PREPARING FOR STRIVING READERS

COMPREHENSIVE LITERACY PROGRAM

CEELO WEBINAR – JUNE 1, 2017
Logistics

- For technical issues please describe your issue in the CHAT BOX
- Questions and comments will be held until the end - enter at any time in the QUESTION BOX
- This session is being recorded and all slides and handouts will be posted on www.ceelo.org
FOR POSTING QUESTIONS

Use Chat for Tech Issues

Use the Question Box for Questions
WELCOME AND AGENDA

- Welcome and Introductions
- Overview of the New Striving Reader Grant Program – Rolf Grafwallner
- Sharon Walpole
- Ellen Frede
- Lauren Mc Bride
- Q & A
Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program (SRCL)

Quick Overview
Absolute Priority

Intervention and practices supported by moderate or strong evidence

- Use independent peer review to prioritize sub-awards to LEAs

- Literacy instruction program must align with the State’s comprehensive literacy plan
Competitive Priorities

- Priority #1
  - Serving disadvantaged children

- Priority #2
  - Alignment with Birth through 5th grade continuum, i.e., improve school readiness and transitions for children across continuum
Fund Allocation

15% Birth through 5

40% K through 5th grade

40% Middle and High School
State and Local Literacy Plans

Submit new or revised State comprehensive literacy plan informed by most recent comprehensive needs assessment

Local literacy plans
- Must align with the State plan;
- Provide professional development;
- Include interventions supported by moderate or strong evidence; and
- Plan to track children’s outcomes
Systems in Early Reading – Research in Support of Designing Grant Proposals for the Striving Readers Comprehensive Literacy Program

Sharon Walpole
Council of Chief State School Officers/
Center on Enhancing Early Learning Outcomes
Webinar
June 1, 2017
Purpose of Striving Readers Grant

• Advance literacy skills from birth through grade 12
• SEAs must ensure that evidence plays a central role in the subgrants to LEAs
• SEAs must submit new or revised State Literacy Plan
Competitive Priority #2

• Alignment with birth to fifth grade continuum

High-quality plan to align, through a progression of approaches appropriate for each age group, early language and literacy projects supported by this grant that serve children from birth to age five with programs and systems that serve students in kindergarten through grade five to improve school readiness and transitions for children across this continuum.
Evidence-based Intervention

• Demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes

• Includes ongoing efforts to examine (assess) the effects of such activity, strategy or intervention.
Cognitive Model of Reading Comprehension
Scott Paris’ Contribution

Constrained skills are those assessed easily and for which mastery is possible

Unconstrained skills are difficult to assess and develop throughout the lifespan

Cognitive Model of Reading Comprehension
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Kindergarten

Phonemic Awareness

Full Alphabet Knowledge

Print Concepts
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Grade 1
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Grade 2

Phonemic Awareness

Print Concepts
Decoding Sight Word Knowledge
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Strategic Knowledge
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Grades 3-5

Phonemic Awareness

Print Concepts

Decoding Sight Word Knowledge

Fluency in Context

Automatic Word Recognition

Language Comprehension

Strategic Knowledge

Reading Comprehension

Vocabulary Knowledge

Background Knowledge

Knowledge of Text and Sentence Structures

General Purposes for Reading

Specific Purposes for Reading

Knowledge of Strategies for Reading

Knowledge of Strategies for Reading

Knowledge of Strategies for Reading
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Tier 1 Grade Level Reading Instruction

Differentiated Instruction

Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 3

Tier 1 Grade Level Writing Instruction
Skills-Based Differentiation Groups

Phonemic Awareness and Word Recognition
- Basic Alphabet Knowledge
- Using Letter Sounds
- Using Letter Patterns

Word Recognition and Fluency
- Blends and Digraphs
- R-controlled Vowels
- Vowel-Consonant-e
- Vowel Teams

Fluency and Comprehension
- With Multisyllabic Decoding
- No Multisyllabic Decoding

Vocabulary and Comprehension
- Students Read Silently
Is the child at benchmark in oral reading fluency?

No

Proficient with vowel teams?

No

Proficient in CVC?

No

Phonemic Awareness and Word Recognition Group

Yes

Vocabulary and Comprehension Group

Yes

Fluency and Comprehension Group

Yes

Word Recognition and Fluency Group
Assessment
Consider the Types of Assessments

Screening
Diagnostic
Progress Monitoring
Outcome

Based on grade level and time of year, is there a problem or not?
Consider the Types of Assessments

Screening
Diagnostic
Progress Monitoring
Outcome

What exactly is the problem?
Consider the Types of Assessments

- Screening
- Diagnostic
- **Progress Monitoring**
- Outcome

Are efforts to address the problem working?
Consider the Types of Assessments

- Screening
- Diagnostic
- Progress Monitoring
- **Outcome**

To what extent is my system of assessment and instruction working? Are there patterns?
### Characteristics to Highlight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screening</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Progress Monitoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed and ease</td>
<td>Validity and Utility</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Logic

Screen (and rescreen midyear) in the most complex skill that is reasonable at that age and stage

Diagnose only for those children whose screening flags a potential problem

Progress monitor only if you are attempting an instructional intervention
We need only free assessments here

- Grade-level oral reading fluency probe
- Diagnostic assessment of decoding
- Letter name and sound inventory
Assessment and Instruction Inventory

- **Diagnostics**
  - Grouping
  - Progress Monitoring

- **Differentiation**
  - Routines
  - Models

- **Outcomes**
  - Transfer task
  - Goal setting
Thank you for your time.

Sharon Walpole, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Education
University of Delaware

swalpole@udel.edu
State Policy Considerations: Improving Literacy Outcomes for Children 0-8

Ellen Frede
Co-Director, National Institute for Early Education Research

June 1, 2017
Not Much Money: What Can We Learn and Do That Moves Our Strategic Plan Forward?

• Estimated $3 million – $80 million with maximum of 5% for state infrastructure
• 15% must go to 0-5 programs; 40% K-5; 40% 6-12
  • CPP1: Serving disadvantaged children includes low income, DLL and special education/inclusion
  • Given this, no reason not to go for CPP2: Alignment within a B-5th grade continuum
  • Administratively complicated and more of the components are missing in ECE or spotty so lobby for at least 2.5% going to early years state support – staff, data, continuous program improvement, etc.
Opportunities: Your Wish List

- Get P-3 experts on Comprehensive Literacy Board and review team
- Develop/Enhance Monitoring and Continuous Program Improvement system for whole state
- Build/improve data and tracking system including at least Head Start and state pre-k (DLL numbers)
- Include 0-5 in state and local needs assessments
- Incentivize through priorities in RFP:
  - Coordination with private providers and building true continuity
  - Possibly favor partnerships with Head Start because of CPP1 (but make sure HS has actually signed on or vice versa)
  - How could this enhance/take advantage of QRIS?
- Develop guidance on choosing evidence-based approaches (or incentivize/limit the options?)
- A lot of this is PD so make sure it is consistent with other state initiatives (e.g. Early EdU). What can you learn that might be scalable?
Dual Language Learners (DLL) Considerations

- How adequately does your Comprehensive Literacy Plan address ELs in P-3?
- Find your bilingual education experts now and have them ready to serve on review committee and Literacy Board
- Opportunity for “Grow Your Own” bilingual teacher preparation
- Most current and comprehensive resource:
  https://www.nap.edu/read/24677/

  “DLLs benefit from consistent exposure to both their L1 and English in ECE settings . .”

  “Not all teachers can teach all languages but all teachers can learn specific strategies that support the maintenance of all languages.”
Massachusetts Early Grades Literacy Grant:
Understand, Integrate, Engage

Lauren McBride, Literacy Specialist
Meeting the Early Literacy Challenge

Challenge

Stagnant 3\textsuperscript{rd}-grade reading scores

Goal

Increase in literacy scores targeted students
Design Process

Empathize
Over 30 interviews with the field

Define
4 root causes

Ideate
Team developed 5 potential proposals

Prototype
Early Grades Literacy draft grant developed

Test
Input from external and internal stakeholders
Identified Root Cause

1. Early grade educators’ lack opportunities to engage with the ELA/literacy standards in ways that help them develop an understanding of the vertical progressions in grades PreK-3 and beyond.

2. Units and lessons are seldom designed to promote integration across reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language strands of the ELA/Literacy standards or integration across disciplines, which promotes soloed instruction.

3. Student tasks may be aligned to the standards in terms of being related to appropriate content, but are seldom at the level of ambition required by the standards in terms of providing students with opportunities to read, write, think and talk about what they are learning.

4. Many schools do not have early grade assessment strategies in place that allow teachers to efficiently and repeatedly diagnose individual and whole class areas of need.
Program Objectives

Understand
the changes made to the Pre-K through Grade 3 2017 ELA/Literacy Frameworks and how the standards for the grades educators teach are part of a vertical learning progression;

Integrate
the standards in unit and lesson design both (1) across the reading, writing, speaking & listening, and language strands within the ELA/Literacy standards and (2) more broadly across content areas (mathematics, social studies, science);

Engage
early literacy students with authentic, developmentally appropriate tasks that (1) reflect intentional integration of standards, (2) provide students with opportunities to read, write, talk, and think about what they are learning, and (3) help teachers assess whether students are meeting the expectations of the standards
Early Grades Literacy Professional Learning Cycle

- Statewide Literacy Institute
  - After School Regional Meeting
  - Full Day Regional Meeting
2 Entry Points for Participation

- Statewide Literacy Institute
- Full Day Regional Meeting
- After School Regional Meeting

Group 2 in addition...

- Administers a code/meaning screener 3 x a year
- On-site support from data specialist
- On-site early literacy consultant support
  - Collaborative observations and cross-site visits
  - School team PLC facilitation
RESOURCES | CONTACTS

Webinar recording and materials found at www.ceelo.org/
Reach us at:

- efrede@nieer.org
- jmartella@edc.org
- lmcbride@doe.mass.edu
- ltadros@nieer.org
- rolf.grafwallner@ccsso.org
- swalpole@udel.edu