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**Introduction**

The following report evaluates Holder Elementary’s literacy program using a compilation of data including assessment scores, professional development opportunities, grouping practices, instructional tasks, personal interviews, surveys and observations amongst staff and administrators during the last four instructional months. This detailed report includes the literacy program’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as provides recommendations for improvement. A ten question anonymous survey was created in order to obtain information from the staff regarding their feelings, attitudes, and suggestions about the reading program at the school. Morrow & Gambrell (2011) state, “Providing all children with exemplary classroom literacy instruction is an essential first step in addressing the needs of children who find learning to read and write more difficult” (p. 97).

**School Background**

Holder Elementary is a Title 1 school that operates on the track 4, year-round schedule in Knightdale, North Carolina. The classroom staff is composed of twenty seven, highly qualified teachers who provide direct literacy instruction to the 743 students enrolled this academic school year. Of these classroom teachers, 37% are still participating in Wake County’s beginning teacher program and 48% have a master’s degree.

Holder Elementary has a diverse population of students in attendance with a notably high mobility rate during the instructional year. Of the 743 students, 50% are Hispanic, 32% are Black, 12% are White, 3% are two or more races, and 2% are Asian. Compared to the 13% state average, this school has an exceptionally large percentage of Hispanic students and, therefore, has a high percentage of students in need of ESL services. To support the high amount of ELL students, Holder Elementary has been allotted 4 ESL teaching positions for the current school year. 73% of students at this school receive free and reduced lunch compared to the state average of 50%. However, in a school wide literacy program, environmental risk factors do not excuse the school from responsibility of meeting each child’s specific literacy needs (Walpole & McKenna, 2013).

Holder Elementary staff members have expressed frustrations with the limited parent support they are receiving at this school. After many failed attempts to create a PTA to support school fundraising, the school has started a PTO. The 2013-2014 School Improvement Plan includes building a PTO and reaching out to community members as one of its main focuses. The school has created a parent phone tree that delivers bilingual monthly messages, Spanish conference night with provided translators, and a bi-lingual school newsletter with the goal to increase parent support and awareness of school activities. Holder Elementary has also been adopted by a neighboring church community to help support field trip funds and social events.

**Instructional Leadership**

Since 2003, Holder Elementary has failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) during seven academic school years. Therefore, an increase in support personnel and instructional leaders has significantly grown over the past several years. The school has been provided an RTI (Response to Intervention) coach to assist with the federally funded program that is “designed to integrate assessment and intervention within a multilevel prevention system to maximize student achievement” (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011, p. 13). The RTI coach facilitates staff meetings, creates progress monitoring schedules, monitors data assessment and personalized education plans, and helps create team formative assessments in order to strengthen the literacy program.

Holder Elementary also has a literacy coach and five Title 1 literacy teachers. Hiring from within, the literacy coach has already formed relationships with the classroom teachers and has been providing job-embedded professional development on an individual basis to enhance literacy instruction (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). With five Title 1 literacy teachers, the school is able to select both long and short term students to serve based on mCLASS and common assessments. The Title 1 teachers have monthly collaboration meetings, and have become student centered by pushing into K-5 classrooms rather than serving one specific grade level as they did in previous years.

For the first year, Holder Elementary has been allotted a graduation coach to assist with the 3-5 students who are struggling to maintain a positive attitude towards school. The coach attends all after school events, eats lunch with the students, introduces students to different colleges, and helps students get involved in after school clubs. During the last four school years, Holder Elementary has received two SIOP (Sheltered Instructional Observation Protocol) coaches to help the teachers meet the needs of the ELL population. The school also has a S.T.E.M (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) coach to help assist with 21st century learning.

Each teacher participates on a SIP (School Improvement Plan) committee once a month to support the school. The committees include parent involvement, school climate, S.T.E.M, ELA, grant writing, and PTO. Each teacher also participates in a PLT (Professional Learning Team) once a week to discuss common assessments and data with grade level peers. In addition, each grade level chair serves on the RTI committee to discuss grade level concerns. Furthermore, at the beginning of the school year 12 school members were voted to hold positions on the leadership committee; which meets once a month to discuss school wide goals.

**Professional Development**

A literacy program that is effective holds strong professional development and has strong leadership and teacher collaboration established in the school community (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). Analyzing teacher transcripts, it is evident that Holder Elementary’s professional development has focused strongly on literacy during the past several school years. Training on the Daily 5 and Daily Café has been provided for the entire staff, as well as small group book studies related to these literacy frameworks. Workshops have focused on the federally funded initiative Race to the Top, Empowering Writers, Foundations of Reading, Disciplinary Literacy, mCLASS, and Common Core. Funding has been spent to bring top literacy specialists such as Rick Duvall and Jen Jones to teach the staff about decoding, vocabulary, and brain research related to literacy.

A strong professional development focus has been on implementing SIOP due to the high percentage of ELL students enrolled. These workshops promote peer coaching, which is a component in learning that has been researched to lead towards 90% of participants transferring new knowledge into the classroom (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). Professional development has also focused on PLT’s in order to help build a community of learners who can discuss curriculum, pedagogy, and content to help support struggling learners (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011).

All teachers have set the same common goal in their Professional Development Plan (PDP) which includes a focus on student centered academic talk. Therefore, future workshops have been scheduled to focus on this content area.

**Assessment Data and Grouping Practices**

After analyzing and gathering multiple literacy assessments, it is evident based on sub-group scores that factors outside of the control of teachers such as economic disparities and high mobility rates might explain the achievement gap reflected on the below tests.

**EOG Reading Scores for 2012**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Grade 3 | Grade 4 | Grade 5 |
| Holder Elementary | 49% | 52% | 62% |
| State Average | 69% | 72% | 72% |

Holder Elementary has consistently met growth targets with their African American population, but have failed to meet growth among the LEP, ED, and SWD sub-groups. When interviewing the principal, she revealed classified EOG scores from the 2013 school year in which she noted that all testing grades drastically declined in student proficiency. The principal stated, “I believe that the increased drop is correlated with the new Common Core which has a heavy focus on academic vocabulary; something that our ELL students have not yet acquired, and these scores do not reflect the strong teaching that occurs on a daily basis at our school.” For the 2012-2013 school year the principal noted that Wake County’s average is 50% proficient on EOG reading, while Holder Elementary is 23% proficient. She mentioned that multiple students are identified in more than one risk sub category.

An interview was conducted with the IRT (Instructional Resource Teacher) to gather the 3-5 Case 21 literacy data for quarter 1. Below are the average scores per grade level and average scores of other schools in Eastern Wake County, NC.

**Case 21 Data for Quarter 1 2013**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 3rd Grade | 4th Grade | 5th Grade |
| Holder Elementary Average | 43% | 47.4% | 64.4% |
| Eastern Wake Average | 53.2% | 65.1% | 72% |

The IRT noted that sub-group trends will be discussed during the next collaboration day. Teachers interviewed expressed concern that some of the Case 21 questions do not correlate with material taught in quarter 1.

**mCLASS Assessment**

Neither of the above assessments are given frequently enough to help drive instruction. “Best practices in reading assessment are balanced so that they provide teachers with rich and current information about their students’ reading development” (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011, p. 323). Therefore, Holder Elementary was chosen to pilot mCLASS Dibels Next diagnostic screening measures to progress monitor struggling readers. It is a school wide expectation that every student indicated “at risk” on any Dibels measure will be progress monitored every 10 instructional days, and students indicated as “some risk” will be progress monitored every 20 instructional days. The figures below represent the beginning of year scores for K-5.
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Analyzing these results, it is clear that an overwhelming percentage of students are still not meeting proficiency. However, it is evident that the 2nd-5th students are able to comprehend the DORF passages and retell details. Also, 1st and 2nd grade students are performing well on the nonsense word fluency assessment. Notably, the 3-5 grades struggle with meeting proficiency on the DAZE assessment; which is an indicator of comprehension. The RTI coach noted that all grade levels showed growth, but noted a trend of large drops between instructional years. For example, K-2 2012-2013 EOY was 60% overall TRC proficiency, however BOY dropped to 30% TRC proficiency.

Holder Elementary demonstrates best practices for a school wide literacy program by taking, “a school wide stance on how, when, and why students are grouped for instruction” (Walpole & McKenna, 2013, p 43). The mCLASS data is the main source used to develop and group students for literacy instruction. Students displaying multiple areas of deficit on these assessments become candidates to receive Title 1 services during their grade level’s literacy intervention time. Holder Elementary classroom teachers create flexible within-class groups that are reconstructed after each progress monitoring session. The Title 1 teachers compile flexible across-grade groups that are reconstructed three times a year; after each mCLASS benchmark period.

**Literacy Scheduling**

Displayed outside each classroom door is a copy of the instructional schedule with indicated intervention times. The literacy coach helped construct a master schedule for the school, located in Appendix D. The allotted amount of minutes dedicated toward literacy instruction is represented in the below table.

Table 6

*Minutes of Literacy Instruction*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Level | Minutes of Literacy Instruction | Minutes of Literacy Intervention |
| Kindergarten | 2 hours, 10 minutes | 1 hour, 10 minutes |
| First Grade | 3 hours | 1 hour |
| Second Grade | 2 hours, 15 minutes | 1 hour, 15 minutes |
| Third Grade | 2 hours, 15minutes | 1 hour |
| Fourth Grade | 2 hours, 20 minutes | 1 hour, 5 minutes |
| Fifth Grade | 2 hours, 25 minutes | 1 hour |

Many teachers indicated that the “tight” schedule does not allow them to extend a literacy lesson. Also, teacher interviews found that many students are missing core instruction by being pulled a few minutes early or returning a few minutes late.

**Instructional Tasks**

Professional Development has targeted instructional tasks during literacy instruction, with a strong focus on vocabulary development due to the school’s high ELL population and the notion that vocabulary is the only common instructional element taught K-5. Lessons developed throughout the school are designed to front load vocabulary, provide visual aids, give opportunities for wide reading, and explicitly teach word structure in order to access meaning. Included in the School Improvement Plan is a requirement to promote word awareness by using interactive word walls for each content area. Although research has shown positive correlation between read-alouds and vocabulary development, the staff survey indicates that only 33% of the classroom teachers conduct 2-3 read alouds per day; which is an instructional task that needs to be enforced by administration to occur more frequently. Holder Elementary currently does not have a schoolwide vocabulary assessment to measure depth of growth.

Fluency instruction was viewed as a strength at Holder Elementary. Resources such as Reading A-Z, DORF progress monitoring, Reader’s Theatre kits, iPads, and multiple Scholastic fluency kits are available to classroom teachers. It is strongly suggested again that the staff conducts more read alouds in order to model appropriate pace, tone, and phrasing to support student fluency. Instruction on fluency was seen primarily in the upper grades despite being considered ¼ of the second grade “instructional literacy diet” (Walpole & McKenna, 2013). The second grade teachers explained that they have so many struggling readers who still need foundational skills, therefore they are unable to focus on fluency.

Multiple resources are available in the library for check-out, as well as provided for each grade level to assist with teaching foundational literacy skills. Only 22% of the staff surveyed indicated that they needed more support in teaching foundational literacy skills, and 55% chose professional development that focused on these skills as the most valuable in supporting their needs. A plethora of manipulatives including letter tiles, letter magnets, primary word cards, rhyming puzzles, sentence cubes, reading rods, and pocket charts are given to classroom teachers to support activities that build phonological awareness. Additionally, the K-1 teachers use Letterland, and incorporate Words Their Way activities into their instruction. Morrow and Gambrell (2011) suggest that phonological awareness and word identification be explicit and systematic in order to support ELL students.

More than 30% of the staff felt that they needed more support in the area of comprehension instruction. With a school focus on accountable talk, teachers were seen asking students, “What makes you say that?” and “How did that strategy help you understand” during instruction in order to help students become metacognitively aware of comprehension strategies. However, interview data suggests that the majority of classroom teachers are still teaching individual strategies rather than how to use sets of strategies. Stepping in the right direction toward best practice, think alouds, graphic organizers, and explicit modeling were conducted in 10 out of the 14 classes observed during literacy instruction. Resources such as Reading Rockets, Reading Quest, Success Maker, and Imagine Learning are being used to support comprehension skills.

Writing instruction and expectations were observed as being inconsistent across grade levels and 44% of teachers feel they need more support in this instructional area. Empowering Writers, Writer’s Workshop, and the county writing curriculum are used as resources during writing instruction. Only half of the classroom teachers implement the Writer’s Workshop framework which includes a self-evaluation and sharing component that aligns with best practices. Morrow & Gambrell (2011) note that, “Establishing a writing community in the classroom and school is critical to building a social context and improving student writing” (p. 303). Teachers using graphic organizers, modeling writing, and pulling strategy groups based on student needs were witnessed during writing observations.

**Strengths of Literacy Program**

Below is a compiled list of strengths in Holder Elementary’s literacy program based on the data collected.

* *School Wide Program:* The most notable strength is the fidelity of the school-wide literacy program. The school distributes power among a team of leaders, collects and communicates information and data, focuses on providing services to students, sets high expectations for behavior, allocates time for collaboration, progress monitors and uses this data to drive instruction (Walpole & McKenna, 2013). The staff is implementing the tiered instruction model, follows scheduled assessments, communicates the assessment results using a data room, uses flexible grouping strategies, and has established a weekly after-school professional development day in order to work, plan, and reflect together in grade levels (Walpole & McKenna, 2013). In addition, the school provides professional development in guided reading and SIOP to the teacher assistants and maintains high expectations for them to be assisting instructionally; rather than clerically.
* *Instruction Meets Student Needs:* Holder Elementary embraces their diverse population and provides professional development to align with school goals that support teachers’ needs (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011). There is a continued emphasis on SIOP and academic talk in order to help develop language skills for the ELL population. Lessons that provided opportunities for interaction in meaningful discussions and being talked *to* rather than talked *at* were observed during classroom walkthroughs (Morrow & Gambrell, 2011).
* *Communication and Collaboration:* Collaboration meetings are held monthly to discuss individual student goals with support staff. Classroom teachers are provided with 4 workdays designed specifically for collaborative lesson planning, as well as meet once a week to discuss data and share instructional ideas. The staff survey had multiple responses indicating support staff’s communication as a literacy strength.
* *Parent Outreach:* Although parent participation is limited, the school’s attempts to link with parents are viewed as a literacy strength. Parents are invited to the school for PAC night four times a year in order to provide them with literacy resources and information to support their child at home. Additionally, two nights a year are designated for Spanish conferences with interpreters to ensure parents are informed on instructional standards. A bilingual monthly phone tree message is sent out to update parents on upcoming fundraisers and events, as well as a monthly school newsletter.

**Weaknesses of Literacy Program**

Below is a complied list of weaknesses that were noted through interviews, surveys and classroom observations.

* *Feedback and Training:* Interviews indicate that lack of feedback after observations from administration makes it difficult to improve their literacy instruction. Additionally, there is insufficient follow-up to view whether professional development content is being implemented in the classroom. Therefore, many teachers suggested that they do not feel a necessity to “try something new” if they will not be held accountable because there is “too much on their plate already.” This “seagull” type of professional development does not align with the cyclical framework originally designed. New teachers also reported not being trained on programs taught during previous professional developments prior to their employment.
* *Resources:* Although multiple resources are available for instructional use, many are outdated, missing components, forgotten about, or broken. A science closet contains piles of outdated basals and kits with missing manipulatives. The library has literacy games and activities that have not even been opened, as well as Lego kits that never get checked out. In addition, 4 of the 5 teachers with Smartboards have reported them as broken, half of the teachers report at least one broken computer in their room, and available flip cameras are reported as “lost”. The leveled book room is disorganized; missing several leveled books per bag, and contains an ineffective check-out system with no accountability for teachers returning books to the appropriate leveled baskets.
* *Read Alouds and Book Availability:* Along with the reported lack of read alouds being conducted in the classroom, the staff survey indicated that 72% of teachers read fiction text. This unbalanced choice of genre is correlated with the fact that 88% of teachers specify that they need more informational text in their classroom libraries. Morrow & Gambrell (2011) note that a large supply of appropriate leveled texts are necessary to have for struggling readers. Each classroom library contains two or fewer baskets of genres other than fiction. Teachers also shared frustration with not being supplied texts that are expected to be used for CMAPP literacy lessons.
* *Higher Order Thinking and Expectations:* According to the audit conducted at Holder Elementary in May 2013, results indicate that 72% of students observed were only activating knowledge or comprehension level of questioning based on Bloom’s Taxonomy levels. In addition, the RTI coach indicated that teachers needed to have higher expectations from their students. She suggested that teachers might be asking lower level thinking questions to make them feel successful, however they need to be teaching core instruction.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings above, a list of recommendations has been compiled to help improve Holder Elementary’s literacy program.

* *Accountability for Professional Development:* Administration needs to hold teachers accountable for implementing new instructional strategies into the classroom. Monthly walk-throughs need to be conducted to ensure that professional development hours are being spent effectively. Presenters need to be asked to return to follow up on their professional development. Administration also needs to ensure that new staff members are trained on expected programs being implemented school-wide; especially those teachers that become employed mid-year.
* *Resource Visibility and Organization:* Teachers must have easy access to resources, since multiple resources are scattered throughout the school it is imperative that the literacy coach makes an organized table indicating what resources are available for literacy instruction. In addition, the resources need to be broken down by literacy skill, grade levels, and by tier of instruction; whole class, small group, or intervention. Each grade level should be required to compile their classroom resources together and discuss uses at a PLT to ensure they are using the most updated materials. Also, administration needs to hold teachers accountable for being respectful of the leveled book room. It is suggested that each grade level takes one planning period a month to help organize books to ensure they are in the correct genre and level basket. Additionally, it is recommended that the literacy teachers use a work day to label standards that can be taught using each book to ensure teachers are thoughtfully using the materials provided.
* *Providing Opportunities and Intersessions:* Due to such large drops in data between instructional years it is recommended that Holder Elementary use funding to employ teachers for one week intersessions in between each track-out. Students should be selected using mCLASS data, and transportation needs to be available. As research notes that retention is ineffective, these additional four weeks of instruction can provide explicit small group literacy instruction for struggling readers (Walpole & McKenna, 2013). The current population at Holder Elementary has limited outside of school experiences; thus they have limited prior knowledge and background experiences to assist with comprehension questions and new vocabulary when reading. Therefore, it is recommended during these four weeks of instruction that teachers try to provide students with new experiences using virtual field trips, realia strategies, and extension lessons that involve opportunities to create and explore.
* *Update and Fix Technology:* Although the teachers employed are eager to teach new literacies, they are unable to with limited and broken technology. Morrow & Gambrell (2011) note that technology can benefit students who struggle in literacy and support diverse learners by being exposed to a variety of applications. It is recommended that all Smartboards be fixed, technology available needs to be listed in a visible place, and a workshop is provided to teach staff how to sign up for Donors Choose to acquire technology needed in the classroom.
* *Implement Schoolwide Reading Log:* It is advised that each classroom teacher begins to keep a reading log documenting read-alouds conducted in the classroom. This implementation will hold teachers accountable for choosing different genres and reading more in order to build comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency skills for students. Another suggestion is to allow students to check out more than one library book for more time in text at home; currently each student is only allowed to check out one book at a time.
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Appendix A

Staff Survey Questions

1. What grade level do you currently teach?
   1. K
   2. 1st
   3. 2nd
   4. 3rd
   5. 4th
   6. 5th
2. How many read alouds do you conduct daily?
   1. 1
   2. 2-3
   3. 3-4
   4. 4-5
3. Reflecting on your classroom read alouds, which genre do you choose most often?
   1. Fantasy
   2. Fiction
   3. Informational
   4. Poetry
   5. Biography
   6. Realistic Fiction
   7. Historical Fiction
4. Which genre of text o you need more of in your classroom library in order to meet Common Core standards in your classroom?
   1. Informational
   2. Historical Fiction
   3. Fantasy
   4. Biography
   5. Poetry
   6. Realistic Fiction
5. Which area of literacy instruction do you feel that you need more support in?
   1. Fluency
   2. Comprehension
   3. Foundational Skills
   4. Vocabulary
   5. Writing
6. Which of these professional developments has been most helpful to you as a classroom teacher in supporting your literacy instruction?
   1. Foundations of Reading
   2. Jen Jones (Lake Myra IRT)
   3. SIOP
   4. Reading Decoding Strategies with Rick Duvall
   5. Race to the Top
   6. I am a new teacher and did not participate in these
7. How would you rate your abilities to analyze Mclass data to drive your literacy instruction? 1=poor 5=strong
8. What additional resources do you feel you need in order to support literacy in your classroom?
9. What do you consider the greatest strength of our school wide literacy program?
10. What do you consider the greatest deficit of our school wide literacy program?

Appendix B

Staff Survey Results

1.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **K** | **27.78%**  **5** |
| **1st** | **27.78%**  **5** |
| **2nd** | **11.11%**  **2** |
| **3rd** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **4th** | **0%**  **0** |
| **5th** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **Total** | **18** |

2.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **None** | **0%**  **0** |
| **3-4** | **0%**  **0** |
| **4-5** | **0%**  **0** |
| **At least a chapter/section of a text** | **22.22%**  **4** |
| **2-3** | **33.33%**  **6** |
| **1** | **44.44%**  **8** |
| **Total** | **18** |

3.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **Fantasy** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Poetry** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Biography** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Informational** | **5.56%**  **1** |
| **Historical Fiction** | **5.56%**  **1** |
| **Realistic Fiction** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **Fiction** | **72.22%**  **13** |
| **Total** | **18** |

4.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **Fiction** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Fantasy** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Historical Fiction** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **Biography** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **Poetry** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **Realistic Fiction** | **33.33%**  **6** |
| **Informational** | **88.89%**  **16** |
| **Total Respondents: 18** |  |

5.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **Fluency** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Vocabulary** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Foundational skills** | **22.22%**  **4** |
| **Comprehension** | **33.33%**  **6** |
| **Writing** | **44.44%**  **8** |
| **Total** | **18** |

6.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **Race To The Top** | **0%**  **0** |
| **Jen Jones (Lake Myra IRT) 50 Shades of the Common Core** | **5.56%**  **1** |
| **I am a new teacher and did not attend any of these** | **16.67%**  **3** |
| **Foundations of Reading** | **22.22%**  **4** |
| **SIOP** | **22.22%**  **4** |
| **Reading Strategies/Decoding Strategies with Rick Duvall** | **33.33%**  **6** |
| **Total** | **18** |

7.

| **Answer Choices –** | **Responses –** |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | **0%**  **0** |
| **2** | **0%**  **0** |
| **5** | **5.56%**  **1** |
| **4** | **38.89%**  **7** |
| **3** | **55.56%**  **10** |
| **Total** | **18** |

8. Open ended responses from 12/18 participants:

1. Better classroom library
2. Better leveled book room library for small group instruction
3. Support from other teachers
4. Literacy coach
5. Hard copies of the books we use for assessment for progress monitoring-copies for each teacher.
6. Training
7. Guided reading staff development-practical strategies
8. More time and more teachers to be able to meet with small groups as often as they need in order to make consistent progress. More lower leveled texts sets for teaching guided reading.
9. More leveled books and training.
10. More professional development on guided reading
11. Better scheduling so students don’t miss instructional time
12. More texts

9. Open ended responses from 13/18 participants:

1. Literacy teachers doing intervention
2. The integration of technology in the classroom
3. Letterland
4. Help from literacy intervention and support
5. Classroom teachers
6. Coaches
7. Being on the same track with word work as a grade level
8. Teaching foundational reading skills
9. Communication and support from other grade level teachers and literacy coaches.
10. Availability of classroom books
11. A lot of support for various areas (coaches, interventionists, etc.)
12. Interventionist work one on one and track progress
13. Intervention and coaching

10. Open ended responses from 14/18 participants:

1. Communication between intervention teachers and classroom teachers needs to be better
2. More books needed to drive instruction (leveled book room)
3. ESL
4. Not enough time to get it all done, plus things always change and we can’t keep up.
5. Too many pull-outs, students are seeing to many different teachers and learning too many different strategies for one concept
6. Too many assessment and not enough time to teach the concepts
7. Resources
8. Expectations for comprehension and writing are not the same across grade levels
9. Meeting the needs/challenging students that are meeting grade level expectations or above…helping/teaching parents how to help their child at home.
10. Limited resources
11. Grammar and writing instruction
12. The fact that a number of our students are still falling below benchmark and we are still struggling to figure out how to best serve them.
13. Too much going on; readers and writers workshop, Debbie Miller, Daily 5. We had a literacy coach, RTI coach, SST teams however teacher still have to waste time completing charts to list data. SST meets to talk and then tells classroom teachers they have to create intervention plan and then argue it is not research based.
14. Tight schedule

Appendix C

Interview Questions With RTI Coach, IRT, Administration and Title 1 Interventionist

1. How many students receive literacy interventions in each grade level?
2. How does your team select the students who will receive short and long term literacy support?
3. What resources is Title 1 given to support phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension?
4. How can we form better communication with parents?
5. What paperwork is required for title 1?
6. How do you feel about the tight schedule?
7. How do you feel about working across grades levels instead of with one specific grade level?
8. How can we promote upper grade levels to conduct more read alouds? How can we get content teachers to integrate literacy?
9. What are our writing resources K-5 available to classroom teachers?
10. What are our reading resources K-5 available to classroom teachers?
11. What is the purpose of the data room? What data is displayed?
12. What types of grouping is being done K-5 during literacy blocks?
13. How can we get teachers more confident in teaching/grading writing?
14. Do you feel we spend too much time on lower leveled instruction?
15. What are the school wide mClass data trends?
16. What are the school wide Case 21 scores and trends?
17. What are the school wide EOG scores and trends?
18. What is the mobility rate of the students at this school?

Appendix D

Holder Elementary Master Schedule 2013-2014

