, 1998).
How to integrate primary language into instruction (Thomas & Collier, 1997).
How to build on ELL students’ funds of knowledge (Gonzalez et al., 2005).
How to analyze text for cultural schema and cross-cultural teaching (Escamilla, 2007).

Effective ELD coaching also involves working closely with school literacy coaches while being mindful of supporting ELLs through linguistically and culturally appropriate ways. Of particular importance for ELD 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 ELL 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 ELL students are allowed to use both their first language and English in learning activities (Escamilla, 2007). ELD coaches are instrumental in mentoring teachers who work with ELL students.

Population Considerations
- K–4 ELD coaches must identify and assess language literacy needs.
- K-12 ELD coaches must have in-depth knowledge on language learning progressions.
- K-12 ELD coaches must have diagnostic skills to pinpoint gaps in students’ language learning.
- K-12 ELD coaches must be adept at developing and supporting instructional activities that are developmentally appropriate.
- K-12 ELD coaches must be able to plan, model and co-teach content lessons with teachers.
- K-12 ELD coaches must be able to plan, model and co-teach literacy lessons with teachers.
- K-12 ELD coaches must be able to plan and model interventions for ELL students.

Implementation Success Factors
- Provide administrative support and guidance regarding the short- and long-term planning of ELD coaches
- Ensure the work of the ELD coach is aligned to the broader vision of the school and the multi-tiered supports in the building
- Provide the foundation upon which the ELD coach can improve, enhance, and develop teachers’ efficacy in literacy 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 in successful coaching (Blachowicz et al., 2005)
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Co-Teaching
Co-teaching is an effective pedagogical strategy that generally refers to the instructional arrangement between two certified educational professionals in one classroom. This
arrangement can be scheduled for the entire day or for a designated time during the day. As a partnership between two educational professionals, co-teaching is designed to intensify instruction and enhance learning for struggling students. The benefits of co-teaching reach further than student academic growth. As a result of co-teaching, practitioners who participate in this arrangement 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, 2007).

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.” Planning, differentiating instruction, and monitoring student progress are shared responsibilities. For example, in the co-teaching model, two first grade teachers would work collaboratively in one classroom to meet the needs of all students together. Moreover, Villa et al. (2013) expand the definition of the co-teaching model to include paraprofessionals and pre-service (student) teachers. A pre-service teacher can work collaboratively with the mentor teacher and co-teach during the student teaching experience, versus the traditional observation roles during this time (Chanmugam & Gerlach, 2013).

Marilyn Friend (2014) offers 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 struggling students. Examples include a special education teacher, an ESL teacher, a speech and language therapist, a media specialist, a literacy or math coach, or a teacher of gifted and talented/highly capable students.

It is important to ensure all staff is using the same definition of roles for co-teaching. For example, co-teaching as described in this menu entry is a different concept than “team teaching” where two or more teachers at a grade level plan and deliver instruction to a combined group of students independently. At the secondary level, team teaching can refer to teachers planning together but delivering instruction independently or two or more content areas teachers, such as ELA and social studies, planning lessons together for the same students, but delivering the content matter independently in his/her own classroom.

Co-teaching may occur for just one period, for a block of time, or for an entire day. The roles of the teachers are shared and lessons are negotiated based upon the needs identified for the students receiving instruction. 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).

The advent of the Common Core State Standards supports high quality instruction by highly qualified teachers. Co-teaching, as defined above, is a viable model that will intensify instructional practices, provide access to core instruction and increase student achievement for all students. While this practice has been explored in the context of providing services for students identified for special education for over thirty years, a recent resurgence of interest has been the result of current reform demands. Co-teaching improves instructional
practices with its in-depth, all-inclusive, collaborative approach to improve teacher effectiveness (Chanmugam & Gerlach, 2013). At the district level, co-teaching is a promising model to enhance instruction at all grade levels with all students.

**Population Considerations**
- Well suited to K–4 classrooms
- Viable for all grade levels
- Promising with ELLs at all levels
- Effective for secondary students

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Provide training on co-teaching model
- Establish communication norms
- Establish collaboration norms and strategies
- Require agreement and openness to participate
- Establish systematic and periodic feedback and evaluation of the model
- Provide administrative support
- Develop strong co-teacher working relationships
- Appropriate allocation of resources
- Develop effective co-assessing strategies
- Provide adequate planning time (co-teaching requires more planning time than solo teaching)

**Resources**

Co-Teaching Connection: [http://www.marilynfriend.com/](http://www.marilynfriend.com/)


**References**


Simmons, R.J. & Magiera, K. (2007). Evaluation of co-teaching in three high schools within one school district: how do you know when you are truly co-teaching? *TEACHING*
Extended Learning Time
Extended learning time (ELT) is defined as additional content time that enhances core instruction. ELT encompasses multiple facets for educational learning opportunities designed to provide accelerated pathways for struggling students. These pathways may consist of extending the regularly scheduled school day, extending the regularly scheduled school year, accelerating literacy learning by focusing on additional literacy development time within the school day, providing before- or after-school programs, designing a literacy rich summer school program, and/or by providing a focused summer book program (ECONorthwest, 2008). Moreover, districts may choose to systematically develop multiple ELT pathways to meet the diverse needs of students and families within the system (Del Razo & Renée, 2013; Stelow, Holland & Jackson, 2012).

Evidence tells us that increased learning time over the course of the academic year, particularly in high-poverty and low-performing schools, can improve student achievement (Del Razo & Renée, 2013; Stelow, Holland & Jackson, 2012; McCombs, 2012). Studies identify several benefits of after-school programs that include improved academic success because there is more time for ELLs to work on oral language fluency, more time for students to build positive relationships, and more opportunities in a safe social/emotional environment for students to develop leadership skills (Stelow, Holland & Jackson, 2012). Summer school expands the school year for students and decreases summer-learning loss. Studies correlate summer reading programs with improvements in reading achievement (Anderson, Wilson & Fielding, 1998).

According to Annenberg Institute for School Reform (AISR), "Expanding learning time is as much about improving the quality of the actual amount of time a child learns as it is about expanding the quality and diversity of a child's learning” (Del Razo & Renée, 2013, p. 28). Extending literacy time is not just about more time; it is about the quality and intensity of the additional time (National Education Association, 2008). AISR, the National Center for Time and Learning (NCTL), and UCLA’s Institute for Democracy, Education, and Access (IDEA) are partnering on systematic reform measures to improve ELT for students. Research is focused on providing both more and better learning opportunities in ELT programs. In generation schools, schools have been able to “expand learning time by up to 30% for all students without increasing teachers’ time in the classroom” (Del Razo & Renée, 2013, p. 30). These schools extended the regularly scheduled school day by staggering the start and end time of the staff they currently have in the building; this enables the school day to extend without increasing the number of employees or the number of employee work hours each day. How districts design ELT will depend on the capacity and unique needs of the district.
Research indicates that achieving success with extended learning time services involves several key components: teacher quality and pedagogy, effective use of data, effective use of time, explicit and systematic implementation, and the use of curriculum that addresses the student’s needs and ability. Extended learning is not more of the same; it must emphasize accelerating achievement by increasing the intensity of instruction with the use of additional time within the school day, during before- or after-school programs, or through summer programs.
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Additional Learning Time within the School Day
The academic focus during additional learning time within the school day should be closely aligned to the CCSS-ELA. Additionally, alignment to the ELP Standards is necessary for ELL students. Collaboration time among teachers is essential to develop clarity and coherence among the general education teachers and the staff members providing the extended learning service for students to meet CCSS-ELA. 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, student needs 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. Struggling students who are not at standard 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 What Works Clearinghouse 2009 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. The best use of this intervention time is to use proven instructional strategies with small groups of students.

Mazzolini & Morely (2006) describe the benefits an extra period within the regular school day for literacy instruction has on accelerating literacy skills for middle- and high-school students reading one or more years below grade level. By regularly utilizing 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 struggling students within the school day will require a design shift for scheduling.

**Population Considerations**

- Additional learning time can work with all students K-12, including ELLs.
- Explicit, systematic instruction on targeted reading skills is best for native English learners and advanced ELLs K-12 (Goldenberg, 2013)
- Lowest-level ELLs need focused instruction on foundational literacy skills—oral fluency, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency and vocabulary
- ELLs home/primary language should be used to enhance literacy development (Goldenberg, 2013)
- Read alouds with time to discuss content and vocabulary is recommended for all groups including ELL and high school students—including interventions focused primarily on improving comprehension skills

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Establish clear goals and learning targets (Goldenberg, 2013)
- Establish routines and classroom norms (Goldenberg, 2013)
- Provide interventions in small homogeneous groups
- Establish regularly scheduled interventions (at least three times per week)
- Providing a positive teacher affect will make a difference for struggling student
- Design instruction based on achievement data and progress monitoring to meet individual student needs
- Design instruction that is systematic, allows time for student practice, and provides specific feedback to students
- Establish a plan that introduces skills in isolation and then integrate new skills with previously learned skills
- Provide support for ELLs in their home/primary language whenever feasible using graphic organizers, videos, and pictures (Goldenberg, 2013)
- Establish an assessments schedule for progress monitoring at least once per month (Gersten et.al., 2009)
- Make instructional decisions, including re-teaching, on the data collected (Gersten et.al., 2009)
Resources

- Foundational reading skills should be the focus for K-4 students
- Skill development and reading comprehension passages aligned to Washington state literacy standards: http://www.readworks.org/
- Understand the specific shifts in the core: http://achievethecore.org/
- The Center on Response to Intervention (www.rti4success.org) has essential components of RTI and suggested screening tools.
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Before and After School Programs

Before- and after-school programs provide students with many benefits, including additional time for literacy outside of the regular school day. Del Razo & Renée (2013) believe that in order to be college and career ready, “our current system—a six-hour school day and 180-day school year...is inadequate to achieve that goal” (p. 28). Parents in middle-class families frequently use their resources to provide their children with multiple opportunities for enrichment after school. From music lessons to sports activities, students from middle-class homes and above are constantly involved in learning opportunities outside of the school day that prepare them for college and career success. Structured literacy components within the after-school program can positively contribute to student growth (Fleming, 2005).

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 from the field comes from an elementary school with a mission “to strengthen children’s social, cultural, and intellectual growth by improving their readings, while at the same time ensuring that enjoyment is a fundamental part of that growth” (Fleming, 2005). The after-school literacy program at this school co-exists with the free YMCA after-school program at the school site project. 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 correlated with program attendance records. The primary design of this program focuses on one-on-one tutoring. During tutoring sessions, literacy best-practices are used to target oral fluency and comprehension. Tutors generally carpool from the local college and arrive half an hour before the program begins to receive on-going tutoring, strategies and to discuss tutoring experiences (Fleming, 2005).

Another example of an out-of-school time (OST) program was designed with a focus on project-based learning (PBL). 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). Since 2009, OST students in this program have completed nearly 1,700 projects across 180 programs. 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. Utilizing 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 ELT programs after-school. Opponents of the core in after-school programs believe that the regular school day should cover the core and 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).

**Population Considerations**
- Cultural interests of students should be part of the design of the program
- Time needs to be adjusted to the age of the student and should be consistent throughout the school year
- Activities should be age appropriate to engage students beyond the school day
- Middle school students need: credible/trained staff and programs that are independent from school yet family connected (NIOST, 2009)
- High school students need: funding collaboration, planning/cooperation from stakeholders, set objectives, connections to community/career readiness, and leadership opportunities (NIOST, 2009)

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Establish sustainable funding
- Provide snacks
- Create a positive environment, dedicated to building connections with students
- Provide training and technical assistance for staff
- Establish goals 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
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**Summer Programs**

Research on summer learning 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.

While attending different school-based, camp, and community programs are beneficial to students, 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 can be delivered through well-designed and implemented summer programs, and they can be served through the continuation of well-designed intensive intervention programs developed during the school year. Tutoring, family involvement, and community outreach programs can extend into the summer months to provide services to students and families.

**Summer School**

According to Duffy (2001), summer school programs have the potential to accelerate the reading development of struggling readers. 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, literacy acceleration, and responsive teaching. Duffy (2001) warns, though, that summer school, as a short-term intervention, should not be viewed as a quick fix for all struggling readers. Some students will need ongoing support to meet grade-level goals and sustain their 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 ELLs and/or students with disabilities at various grade levels from entering kindergarten through 12th grade. 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, also 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.

**Population Considerations**
- Benefits all struggling students K-12
- Students identified for free and reduced lunch
- English language learners

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Provide small class sizes (staff to student ratios)
- Hire experienced staff that is highly qualified and trained
- Provide individualized instruction
- Promote the love of reading
- Engage parents and families
- Adjust programs based the progress of students
- Provide adequate time every day for multiple weeks
- Align program to regular-year curriculum, assessment, and evaluation
- Provide free programs that are available to all students
- Provide transportation, breakfast, and lunch
- Support connection to core instructional strategies and content
- Provide access to materials that match the instructional levels of students
- Encourage and sustain students’ regular participation & engagement
- Evaluate programs to ensure the summer program is effective at improving student outcomes (Newhouse, et al. 2012)
- Use observational data; youth, parent, and staff input; and student academic data to evaluate programs
- Evaluate quality, engagement, student academic and behavioral outcomes, and how well the gains are sustained
- Provide regular communication between the program and home
- Help parents and families reinforce extended year academic programming and activities
- Explore a mixture of academic and enrichment programming

**Resources**

**References**
Summer Book Programs

Summer book programs are promising because students can participate from home. Book programs can slow down and decrease summer learning loss, and for some students, summer book programs can even result in substantial academic growth. Results depend on the specificity and implementation of the program. Simply providing students with access to books does not result in accelerated academic gains in summer reading programs (Blazer, 2011).

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). Reading just five books over the summer can prevent summer learning loss (Heyns, 1978). 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. Books are provided to students to read at home and, in many cases, parents are provided with enrichment activities that they can use with their children. 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).

In a 2008 summer book program study, 400 students in grades 3-5 displayed significant differences based on their intervention groups (Blazer, 2011). These intervention groups included: (1) no books, (2) books only, (3) books with fluency scaffolding, and (4) books with fluency and comprehension scaffolding. Not only did the study result in significant differences in the “no books” and the “books with fluency and comprehension scaffolding” groups, it also showed that simply having books was not sufficient for student growth. Black, Hispanic, and low-income students in the books with both oral fluency and comprehension scaffolding showed average gains of four months of academic growth over the course of three months (Blazer, 2011). Instead of experiencing the classic three-month learning loss over the summer with four months of growth, the overall summer reading growth represents a seven-month gain for these students as they started the school year in the fall.

Not only should the summer book selection be at the student’s independent reading level, it is important to honor student choice to enhance student motivation and achievement. 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 level
- Send at least eight books that match the students 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

Summer book programs need to be both easily accessible and free for students and parents; these programs have the greatest gains when started early (K-1). Digital devices can enhance summer reading programs as multiple websites provide free magazines and grammar games that can enhance summer reading activities. Digital devices can also promote communication with students and families over the summer. For older students, digital devices are more practical based on their daily access to laptops, cell phones, and
tablets, but digital devices are becoming more and more accessible to younger students as well (Fink, 2012).

Many students prefer to read using a digital device and “teachers can take advantage of these digital devices to enhance students’ reading and writing abilities” (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, and critical thinking skills with a variety of apps and websites. However, it is important for teachers and parents to provide on-going guidance and support while students are utilizing digital devices to ensure students are benefiting from the intended use and not merely spending time on activities that do not provide educational opportunities.

**Population Considerations**

- Benefits all struggling students K-12
- Students identified for free and reduced lunch
- English language learners
- All K-4 students

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Provide multi-year programs designed and intentioned to accelerate reading growth
- Help students select books
- Seek grant funding to provide books for low-income, at-risk students
- Engage families as partners
- Use reading logs
- Provide families with meaningful strategies and resources that can be carried over and implemented in their home, which ensures continuity of summer reading programs throughout the year, after the intervention has concluded (Blazer, 2011; Timmons, 2008)
- Collaborate with community libraries
- Provide external motivators to help with engagement.
- Read out loud to primary students who are not independent readers
- Allow students to self-select books to increase reading motivation
- Provide guidance to students as they select books to ensure books are not too difficult.
- Encouraged students to read a wide selection of genres
- Provide access and availability to books during the summer
- Create a schedule to open the school library during summer months
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Family Involvement

According to Mort (2014), "[v]ulnerable children often have vulnerable parents"; this should be a primary consideration when designing plans to include vulnerable families (p.189). Vulnerable families are those with students at risk of academic failure due to the family's low levels of formal education and socioeconomic status. In a ten-year longitudinal research study, the Harvard Family Research Project (2008) reviewed factors involved in the successful academic development of low-income, ethnically diverse families. This study on family involvement in school and outside of school in kindergarten through fifth grade concludes that high levels of family involvement can be a significant predictor of a student’s literacy gains (Harvard Family Research Project, 2008). Student motivation increases student performance, and family involvement improves student motivation and literacy self-efficacy. This, along with a positive school culture that involves staff commitment and teacher outreach to increase family involvement, can predict higher literacy achievement for students (Harvard Research Project, 2008).

According to Drummond & Stipek (2004), family involvement is typically at its highest during K-2 and begins to decrease in grade 3. Studies have shown family involvement to be a modifying factor that has positive effects on student literacy achievement (Jeynes, 2013). However, low-income parents have reported time and flexibility as significant barriers to meeting family involvement expectations in the school system. As professionals, we must recognize and acknowledge such challenges as we establish cooperative and positive relationships with vulnerable families.

Establishing effective communication is essential in helping families know how they can support their student’s literacy growth. Communication to parents must be clearly stated in a language the parent can understand. This is the first step for families to gain access to opportunities that will enable them to participate in the education of their child(ren). Mort (2014) offers several suggestions to build parent rapport:

- Call every family during the first three weeks of school
- Form a parent/family volunteer cadre and ask volunteers what their interests and hobbies are to match volunteers with literacy development tasks
- Electronically record student performance on reading tasks and projects and send it home
- Establish a welcoming environment in the school for families to wait for students and get information
- Open access to the school facility in the evening to access the library, computers, and games
- Establish a routine to connect with families in between grading periods with phone calls and notes home

The Flamboyan Foundation (2011), in their review of multiple research studies, indicates that:

- Supporting child reading, providing supervision, and engaging in home-learning activities are important in a student’s literacy success.
- Families engage in schools differently. Efforts need to be made to move from traditional forms of involvement like attending school events or conferences to actually interacting with school staff about the academic needs of students.
- Helping students understand the importance of education matters most.
  - These practices include families having high expectations for their child, discussing aspirations for the future, fostering child accountability for learning, and talking about the value of education.

Families are invaluable partners in school success. By facing challenges together and through the design and implementation of improvement plans, activities, and community outreach, student academic success can be transformed and accelerated (Epstein & Salinas, 2004). The six distinct types of family involvement both in and outside of school identified by Epstein and Salinas are: 1) parenting skills to support learning, 2) establishing communication pathways with families, 3) organizing family volunteers to support learning in the classroom, 4) providing guidance for at home learning opportunities, 5) including families in school decision making, and 6) establishing a learning community culture (Epstein & Salinas, 2004). A family advocacy coordinator can plan, organize, and implement family involvement at school (Harvard Research Project, 2008).

**Family Involvement at School**

Teachers and administrators need to explicitly communicate with families regarding volunteer opportunities at school. Volunteers can greatly enhance tutoring programs during the regular school day and during before- and after-school learning time. In addition to volunteer opportunities, families can participate within the school day by celebrating student academic success, attending regular-scheduled lunches for families to come eat with their students, attending assemblies that showcase student achievement and growth, and participating in back-to-school nights to connect families and educators. Multiple pathways to encourage family involvement are necessary to accommodate flexible scheduling (Drummond & Stipek, 2004).

There is compelling evidence that reveals a strong connection between parent and family involvement in schools and a child’s academic achievement, attendance, attitude, and
continued education (Henderson & Berla, 1994). When school staff directly prioritize family involvement in schools, students’ academic literacy achievement increases (Drummond & Stipek, 2004; Harvard Family Research Project, 2008).

**Population Considerations**
- Family involvement benefits all students K-12
- Family involvement typically starts to decrease as early as grade 3
- Family involvement with school may be new to some groups and new immigrant families

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Create a family-friendly school learning community
- Establish relationships with families, community members, and school staff built around trust and collaboration (Ferguson et al., 2008)
- Recognize families’ needs, socio-economic status, and cultural differences in order to encourage greater understanding, respect, and collaboration (Ferguson et al., 2008)
- Involve all stakeholders in shared partnerships and mutual responsibility to support student learning (Ferguson et al., 2008)
- A welcoming environment in the school is an essential component of building relationships that will impact students throughout their time in school and ease the transition to an academic setting

**Resources**
- Family Engagement Resource List, Updated March 2014

The National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) uses research-based approaches to help schools and districts establish and strengthen their partnerships with parents and the community. Models that schools and districts can use to support parents can be found on the NNPS website http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/Research/index.htm. Joyce Epstein's (2011) extensive research on school, family, and community partnerships is laid out here. A review of the literature provided on this website suggests ways to improve partnerships with families and communities that will contribute to student achievement. In the Teachers Involve Parents in Schoolwork (TIPS) section, teacher action items for working with parents are suggested based on the research citations provided. Providing parents with information about required reading skills, how to monitor and discuss literacy skills, and having interactive activities that require students to discuss class work with their parents are practices that can be employed to actively involve parents.
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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 first grade as well as at the end of 5th and 6th grade (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).

**Population Considerations**

- Family involvement benefits all students K-12
- Family involvement starts to decrease as early as grade 3
- Family literacy support K-4 results in students being more likely to complete high school and go onto college
- All students K-12 benefit from family involvement

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Create a family friendly school learning community
- Design home “talk” activities and talking points for parents to promote oral language (Mort, 2014)
- Design activities and games for students to take home and play with their families (Mort, 2014)
- Establish home reading expectations and guidance for parents (Mort, 2014)
- Establish multiple opportunities for students to read the same book (Mort, 2014)
- 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: e-mails, 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 (Henderson & Mapp, 2002)
- 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

- Family Engagement Resource List, Updated March 2014


- The National Network of Partnership Schools (NNPS) uses research-based approaches to help schools and districts establish and strengthen their partnerships with parents and the community. Models that schools and districts can use to support parents can be found on the NNPS website
  http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/Research/index.htm. Joyce Epstein's (2011) extensive research on school, family, and community partnerships is laid out here. A review of the literature provided on this website suggests ways to improve partnerships with families and communities that will contribute to student achievement. In the Teachers Involve Parents in Schoolwork (TIPS) section, teacher action items for working with parents are suggested based on the research citations provided.
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Transition-Based Family Involvement

Transition is the movement students make when they enroll in a school or from one school setting to the next. School systems can support a successful student transition for all students by providing support services that involve families.
Entering into the public school system for the first time is a big transition. Students are leaving their familiar home environments to enter a completely new environment. For some students, this is a very exciting, proud, delightful time; however, for others students, this is a time of uncertainty, concern, and fear (National Center on Parent, Family, and Community Engagement, 2013). This demands understanding and patience of adults as children adapt emotionally, behaviorally, and academically. “When teachers reach out to inform and engage parents and children in activities to smooth the transition from preschool to kindergarten, more parents gain confidence about helping their children adjust to the new school” (Van Voorhis et al., 2013, p. 117).

Involving parents in a meaningful manner at any point at which 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 al. 2013). Struggling students often need additional support and care when transitioning.

Changing learning environments presents new challenges for students and families. New academic expectations, different school structures, and new social interactions with peers or adults are all significant changes. This transition can be a time of uncertainty and heightened concern about the unknown. Transitioning students have reported concerns in three areas (Uvaas & McKevitt, 2013):

- Academic—expectations, coursework, homework and new teachers
- Procedural—managing school layout, multiple classes and multiple teachers
- Social—adjusting to new expectations, friends and classmates

By providing transition-based family involvement services, schools can prepare all stakeholders for changes to the learning environment. These services will minimize lost learning time, increases confidence, and start the new experience on a positive note.

**Support for Transitions**

“Work in this area requires: (1) programs to establish a welcoming and socially supportive community especially for new arrivals, (2) programs for articulation (for each new step in formal education, vocational and college counseling), support in moving from programs for students with limited English proficiency, support in moving to and from special education, support in moving to post school living and work, (3) before and after-school programs (including intersession) to enrich learning and provide recreation in a safe environment, and (4) relevant education for stakeholders” (Adelman & Taylor, 2012, p. 39).

The grade level at which this transition support takes place depends on the circumstances of each district or school. For example, in districts that have K–5 and 6–8 schools, the transition support would take place between 5th and 6th grades. A critical transition point is from middle school/junior high to high school, mostly between the 8th and 9th grades in Washington. Another other critical transition point that needs to be considered for youth who have dropped out and reenroll in a school or diploma program. Additional information on transition services can be found in the menu entry “Services under RCW 28A.320.190: Extended learning Opportunities” in this document.
Population Considerations

- Kindergarten
- Middle School
- High School

Implementation Success Factors

- Initiate services early
- Tailor services to the cultural, linguistic and learning needs of individuals and their families
- Provide opportunities to share student achievement data
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Professional Development

According to WSIPP’s Inventory of Evidence-based and Research-based Practices for LAP (2015), targeted professional development in the use of data to guide instruction was determined to be evidence-based with 100 percent cost-benefit percentage. Targeted content/grade level professional development was determined to be evidence-based with a 76 percent cost-benefit percentage. Targeted content/grade level professional development refers to a focus on improving teaching practices in a particular content area and/or a particular grade level. For example, this could include professional learning in the foundational reading skills of phonemes and phonics for educators of K-2 students. One common current delivery model for professional development is Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). The use of PLC’s has been identified as a promising practice. However, non-targeted professional development and the “train the trainers” model for using data to guide instruction have been determined by WSIPP to produce null or poor outcomes and are not included in this menu (WSIPP, 2015).
**Targeted Professional Learning**

Research suggests that targeted professional learning can positively impact student outcomes. However, in order to improve student achievement, professional development must be contextualized and sustained; that is, effective professional development must be provided as an ongoing, systematic process informed by evaluation of student, teacher, and school needs, and embedded within a comprehensive plan for school improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Yoon et al., 2007; Garet et al, 2001). When implemented according to research-based practices, professional development can have a significant impact on student success. Extensive, targeted professional development for teachers in literacy has a significant impact on student achievement (Scanlon, et al., 2009).

As a recent review of the most current research on best practices in professional development, “Professional Learning in the Learning Profession,” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009) notes, professional development is most effective when it is targeted and explicitly tied to goals for student achievement and school improvement. Professional development shown to improve student achievement is focused on “the concrete, everyday challenges involved in teaching and learning specific academic subject matter, rather than focusing on abstract educational principles or teaching methods taken out of context” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 10). Moreover, effective professional development should be aligned to learning standards and/or instructional strategies and must be aligned to the needs of learners. Data analysis should be utilized to help define a clear set of learning goals. As noted by McREL’s (Snow-Renner & Lauer, 2005) report, “Professional Development Analysis,” professional development that is long lasting, content-focused, and based on student and teacher performance data takes more time and effort to implement when compared to less effective types of professional development. But as 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).

Effective professional development supports teacher motivation and commitment to the learning process. It combines the needs of individuals with school or district goals. According to Joyce and Showers (2002), professional development should consist of a continuum in which participants receive a presentation of the theory, see demonstrations, practice and receive feedback around an applied practice, and are ultimately provided with coaching or other classroom supports to self-evaluate with the goal of positive growth (Joyce, 2002). High quality professional development is supported by multiple activities such as courses, workshops, institutes, networks, or conferences. It may be delivered in person or through an online format.

**Population Considerations**

- K-4 foundational literacy skills
- K-12 content-literacy
- Content specific to the needs of K–4 ELA essential skills
- Focus on the needs diverse learners, to include ELLs and students with disabilities
- Use of data and student work guide instructional planning and decision-making.
- Instructional strategies to support struggling learners

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Provide theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and classroom support as part of ongoing professional development (Yoon et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009)
- Focused on specific content and/or instructional strategies rather than a general approach (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009)
- Create a coherent program clearly aligned with school improvement goals and student achievement standards (Yoon et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009)
- Focus on the modeling strategies for teachers and opportunities for “hands-on” work that builds knowledge of content (Yoon et al., 2007; Garet et al., 2001; Supovitz, Mayer & Kahle, 2000)
- Ensure collaboration is focused, involving building of relationships among teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009)
- Ensure planning for professional development includes timing, organization, and follow-up (Jones, et al., 2013)

**Resources**
- Learning Forward: The Professional Learning Association
  Site for National Council of Professional Learning
- International Literacy Association
  [http://www.reading.org/Resources/ProfessionalDevelopment.aspx](http://www.reading.org/Resources/ProfessionalDevelopment.aspx)
  Site focused on professional development for teachers of literacy, with an emphasis on reading
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Professional Learning Communities
A large body of rigorous research suggests that the most effective professional development should involve relationship building among teachers. While this research does not involve comparison-group studies, evidence in support of professional learning communities (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 development, “collaboration” is one of four identified characteristics of the kind of professional development 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, p. 11). The development and utilization of professional learning communities as a strategy for professional development capitalizes on the positive effects of collaborative learning.

A professional learning community, or PLC, 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 improve student-learning outcomes. 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 professional learning
community 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. Blainkstein (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.

**Population Considerations**

- Focus on literacy support designed to must be specific to the needs of K–4 ELA learners
- Incorporate the needs of diverse learners, to include ELLs and students with disabilities
- Use data and student work to guide instructional planning and decision making
- Incorporate instructional strategies to support struggling learners

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Develop clear and shared mission, vision, values, and goals (DuFour, 2008)
- Design a vision focused on student learning and a commitment to improvement by teachers, paraeducators, and administrators (Jones et al., 2013)
- Create a collaborative culture
- Design with common goals and mutual accountability (DuFour, 2008, p. 15)
- Focus outcomes on the improvement student learning (Louis, 2006)
- Analyze data when goals for student outcomes are not met (Louis, 2006)
- Be action oriented: PLCs have a strong focus on bridging the knowing-doing gap (DuFour, 2008)
- Aspire to turn actions and visions into reality (DuFour, 2008)
- Use a continuous improvement model and evaluate it for student effectiveness (DuFour, 2008)
- Provide professional development early in the work day when teachers are energetic and can work (Jones et al, 2013)

**Resources**

http://learningforward.org/standards/learning-communities#.VQnzjylZFkg

- All Things PLC: http://www.allthingsplc.info
- The Center for School Reform and Improvement: http://www.centerforcsri.org/plc/
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**Services under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program**

Services under RCW 28A.320.190 generally fall within the broad category of extended learning opportunities. The law was created for eligible 8th, 11th, and 12th grade students who are not on track to meet local or state graduation requirements, as well as eighth grade students who need additional assistance in order to have the opportunity for a successful entry into high school. To the extent funds are available, after meeting requirements for K–4 reading instruction, LAP funds may be used for services outlined under the law, including but not limited to:
1. Individual or small group instruction.
2. Instruction in ELA and/or mathematics that eligible students need to pass all or part of the Washington assessment of student learning.
3. Students’ attendance in a public high school or public alternative school classes or at a skill center.
4. Student inclusion in remediation programs, including summer school.
5. Language development instruction for ELLs.
6. Online curricular and instructional support, including programs for credit retrieval and Washington assessment of student learning preparatory classes.
7. Reading improvement specialists available at the educational service districts to serve eighth, eleventh, and twelfth grade educators through professional development in accordance with RCW 28A.415.350. The reading improvement specialist may also provide direct services to eligible students and those students electing to continue a fifth year in a high school program who are still struggling with basic reading skills.

The following promising practices are examples of services under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program, but are not an exhaustive list of allowed services.

Credit Retrieval
Credit retrieval, or credit recovery, refers to courses retaken after a student has completed the course without earning credit on the initial attempt. Reasons for a student not earning credit for a course may include unsatisfactory grades and/or insufficient attendance. Credit retrieval programs are often used to keep students in school and on track for graduation (Watson and Gemin, 2008). Credit recovery courses may be offered at an alternate time, such as after school or during the summer (D’Agustino, 2013). Credit retrieval programs may also be offered in a variety of formats such as online, face-to-face, and through a blended approach.

Online credit retrieval programs may pose challenges for some learners, although the experience of online learning can be valuable. 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, many of the students engaged in online programs have not sufficiently developed these attributes, making it more difficult for them to be successful” (p. 18). Online components of credit retrieval programs, however, can offer benefits to struggling students, as Watson and Gemin (2008) suggest: “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).

Population Considerations
- Services are not available to K–4 students
- Services are for 8th, 11th, and 12th grade
Implementation Success Factors

- Identify students early when they are at risk of not graduating (Archambault et al., 2010)
- Provide rolling enrollment in credit retrieval courses (Archambault et al., 2010)
- Provide counseling services for students in credit retrieval courses (Franco & Patel, 2011)
- Design curriculum that is rigorous to ensure that students are learning the material and not simply moving through the course (Watson and Gemin, 2008)
- Develop diagnostic testing to ensure students can demonstrate mastery of the elements of a subject that they learned in their previous attempt to pass the course, and allow them move on to the parts of the course that they need to master (Watson and Gemin, 2008)
- Create a strong technological infrastructure for online and blended programs (D'Agostino, 2013)
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Transition Readiness

High School transitional opportunities refer to courses that intended to support the successful transition from 8th grade Language Arts to high school English. Students identified for this program might lack one or more of the following: motivation, self-efficacy, and/or literacy skills. A transitional program must engage all students in productive ways with meaningful English Language Arts content and effective literacy instruction. 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 Habeeb (2013), “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). Since some students lack that maturity to make decisions that will have long-term consequences, freshman transition programs can be critical for students for many students. Characteristics of effective freshmen transition programs include support that is flexible, positive, goal oriented, efficacious, and
empowering (Habeeb, 2013).

College transitional opportunities refer to interventions intended to support the successful transition from high school to postsecondary education, in this context, with a specific focus on the literacy skills needed to succeed in entry-level English courses as well as courses across the college curriculum. Unfortunately, reviews of the literature conducted by the federal Office of Vocational and Adult Education (2010) and Valentine et al. (2009) note that few evaluations of transition to postsecondary education interventions using rigorous research methodologies have been conducted. However, the report defines and describes several different types of transition interventions (p. 5) that should be considered promising practices. These include:

- Supportive Interventions
- Academic Preparation Interventions

Supportive interventions include systems designed to promote successful transitions by providing support to students by addressing factors outside the classroom that are obstacles to the transition to and completion of college (OVAE, 2010, p. 5). Programs can support students through interventions such as counseling, financial aid and academic advising, first-year orientation programs (OVAE, 2010, p. 5).

In the case of English Language Arts, academic preparation interventions are often designed for students who intend to attend college, but do not meet the Common Core standards for college readiness in ELA, as determined by the 11th grade Smarter Balanced assessment. For example, the current Washington State Bridge to College initiative will implement a 12th grade college transition course designed to enable the successful transition to college-level English courses. A strong academic transition program would address student motivation to pursue academic goals with conceptual understanding and skill building in English Language Arts. Such transitional programs should include: 1) student engagement, 2) student participation and discourse, 3) positive motivation and 4) risk-taking.

Dual enrollment programs have also been studied as a means to better prepare students for the transition to college. These programs allow students to enroll in college courses and gain college credit, while maintaining enrollment in high school. While such programs show promise as a transition intervention (Bailey, Hughes, & Karp, 2002; Karp et al., 2007), they are most often targeted towards high school students who demonstrate college readiness, rather than the struggling students eligible for LAP interventions.

Career transition opportunities, often examined under the broader category of Career and Technical Education (CTE), refer to interventions and programs designed to promote the transition from high school to the job market through technical and vocational education. Some career transition interventions focus on preparing students for a vocation while simultaneously preparing them to for the postsecondary education needed to attain that vocation. “Career pathway programs” provide students with “career and technical education (CTE) and academic education that supports their transition from secondary to postsecondary education and into family-sustaining wage careers” (Lekes et al., 2007, p. 1).
According to the comprehensive review and analysis by Castellano et al. (2003) of CTE reform efforts, research indicates that effective CTE efforts should include “performance-relevant assessments,” interdisciplinary curricula, which integrates “academics and real-world applications,” project-based learning, and the use of technology to enhance learning and assess student performance (262).

Transition courses may be offered:
- during the summer
- before/after school
- extended block/period
- embedded within the school day, ex: advisory, study hall
- at alternative schools

**Population Considerations**
- Design transition intervention programs specifically to target ELL populations.
- Provide transition intervention programs that address the needs of diverse learners, including ELLs, and students with disabilities.

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Provide transition interventions that rely on research-based instructional strategies proven to support struggling students (OVAE, 2010; Valentine et al., 2009)
- Use data and student work to guide instructional planning and decision-making
- Design transition interventions with models that accelerate learning (Herlihy, 2007)
- Incorporate practices that address non-cognitive factors and support development of the habits of mind possessed by successful students
- Design interventions that are led by experienced and qualified (Herlihy, 2007)
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Tutoring

Research supports that well-designed tutoring services can have a significant impact on the ability to reduce the achievement gap through one-on-one instruction. Qualities of a well-designed program include training for tutors, clearly defined goals, and formative assessments for progress monitoring (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009; Ritter et al. 2009; Slavin et al. 2011). Tutoring services are generally one-on-one and can vary from homework help to specific skill development. In fact, “[s]hared-reading activities are often recommended as the single most important thing adults can do to promote the emergent literacy skills of young children” (NELP, 2008). What Works Clearinghouse (2006) defines shared-reading as an adult reading to one or more students in a small group setting explicitly modeling reading fluency. This reading experience does not require additional work or testing of the student(s). Tutoring services can be provided by a variety of people and in a variety of locations. Schools provide tutors with teachers, paraprofessionals, volunteers, and peers. Additionally, parents and private agencies can also provide tutoring services (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009; Warkentien & Grady, 2009).

All tutors and adult volunteers must be trained to provide literacy instruction based on the needs of the children they are serving. Studies have indicated that trained, non-certified tutors can improve reading fluency, which will result in improved comprehension. Untrained tutors can have negative effects on learning (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009; Elbaum et al., 2000; Shinn, Deno & Fuchs, 2002). By adequately training tutors, struggling students will have access to tutoring with the essential skills for literacy development. If tutoring is already part of the program but accelerated academic gains are not being made by students, then the program should be reviewed for the intensity of services and the expertise of the tutor (Allington, 2001). The intensity of the tutoring is strongly connected to the outcomes.
Considerations for designing tutoring services are to provide students who require the most intensive instruction with one-to-one literacy interventionist tutoring, adult tutoring, or peer tutoring, in that order. Another "best case" scenario to consider would be small group tutoring consisting of three (3) to six (6) students (Baker et al., 2014; Glaser, 2005; WSIPP, 2015). How the services are provided requires thoughtful considerations regarding student groupings in order to facilitate increased instructional time on task, peer interaction, and grade-level literacy skills. Benefits are greatest when students receive instruction that is based on their identified needs with a trained, skilled tutor (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009).

A strong system-wide process that exemplifies organization can be effective in helping the tutors collect important data that helps monitor the progress of the students. In turn, the data can be used to facilitate goal-setting by the student and the teacher, continual development of reading skills, a schedule for assessing, and reviewing student progress (Ritter et al., 2009).

**Literacy Interventionists/Specialists**

Literacy intervention specialists working in one-on-one and small-group contexts supplemental to core classroom instruction must be highly trained and pursue continuing professional development (Gordon, 2009). If the intent is to accelerate struggling readers’ 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 teaching, and interventions require robust modifications.

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 the interventionist should be to work with classroom teachers to identify text at the best reading level for struggling students to access content area materials. Even as more difficult texts are required for students to be college and career ready, it is necessary to have text at the appropriate reading level for struggling students to scaffold their learning. According to Allington (2001), students need to have access to [engaging] books throughout the day that are at the appropriate levels.

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 need a deep knowledge of content, instructional pedagogy, and the concepts embedded in various practices in order to provide optimal services. Reading intervention specialists must be able to draw on their discipline-specific expertise to intentionally select those practices that best match the needs of the specific reader or readers and the learning goals. They must be able to teach for the transfer of skills and strategies necessary for successful classroom achievement.
Population Considerations

- All students benefit from tutoring
- One-to-one and small group tutoring, consisting of three (3) to six (6) students

Implementation Success Factors

- Select a scientifically research-based intervention model within a multi-tiered system of support that utilizes individualized, diagnostic assessments to design appropriate developmental lessons for students (Baker, et al. 2014; Gordon, 2009)
- Provide regular, structured opportunities to develop written language skills (Baker et al, 2014)
- Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies (Shanahan et al. 2010)
- Provide small-group (3-6 students) instructional intervention to students struggling in areas of literacy and English language development (Baker et al., 2014)
- Integrate oral and written English language instruction into content-area teaching (Baker et al, 2014)
- Establish an engaging and motivating context in which to teach reading comprehension (Shanahan et al., 2010)
- Utilize highly trained literacy intervention teachers to observe and prompt individual learner’s relevant background knowledge to new learning through a problem-solving process
- Provide a setting where distractions do not interfere with productive engagement to enhance the child’s likelihood for success (Gordon, 2009)
- Provide frequent opportunities for shared-reading experience with the most at-risk students (Allington, 2001; NELP, 2008)
- Establish a continuation of communication between with families (Gordon, 2009)
- Ensure strategies and programs are evidence-based and provide short diagnostic assessments to design appropriate developmental lessons for students (Gordon, 2009)
- Design and implement a highly structured program where knowledge is constructed from the integration of previously learned and newly acquired skill sets (Gordon, 2009)
- Schedule tutoring time that pairs expert professionals need with the students who have the greatest needs

Resources

- [http://www2.ed.gov/teachers/how/read/tutors.html](http://www2.ed.gov/teachers/how/read/tutors.html)
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Adult Tutors
Adult tutors who facilitate reading are an asset to the development of a comprehensive literacy program. Carefully selected adult tutors can include specifically trained teachers, intervention specialists, para-educators, other classified personnel, and volunteers. Research has consistently shown that students benefit from tutoring programs that are well structured 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 all students.

Tutoring sessions should be provided in conjunction with the 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).

Interventions should be designed around evidence-based and reliable diagnostic information of the struggling student provided by assessments administered at the beginning and throughout the intervention program for progress monitoring. Well-
designed tutoring programs can improve students' their literacy skills. From one-to-one instruction to small group instruction, tutors can accelerate academic outcomes. Through carefully coordinated processes and multi-tiered systems of support, students who require more intensive literacy instruction will develop proficiency (Allington, 2001).

**Population Considerations**
- All students benefit from tutoring K-12
- One-to-one and small group tutoring, consisting of three (3) to six (6) students, is instrumental in improving grade-level reading among struggling readers (Glasser, 2005; Baker et al., 2014; WSIPP, 2015)
- Findings support a strong focus on improving classroom instruction and providing one-to-one, phonetic tutoring to students who continue to experience difficulties (Slavin et al. 2011)

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Select a scientifically research-based intervention model within a multi-tiered system of support that utilizes individualized, diagnostic assessments to design appropriate developmental lessons for students (Gordon, 2009).
- Provide a setting where distractions do not interfere with productive engagement enhance the child's likelihood for success (Gordon, 2009)
- Provide training for tutors that include observation and correction technique (Gordon, 2009)
- Design and implement a highly structured program where knowledge is constructed from the integration of previously learned and newly acquired skill sets (Gordon, 2009)
- Recognize that untrained tutors can have negative effects on learning (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009; Elbaum et al., 2000; Shinn, Deno & Fuchs, 2002).
- Schedule tutoring time that pairs expert professionals need with the students who have the greatest needs
- One-to-one and small group tutoring, consisting of three (3) to six (6) students
- Provide extensive and ongoing training for all tutors to produce the largest impact on accelerated literacy outcomes (Wasik and Slavin, 1993)

**Resources**
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Peer Tutoring
Peer tutors may be students who are in the same class or age group, in the same small reading group, reciprocal literacy groups, or cross-age tutors as those receiving tutoring. Peer tutoring is a comprehensive, instructional approach based on turn-taking in which the whole group is actively engaged (Topping, 2008). According to research by Fuchs & Fuchs (2005), “reading competence improves when [students] work with each other in a cooperative and structured manner.” Peer tutoring is especially effective in improving peer relationships, personal development, and motivation (Topping, 2008). As Hattie notes, research demonstrates that peer tutoring has numerous “academic and social benefits for both those tutoring and those being tutored” (Hattie, 2009).

The criteria for peer tutors is very broad. Students do not need to have straight A’s or outstanding behavioral records; rather, they just need the training, coaching, and confidence of the teacher that they can do it. Peer tutoring will be most effective with purposeful planning and preparation.

Logistical support is essential for program implementation [of peer tutoring] (Smith, 2007). One suggestion for partnering classroom peers is to use performance data to divide students in half and then partner the highest to lowest partner in each group together. It is also suggested to alternate partners every four weeks (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005).

In addition to one-to-one peer tutoring or cross-age peer tutoring in which the roles of tutor and tutee are static and defined by ability or age, a reciprocal peer tutoring opportunity can also be used to increase the learning time and opportunities within a classroom. Reciprocal peer tutoring is an intervention strategy in which students alternate roles between the tutor and the tutee. Whenever reciprocal peer tutoring 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, the activities, and the daily schedule (Gersten et al., 2007; Fantuzzo & Rohrbeck, 1992).

Most importantly, when implementing peer tutoring arrangements, practitioners should combine organized structures, foundational skills in reading instruction, partner reading with story retelling, summarizing text (paragraph shrinking), and making predictions (prediction relay), and group-reward contingencies to experience positive results (Gersten et al., 2007; Fantuzzo & Rohrbeck, 1992).
Research on peer tutoring in grades K-6 shows its effectiveness in 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 first 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 lunch populations.
4. No one pedagogical best practice 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.

Population Considerations
- All students benefit from peer tutoring K-12
- K-1 student peers benefit most from phonological awareness, decoding and fluency practices with focus on word level reading skills, word attack, word identification and spelling activities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005)
- It is recommended to use peer tutoring with upper-level elementary students
- Peer tutoring can be implemented in a small group setting or whole class configuration

Implementation Success Factors
- Provide training and coaching time to establish and review roles for peer tutors K-12 (Smith, 2007)
- Provide peer tutors with multiple opportunities to develop their skills as a tutor
- Develop peer tutors to serve as partners in reading with story retelling, summarizing text (paragraph shrinking), and making pre-dictions (prediction relay) (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005; Gersten et.al, 2007)
- Train peer tutors to respond with structured prompts when tutees were having difficulty (Gersten et.al, 2007)
- Train student tutors to model study skills, communication skills, work habits, questioning skills, and other helpful educational behaviors
- Train adult supervisors to constructing peer partnerships (Bixby et al., 2011)
- Monitor student growth to ensure peer tutoring is meeting literacy goals (Bixby et al, 2011)
- Provide practice time for both the tutor and the tutee (Bixby et al., 2011)
- Establish routines for peer tutoring time three or more times per week (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005)
- Ensure each partner is provided same amount of time (e.g. five minutes) for reading out loud during partner reading (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005)
· Utilize a variety of students of different ages and different abilities for greater results

**Resources**

- Peer-to-Peer Tutoring: [https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/ell-peer-tutoring-inps](https://www.teachingchannel.org/videos/ell-peer-tutoring-inps)
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Conclusion and Next Steps

Through 2013 ESSB 5946 (RCW 28A.655.235), Washington state’s legislature directs districts to use the state Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts to guide support for students struggling with literacy achievement. This effort is significant in its potential to improve student outcomes across the state. Historically, even with similar funding levels, student outcomes by district have been uneven. Fidelity of implementation is key to producing consistent improvements, and is based on the design of the district plan and the degree to which the plan is delivered as intended. It is critical to ensure that the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA are used to design intensive intervention plans for struggling students. These plans need to be implemented with fidelity because even proven practices, when implemented poorly, can fail to raise student outcomes.

The ELA panel of experts recognizes that there are a number of next steps to ensure that the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA is implemented with fidelity across the state.

The following activities will occur during the 2015-16 school year:

1. Distribute the Best Practices and Strategies for ELA to stakeholders through a variety of avenues including:
   - Electronic distribution July 1, 2015;
   - Workshops, webinars, and trainings provided to educators across the state in partnership with OSPI, Educational Service Districts (ESDs), and school districts.

2. OSPI will offer training and targeted technical assistance on the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA in a variety of formats:
   - ELA Menu 101 Webinar and PowerPoint—provides an overview of what the menu is, what it includes, how it is organized, and other high-level information to the broadest audience.
   - Targeted training—e.g., spring regional Title 1/LAP director meetings, including delivered by OSPI LAP and Teaching and Learning staff to train audiences on the Menu and how it supports the Washington State Standards for English Language Arts.
   - Extended training—District team trainings/practitioner workshops to develop a shared understanding of Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA and how they work at the building/classroom level. These trainings will include Title 1/LAP directors, curriculum directors, principals, K-12 teachers, and intervention specialists.
   - Trainings will lead district personnel through:
     - self-assessment of current practices;
     - needs assessment/gap analysis;
     - review of the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA to meet needs/fill gaps;
     - development of practice profiles; and
     - development of fidelity assessments.
The ELA panel of experts will continue its work, including:

a) Examining proposed best practices and strategies that the committee chose to table for future consideration for placement on the updated July 1, 2016 **Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA**;

b) Addressing public comments and district implementation feedback that suggest additional practices and strategies for inclusion in the July 1, 2016 **Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA**; and

c) Vetting potential ELA best practices and strategies recommended by districts and others.

**OSPI’s LAP Department** will continue to provide guidance and support on data collection instruments that districts may use to meet the reporting requirements within parts 1 and 2 of 2013 ESSB 5946 (RCW 28A.655.235).

Interested stakeholders are invited to submit recommendations for intervention practices, along with related research references, for consideration by the expert panel and 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](https://www.ospi.wa.gov) on OSPI's website.
Appendix

Appendix A: Essential 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 all 4th grade reading achievement scores. Each component is directly correlated with and an early predictors of literacy success (NELP, 2008; NICHD, 2000). Deep understanding of these essential foundational literacy skills must guide professionals as they plan and develop appropriate and engaging supplemental services for struggling students and for teachers through professional development opportunities (Pittman & Dorel, 2014; Strictland & Shanahan, 2004).

Language Development for English Language Learners (ELL)
An ELL student acquires his/her primary listening and speaking skills in a language other than English. These students encounter greater challenges in school because they are faced with the challenge of simultaneously acquiring English and learning academic content. To address this challenge, educators need to understand the different levels of language acquisition within oral and literacy language domains. Educators must also be aware of how oral and literacy skills develop across different contexts (both in and out of school) as well as across the different academic content areas. It is important to note that language proficiency levels vary greatly, both across grade levels as well as within the same age/grade level. Given these understandings, ALL teachers need to create learning environments where students are taught and expected to use the appropriate content vocabulary of grade level curriculum.

Instruction for ELLs should have an explicit focus on:
- conceptual language development;
- learning contextualized and grounded in students’ prior knowledge;
- explicit teaching of academic strategies, expectations, and norms; and
- engage in collaborative and authentic/meaningful activities (Walqui, 2000).

To the greatest extent possible, students’ primary language and cultural background should be integrated into instructional practices to enhance comprehension and conceptual development. When feasible, bilingual instruction programs should be offered to strengthen students’ literacy skills in both English and their primary language. Recommendations for success for secondary English learners also highlight the importance of student identity, identity
groups, and the creation of a community of learners [aka Funds of Knowledge] (Faltis & Coulter, 2008; Flores-Gonzalez, 2002; Walqui, 2000).

Of the approximately 107,000 students who are currently identified as ELL in Washington, 68 percent are in grades K–4. It is imperative that a solid foundation of English language development be in place for these students in the early grades in order to foster academic success in the English-speaking classroom. As students begin school and start to develop literacy in a language that is not their own, it is important to build upon the language strengths that students bring with them from their home language and culture. Fostering an atmosphere of success that acknowledges what students bring to the learning experience is an essential component of long-term success.

As ELLs in the early grades are learning the foundations of literacy alongside their native English-speaking peers, they are simultaneously developing the vocabulary, syntax, and constructs of an entirely new language system. As Pauline Gibbons notes, “many approaches and mainstream reading programs do not take into account the needs of ELLs, since most are based on the assumption that learners are already familiar with the spoken form of the language” (2009, p. 83). For this reason, developing literacy with ELLs must take into account the development of the student’s oral language skills in English. When students lack an oral base to serve as a foundation for literacy development, research has shown that reading interventions have a minimal effect. A study by Klingner and Vaughn (1996) indicated “children with the potential to benefit most from the [reading] intervention had some initial reading ability and fairly high levels of second-language oral proficiency” (In August, et al., 2008, p. 163).

It is important to draw on students’ background and strengths in their home languages to develop English and employ knowledge of their current levels of language acquisition. ELL students need ample opportunities for verbal interaction with the target language, and they require learning opportunities that integrate language across subject areas, thus increasing both depth and frequency of language use. It is essential to use a variety of visual support, realia, and experiential learning to help build vocabulary. Specific vocabulary instruction is necessary to develop English language skills.

ELL students benefit from collaborative and cooperative learning opportunities that allow students to interact with both native English speakers and English language learning peers. A special effort needs to be made to ensure that ELL students do not characterize themselves as incompetent learners; their first languages and home cultures must be recognized as strengths and integrated into classroom practices.

All staff members need to know a student’s current language level to make appropriate language development goals to target the needs of the students throughout the day. A
distinction must be made between new ELLs and long-term ELLs. Teachers should use a multi-modal approach to instruction and use the English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards in daily planning. Professional development and additional collaboration time are needed to address the needs of these students.

Students need to hear excellent models of English—word choice, language structure, and grammar usage with increasingly complex texts. Students must have multiple opportunities to practice English. Additionally, students need to have sufficient response time to solidify the answer and then to consider the appropriate English word to use. Depending on their level, ELL students may require additional English language instruction to accelerate growth. A range of learning opportunities must be considered.

**Oral Language**

Research has demonstrated that oral language ability impacts children’s success in learning to read, as well as in academic success overall (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). The oral language ability of children as they enter school varies widely and may be impacted by socio-economic and cultural factors (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000; Crawford-Brooke, 2013).

Factors affecting English oral language development can include:

- limited exposure to language and print,
- lack of opportunities to expand their background experiences, and
- a second language spoken in the home.

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).

Research indicates that 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 ELLs and native English students alike. Beginning readers use their oral vocabulary to make sense of the words they see in print. Older readers must know what most of the words mean before they can understand what they are reading. Thus, students need to have purposeful interaction using oral language, listening, and speaking. 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.

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 and signs for routine activities, such as marking lunch choices, and should be accompanied by picture clues. 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. Thoughtfully planned oral language activities may include read-alouds,
think-alouds, shared reading, reader’s theater, daily news, and show and tell. “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. Using the precise language of the content is important because development of language needs to be simultaneous with content learning. Additionally, students benefit from rehearsing their thinking out loud before attempting to write.

**Phonemes**

Phonemic awareness is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate individual sounds—phonemes—in spoken words. 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, or *phonemes* (the smallest parts of sound in a spoken word that make a difference in a word’s meaning). “Research tells us that phonemic awareness is the primary indicator of readiness for reading instruction, as well as a reliable predictor of future success in reading” (Mort, 2014, p. 61).

**Phonemic Awareness Can Be Developed Through 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 Most Effective When:**

- Students are taught to manipulate phonemes by using alphabet letters.
- Instruction focuses on only one or two rather than several types of phoneme manipulation.
- Phonemic instruction is taught in kindergarten to 1st grade.

**Phonemic Awareness Instruction Basics**

Early readers can show they have phonemic awareness in several ways:

- recognizing which words in a set of words start with the same sound
- isolating and saying the first or last sound in a word
- combining or blending the separate sounds in a word in order to say the word
- breaking up or segmenting a word into its separate sounds.

Reading success is directly connected to phonological awareness. Listening, rhyming, and identifying sounds in words are early literacy skills that develop successful readers (Sullivan-Dudzic, Gears, & Leavell, 2007). Phonemic awareness can be stimulated through parent-child activities [such as] playing rhyming games and reading rhymes (Pressley & Allington, 2015).
**Alphabet Knowledge**

The NELP (2008) recognizes alphabet knowledge (AK) as an essential component in literacy and early predictor of literacy success. Jones and 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 and those genetically at risk for dyslexia. Delayed AK acquisition is connected to socioeconomic status. Students from high socio-economic groups complete AK by age 5.61, whereas students from low socio-economic groups are delayed by more than a full year and do not acquire AK until 6.79 (Jones & Reutzel, 2012, pp. 449).

Letter instruction is predominately traditional versus research based. Teaching a-letter-a-week in sequential order of the alphabet has many disadvantages and 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 is 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 comprehension (Jones & Reutzel, 2012; Strictland, D.S. & Shanahan, T., 2004). AK can be supported in a variety of ways at home. In addition, it is a common focus of children’s television shows, storybooks, and computerized applications (Pressley & Allington, 2015).

Suggested tips: (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).

**Phonics**

Phonics defines the relationship between written letters and the spoken sounds that those letters represent. Closely related to phonics is "phonemic awareness:" a child’s understanding of the idea that spoken words can be broken down into sounds. Research has shown that daily studies of the elements of phonics supports a child in being a successful reader. Jean S. Chall (1996), who surveyed the entire body of reading research, found that, “The research ... indicates that a code-emphasis method – i.e., one that views beginning reading as essentially different from mature reading and emphasizes learning of the printed code for the spoken language – produces better results ... The results are better, not only in terms of the mechanical aspects of literacy alone, as was once supposed, but also in terms of the ultimate goals of reading instruction – comprehension and possibly even speed of reading. The long-existing fear that an initial code emphasis produces readers who do not read for meaning or with enjoyment is unfounded. On the contrary, the evidence indicates that better results in terms of reading for meaning are achieved with the programs that emphasize code at the start than with the programs that stress meaning at the beginning” (p. 307).
Conclusions of decades of research in reading are summarized succinctly in the following set of recommendations:

- **Teach phonemic awareness explicitly.** Almost all children benefit greatly from explicit phonics instruction. Phonemic awareness is a prerequisite for successful subsequent phonics instruction.

- **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 read successfully 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 phonics program gets children reading as soon as possible by teaching the highest frequency relationships early and presenting students with stories that consist of words containing only the relationships that have already been taught.

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

- **Correct every oral reading error.** All children, and especially children with reading difficulties, benefit the most when they receive corrective feedback regarding all reading errors, regardless of whether those errors influence the meaning of the passage (many meaning-emphasis programs encourage teachers to correct only errors affecting meaning).

**Fluency**

Reading fluency is the ability to decode quickly, smoothly, and accurately. Allington (2006) believes, “[Fluency is reading in phrases, with appropriate intonation and prosody—fluency is reading with expression” (p. 94). The automaticity of reading develops with frequent and extensive practice at the students reading level (Erion & Ronka, 2004). Poor reading fluency is directly associated with poor reading comprehension, and fluent readers simply read more than those who struggle with reading because they are self-motivated and they read for pleasure (Rasinski, 2002). 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).

Oral reading fluency is commonly measured by counting words correct per minute (wcpm) to assess students’ progress and growth (Hunley, Davis Miller, 2013; Valencia, et al., 2010). This tradition began in 1915 with the “Grey Standardized Oral Reading Paragraphs” that tested oral reading rate, and in 1999, the American Federation of Teachers recommended establishing reading rates for students (Allington, 2001, p. 71). Calculating oral reading fluency as a classroom-based, or curriculum-based, measurement (CBM) is a quick and easy way for educators to identify, monitor, set goals and graph fluency progress with struggling readers (Hunley, et al, 2013; Valencia, et al., 2010).
Although CBMs that measure wcpm 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' wcpm “does not improve text-reading performances (p. 95). To be efficient readers, students must practice appropriate intonation, prosody, and phrasing (Allington, 2001; Rasinski, 2006). Recent research shows that wcpm in later grades has only a moderate correlation to comprehension, but it does have a higher correlation as an accurate performance indicator for elementary students (Hunley, et al., 2013; Valencia, et al. 2010). As a screening tool, it is important to note that false negatives are likely to occur when calculating wcpm. Valencia, et al. (2010) reports, “findings of under-identification parallel several other studies of screening accuracy using wcpm oral reading measures... rates ranged from 15% to as high as 47%, depending on the benchmark used” (p. 287). When students are screened for rate and accuracy, nearly half of the students identified will also receive the wrong intervention (Valencia, et al., 2010).

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. Teaching reading fluency needs to be a primary focus of reading instruction (Palumbo & Willcutt, 2002). Rasinski (2004) associates reading out loud to 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). 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).

Suggested activities: (1) shared-reading, reading out loud to students, modeled reading, (2) assisted reading: echo reading, shared reading, choral reading, and deep reading, (3) repeated oral reading (short passage), (4) reader’s theater, reading for performance, (5) buddy-reading/paired-reading/ peer tutoring model, (6) independent reading and (7) audiobooks (Allington, 2001; Palumbo & Wilcutt, 2002; Rasinski, 2002; Rasinski 2004; Rasinski, 2013; & Shanahan, 2013).

Resources: (1) trade books, (2) picture dictionaries, (3) paired texts, (4) poetry, (5) student selected high interest books, (6) leveled texts, and (7) audiobooks (Allington, 2001; Palumbo & Wilcutt, 2002; Rasinski, 2002; Rasinski, 2004; Rasinski, 2013; & Shanahan, 2013 & Whittingham et al., 2013).

**Vocabulary**

Like fluency, vocabulary knowledge is directly associated with reading comprehension. However, there is a significant disparity among vocabulary depths of knowledge when students start school. The number of vocabulary words a student starts with on the first day of school can be as low as zero (for students who do not speak English as their primary language at home); it generally ranges from 5,000 words to 20,000 words and is highly correlated to the families socio-economic status (Marulis & Neuman, 2010). Vocabulary
knowledge can be acquired multiple ways: by listening, speaking, reading, writing, and sight practice (International Reading Association, 2002).

Jensen (1998) addresses how vocabulary skills start developing in infancy when adults talk to, sing, and read to children. Natural approaches to vocabulary acquisition are an effective strategy for ELL students; however, the classroom cannot easily replicate primary language learning experiences (Jesness, 2004). A careful balance of formal study and natural approaches enable ELL students to acquire active knowledge. Younger students benefit more from natural techniques, and intermediate students require a more balanced approach. Teachers need to understand which words are best taught naturally and which words are best taught analytically. Vocabulary acquisition requires a significant time allotment for students to be successful, and class size makes a big difference in interaction time. Larger classes need to have English-speaking volunteers and assistants (Jesness, 2004).

Reading Standard 4 and Language Standards 4, 5 & 6 explicitly focus on vocabulary in English language arts. Vocabulary is an indirect focus, but necessary comprehension tool across multiple content area standards (Fisher & Frey, 2014). Vocabulary knowledge is “emphasized...more than 150 times” in the Common Core Standards (Manyak et al., 2014, p. 13). Vocabulary instruction should be provided both directly and indirectly to support all areas of learning (International Reading Association, 2002).

Manyak et al. (2014) recognize that vocabulary instruction outcomes are dependent on high quality implementation of research-informed instruction and activities—simply applying these techniques and strategies "does not in and of itself guarantee efficient and effective vocabulary instruction” (p. 22). It is observed, on average, only 1.4 percent of the time, and when vocabulary instruction is observed, 39 percent of the instructional time is dedicated to worksheets and dictionaries (Fisher & Frey, 2014). In lower elementary classrooms, vocabulary instruction is often taught during read-aloud times, but this only results in 20-40 percent improvement on target words. "Few read-aloud interventions have shown effects on general vocabulary knowledge” (Silverman & Crandell, 2010).

Vocabulary instruction needs to be multi-faceted and varied for all students. A one-size-fits-all approach does not work for two reasons: (1) students come to classrooms with various depths of vocabulary knowledge, and (2) words simply “differ in nature, ranging from concrete nouns like peninsula...to densely conceptual terms like democracy” (Manyak et al., 2014). Effective vocabulary instruction should be part of rich routines, provide explicit definitions and examples with anchor experiences to support active and deep processing. Vocabulary acquisition requires complete participation from all students (Manyak et al., 2014). Vocabulary interventions that are taught explicitly versus passively have better results (Marulis & Neuman, 2010).

Suggested activities: (1) gestures/act it out, (2) games, (3) songs, (4), pictures and picture dictionaries, (5) interactive read-alouds/shared readings, (6) total physical response, (7) movies with subtitles, (8) cognate connections, (9) building vocabulary with word
blocks/white boards, and (10) focused modeling of vocabulary (Allington, 2001; Jesness, 2004; & Manyak et al., 2014).

**Comprehension**

Mastery of the before-mentioned foundational skills in literacy is directly correlated to successful reading comprehension. Fluency and vocabulary knowledge are both strong predictors of student success in reading comprehension. When approaching interventions for reading comprehension, it is necessary to also assess the student’s proficiency in fluency and vocabulary to ensure the intervention service(s) provided meet the individual needs of the student. It is important to scaffold the interventions accordingly to ensure the reading intervention needed is comprehension and not decoding (Watson et al., 2012).

Having the ability to process information to analyze text, to synthesize text, and to draw conclusions from text, are strategies that can be practiced and supported in the classroom. Activating prior knowledge (schema) is one of the most effective ways to help students connect to text and build understanding (Messenger, 2015).

The following reading strategies are a guide for scaffolding reading comprehension (Messenger, 2015; Watson et al., 2012):

- Activate prior knowledge
- Make predictions
- Draw conclusions
- Ask questions
- Make inferences
- Synthesize
- Build fluency
- Develop vocabulary
- Self-regulation
- Text structure

Research supports explicit instruction will benefit students who struggle with reading comprehension (Watson et al., 2012). Current studies specify that direct teaching of expository text organization and expository text exposure is beneficial to students as early as pre-school (Culatta et al., n.d.).
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Appendix B: Learning Assistance Program (LAP)

LAP is a supplemental services program that assists underachieving students in reading, writing, and mathematics, as well as the readiness skills needed to successfully learn these core content areas. LAP also serves students who need behavioral support in order to reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom. Lastly, five percent of LAP funds may be used for “Readiness to Learn” services, which include the development of partnerships with external organizations to provide academic and non-academic supports for students and their families. These supports are intended to reduce barriers to learning, increase student engagement, and improve readiness to learn. The Learning Assistance Program was created by the Legislature in 1987 and, over the past 25 years, LAP has grown to reach 12.0 percent of the statewide, K–12 population (126,627 students).

Table 1 shows LAP enrollment by grade level and subject area for the 2013-14 school year. As you can see, 76,691 students in Washington state received LAP services in reading and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Day K</td>
<td>5,880</td>
<td>1,413</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-Day K</td>
<td>4,131</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>11,898</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>10,547</td>
<td>3,584</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>8,623</td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>552</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>7,285</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>4,851</td>
<td>4,412</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>6,581</td>
<td>735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>5,786</td>
<td>7,512</td>
<td>1,314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>6,563</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>3,224</td>
<td>7,646</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>2,024</td>
<td>4,202</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76,691</td>
<td>60,221</td>
<td>11,595</td>
<td>3,266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Columns left blank had an n < 30

A Read as “5,880 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP reading.”
B Read as “1,413 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP math.”
C Read as “313 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP language arts.”
D Read as “1,332 full day kindergarteners received services in LAP readiness.”

Table 1: LAP Enrollment by Grade Level and Subject Area in 2013-14

11,595 received services in language arts in 2013-14. Nearly two-thirds of reading students served are K–4.
LAP funds are distributed at the district level and are allocated based on the districtwide percentage of students in grades K–12 who were eligible for free- or reduced-price meals (FRPL) in the prior school year. A student is eligible to participate in LAP if they are in kindergarten through 12th grade, and are below standard in reading, writing, or mathematics. LAP funds may only be used in support of students identified for LAP services.

Districts determine which students are eligible by using measures of performance, including state assessments, other assessments that are used as indicators of student progress, by teacher recommendation or parent referral, or by credits earned/GPA.

The expert panel offered additional considerations to OSPI with regard to specific priorities within the parameters of allowable LAP funding, specifically that the linguistic and cultural needs of ELLs be integrated into all of the LAP-approved instructional and professional development offerings described in this document; and that LAP services be provided to ELL students in their primary language whenever feasible.

Beginning in the 2015-16 school year, expenditure of funds for the Learning Assistance Program must be consistent with the provisions of RCW 28A.655.235. Districts must first focus on K–4 students who struggle with reading or who do not have the readiness skills that will improve their ability to read. Every school, where 40 percent or more (of non-exempt) students scored at basic or below basic on the 3rd grade state ELA assessment in the previous school year, must integrate intensive reading and literacy best practices and strategies—across grades K–4. Additionally, districts must use data to inform program development and integrate effective best practices and strategies to support supplemental instruction/services that target struggling students.

To the extent they are included as a best practice or strategy in one of the state menus or an approved alternative, the following are services and activities that may be supported by the Learning Assistance Program, per se, and shown in Figure 1:
Figure 1: Current LAP Service Categories and Examples

1. Extended learning time occurring:
   a. Before or after the regular school day;
   b. On Saturdays; and
   c. Beyond the regular school year.

2. Services under **RCW 28A.320.190**, which include:
   a. The extended learning opportunities program, which was created for eligible 11th and 12th-grade students who are not on track to meet local or state graduation requirements, and for 8th-grade students who need additional assistance to have a successful entry into high school.
   b. Under the extended learning opportunities program, instructional services for eligible students can occur during the regular school day, evenings, weekends, or at a time and location deemed appropriate by the school district (i.e., the educational service district). Instructional services can include, the following:
      i. Individual or small group instruction;
      ii. Instruction in English language arts and/or mathematics to pass all or part of the Washington Assessment of Student Learning;
iii. Attendance at a public alternative school or a skill center for specific courses;
iv. Inclusion in remediation programs;
v. Language development instruction for English language learners;
vi. Online curriculum and instructional support, including programs for credit retrieval or preparatory classes for Washington assessments; and
vii. Reading improvement specialists to serve 8th, 11th, and 12th-grade educators through professional development (in accordance with RCW 28A.415.350). The reading improvement specialist may also provide direct services to eligible students, which includes students enrolled in a 5th year of high school who are still struggling with basic reading skills.

3. Professional development for certificated and classified staff that focuses on:
   a. the needs of a diverse student population;
   b. specific literacy and mathematics content and instructional strategies; and
   c. the use of student work to guide effective instruction and appropriate assistance.

4. Consultant teachers to assist in implementing effective instructional practices;
5. Tutoring support for participating students;
6. Outreach activities and supports for parents of participating students. This could potentially include employing the parent or the employment of a family engagement coordinator.

7. Finally, up to five percent of a district’s LAP funding allocation may be used for the development of partnerships with community-based organizations, educational service districts, or other local agencies. The purpose of these partnerships is to deliver academic and nonacademic supports to participating students who are at risk of not being successful in school. The goals of these partnerships are to reduce barriers to learning, increase student engagement, and enhance students’ readiness to learn. OSPI must approve any community-based organization or local agency before LAP funds may be expended.
Appendix C: Expert Panel Member Selection Process and Work Plan

Panel members are appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Panel applicants are solicited through several professional channels. Candidates are nominated by OSPI, Educational Services Districts, school districts, and state educational associations. The initial panel of experts was drawn from existing OSPI advisory groups, such as the Curriculum Advisory and Review Committee, the Bilingual Education Advisory Council, and the Special Education Advisory Committee. Each year, nominations are collected and reviewed by OSPI’s Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes Team. OSPI sought leaders nationally and within Washington who possess expertise and experience with multi-tiered systems of support frameworks (such as Response to Intervention), state learning standards (CCSS-ELA), and broad assessment systems that use data to make instructional decisions.

The cross-disciplinary panel reflects a wide range of experience and professional expertise within the K–20 environment. The state Legislature has charged the panel to “assist in the development of a menu of best practices and strategies that will provide guidance to districts as they work to impact student ELA academic achievement.”

Candidates are nominated and selected based on evidence of their expertise in one or more of the following criteria:

- ELA classroom and/or district leadership experience
- Classroom and system expertise in supporting struggling readers K–4
- Classroom and system expertise in supporting struggling readers K–12
- Educational research expertise and experience in implementing new strategies
- Knowledge of research best practices and strategies in working with diverse student populations, including ELLs and students with disabilities
- Representatives from high poverty school districts that range in size from urban to rural with large populations of struggling ELA students
- Representatives that reflect the diversity of the state’s student population
- Involvement with national ELA research on and implementation of effective instruction

Each year, after a review of all candidates, OSPI’s team recommends panel candidates to the state superintendent for his consideration. See Appendix E for a list of current and former panel member and their biographies.

Each year OSPI establishes a work plan for the panel. Panelists participate in an orientation webinar to review the legislative charge of 2013 ESSB 5946 (RCW 28A.655.235) read the bill, review LAP services, and review the work plan. Panelists are asked to review selected research literature in advance of each session based on the work plan.
Panelists then work together as a whole group to deliberate the topic at hand and determine the direction and progression of the work. Once these determinations are made, with the consent of the panel, small groups are formed to review the body of peer-reviewed research. Panelists provide written descriptions of the practices and strategies, cite evidence of effectiveness, identify grade-level considerations when applicable, and identify implementation considerations.

Prior to finalizing the menu, panelists review all of the original and updated menu entries and vote on each practice for inclusion in the menu. Panelists vote based on the strength of the body of research and their expert opinion on the effects of the practice in positively impacting student achievement. Panel votes are represented in Table 1: Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA.

Practices that did not garner support from at least 50 percent of the panelists were not included in the menu. For practices that received more than 50 percent support, but less than 100 percent support, panel members provided research-based evidence representing the counterclaims. Counterclaims from the panel of experts, when identified, are available in the menu entries as part of the implementation success factors. If the menu entry does not have a counterclaim, the panel fully endorsed it.

It is important to note that the existence of an ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is not sufficient to ensure all students will succeed. The panel of experts, in their deliberations, strongly voiced the importance of ensuring that each of the instructional strategies and best practices described in the menu be designed to meet the diverse needs of all students and implemented with fidelity. The panel expressed the importance of integrating the linguistic and cultural needs of ELL students into all instructional and professional development.
offerings described in this document. This instruction should be provided to ELL students in their primary language whenever feasible.

Educators must engage in the process of observation, analysis, action, and reflection in their classrooms, regardless of the intervention(s) chosen. This ongoing action research helps solve problems as they arise, and can ensure that the intervention(s) chosen by the implementation team will have the greatest impact on accelerating the achievement growth for struggling students.
Appendix D: 2015 Expert Panel Members

Annie Pennucci (2014-2015) has conducted applied policy research for the state Legislature for over 12 years, specializing in education (spanning early childhood, K–12, and higher education topics). In her K–12 studies, she has examined educational services for students who are deaf and hard of hearing, English Language Learners, recent immigrants, and in foster care; the Learning Assistance Program; academic assessments; education finance; and innovative schools in Washington State. She has experience as a fiscal analyst for the K–12 capital budget in the state House of Representatives, and as an evaluator for a nonprofit that provides social services to adults. Annie holds a certificate from the Senior Executives in State and Local Government program at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government and an M.P.A. from New Mexico State University.

Cheryl Vance (2014-2015), Capital Regional Educational Service District 113 (CRESID113). She spent 18 years in rural, elementary classrooms where she taught kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grades. She received her Master's in educational technology from City University. Cheryl began her leadership journey by being a part of a statewide literacy group led by OSPI and Margaret Mooney. She left the classroom to work for CRESID113 in 2000 beginning as a content specialist and now serves as the K-4 Regional Literacy Coordinator. She also supports elementary mathematics and science. Cheryl provides on-going technical support to schools in the instructional improvement process. Additionally, she helps provide student-focused data analysis, curriculum adoption support, program implementation, and alignment to CCSS and support for understanding the new assessment system. Cheryl is a certified LETRS and Early LETRS trainer, DIBELS Mentor, 6 Trait Writing trainer, and has presented at numerous conferences and institutes in Washington State. Cheryl also served as president of WORD, which is the state branch of the International Reading Association. She will be adding a new leadership opportunity next year by co-leading the state Regional Literacy Coordinators.

David Tudor (2014-2015), MAT Special Education, Curriculum Director, Washougal School District. David received his Master's in special education from Pacific University. He spent seven years in the classroom where he taught students with emotional and behavioral disabilities at the high school level and resource room at the middle school level. David left the classroom to work for OSPI. He was a Program Supervisor in the Special Education department. He supported districts with learning improvement for mathematics and reading. He also served as the RTI coordinator for a year before moving to the School Improvement department. For the next two years, David helped to conduct system and program reviews and provide targeted supports to schools and districts in working with struggling learners. Currently, David works as the Curriculum Director in the Washougal School District.

Glenda Sederstrom (2014-2015), M. Ed, Special Education, Northeast Washington ESD 101, Spokane, Washington where she is the Coordinator for The Center for Special Education Services. Ms. Sederstrom received her degrees from Gonzaga University. She provides technical assistance to the districts within the ESD region for special education practice, collaboration, data analysis, interventions, and compliance as well as Instructional Coaching. She is a certified Right Response De-Escalation Trainer. She is a vetted regional
trainer for Response to Intervention and co-developed the Implementation Integrity Rubric Training for the State of Washington based on the National Center for Response to Intervention Integrity Rubric. She served on the evaluation cadre for two state initiatives: Improving Core Subject Instruction for All Students pilot project and Re-tooling Instruction through Response to Intervention. Before coming to the ESD, she worked as a middle school special education teacher for most of her career. She was a self-contained Resource Room teacher, a Behavior intervention teacher and an inclusion model co-teacher. She also worked for five years as an Instructional Coach with the focus of literacy across content areas.

Justin Young (2015) 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.

Kathy Shoop (2014-2015), Ed.D. earned both her bachelor’s in English/Theater/Speech Education and master’s degree in Curriculum and Instructional Leadership at Western Washington University. Her doctorate in Educational Leadership is from Seattle Pacific University, where her dissertation focus was on self-reflection and its effect on student achievement. She has 32 years’ experience teaching K–12, six years’ experience teaching college-level education classes at the bachelor’s and master’s levels, and has been an Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning at the Northwest Educational Service District. She retains professional memberships in Phi Delta Kappa, ASCD, WSASCD, WASA, and WERA.

Kim Witté (2015) is in her 15th year of public education as an Elementary School Teacher in the Central Kitsap School District. She has taught 1st, 2nd, and 3rd grade; most of her time has been spent in 2nd grade. Kimberly was honored as the 2015 ESD 114 Teacher of the Year. Kimberly is a National Board Certified Teacher and is currently serving as a Leadership Coach for WEA NBCT Teacher Leadership Academy. Kimberly earned her master’s degree in Literacy from Walden University. At school, Kimberly is the Teen and Adult Mentor Coordinator, Safety Patrol Advisor, ASB Advisor, an active PTA member, Primary Choir Director, and a mentor to new teachers. Kimberly loves hosting practicum students from local universities and students teachers into her classroom- so far she has hosted seven students. Some awards that Kimberly has recently received are: National Citizenship Education Teacher Post Recognition Award from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Henry Bryner Post 4992 Teacher of the Year, Paul Harris Fellow from the Rotary Foundation, and Innovation in Education award from the Silverdale Chamber of Commerce. When Kimberly is not teaching, she loves to travel to Malawi, Africa. Since 2004, she has spent between two weeks and two months each summer in Malawi teaching orphaned children alongside Malawian teachers and leads teacher-training workshops. These workshops have ranged from brain-based research to teaching Science.
**Linda Wert (2014-2015)** 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.

**Lyon Terry (2015)** teaches 4th grade at Lawton Elementary in the Seattle Public Schools. This is his 17th year in the classroom. He is the 2015 Washington State Teacher of the Year. Lyon has a Master's Degree in Education from Portland State University with a focus in early elementary reading instruction. He is also a National Board Certified Teacher with a focus on ages 7-12. While teaching for five years in New York City, Lyon participated in many Columbia Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project institutes to enhance his literacy instruction. He has conducted reading and writing trainings for teachers at many different levels, served on the literacy cohort for SPS aligning units of study to the new state standards, and is the lead of his school literacy committee. Lyon believes strongly in building classroom community through read aloud and singing songs accompanied by guitar.

**Matt Lemon (2014-2015)** 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.

**Rachel Dibble (2015)** Rachel earned her undergraduate degree from the University of Washington, and her Master’s Degree from Heritage University. Her teaching experience spans the primary and intermediate grades, and includes experience as a Reading Specialist and Instructional Coach. More recently, she has served as an Assessment Specialist with the Yakima School District, helping support colleagues in the classrooms with local and state assessments. Rachel is a 2013 Crystal Apple award winner for her work with the community.
Saundra Hill, JD (2014-2015) has been Pasco School District’s Superintendent since 2002, but her roots in the community reach back three decades. She came to Pasco in 1982 to work as a Migrant Resource Teacher at Longfellow Elementary. She has also served as an instructional coach to support teachers working with migrant and bilingual students, as Migrant Night School social studies teacher, Migrant Summer School principal, Bilingual Program Administrator, Director of Staff Development and Evaluation, and Director of Special Programs. Prior to beginning in Pasco, Saundra taught in Pe Ell, Washington, where she worked as a Reading Specialist and primary teacher and in Bickleton, Washington, teaching a K–2 combo classroom. She has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Education from the University of Puget Sound, a Master of Arts in Education from Central Washington University in reading and literacy, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School Of Law. In 2010–11, she was chosen by her peers to serve as president of the Washington Association of School Administrators. She was also selected as the 2013 Washington State Superintendent of the Year. A fierce advocate for all students and families, she has been recognized with several awards and honors from various community groups representing Latino and African American students.

Theodore (Ted) Howard II (2015) joined the Seattle School District team in 1990. He earned his Bachelors of Arts in Education at Western Washington University and is endorsed to teach ESL, Special Education, and Regular Education. He earned his Master’s degree in Educational Administration. His work experience is wide spread in the Seattle School District; he has been a dedicated educator for over 22 years and is serving in his 11th year as principal of Garfield High School. During his leadership at Garfield, Garfield has won two consecutive years the School of Distinction Award from the State of Washington for School Improvement, and has been named as one of the top high schools in the United States by several news sources. Garfield has won the Golden Apple Award as a school demonstrating academic excellence at all levels, Ted Howard and Garfield High School won the Thomas B Foster Award for Principal Excellence, and he was named the King Co 4A League Distinguished Principal of the Year. He was appointed to the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board by the Governor.

Dr. Todd E. Johnson (2015) 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.
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Appendix F: List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSS-ELA</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Washington State Birth through 12th Grade Comprehensive Literacy Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELD</td>
<td>English Language Development [Coaches]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP</td>
<td>Washington State English Language Proficiency Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Educational Service District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSB</td>
<td>Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSS</td>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Support Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSIPP</td>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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