



**Date:** June 2, 2011

**To:** Board of Education

**From:** Lisa Wachtel, Executive Director of Curriculum & Assessment

**RE:** Literacy Program Evaluation

---

### Background

2010-11 was the first year in which a formal curricular review cycle has been initiated. According to the program review cycle approved by the MMSD Board of Education, literacy was the first area to be reviewed. As a part of an intensive first year (Year 1) review cycle, the Literacy Evaluation and Recommendations were presented to the Board in February, 2011. At the March, 2011 Board meeting, a panel presentation was made in addition to sharing updated action plans and budget implications. Additional budget clarifications were made at the April, 2011 Board meeting.

### Recommendations Requested on June 6, 2011

It is recommended that the Board approve the Literacy Program Evaluation: Findings and Recommendations.

It is recommended that the Board approve \$611,000 to support the Literacy Program Evaluation recommendations. \$531,000 of this amount is included in the Superintendent's 2011-12 Balanced Budget. Funding for READ 180 in the amount of \$80,000 is included in the recommended funding for additions to the 2011-12 cost-to-continue budget (memo dated May 16, 2011) from cost savings measures.

It is recommended that the Board approve the plan to purchase learning materials to support literacy in the amount of \$415,000. In October, 2011, the Board requested a plan to outline the purchase. This plan supports the Literacy Evaluation Recommendations, including K-12 literacy instructional materials, Dual Language Immersion, and equity purchases. Funding for the \$415,000 purchases is included in 2010-11 contingency accounts (Fund 10) transferred to Curriculum & Assessment (Fund 10) to supplement the Instructional Learning Materials Budget (ELM).

### Supporting Documentation

The full report, K-12 Literacy Program Evaluation: Findings and Recommendation for Continual Improvement of Literacy Achievement & K-12 Alignment was submitted by courier to the Board on February 22, 2011. This document is in a 3-ring binder, and is not being re-sent in this packet.

A summary document, titled Recommendations, Cost Considerations and Plan Description (dated March 17, 2011) provides more detail regarding how the action steps are being carried and reflects the most current budget requests totaling \$611,000. This document includes budget updates and current detail to

Chapter 11 of the full document. Approval of the supporting budget is requested at this time so that principals and teachers can be informed of new programs being implemented in their schools prior to the end of this school year. Preparation that must be in place prior to the start of the 2011-12 academic year including adjusting student schedules so that they can benefit from the literacy interventions, scheduling appropriate classroom space and allowing teachers to participate in professional development to gain familiarity with the new programs.

The Board requested more information on how the Literacy Program Evaluation would proceed over the course of a complete review cycle. Included in this packet the Board will find a document titled Literacy Program Evaluation: Annual Tasks and Activities. This document provides information regarding the projected on-going work of a full review cycle of Literacy.

The document titled Literacy Instructional Materials Purchase Plan is also included in this packet. This plan describes the need for increased instructional materials funding and outlines specific literacy needs that are in alignment with the findings and recommendations of the Literacy Program Evaluation. The K-12 purchase plan provides for new purchases and equity purchases to help support schools in current need of student literacy resources (e.g. book rooms). The \$415,000 plan is funded through the 2010-11 budget.

Working through the first program review during 2010-11 was a collaborative and systemic effort. It has yielded deeper insight into the complex needs underlying the District responsibility to ensure all students of the Madison Metropolitan School District are proficient readers and writers, fully prepared for the college and/or career options of their choosing. We look forward to discussing and remaining questions that the Board may have regarding these documents and their implications at the June 6 Special Board Meeting.

Attached:

Recommendations, Cost Considerations and Plan Description (dated March 17, 2011)  
Literacy Program Evaluation: Annual Tasks and Activities (dated May 19, 2011)  
Literacy Instructional Materials Purchase Plan (dated April 28, 2011)



**Date:** May 19, 2011

**To:** Board of Education

**From:** Daniel Nerad, Superintendent of Schools

**RE:** Literacy Program Evaluation: Annual Tasks and Activities

---

### **Background**

2010-11 was the first year in which a formal curricular review cycle has been initiated. According to the program review cycle approved by the MMSD Board of Education, literacy was the first area to be reviewed. As a part of an intensive first year (Year 1) review cycle, the Literacy Evaluation and Recommendations were presented to the Board in February, 2011. At the March, 2011 Board meeting, a panel presentation was made in addition to sharing updated action plans and budget implications. Additional budget clarifications were made at the April, 2011 Board meeting.

### **Annual Tasks and Activities**

Program evaluation is an on-going process over a period of several years. The document attached provides information regarding the on-going work of the Literacy Program Evaluation over the course of a full review cycle. A brief description of the type of activities is described on an annual basis beginning in 2010-11 (Year 1) through 2015-16 (Year 6). It is projected that literacy would re-enter a Year 1 cycle of activities in 2016-17.

Attached: Literacy Program Evaluation: Annual Tasks and Activities





**MADISON METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT**  
**Literacy Program Evaluation and Curriculum Review Cycle**  
**Updated Annual Tasks and Activities**  
**May, 2011**

Program evaluation is designed in a cyclical and on-going manner. In addition to the cyclical tasks described below, the proposed process includes tasks that are performed annually for literacy.

Year	Task	Activity
<b>Year 1</b>		
<b>2010-11</b>		
	1	Initiate program evaluation per MMSD Board of Education approved process.
	2	Confirm evaluation questions to be pursued with Board of Education.
	3	Define measurement approach in conjunction with Program Evaluation Advisory Committee and curriculum-specific teacher leadership team.
	4	Allocate resources to support evaluation team work including determination of what external third party resources might be used for evaluation tasks, if any.
	5	Implement data collection in support of the measurement plan.
	6	Analyze data and generate summary of findings.
	3	Collaborate with central office and schools to cycle teacher leadership work with major curricular initiatives (e.g., new course proposals).
	6	Establish Literacy Advisory Committee inclusive of multiple perspectives.
	7	Review state and local assessment data to determine patterns and trends across schools and student subgroups.
	8	Review local, state, and national curricular standards.
	9	In conjunction with Research & Evaluation, conduct a teacher instructional practices survey and review results.
	10	Conduct secondary research of instructional strategies and validate the quality of that research.
	11	Review program mission and program goals.
	12	Identify gaps and redundancies of program interventions and instructional practices.
	13	Prepare draft documents and determine resource needs/budget amount.
	14	Present report, recommendations and budget resource requests to the Board of Education for approval.
<b>Year 2</b>		
<b>2011-12</b>		
	1	Purchase literacy materials as approved by the Board of Education and the Curricular Review Process.
	2	Establish K-12 Scope & Sequence Teacher Leadership Committee.
	3	Implement Core Literacy Practices K-5.
	4	Establish Core Adolescent Literacy Practices grades 6-12.
	5	Implement K-12 professional development for Elementary Instructional Resource Teachers, Middle School Learning Coordinators and High School Literacy Coaches.
	6	Implement Interventionist professional development.
	7	Implement Kindergarten Literacy Pilot Program with selected schools. Provide professional development and student data support. Analyze Kindergarten pilot student achievement data and compare with non-pilot Kindergarten student achievement data. Communicate next steps for 2012-13 by June 2012.

Year	Task	Activity
	8	Implement Word Work materials in all grades K-3. Provide professional development and student data support to enable effective analysis
	9	Implement intensive professional development plan for Kindergarten, grade 6, 9 and 10.
	10	Design common formative assessment plan.
	11	Establish Response to Intervention Plan (RtI) for Literacy.
	12	Administer and analyze annual instructional practice survey
	13	Administer MAP grades 3-7.analyze data.
	14	Analyze student achievement data to inform professional development, core practice, Response to Intervention, and School Support Team work.
<b>Year 3 2012-13</b>		
	1	Purchase literacy materials as approved by the Board of Education and the Curricular Review Process.
	2	Implement Literacy Scope & Sequence K-12
	3	Sustain and support comprehensive professional development for literacy.
	4	Implement Core Adolescent Literacy Practices grades 6-12.
	5	Implement consistent RtI Tier 1, 2, and 3 interventions for Literacy.
	6	Administer and analyze annual instructional practice survey.
	7	Administer all literacy assessments per the Balanced Assessment Plan.
	8	Analyze student achievement data to inform professional development, core practice, Response to Intervention, and School Support Team work.
<b>Year 4 2013-14</b>		
	1	Purchase literacy materials as approved by the Board of Education and the Curricular Review Process.
	2	Sustain and support comprehensive professional development for literacy.
	3	Monitor Literacy Scope & Sequence implementation. Make adjustments as needed.
	4	Monitor implementation of RtI Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions for Literacy. Make adjustments as data indicates.
	5	Administer and analyze annual instructional practice survey.
	6	Administer all literacy assessments per the Balanced Assessment Plan.
	7	Analyze student achievement data to inform professional development, core practice, Response to Intervention, and School Support Team work.
<b>Year 5 2014-15</b>		
	1	Purchase literacy materials as approved by the Board of Education and the Curricular Review Process.
	2	Sustain and support comprehensive professional development for literacy.
	3	Monitor Literacy Scope & Sequence implementation. Make adjustments as needed.
	4	Monitor implementation of RtI Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions for Literacy. Make adjustments as data indicates.
	5	Administer and analyze annual instructional practice survey.
	6	Administer all literacy assessments per the Balanced Assessment Plan.
	7	Analyze student achievement data to inform professional development, core practice, Response to Intervention, and School Support Team work.

**Year 6**  
**2015-16**

- 1 Purchase literacy materials as approved by the Board of Education and the Curricular Review Process.
- 2 Sustain and support comprehensive professional development for literacy.
- 3 Monitor Literacy Scope & Sequence implementation. Make adjustments as needed.
- 4 Monitor implementation of RtI Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions for Literacy. Make adjustments as data indicates.
- 5 Administer and analyze annual instructional practice survey.
- 6 Administer all literacy assessments per the Balanced Assessment Plan.
- 7 Analyze student achievement data to inform professional development, core practice, Response to Intervention, and School Support Team work.
- 8 Prepare for new review and evaluation cycle to begin in June of Year 1







**Date:** June 2, 2011

**To:** Board of Education

**From:** Lisa Wachtel, Executive Director, Curriculum & Assessment  
Sue Abplanalp, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Learning Office

**RE:** Literacy Program Evaluation Findings and Recommendations  
and  
Literacy Program Evaluation Budget Addition Request

---

## **I. Introduction**

### **A. Title**

Literacy Program Evaluation Findings and Recommendations  
and  
Literacy Program Evaluation Budget Addition Request

### **B. Presenters/contact person**

Lisa Wachtel, Executive Director of Curriculum & Assessment  
Sue Abplanalp, Deputy Superintendent

### **C. Background information**

At the December 14, 2009 Board of Education meeting, administration was directed to evaluate district reading programs. The process to carry out this directive was approved on February 8, 2010. The literacy program is the first content area to be reviewed under the MMSD Program Evaluation and Curriculum Review Process. A literacy advisory committee was formed and included district-wide representation. The Board received the full report, including findings, recommendations and budget implications in February, 2011. A panel of the Literacy Advisory Committee members presented the Literacy Program Evaluation Findings and Recommendations on March 21, 2011 to the Board of Education. Also discussed on March 21 was the Literacy Program Evaluation: Action Plan Updates.

### **C. Describe the action requested of the BOE**

It is recommended that the Board approve the Literacy Program Evaluation: Findings and Recommendations.

It is recommended that the Board approve \$611,000 to support the Literacy Program Evaluation recommendations. \$531,000 of this amount is included in the Superintendent's 2011-12 Balanced Budget. Funding for READ 180 in the amount of \$80,000 is included in the recommended funding for additions to the 2011-12 cost-to-continue budget (memo dated May 16, 2011) from cost savings measures.

## **II. Summary of Current Information**

### **A. Provide a brief synthesis of the topic**

The Literacy Advisory Committee met on a bi-weekly basis since August to fulfill the request to evaluate the literacy program. In addition to the work undertaken by the full committee, four (4) subcommittees were also established to address specific areas, including:

instructional practices survey design and implementation; inventory of district-wide literacy programs and practices programs; intervention research; and focus groups.

Through the analysis and discussion of the data collected, several themes emerged independently from various groups. Many areas of strength and best practice emerged, although these practices are not system-wide and remain isolated. General findings pointing to areas of improvement are summarized into broad themes below, and are described in more detail in the full report:

- Core literacy practices are not clearly defined, particularly at the secondary level. Consequently, student learning outcomes are not consistent or aligned. There is not clear understanding of who is responsible for developing increasingly sophisticated literacy skills at the secondary level required for post-secondary success. There is significant variance in instructional practice, within and among grade levels, schools and within buildings.
- A consistent, systemic approach to support struggling readers (e.g. interventions) is lacking. Currently, schools are relying heavily on computerized software in the absence of a well-defined intervention plan and system of support.
- A greater breadth and depth of books, resources and materials, especially culturally relevant materials, are needed District-wide to support a wide and diverse range of learners.
- Specialized teacher knowledge about the reading and writing process is a necessary component of a strong literacy program K-12.
- A more developed assessment system is needed to monitor learning progress.
- Providing high quality literacy instruction to diverse learners is challenging, and professional development is needed to help staff and administrators meet these challenges.

#### **B. Clearly label any recommendations**

Each recommendation includes: 1) findings resulting from this evaluation process; 2) action required by the District; and 3) cost considerations.

The broad areas of recommendation described more fully in the report include:

Recommendation I	K-12 Alignment
Recommendation II	Program and Practices
Recommendation III	Intervention Systems (Rtl)
Recommendation IV	Instructional Materials
Recommendation V	Accountability System
Recommendation VI	Specialized Staff
Recommendation VII	Professional Development

### **III. Implications**

#### **A. Budget**

Specific Budget Addition Requests of \$611,000 are detailed in Chapter 11.

#### **Budget Additions to Support the Literacy Program Evaluation for 2011-2012**

MMSD Balanced Assessment Plan*	\$311,000
System 44	\$160,000
READ 180 Expansion	\$80,000
Achieve 3000	\$60,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$611,000</b>

\* Includes MAP, Explore, Plan, General Intellectual and Advanced Placement. \$135,000 are MAP costs.

\$531,000 of this amount is included in the Superintendent's 2011-12 Balanced Budget. Funding for READ 180 in the amount of \$80,000 is included in the recommended funding for additions to the 2011-12 cost-to-continue budget (memo dated May 16, 2011) from cost savings measures.

## **B. Strategic Plan**

*Support of the Strategic Plan Objectives include:*

Student	Achievement for All Students
Curriculum	Accelerated Learning Assessment Cultural Relevance Flexible Instruction
Staff	Professional Development
Resources/Capacity	Prioritize and Allocate Resources  Rigorous Evaluation

## **C. Equity Plan**

*Connections to the Equity Plan are:*

Access & Achievement: Elimination of gaps in access and achievement due to current or historic inequalities.

## **C. Implications for other aspects of the organization**

Improvement of literacy achievement can serve as the core focus for MMSD to make significant gains in closing the achievement gap, ensuring college and career readiness, and preparing literate citizens for a global economy. Students who can not read or write have minimal chance of graduating or obtaining post-secondary college or career options providing livable wages.

## **IV. Supporting documentation**

Literacy Program Evaluation Findings and Recommendations (3 ring binder)

Included in this packet:

- Recommendations, Cost Considerations and Plan Description (Chapter 11 chart)
- Annual Tasks and Activities, Action Steps Years 1-6

## **V. Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Board approve the Literacy Program Evaluation Findings and Recommendations.

It is recommended that the Board approve \$611,000 to support the Literacy Program Evaluation recommendations. \$531,000 of this amount is included in the Superintendent's 2011-12 Balanced Budget. Funding for READ 180 in the amount of \$80,000 is included in the recommended funding for additions to the 2011-12 cost-to-continue budget (memo dated May 16, 2011) from cost savings measures.





**Date:** March 17, 2011  
**To:** Board of Education  
**From:** Daniel Nerad, Superintendent of Schools  
**RE:** Literacy Program Evaluation: Action Plan Updates

---

The MMSD Board of Education received the Executive Summary of the Literacy Program Evaluation: Findings and Recommendations for Continual Improvement of Literacy Achievement and the Literacy Program Evaluation document in February, 2011. Since that time, progress has been made in several of the Action Step areas. The intention of this document is to provide the Board with additional information regarding:

- process and timeline for action steps described in the original document
- current Budget Addition Request information relative to literacy
- assessment information to assure integrity of implementation

Two documents are attached.

The first document contains the original recommendations (Chapter 11) with two modifications. An additional column title "Plan Description" was added to enter current information about how the Action Steps are progressing to date. The second change from the original document is the updated Budget Addition Requests to reflect the current budget planning.

The second document contains the assessment information for maintaining integrity of elementary literacy. The Environment Scale for Assessment Implementation Levels (ESAIL) has been used in all elementary schools during 2010-11 to gather baseline information. The guiding principles used with the ESAIL to ensure integrity of development and implementation of elementary literacy are:

- the composite of the ten features of ESAIL work together to comprise a school plan for implementing a comprehensive literacy model
- model classrooms
- embedded coaching within the model classroom by a trained literacy coach
- team members mentor one another within and across grade levels
- curriculum and instruction are aligned vertically and horizontally
- weekly professional development for core instruction and tiered interventions
- comprehensive assessment system that leads to tiered and layered interventions
- portfolio of specific interventions K-5.

Attached:

Literacy Program Evaluation: Action Plan Updates  
Environmental Scale for Assessment Implementation Levels

## Recommendation II

### Establish and maintain K-12 common core literacy programs and instructional practices

#### Findings to support recommendations are:

- Range of fidelity and expertise in elementary schools (Principal Focus Groups)
- Range of literacy practices in secondary schools (Teacher and Principal Focus Groups)
- Need to identify and implement core literacy practices for adolescent learners (Current Programs & Practices Questionnaire)
- Lack of consistent practice in both adolescent reading in the content area and writing (Current Programs & Practices Questionnaire)
- Low value added classrooms were more likely to report they spent time on both reading and listening comprehension practices compared with high value added classrooms (94.1% vs 80.6%) who, in turn, were much more likely to report only focusing on reading strategies (19.4% vs. 5.9%) (Instructional Practices Survey)

Action Step	Cost Considerations	Plan Description
1. Intensify reading instruction in Kindergarten in order to ensure all students are proficient in oral reading and comprehension as measured by valid and reliable assessments by 2011-2012.  Instruction and assessment will be benchmarked to ensure Kindergarten proficiency is at reading levels 3-7 (PLAA, 2009).	No additional costs. Professional development provided by central office and building-based literacy staff must focus on Kindergarten.	Core practices for kindergarten literacy are currently being defined. These core practices will be presented to all Instructional Resource Teachers and Principals during two professional development sessions on April 8 and 26, 2011. District and building-based professional development will focus on kindergarten during summer 2011 and throughout 2011-12. Building staff will be provided with a professional development framework for intensive focus at kindergarten during 2011-12 in addition to the establishment of model kindergarten classrooms.
2. Fully implement Balanced Literacy in 2011-12 using clearly	Learning materials may be partially funded through the Curricular	<b>Balanced Literacy 2.0</b>

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

<p>defined, consistent practices and progress monitoring as informed by the Comprehensive Literacy Model (Linda Dorn), the MMSD Primary Literacy Notebook and the MMSD 3-5 Literacy Notebook.</p> <p><b>Also</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Explore research-based reading curricula using the Board of Education Evaluation of Learning Materials Policy 3611 with particular focus on targeted and explicit instruction, to develop readers in Kindergarten.</li> <li>b. Pilot the new reading curricula in volunteer schools during 2011-12.</li> <li>c. Analyze Kindergarten reading proficiency scores from Kindergarten students in fully implemented Balanced Literacy schools and Kindergarten students in the volunteer schools piloting the new reading curricula incorporated into a Balanced Literacy framework to inform next steps.</li> <li>d. Continue pilot in volunteer schools in Grade 1 during 2012-13 and Grade 2 during 2013-14.</li> </ul>	<p>Review and Renewal Cycle Process.</p>	<p>Intensive work to establish fidelity within Balanced Literacy was initiated as a focus for the 2010-11 Instructional Resource Teacher and Principal professional development. 3-hour learning seminars have been conducted on a bi-weekly basis, focusing on core practices, assessments, progress monitoring and culturally relevant instructional practices. Additional learning was provided by Linda Dorn (Balanced Literacy) and Tara Fortune (Dual Language Immersion). A Balanced Literacy 2.0 Core Practice Summit, including IRTs and Principals, is scheduled for full days on May 12 and 13, 2011. The core practices established and communicated during this summit will be supported and implemented in all elementary buildings during 2011-12.</p> <p><b>Kindergarten Pilot</b></p> <p>A teacher committee has been formed to review, evaluate and recommend a kindergarten reading curricula. Materials included in the review have been identified. The timeline for the review process is spring, 2011. Professional development for participating schools and purchase of the materials will occur prior to the start of the 2011-12 year. Four (4) elementary schools have volunteered to pilot the materials in 2011-12.</p>
---	--	---

<p>3. Incorporate explicit reading instruction and literacy curricula into 6<sup>th</sup> grade instruction.</p>	<p>Learning materials may be partially funded through the Curricular Review and Renewal Cycle Process. Re-allocation of current middle school FTE is required.</p>	<p>All middle schools were provided with a selection of differentiated, non-fiction reading materials to support 6<sup>th</sup> grade science and social studies in winter, 2010. A core set of instructional units have also been provided to all schools. Additional materials will be reviewed for purchase and implementation in 2011-12. Professional development for 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers is scheduled for summer, 2011. 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers and interventionists will join the intensive professional development for 2011-12, thus creating consistency for K-6 core literacy instruction.</p>
<p>4. Identify and implement consistent district-wide strategies for reading in all content areas in grades 7-12. Consider using exemplary district models resulting in dramatic student achievement gains such as the Brockton (MA) High School (Transformed by Literacy, Principal Leadership, 2010).</p>	<p>Re-alignment of current professional development funding across the District to prioritize literacy. Budget sources include: Educational Services, Curriculum &amp; Assessment, Professional Development, REaL Grant, Title, and School Improvement Planning and Strategic Plan funding.</p>	<p>Core literacy practices are being identified for kindergarten and grades 1-5 in spring, 2011. These practices will be shared with IRT's and principals in April-May, 2011. Implementation of these practices begins in 2011-12. Core literacy practices are in development for secondary, grades 6-12.</p>
<p>5. Develop integrated units to support reading and writing skills as a part of the K-12 alignment process in all content areas.</p>	<p>Re-alignment of current professional development funding across the District to prioritize literacy. Budget sources include: Educational Services, Curriculum &amp; Assessment, Professional Development, REaL Grant, Title, and School Improvement Planning and Strategic Plan funding.</p>	<p>The process to align K-12 literacy to the Common Core State Standards and the ACT College &amp; Career Readiness Standards in Eclipse, using the Universal Design for Learning framework, will provide the basis for integrated units to be written K-12. Professional development for central office staff to be able to</p>

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.



		support the alignment work at the building level was begun in March, 2011.
6. Identify, develop and implement literacy core practices for all grades, with particular attention to secondary grades 6-12. In order to identify core practices in literacy at the secondary level, teams of practitioners will be collaborating to identify particular high-leverage aspects of both reading and writing that are essential for all students to know and be able to perform with proficiency or better. Teams will use such resources as the Common Core State Standards, the ACT Standards, the Wisconsin State Superintendent's Adolescent Literacy Plan, the Carnegie Report on Adolescent Literacy, and other current, research-based publications.	Re-alignment of current professional development funding across the District to prioritize literacy. Budget sources include: Educational Services, Curriculum & Assessment, Professional Development, REaL Grant, Title, and School Improvement Planning and Strategic Plan funding.	Core literacy practices are in development for secondary, grades 6-12.

### Recommendation III

Implement consistent District-wide K-12 literacy intervention supports and programs in compliance with the federal Response to Intervention (RtI) mandate so that all grades and schools have full access to Tier 1, 2, and 3 level interventions targeting early intervention.

**Findings to support recommendations are:**

- Need for objective screening tool (Psychologist Focus Group)
- General reading achievement, the ability to read text both accurately and with understanding, is only listed as a proven outcome of two early interventions: Reading Recovery (positive effect) and Success for All (potentially positive) (Intervention Research)
- Early intervention is a preventative approach to closing the achievement gap which, once in place, is highly resistant to change (Intervention Research)

Action Step	Cost Considerations	Plan Description
1. Ensure that all K-12 students have full access to consistent core reading instruction with fidelity and accountability beginning at K-6 in 2011-2012 and secondary in 2012-2013.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  Re-allocation of FTE at middle school is required. Building-base leadership is required to ensure fidelity and accountability.	All School Improvement Plans are required include goals that address the improvement of student achievement in literacy.  Central office is in the process of restructuring staff and service delivery in order to more effectively support schools. In this process, instructional leaders will benefit from enhanced support to renew their focus on the critical, district-wide importance of literacy and the centrality of School Improvement Plans to guide school-based work.
2. Ensure that intervention is provided K-12 in addition to core instruction to accelerate literacy learning by 2011-2012.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  Tier 2 intervention is provided by teaching staff. Central office and	Intervention interfaces with core instructional practices, assessments and Response to Intervention (RtI). The District-

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

	<p>building-based literacy staff must provide professional development to support teaching staff in implementing research-based interventions.</p> <p>Re-align Reading Recovery allocations to ensure that the neediest 20% of students district-wide will have access to Reading Recovery. Re-align interventionists to meet the needs of all students K-6 without access to Reading Recovery.</p>	<p>wide Balanced Assessment Committee is merging with the Response to Intervention Committee in order to more effectively and expeditiously provides guidance to all schools regarding the necessity of providing: 1) access to high quality instruction for all students; 2) regular, consistent progress monitoring; and 3) research-based interventions, provided with fidelity.</p>
<p>3. Screen all K-8 students for potential reading problems at the beginning of the year and again in the middle of the year (Tier 1). Screen 9-12 students as indicated by progress monitoring. Use the most developmentally appropriate measures for screening.</p>	<p>Costs to be determined. Tier 2 intervention is provided by teaching staff. Central office and building-based literacy staff must provide professional development to support classroom teachers in implementing research-based interventions.</p>	<p>The Primary Language Arts Assessment (PLAA) and Spanish Primary Language Arts Assessment (SPLAA) are required for all Kindergarten students in spring and fall and for all K-2 students in spring. Future implementation of Measures of Academic Progress will provide standardized reading and language student data twice a year for all grade 3-7 students. Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) is currently used for elementary students scoring above the PLAA ceiling and for secondary students. Consistent and more frequent progress monitoring systems are in development.</p>
<p>4. Provide time for differentiated reading instruction for all students based on current reading level.</p>	<p>No additional costs for 2011-12.</p>	<p>K-12 core literacy practices are being developed to guide classroom practices. The consistent use of the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework is currently being used to develop</p>

		curriculum and instruction aligned to the Common Core State Standards and ACT College & Career Readiness Standards. The UDL work is focused on ensuring curriculum is designed and implemented to meet the wide range of student needs in the regular classroom. Differentiation is a core practice defined within the UDL framework.
5. Provide intensive, systematic instruction in small groups to students below the screening benchmark (Tier 2).	Costs will be determined after analysis of small group intervention pilots.	Interventionists, Reading Recovery Teachers, and Instructional Resources Teachers will participate in specialized K-6 professional development during 2011-12 to increase their abilities to provide intensive, systemic literacy instruction to small groups of students. Professional development was initiated in 2010-11 and will be sustained and intensified in 2011-12.
6. Computerized intervention programs will be implemented with full integrity to the research design with highly qualified reading teachers, targeting grades 6 and 9 including a plan for exiting students on schedule and consistent entrance criteria.	* Expand READ 180 to schools currently without @ \$40,000 per school. Two schools currently do not have READ 180  *2011-12 Budget Addition Request READ 180* - \$80,000	READ 180 professional development is provided annually. Staff new to READ 180 and new READ 180 school staff will participate in the professional development with on-going support provided from central office staff.
7. Pilot research-based, small group interventions identified as "promising" in gap areas, targeting secondary levels (Tier 2). Highlight best practices being piloted in high schools.	Costs will be determined upon selection/development of screeners and progress monitoring systems.	Interventionists, Learning Coordinators, Literacy Coaches and central office staff will review secondary student literacy data, current best practices and intervention research to recommend interventions to be piloted in 2011-12.

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

<p>8. Pending valid and positive pilot evaluation results, implement System 44 in secondary schools (Tier 3).</p>	<p>* Implement System 44 in secondary schools currently without @ \$20,000/school.</p> <p><b>*2011-12 Budget Addition Request System 44 - \$160,000</b></p>	<p>A final report on the efficacy of System 44 will be available in June, 2011. Pending positive results of the student achievement data and funding, schools currently using System 44 will continue and new schools will be added in 2011-12.</p>
---	---	---

#### Recommendation IV

**Review and purchase literacy program instructional materials to achieve consistency and District-wide equity K-12.**

**Findings to support recommendations are:**

- Need for resources (Teacher and Principal Focus Groups)
- Inequitable access to high quality materials and resources (Core Programs & Practices Questionnaire)

Action Step	Cost Considerations	Plan Description
1. Review and purchase consistent 6 <sup>th</sup> grade literacy instructional materials.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  According to Program Evaluation Curricular Review Cycle, 6 <sup>th</sup> grade learning materials funding is targeted to literacy in 2010-11 and 2011-12.	An instructional unit around comprehension strategies was provided to all middle schools in fall, 2010. Additionally, in winter, 2010, all middle schools were provided with a selection of differentiated, fiction and non-fiction materials to support 6th grade reading instruction that are connected to units of study in science and social studies. Additional materials will be reviewed for purchase and implementation in 2011-12.  Professional development for 6 <sup>th</sup> grade teachers is scheduled for summer, 2011. 6 <sup>th</sup> grade interventionists will join the intensive professional development for 2011-12, thus creating consistency for K-6 core literacy instruction.
2. Inventory literacy materials K-12 in order to identify gaps by grade level and schools. Purchase materials using district funds to achieve equity among grade levels and schools.	Learning materials may be partially funded through the re-alignment of instructional learning materials budget and process implemented in 2010-11.	Initial phases of the literacy inventory began in spring, 2011.  Equity purchases were allocated to 3-5 schools in need.  Pending continued funding, additional phases will continue K-

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

		12 through year 4 of literacy evaluation cycle. Grade 6, high school English and kindergarten are scheduled for review and purchase in 2011-12.
3. Achieve equitable book room inventories at all elementary schools, targeting grades 3-5 non-fiction areas to align with the Common Core State Standards.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  According to Program Evaluation Curricular Review Cycle, learning materials funding is targeted to literacy in 2010-11 and 2011-12.	Initial phases of the literacy inventory began in spring, 2011.  Additional funds were provided to schools with the greatest needs/gap in their 3-5 bookrooms. Pending continued funding, additional phases of identification and resource allocation will continue K-12 through year 4 of literacy evaluation cycle.
4. Increase library inventory commensurate with languages spoken in MMUSD.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  Common School Funds, district and school-based library funding must be re-allocated to meet this goal.	Professional development and collaboration with specialized agencies to support librarians in the selection process of books in representative languages, and district-wide sharing of recommended vendors and books lists in on-going.
5. Increase library and book room inventories of culturally relevant materials.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  Re-allocation of funds current used to purchase curricular materials is required.	Professional development and collaboration with specialized agencies to support librarians and Instructional Resource Teachers in the selection of high quality, authentic, culturally relevant books, and district-wide sharing of recommended vendors and books lists in on-going.
6. Increase library inventory to support dual language immersion sites.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  Re-allocation of funds current used to purchase curricular materials is required.	Targeted funding has been allocated through the Common School Fund process to dual language immersion schools in their initial year.

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

7. Increase selection of leveled reading materials for secondary.	Learning materials may be partially funded through the re-alignment of instructional learning materials budget and process implemented in 2010-11.	6 <sup>th</sup> grade leveled reading selections were purchased in winter, 2010. Recommendations for a wider range of leveled instructional materials will also be addressed through the district-wide teacher leadership teams that review and recommend learning materials.
8. Pending positive pilot evaluation results, implement Achieve 3000 in targeted secondary schools to support dual language immersion.	<p>* Achieve 3000 at secondary dual immersion sites @ \$65 per student per year assuming computer technology to support program exists in the school.</p> <p>* 2011-12 Budget Achieve 3000 - \$60,000</p>	A final report on the efficacy of Achieve 3000 will be available in June, 2011. Pending positive results of the student achievement data and funding, dual language immersion schools will be added in 2011-12.

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.



### Recommendation V

**Develop and implement a literacy program monitoring and accountability system.**

**Findings to support recommendations are:**

- Need for accurate progress monitoring walls (Psychologist Focus Group)
- Need for standardized and unbiased assessments (*Psychologist Focus Group*)

Action Step	Cost Considerations	Plan Description
1. Implement literacy assessment recommendations per the MMSD Balanced Assessment Committee.	<p>* Increased costs known at this time per the MMSD Balanced Assessment Committee recommendations are \$12.50 per student to administer the Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) up to 4 times per year. Additional costs will include progress monitoring and administration of the Educational Planning and Assessment System (EPAS) after the REaL grant ends.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">* 2011-12 Budget Addition Request \$311,000 (repeat of I-3)</p>	MMSD Balanced Assessment Committee is merging with the Response to Intervention (RtI) Committee for the 2011-12 year. Development and implementation of the benchmark assessment plan is underway in 2010-11. In 2011-12, common formative assessments will be addressed.
2. Administer an instructional practices survey annually to all instructional staff.	Sustaining costs may include hiring additional research support to analyze data and report findings.	The instructional practices survey was administered as a part of the literacy program evaluation in fall, 2010. A revised version of this tool will be administered annually.
3. Develop and implement literacy common assessments K-12. Include principals in training with emphasis on what the program looks like in practice so that principals can provide effective	<p>Costs for professional development will be determined upon the completion of a comprehensive professional development plan.</p> <p>Costs for development/purchase of new assessment will be</p>	MMSD Balanced Assessment Committee is merging with the Response to Intervention (RtI) Committee for the 2011-12 year. Development and implementation of the benchmark

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

monitoring and feedback on an ongoing basis.	determined upon findings and recommendations of the Balanced Assessment Committee.	assessment plan is underway in 2010-11. In 2011-12, common formative assessments will be addressed.
4. Develop and implement regular and frequent student progress monitoring systems. Develop "calibration checks" for teachers to use to monitor their own implementation.	Costs for professional development will be determined upon the completion of a comprehensive professional development plan.  Costs for development/purchase of new assessment will be determined upon findings and recommendations of the Balanced Assessment Committee.	Regular progress monitoring is a requirement of Response to Intervention (RtI). Several promising progress monitoring tools are currently being piloted at the elementary level. Further development and implementation will take place in 2011-12.
5. Monitor the progress of Tier 2 secondary students at least once a month.	No additional costs for 2011-12.	Literacy interventionists have been provided to high needs elementary and middle schools in 2011-12. A role of the interventionist is to provide interventions and monitor student progress regularly.
6. Provide daily, intensive, small instruction to promote the development of reading proficiency for those students who show minimal progress in Tier 2.	No additional costs for 2011-12.	Literacy interventionists have been provided to high needs elementary and middle schools in 2011-12. A role of the interventionist is to provide interventions and monitor student progress regularly.
7. Develop a plan for monitoring implementation of the program that includes data collection, observation of the program as implemented, analysis of the data, and plans to address poor fidelity.	No additional costs for 2011-12.	Progress monitoring requires frequent data input and analysis. Prototype electronic progress monitoring currently being used in MMSD will be reviewed and enhanced for large-scale use.  Central office staff will work with building-based staff to closely monitor student achievement data and intervention program implementation.

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

### Recommendation VI

**Provide all schools with literacy specialists and library media specialists.**

**Findings to support recommendations are:**

- Certified reading teachers and specialists needed (Current Programs and Practices Questionnaire)

Action Step	Cost Considerations	Plan Description
1. Modify position descriptions as needed to ensure 1 FTE reading teacher/specialist (Wisconsin License Codes 316/317) at each secondary school.	No additional costs for 2011-12.  Position descriptions will be modified as vacancies occur.	Principals will modify position postings as vacancies and transfers occur to ensure each building has a minimum of 1.0 FTE reading teacher/specialist.
2. Allocate for 1 FTE reading teacher/specialist (Wisconsin License Codes 316/317) to provide services in the alternative programs.	Re-allocation of current positions will be explored.  * 2011-12 Budget Addition Request has been withdrawn.	
3. Review previous Reading Recovery recommendations, with considerations to:  • Place Reading Recovery Teachers in buildings as needed to reflect the needs of 20% of our District's lowest performing first graders, regardless of what elementary school they may attend;  • Analyze the other instructional assignments given to Reading	No additional costs for 2011-12.	Reading Recovery will continue to support high needs 1 <sup>st</sup> grade students and share literacy expertise with building-based staff.

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

<p>Recovery teachers in order to maximize their expertise as highly skilled reading interventionists.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure standard case load for each Reading Recovery teacher at National Reading Recovery standards and guidelines (e.g. 8 students/year).</li> <li>• Place interventionists in buildings without Reading Recovery. Interventionists would receive professional development to lift the quality of interventions for students who need additional support in literacy.</li> </ul>		
<p>4. Adjust allocation of elementary literacy coaches to ensure 1 FTE per 600 students.</p>	<p>No additional costs for 2011-12.</p> <p>In future budget planning, strategize to maintain middle and high school literacy positions currently funded by limited-term ARRA funding and the REaL grant.</p>	<p>All elementary schools have a minimum of 1.0 FTE. Many elementary schools supplement this allocation to meet individual building needs.</p>
<p>5. Work toward equity and continuity in MMSD library media programs throughout the district using the American Association of School Librarians position statement on appropriate staffing for School Library Media Centers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students, teachers and administrators in each school building at all grade levels must have access to a library media program provided by one or more certified library</li> </ul>	<p>No additional costs for 2011-12.</p>	

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

<p>media specialist working full-time in the schools library media center. Consider additional educational assistant time in the libraries to perform clerical duties. Analyze scheduling variances across the district to maximize time for librarians to support literacy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both professional personnel and support staff are necessary for all library media programs at all grade levels.</li> <li>• More than one library media professional is required in many schools. The specific number of additional professional staff is determined by the schools size, number of students and teachers, facilities, and specific library programs.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

### Recommendation VII

**Establish a comprehensive and flexible literacy professional development model that includes online learning opportunities (e.g. access to exemplary practice videos) to optimize all instructional staff and administrators participation in literacy professional development.**

**Findings to support recommendations are:**

- Programs vary in effectiveness according to the expertise of the teacher. Professional development is critical to the success of an intervention (Intervention Research)
- Importance of and need for professional development (Teacher and Principal Focus Groups)
- Differentiation is challenging (Teacher and Principal Focus Groups)
- Need for professional development to support non-English speaking students (Psychologist Focus Groups)
- Lack of systemic professional development opportunities in literacy (Current Programs and Practices Questionnaire)

Action Step	Cost Considerations	Plan Description
1. Prioritize and sustain funding to support literacy professional development.	<p>Re-alignment and prioritization of current District professional development funding and time is required. Possible funding sources include: Educational Services, Curriculum &amp; Assessment, Professional Development, REaL Grant, Title, and School Improvement Planning and Strategic Plan funding.</p> <p>Future budget planning must include strategies to maintain funding after ARRA funding and the REaL grant conclude.</p>	District-wide professional development funding will be maximized across departments and schools to adequately fund the 2011-12 literacy initiative. A five-year Investing in Innovation (i3) grant is being developed to potentially fund significant aspects of this work.
2. Central Office Departments collaborate to provide professional development and support to building-based literacy staff and	Possible additional costs to support professional development materials and/or delivery.	Central office restructuring is in process. Cluster teams, representing all central office departments and divisions, will

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

administrators.		provide support to schools beginning in 2011-12. Literacy is the focus area for cluster support work and professional development for 2011-12.
3. Building-based literacy staff (Literacy Specialists, IRT, Learning Coordinators, Literacy Coaches, etc) provides regular, job-embedded literacy professional development based on school-based literacy data.	No additional costs.	School-based instructional leaders will work with central office cluster teams to improve literacy and focus professional development around literacy at the building level in 2011-12.
4. Communicate clearly to all instructional staff and administrators that professional development in literacy is a district professional requirement.	No additional costs.	School Improvement Plans, including a literacy focus, will guide all schools in providing effective professional development throughout the year.  District-wide literacy professional development will be clearly communicated to staff and administrators.
5. Establish a flexible professional development model so that all instructional staff and administrators will participate in literacy professional development.	Possible increase in summer institute professional development funding.	Innovative use of currently existing professional development opportunities will be maximized to focus on literacy. Examples include: summer institutes, administrator institutes and IRT and Principal professional development.
6. Provide required, on-going literacy training for librarians in the following areas:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing the pedagogy, strategies, and content language of the literacy program used in the classroom.</li> </ul>	Re-alignment and prioritization of current District professional development funding and time is required.	The role of the librarians can be expanded to include a greater focus on supporting school and district-wide literacy. Librarians will be included in literacy professional development as well as providing specialized sessions that focus on specific needs and

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning 21<sup>st</sup>-century instructional technology tools to support literacy and ways to integrate those tools into the curriculum.</li> <li>• Locating and evaluating culturally relevant materials.</li> <li>• Identifying resources to differentiate instruction and meet the learning needs of all students.</li> <li>• Provide professional learning communities for librarians at elementary, middle and high for the purpose of weaving on-going literacy training into the daily operation of MMSD's libraries.</li> </ul>		roles of librarians (e.g. see Recommendation IV, #4 and #5).
--	--	--

#### **Total Cost Considerations 2011-2012**

MMSD Balanced Assessment Plan*	\$311,000
System 44	\$160,000
READ 180 Expansion	\$80,000
<u>Achieve 3000</u>	<u>\$60,000</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$611,000</b>

\* Includes MAP, Explore, Plan, General Intellectual and Advanced Placement. \$135,000 are MAP costs.

\*Budget Addition Request has been included in the 2011-12 budget planning process.





**DATE:** April 28, 2011

**TO:** BOARD OF EDUCATION

**FROM:** Lisa Wachtel, Executive Director, Curriculum & Assessment

**RE:** Instructional Materials Purchase Plan

### 1. Project Title: Literacy Instructional Materials Purchase Plan

**2. Project Description:** The Evaluation of Learning Materials (ELM) policy refers to the Board of Education Policy 3611. This is a process used to ensure that preK-12 curricular materials and learning opportunities are standards-based, high quality and equitable district-wide. Many initiatives are currently underway to strengthen our District's ability to provide all students with equitable access to research- and standards-based curricular materials and programs. In alignment with the Re-organization Plan, Strategic Plan, Equity Plan, REaL Grant, Information and Technology Plan and other systemic initiatives, a revised process for supporting curricular review, renewal and program evaluation was developed and approved by the Board of Education in 2010. The revised Curricular Review and Renewal Process includes changes in learning materials allocation, establishment of a curricular review and purchase cycle, and the initiation of program evaluation processes that will include all content areas over time.

2010-2011 was the first year of the Program Review Cycle, beginning with a comprehensive review of literacy. Recommendations include enhancement of instructional learning materials, in particular, reading instruction in 6<sup>th</sup> grade and improving equity in elementary books rooms. The Math Task Force Recommendations include consistent textbooks, focusing at high school. The Fine Arts Task Force recommendations include ensuring equity among learning opportunities in art and music K-12. All of these recommendations point to the need for increased budget to support instructional learning materials in our District's classrooms.

\$415,000 will be used to supplement core purchases to support the Literacy Evaluation Recommendations in Year 1 and Year 2. This funding will allow for full, K-12 district-wide implementation of literacy instructional materials across levels, including Dual Language Immersion and equity purchases to ensure all schools have core materials. A preliminary purchase plan by level is found below:

Elementary	Middle	High
Cost Estimate - \$100,000	Cost Estimate - \$157,500	Cost Estimate - \$157,500
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuum of Literacy Learning, K-8 (4-5)</li> <li>Spelling and word work (4-5)</li> <li>Assessment Resources</li> <li>Units of Study for Teaching Reading (3-5)</li> <li>Phonics/Word Study Center Pack (K-3)</li> <li>Phonics/Word Study Additional Kits</li> <li>Comprehension Toolkits (equity)</li> <li>Lucy Calkins Writing (equity)</li> <li>Leveled Literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Units of Study for Teaching Reading</li> <li>Book Room development</li> <li>Literacy Kits</li> <li>Continuum of Literacy Learning</li> <li>Student consumables for Read180 and System 44</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update and supplement current English department libraries</li> <li>Purchase leveled text around identified English topics</li> <li>Book Room development: high-interest books</li> <li>Add to literacy centers: text books, writing books, etc.</li> <li>Digital media: practice programs (speed</li> </ul>

Interventions		reading, grammar tutorial, vocabulary development, etc)
• Book Room development (equity)		
<b>TOTAL \$415,000</b>		

**3. Analysis:** MMSD's learning materials budget ranks low compared to other Wisconsin districts of similar size. The current Instructional Learning Materials budget (e.g. ELM) to sustain current learning (e.g. consumables, replacement texts), improve equitable access (e.g. elementary bookrooms) and purchase new learning materials is ca. \$39/student. In a recent survey of surrounding districts, similar budgets ranged from:

• MMSD	24,628	\$959,865	\$39/student
• Green Bay	20,332	\$1,240,000	\$61/student
• Kenosha	22,933	\$1,168,000	\$51/student
• Racine	221,276	\$3,173,000	\$146/student
• Milwaukee	82,096	\$6-7 million	\$73-85/student

In order to work towards equitable access to high quality materials and sustain current, standards-based curricula, the funding for instructional learning materials must be increased.

The primary outcome of the increase in Instructional Learning Materials budget will enhance the District's ability to achieve minimal standards in all elementary literacy books rooms, purchase consumables annually, and support recommendations from Program Evaluations and Curricular Review and Renewal Cycles.

An excerpt from the MMSD Mission Statement states "challenging and supporting every student to achieve academic excellence". Although highly qualified teachers are the primary conduits for ensuring academic excellence, teachers and students require materials appropriate for the learning environment. Instructional learning materials (e.g. textbooks, workbooks, book rooms) are necessary to support high quality instruction in a rigorous, standards-based, culturally relevant and equitable learning environment.

4. **Applicable Board Policies:** The Evaluation of Learning Materials (ELM) policy refers to the Board of Education Policy 3611.
5. **Advertising/Notices/Invites:** NA. The Evaluation of Learning Materials review and selection process is/will be applied to all purchases.
6. **Vendors Receiving RFP:** NA. The Evaluation of Learning Materials review and selection process is/will be applied to all purchases.
7. **Bids Respondents:** NA.
8. **Estimate:** \$415,000
9. **Previous Fiscal Year Expenditures:** 2009-2010 ELM Purchases totaled \$959,865.
10. **Funding Source:** \$415,000 in local funds currently in contingency accounts (Fund 10) transferred to Curriculum and Assessment (Fund 10) to supplement the Instructional Learning Materials Budget (ELM).
11. **Project Schedule:** Reviews and purchases will be made to support the Literacy Evaluation Recommendations in Year 1 (2010-11) and Year 2 (2011-12).
12. **Contract Compliance:** NA.

13. **Recommendation:** It is recommended that the Board approve an increase to the Evaluation of Learning Materials budget in the amount of the \$415,000 to support the Year 1 and Year 2 instructional learning materials recommendations consistent with the Literacy Evaluation and Recommendations.

## Literacy ELM for 2011-12

Elementary	Middle	High
\$100,000	\$157,500	\$157,500
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuum of Literacy Learning, K-8 (for 4-5) (\$43/teacher)</li> <li>Spelling and word work, 4-5 (\$52/teacher)</li> <li>F&amp;P Assessment kit (\$310/2xschool)</li> <li>Units of Study for Teaching Reading (3-5)-every teacher (\$240/teacher)</li> <li>Phonics/Word Study Center Pack (\$45/K-3 teachers)</li> <li>Phonics/Word Study Additional Kits (1+/school) (\$145)</li> <li>Comprehension Toolkits (equity) (\$160/teacher)</li> <li>Lucy Calkins Writing (equity) (\$172/teacher)</li> <li>Leveled Literacy Interventions (F&amp;P) (\$2000/grade level interventionist)</li> <li>Additional Bookroom materials (equity)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Units of Study for Teaching Reading (1-2 kits/school)</li> <li>Bookroom development</li> <li>Literacy Kits</li> <li>Student consumables for Read180 and System 44</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update and supplement current English department libraries</li> <li>Purchase leveled text around identified English topics</li> <li>Book Room development: high-interest books</li> <li>Add to literacy centers: text books, writing books, etc.</li> <li>Digital media: practice programs (speed reading, grammar tutorial, vocabulary development, etc)</li> </ul>
<p>?Assessment Binders (1 ½" per student)</p> <p>? Choice Literacy site license, one for each school</p>		