



Consortium on Reading Excellence®
Your Implementation Partner
for Literacy Achievement

Implementation Resource Packet, Elementary



CORE and Consortium on Reading Excellence are registered trademarks of Consortium on Reading Excellence, Inc.

Copyright © 2005 Consortium on Reading Excellence, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. This publication is protected by copyright, and permission should be obtained from the publisher prior to any reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise.

Version 2.0

For information about or to gain permission to use any content in this document, write to:

Permissions, Editorial Department
Consortium on Reading Excellence, Inc.
5855 Christie Avenue, Suite A
Emeryville, CA 94608
Telephone: (888) 249-6155
Facsimile: (888) 460-4520
E-mail: info@corelearn.com
www.corelearn.com

CORE Mission

CORE serves as a trusted advisor at all levels of K–12 education, working collaboratively with educators to support literacy achievement growth for all students.

Our literacy implementation support services and products help our customers build their own capacity for effective instruction by laying a foundation of research-based knowledge, supporting the use of proven tools, and developing literacy leadership.

As an organization committed to integrity, excellence, and service, we believe that with informed school and district leaders, expert teaching, and well-implemented programs, all students can become proficient readers and writers.

Implementation Resource Packet, Elementary

This packet is a collection of resources that supports implementation of an effective reading program. With the assistance of your CORE Educational Consultant or District Implementation Advisor, use these resources to plan interventions for students and teachers, measure your level of implementation, design and implement a literacy plan with a strategic timeline, and make effective use of your leadership team.

Table of Contents

Supporting Implementation Through Assessment and Differentiation	3
K–6 Implementation Rubric	13
Developing a Site Literacy Plan for ALL Students	21
Strategic Literacy Plan and Calendar	29

Using Classroom Assessment to Increase Student Achievement

“The best classroom assessments also serve as meaningful sources of information for teachers, helping them identify what they taught well and what they need to work on. When as many as half the students in a class answer a clear question incorrectly or fail to meet a particular criterion, it’s not a student learning problem—it’s a teaching problem.” Thomas Guskey, “How Classroom Assessments Improve Student Learning,” *Educational Leadership*, Volume 60, No. 5, February 2003.

Successful schools use data to drive their practices. In such schools and districts, there exists a widespread, systematic use of data. Districts that are demonstrating success with high-poverty populations and diverse learners all attribute their significant improvement to implementation of a research-based program, alignment, and rigorous use of and attention to ongoing assessment data. In one study of four school districts in Texas, a central office administrator describes the focus that led to their achievement: “Superintendents and boards discussed student achievement regularly in board meetings. Principals discussed with teachers data for the campus and for each teacher, and the teachers discussed it with each other. Central office personnel helped campus leaders and teachers use data to focus, plan, and monitor the implementation of their plans.” (*Equity-Driven Achievement-Focused School Districts*, Charles Dana Center, University of Texas at Austin, 2000, p. 28.)

To use data well and wisely, we will want to frame the work carefully.

Guiding principles

1. Look honestly at the data.
2. Determine whether the data is the result of student problems or teaching problems. (Use the flowchart for decision making on page 2-47 to determine steps.)
3. Identify each student who is not succeeding (strategic and intensive) by name; this makes the numbers real.
4. Disaggregate the data by all groups including special education and English learners.
5. Shoot for 80-90% of students meeting your targets in each classroom and throughout each school. Be bold but realistic.
6. Use the information to make systematic adjustments for schools, teachers, and students. Base the intensity of intervention on the categories of student achievement (i.e., strategic or intensive).
7. Identify benchmark teachers and schools that can serve as positive models for visitation and creation of video demonstrations.
8. Hold administrators and teachers accountable for implementing the necessary adjustments.

Use the process on the next page to guide your data study.

K–6 Implementation Rubric

This rubric was developed to assist teachers and administrators in effectively implementing a research-based reading/language arts program. The criteria attached are consistent with the National Academy of Sciences 1998 report *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*, *Reading IS Rocket Science* (AFT), *Report of the National Reading Panel* (2000), *Put Reading First* (2001), the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act, and many states' standards and legislation. The rubric includes the Secretary of Education's Six Steps to Success as well as one additional step: the selection of research-based materials.

In order to make the structural and instructional changes necessary to ensure that all students will read well, school leaders play a vital role. It is not enough that teachers are trained, but schools must significantly alter the ways they organize and conduct the teaching of reading. Schools more than at any time, perhaps, will be under close scrutiny in the implementation of state program requirements. Large sums of money have been invested in professional development, but unless administrators and teachers are diligent and relentless in the pursuit of excellence in teaching reading, much of the money may be wasted. This rubric is intended to serve as a blueprint to assist administrators and others responsible for literacy leadership, as well as classroom teachers, to understand the elements that must be in place for full and successful implementation leading to high student achievement.

This rubric is not to be used for teacher evaluation; rather, it is a continuous improvement document that should be used for support and growth.

The rating of 4 represents full implementation and strong evidence of the component.

3 indicates implementation is evident but not consistent.

2 indicates the components are evident in a limited way.

1 indicates poor implementation and limited evidence.

SBRR = Scientifically-based reading research

Criterion 1. Selection of a high-quality curriculum. The school has identified and selected a curriculum program with evidence of success for the largest possible number of students and grounded in the SBRR. The selected program will have systematic and explicit instruction in phoneme awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, in line with *Put Reading First* (2001) and state standards. The writing, grammar, and language components support reading, are of the highest quality, and are aligned to standards.

4	3	2	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The program emphasis in grades K-1 is on the systematic instruction needed to build automaticity with decoding and fluency. ■ Kindergarten components include systematic and explicit instruction in phonemic awareness with an emphasis on oral blending and segmenting; and alphabet recognition and letter-sound relationships following a linguistic sequence leading to fluency. ■ First grade program components include a strong emphasis on phonemic awareness linked to explicit, systematic phonics instruction following a logical sequence. Grade 2–6 components include systematic instruction in multisyllabic word recognition. ■ The program materials provide ample distributed practice leading to mastery. Pre-decodable books and decodable books are sufficient and include clear guidelines for use. ■ In all grades materials to develop vocabulary, language, and comprehension are explicit and systematic. ■ Assessment components include diagnostic tests, oral fluency assessments, and unit or theme tests to monitor implementation. ■ Guidance is provided in the use and interpretation of the assessments. ■ Instruction in writing, language, and conventions is strongly connected to the reading components and is explicit and systematic. ■ Clear direction is provided in organization, pacing, scheduling, and use of the materials, including critical routines. ■ Literature selected is of high quality, multi-cultural, varied by genre, and provided at multiple levels to meet student needs. ■ Clear guidelines and materials are provided to differentiate instruction (reteaching, preteaching, and intervention) and meet the needs of benchmark, strategic, and intensive students as well as advanced learners, English language learners, and special education students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Some systematic instruction to build automaticity and fluency is evident in K-1 components. ■ Some systematic phonemic awareness instructional components are evident. ■ Materials for kindergarten provide practice to develop alphabet recognition and understanding of letter-sound relationships. ■ First grade components provide instruction connecting phonemic awareness to explicit phonics. Grades 2 and above include some instruction in multisyllabic word recognition. ■ Distributed practice materials are available with some decodable and pre-decodable texts. ■ Materials to develop vocabulary, fluency, language, and comprehension are mostly explicit and somewhat systematic. ■ Many assessment materials exist. ■ Guidance in the use and interpretation of the assessments is limited. ■ Instruction in writing, language, and conventions is somewhat linked to reading. ■ Directions for organization, pacing, scheduling, and routines are evident but limited. ■ Literature is of high quality, multi-cultural, varied, and provided to meet the needs of multiple levels. ■ Some information to differentiate instruction is provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The K-1 program contains limited resources to build automaticity and fluency. ■ Phonemic awareness instruction is limited and not systematic. ■ Materials to develop alphabet recognition and letter-sound relationships may be more implicit than explicit. ■ The first grade program is insufficiently explicit and systematic in teaching students to decode. In grades 2 and above, limited instruction in recognition of multisyllabic words is evident. ■ Practice is often massed rather than distributed and is limited. ■ Materials to develop vocabulary, fluency, language, and comprehension are limited and lack specificity of instruction. ■ Assessments are not clearly those directed by the research. Fluency assessment is inadequate. ■ Instruction in the use and interpretation of assessment data is limited. ■ Writing, conventions, and language instruction is included but not connected to reading well. ■ Little or no direction is provided in the organization, pacing, scheduling, and use of materials. ■ Literature is varied and of high quality. ■ Limited information is provided to differentiate instruction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The K-1 program emphasizes a naturalistic approach and provides very limited or no emphasis on building automaticity and fluency. ■ Little or no evidence exists of a systematic and explicit approach to phonics or multisyllabic word recognition. ■ Practice is insufficient. ■ Vocabulary and comprehension development are limited and insufficient. Fluency development is not evident. ■ Assessment is not research-based and of limited use. ■ Emphasis is on running records and assessments derived from whole language. ■ Writing, conventions, and language instruction components are limited and of poor quality. ■ No direction in organization, pacing, scheduling, or component use is provided. ■ Literature may be of good quality. ■ No information to differentiate instruction is provided.