

## READ TO ACHIEVE GRANT APPLICATION COVER PAGE

*This page must be complete and returned with the application to be responsive*

<b>DISTRICT:</b>	Bourbon County Schools
<b>SUPERINTENDENT</b>	Ms. Lana Fryman
<b>SCHOOL APPLYING FOR GRANT:</b>	Bourbon Central Elementary
<b>SCHOOL ADDRESS:</b>	367 Bethlehem Road
<b>SCHOOL TELEPHONE:</b>	859-987-2195
<b>PRINCIPAL:</b>	Mr. Joseph Sheroan
<b>PRINCIPAL'S EMAIL:</b>	Joseph.sheroan@bourbon.kyschools.us
<b>FISCAL AGENT:</b>	<b>Bourbon County Board of Education</b>
	<b>DISTRICT FINANCE OFFICER</b>
	Ms. Andrea Kiser
<b>DISTRICT FINANCE OFFICER'S EMAIL:</b>	Andrea.kiser@bourbon.kyschools.us

I assure the attached application has been reviewed and approved for implementation by all stakeholders and the district and school will comply with all requirements, both technical and programmatic, pertaining to the Read to Achieve grant. Failure to do so could impact future funding.

Lana Fryman

Superintendent

1-30-14

Date

Andrea A. Kiser ID# 414617

2/24/14

Notary Public

My commission expires

Notary seal

Joseph Sheroan

Principal Signature

JAN. 30, 2014

Date

Andrea A. Kiser ID# 414617

2/24/14

Notary Public

My commission expires

Notary seal

READ TO ACHIEVE GRANT APPLICATION

COVER PAGE	NO PAGE NUMBER
TABLE OF CONTENTS	NO PAGE NUMBER
NARRATIVE: PROPOSED GRANT INTERVENTION -This section can be <i>NO MORE THAN 30 pages</i> total.	MAXIMUM OF 30 PAGES
PART 1 – Identification of Literacy Needs	Page <u>1</u>
PART 2 – Identification of Students to be Served	Page <u>10</u>
PART 3 – Implementation of the Intervention/Family Involvement	Page <u>15</u>
PART 4 – Description of Teacher Selection and Professional Learning	Page <u>18</u>
PART 5 - Description of Budget Process  <i>The School Budget Summary form is included in the RFA. Refer to the RTA funding matrices included as appendices A&amp;B.</i>	Page <u>22</u>
PART 6 – Implementation of prior RTA grant (not every applicant will complete this section)	Page <u>24</u>

**Part 1: Identification of Literacy Needs Part 1:1.1** Bourbon Central Elementary

School (BCES) is a Title I school located on the outskirts of the Paris City Limits in Bourbon County with an enrollment of 571 K-5 students. A myriad of research reflects the need to give children an early start in education and how to help struggling readers improve. Research shows that children who fail in reading and do not improve by the end of their first grade year are at high risk of failure in other academic areas throughout school (McIntosh, Horner, Chard, Boland, & Good, 2006). There is evidence suggesting children who encounter such difficulty fall further behind their peers as time passes (Stanovich, 1986) or at the very least remain at the low end of the achievement distribution (Juel, 1988). McGill-Franzen and Allington (1991) research shows children's achievement at the end of first grade predicts with alarming accuracy their success or failure not only in school tasks but also in life experiences. The National Reading Panel's (NRP) extensive research in 2000 found the most important skills in early literacy development and effective reading instruction are phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, fluency, and comprehension. There are many children at risk of experiencing reading difficulties, including those who have phonological problems and who have not fully developed oral language skills. Those who have not developed oral skills are mostly children living in poverty and who are not exposed to classroom-based learning (Foorman & Torgesen, 2001). Most importantly, recent research overwhelmingly suggests that for the vast majority of children, reading problems are preventable if they receive additional support in the form of an effective early literacy intervention (Pikulski, 1994). The U.S. Department of Education's Research Institute claimed there is ample scientific evidence that one-on-one instruction

and small group instruction (2-5 students) by highly qualified teachers in grades K-3 is an effective literacy intervention strategy for those students who have not succeeded with whole class teaching. Based on the above research, BCES's Literacy Team selected Reading Recovery (RR) for Grade 1 and the Comprehensive Intervention Model (CIM) for Grades K-3 as the research-based intervention models, both of which address the literacy needs of BCES primary students. **Part 1:2.1** An identified literacy trend at BCES reveals the core classroom instruction is often geared toward meeting the needs of the average performing students neglecting the needs of the lowest performing students. A salient trend within the classroom is teaching of isolated literacy skills, whereas, at-risk students need multiple opportunities to incorporate these isolated skills into reading of continuous text. To identify the current literacy needs an on-going system of multiple measures is implemented that includes the BRIGANCE Early Childhood Screen, Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment, the state assessment, K-PREP, for grade 3; and STAR Reading. A thorough analysis of the assessment data shows the at-risk primary grade students need supplemental support in the foundational skills of reading including phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency, which are taught through Reading Recovery (RR) and the Comprehensive Intervention Model (CIM). RR is a short-term (12-20 weeks) program that provides daily 30-minute lessons, five days per week in a one-on-one setting. Pinnell (1993) provides evidence that the RR Program is (1) based on a reading theory that emphasizes meaning; (2) provides connections between children's reading and writing behaviors; (3) teaches reading strategies that are applied to connected text; and (4) employs teachers who have learned to use strategies identified as being characteristic of effective

teachers. The Comprehensive Intervention Model (CIM) is a systemic design for identifying and diagnosing reading problems, followed by a highly specialized teacher plan for layering, matching, and mixing evidence based interventions across classroom and intervention settings for meeting the identified literacy needs of struggling readers. The menu of interventions offered through CIM include: Interactive Writing, Guided Reading Plus, Assisted Writing, and Comprehension Focus Groups (CFG). CIM provides daily 30 minute lessons in a small group setting (2-5 students). The RR Program and CIM are designed to meet the school's current literacy needs and trends in the five essential components of effective reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary development, fluency and comprehension. The following strategies RR and CIM teachers use to address each of the five essential components of effective reading instruction are: **Fluency**-Using carefully selected continuous texts that are in the child's instructional range; providing many opportunities for oral reading; providing opportunities for multiple readings of familiar texts; **Phonemic Awareness**-Identifying and working with syllables in spoken words; hearing onsets and rhymes and individual phonemes in spoken words as strategies for solving unfamiliar words; **Phonics**: Using leveled books that provide opportunities to apply principles they are learning; using magnetic letters for letter/word study; disassembling words into letters or word parts; making new words by adding, deleting, or substituting letters; representing phonemes in words with letters by saying words slowly; segmenting words into sounds heard using sound boxes and then blending word parts together; **Comprehension**-Using prior knowledge about a new story to be introduced and building experiences needed to enhance understanding; building connections during and after reading to support

understanding; having meaningful conversations about the text; holding the child accountable for meaning during oral reading through the use of questions; examining records of oral reading behavior for evidence of meaning; teaching for comprehension when children are writing and reading; and **Vocabulary**-Using magnetic letters to explore how words work; teaching analogies or spelling patterns to write new words; teaching strategies solving new and unfamiliar words when children are writing and reading. On-going professional development, clinical observations, and action research projects facilitate collaboration in the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for both RR and CIM teachers. Studies have shown RR and CIM to be more effective in achieving short-term and sustained progress in reading and writing than other intervention programs, both one-to-one tutorial and small group methods (Pinnell, G.S. & McCarrier, A, 1994). **Part 1:2.2** The Response to Intervention (Rti) framework at BCES is firmly grounded in research that maximizes on-going professional collaboration and complements RR and CIM by exploring and implementing research-based practices, building consistency school and district wide, becoming confident with using assessment data for flexible grouping and instruction, and moving students among tiers of service. Teachers meet regularly in Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to discuss student progress and work together collegially to improve classroom practice. The following chart summarizes the complementary factors of the Rti framework with the two selected intervention models: RR and CIM:

**Complementary Factors: Response to Intervention with Reading Recovery/CIM Interventions**

<b>Response to Intervention</b>	<b>Reading Recovery/CIM Interventions</b>
Systematic approach to literacy assessment and instruction	Comprehensive / RR/CIM Intervention-Both programs naturally fit into the comprehensive school-wide plan for literacy learning
School Literacy Teams determine which students need	RR and CIM teachers use universal screening data for student selection

further monitoring and instruction	
Research-based interventions with documented effectiveness	What Works Clearinghouse research shows RR the strongest research base of any early reading intervention across all four domains
Teacher expertise is central to instructional improvement for children having difficulty with literacy learning	RR provides in depth professional development including college level courses; teacher expertise is a distinctive characteristic of the intervention; CIM professional development follows many of the same characteristics as RR
Responsive and differentiated teaching is paramount in meeting each student's need	RR teachers design a unique individualized instructional plan for each student while CIM teachers design instructional plans to meet the needs of the identified small groups
On-going progress monitoring is essential	Both RR and CIM must employ the monitoring of student progress using various assessments, daily and weekly observational records and anecdotal notes documenting change over time
Fidelity measures are in place to ensure that interventions are implemented as prescribed	Assurance of program fidelity in RR and CIM is documented through Standards and Guidelines clearly defined, intensive year-long training, on-going professional development, observations conducted by the school's principal and RR Teacher Leader, and annual evaluation of outcomes
Requirement of close collaboration among stakeholders	RR and CIM operate with an established system of collaboration developed through the school's Literacy Council

If the need is greater than one RTA teacher can address, BCES has a fully functioning Rti program with a menu of intervention services available to support students as they move up and down the intervention tier process. All students qualifying for interventions in Tiers 2 and 3 who cannot be served by the RTA teachers, will receive a different intervention, such as MARS (Multi-sensory Approach to Reading Strategies) with trained personnel implementing the strategies. BCES has a strong core literacy program in place for all students (Tier 1). RR and CIM are Tier 2 and 3 interventions for students in grades K-3 who fall in the bottom quartile based on MAP assessment. CIM groups are considered Tier 2 or Tier 3 depending on the size of the group. Small groups of 2-3 students are Tier 3 whereas groups of 4-6 students are considered Tier 2. All CIM groups meet daily. RR is a Tier 3 intervention providing one-to-one daily instruction.

**Part 1:2.3** BCES reflects a cross segment of the county's diverse population including EL students, Migrant students, students from non-traditional home settings, students of

poverty, students with special needs, and students represented by parents with low literacy skills. The extent of diverse learners that place BCES students at risk of educational failure include: **(1)** a continued influx of limited English Proficiency (EL) students and parents due to Bourbon County's agricultural environment and thoroughbred industry offering opportunities for the migrant labor force- In 2012-13, more than 80% of the EL 3<sup>rd</sup> grade BCES students scored below proficiency in reading on the State Assessment. 2013-14 Bourbon County School records reveal there has been a 44% increase in Hispanic children attending Bourbon County Schools since 2007. Currently, there are 60 English Language Learners at BCES with one part-time EL teacher (One day per week); **(2)** multitude of seasonal agricultural opportunities- Bourbon County has the largest migrant education program in the state. 2013-14 school data show there are 20 migrant students attending BCES; **(3)** high numbers of children living in non-traditional homes-2012-13 Bourbon County Family Resource Center data report there are 78 identified homeless BCES students based on Kentucky guidelines exceeding the previous year's total of 54; **(4)** high poverty area-BCES is a Title I school with 59.4% of students qualifying free and reduced lunch; **(5)** high percentage of students identified with special needs- 2013-14 Special Education data show that 14.5% of the BCES student population have been identified to be included in the Exceptional Education program; and **(6)** high rates of illiteracy among students' parents- Despite Bourbon County having a myriad of quality educational choices, the 2010 U.S. Census data indicated that 53% of Bourbon County residents exhibited low literacy skills (reading below a 6<sup>th</sup> grade level). The average educational level of Bourbon County adults, 18-24 years of age, was approximately 26.6% without a high school diploma with

8.1% of those adults having less than 9<sup>th</sup> grade education; 31.4% of having a high school diploma or equivalent; 37.4% had some college but no degree, and 4.6% had a Bachelor's degree or above. *Kids Count 2013* data show 21% of Bourbon County's births were to mothers with no high school diploma. Harold Hodgkinson is an expert lecturer and analyst of demographic and educational issues from the Institute for Educational Leadership in Washington, D.C. His research has shown that students are at risk of educational failure when they come from low-income families; have limited proficiency in English; have parents who are not high school graduates; speak English as a second language; are single-parent children; have no permanent living status, and/or have low academic skills. Mr. Hodgkinson's research reveals that future school dropouts can be predicted as early as elementary school. Each student brings different abilities and learning needs to the classroom. Identification of diversities is necessary before appropriate instructional strategies can be designed that will lead to success in learning for each student. The specific literacy needs of the identified diverse learners experiencing reading and writing deficiencies include: **(1) EL students-**Active orientation such as magnetic letters; hands on applications to literacy (acting out scenes of a story, retelling, etc.); provision of small books directed toward each student's ethnic interests to provide cultural relevance within the reading program; provision of an alternative means of communicating with parents; **(2) Migrant Children-** Assisting children in locating personal interests and providing small books for in/out of classroom related to those interests; provision of take home curricular products needed for educational exploration (pencils, paper, electronics, books, pamphlets, etc.); **(3) Children from non-traditional homes-**Small books available for taking home; frequent

communication with child's guardian discussing literacy needs; provisions of concrete ideas for the child's guardian in how to reinforce literacy development while at home;

**(4) Children of Poverty-** Small books available for students to take home; opportunities to attend Family Literacy nights for parents to learn more about literacy;

**(5) Children with identified disabilities-**Increasing listening comprehension; developing content strategies; practice in following directions both verbal and written; practice social skills with peers and adults that relate to literacy studies; **(6) Low literacy levels of parents-**Provide alternative means of communicating with parents; provide leveled books with a variety of topics. The school's primary reading program is guided by the Common Core, which is the District's curriculum map for each grade level. The Common Core provides explicit guidance to the school's and district's Professional Learning Communities (PLCs)/grade level teams who plan vertically and horizontally to ensure inclusion of the above specific literacy needs of diverse learners. Important in all PLC planning is including implementation strategies for teaching students how to make connections between writing and reading acquisition. RR and CIM are embedded with effective strategies to reinforce the relationship between reading and writing to foster literacy development that include: **(1)** immersing in a specific genre which is of particular interest to a child or group of children in the classroom; **(2)** using appropriate text as a model to support students' writing; **(3)** helping students use their knowledge of reading to help them write and writing knowledge to help them read; **(4)** allowing student choice in their reading and writing experiences; and **(5)** modeling to students how the reading and writing reinforce and strengthen each other. Part 1:3.1 BCES uses multiple forms of K-3 literacy data for the bottom quartile

of students to meet the requirements of Unbridled Learning legislation. (1) The BRIGANCE screening assessment measures the percent of children entering school who are ready to engage in and benefit from early learning experiences that best promote the child's success. All 2013-14 BCES kindergarten students were screened in July 2013. The data collected from the screenings classified students as Not Ready, Ready, or Ready with Enrichments in each category assessed. The 2013 BRIGANCE screening results showed 58% of all BCES Kindergarten students are Not Ready for Kindergarten learning. In the category of Language Development, 35% of the BCES kindergarten students scored as Not Ready for kindergarten. (2) MAP assessments provide detailed, actionable data about where each child is on their unique learning path in foundational skills of letter understanding, letter recognition, sounds, and the concept of print. The screener assesses components of research-based reading instruction, including fluency, phonics, phonemic awareness, and comprehension as well as vocabulary and writing. All BCES students, K-3, are screened using MAP for reading. The MAP screening for students in Grades K-3 was conducted in September 2013, again in December 2013, and will be administered again in spring 2014. According to the 2013 MAP fall entry scores, the BCES K-3 students are 56% behind the National Norm Average in the area of Foundation Skills (phonics, phonemic awareness, and fluency). BCES K-1 students show the greatest need in foundational skills with K students scoring 78% and Grade 1 scoring 60% below the National Norm. (3) BCES's state test scores in the early grades support the trend of low reading levels. Since the transition to the new Common Core State Standards, students reading at a novice level have increased. The percent of BCES students, grades 3-5, scoring below Proficiency

in reading in 2011-12 on the K-PREP increased from 38% to 43% in 2012-13. (4) BCES uses the Standardized Testing and Reporting Results (STAR) pre-and post- reading assessment in all grades to determine each student's current reading level. 2012-2013 STAR entry grade level for BCES K-3 students show RTA students starting the school year more than one grade level behind their peers. (5) As part of the school's Rti plan, each teacher maintains informal data that includes classroom observations, analysis of student work samples, log of parent contacts with topic of discussion, and anecdotal records of student milestones. **Part 2: Identification of Students to Be Served** Part 2:1.1 Eligibility for the RTA program is determined through a process beginning with the use of multiple assessments. BCES utilizes MAP as the universal screener to identify students for intervention services for RTA. The Rti Literacy Team then uses the bottom quartile from MAP data and the previous year's alternate ranking form , completed by the previous year's classroom teacher who ranked the students' reading from highest to lowest based on formal and informal data, to determine placement in intervention services. The lowest students on the ranking form are targeted for intervention services. The RR teacher then assesses these targeted K-1 students using the Marie Clay Observation Survey (OS), the official assessment for RR. The OS assessment includes Text Reading, Concepts about Print, Writing Vocabulary, Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words, Word Test, and Letter Identification. The Slosson Oral Reading Test is also administered. Based on assessment results, the RR teacher then works in collaboration with the District RR Teacher Leader to select the first grade students with the lowest scores to receive RR intervention services at the beginning of the school year. The next lowest group of children receive CIM instruction from a RR

teacher until the student meets the exit criteria or until a slot opens for RR. The lowest Kindergarten students are eligible to receive CIM intervention by the RTA teacher or another RR teacher. Grade 2-3 Students in the lowest quartile of the MAP assessment and those lowest on the alternate ranking forms are administered the Text Reading Level and the Slosson Assessment. The Rti Literacy Team collaborates to discuss the results of these assessments to determine intervention placement options. The Rti team is composed of grade-level teachers, intervention teachers including the RTA teacher, the district's literacy specialist (RR Teacher Leader), school psychologist, school social worker, school principal, and special education teacher when needed. The assessment data may also include surveys, classroom grades and sample work, state assessment, BRIGANCE, and STAR. The Rti Literacy Team determines the intervention that best fits the needs of each child in the bottom quartile. Every child in the bottom quartile will receive intervention services, with the RTA teacher providing RR and CIM. **Part 2:2.1**

The process/plan BCES uses to ensure the reading intervention is based on on-going assessment of individual student needs comes naturally through RR and CIM. Intensive training through graduate college classes and several years of professional development in these two early interventions teaches RR and CIM teachers to analyze data produced from Marie Clay's Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement, which includes running records of text reading. Using these assessments paired with skilled teacher observations taken during each lesson, the RTA teacher is equipped to design instruction based on each individual child's strengths and weaknesses. The focus of each day's lesson is based on an analysis of the previous day's running record and lesson, which then guides instruction for the next lesson. Progress monitoring to

show change over time is completed daily in RR lessons. The CIM framework includes bi-weekly progress monitoring using running records of text reading as well as writing samples. CIM teachers also use a rubric for both reading and writing, which are used every two weeks as progress monitoring tools. Additional grade level progress monitoring through MAP and Moby Max is used with all students by the classroom teacher and is analyzed monthly during Rti meetings. In the System of Interventions, the RR and CIM teacher in Tiers 2 and 3 conduct on-going assessments of individual student and maintains and manages these records of student data. Frequent progress monitoring of the RTA program is a natural part of the school's Rti framework; therefore, students involved in intervention services through the RTA program are discussed by the Rti Literacy Team as well as all other students receiving interventions. The Rti literacy team meets monthly to discuss student progress and possible movement of students among tiers. Students who demonstrate regular progress and meet exit criteria may be moved out of an intervention service. This procedure also applies to RR students at the end of their 20 weeks of intervention, should they require the whole program. Team members record comments and decisions on each child's individual intervention plan providing evidence of the meeting and that all decisions were based on the data analysis. The process of assessment analysis is an integral step fulfilling the long- and short-term assessment goals. The long-term assessment goal is to provide diagnostic reading assessments and intervention services for those students who need them in order to read at a proficient level. The short-term goals for a RR student is based on the immediate needs of that student. The goals are recorded on a Predictions of Progress Report. Once a student has mastered the specified short-term goal, a new

goal or focus is determined. For CIM, the same procedure is used to determine the short-term goals of the group. To meet this assessment goal, fidelity in assessment administration and delivery of instruction is paramount, which is verified by the school principal and the RR Teacher Leader. **Part 2:3.1** BCES has developed a process to determine student movement between tiers. Students in the bottom quartile are identified for Rti services. All movement among the tiers is based on progress monitoring. The RTA program works in tandem with other school intervention services to serve all students in the bottom quartile. Students do not skip tiers up or down, which assures appropriate scaffolding and transferring of knowledge. The school's plan for students who exit successfully and for those who need further intervention is embedded in data analysis, individual intervention plan, and documented progress. Specific exit criteria for each grade level is represented in the charts below:

**Exit Criteria from Tiered Interventions for Kindergarten**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Assessment Used</b>	<b>Dates of Assessments</b>	<b>Exit Criteria per Assessment From Tier 3 to 2/From Tier 2 to 1</b>
K	<b>Observation Survey</b> -Letter ID -Concepts about Print -Writing Vocabulary -Hearing and Recording Sounds and Words -Text Reading Level	Early Spring (Feb/Mar)	-40 letters/45 letters -7 out of 10 items/10 out of 10 items -10 words/ 20 words -15 out of 37 sounds/ 20 out of 37 sounds -Level 2/Level 2
	Letter ID -Concepts about Print -Writing Vocabulary -Hearing and Recording Sounds and Words -Text Reading Level	End of Year (Apr/May)	-45 letters/50 letters -7 out of 10 items/10 out of 10 items -10 words/20 words -15 out of 37 sounds/20 out of 37 sounds -Level 2/Level 3
	<b>Kindergarten Sight Word list</b>	Early Spring (Feb/Mar) End of Year (Apr/May)	-10 words/20 words -10 words/20 words

**Exit Criteria from Tiered Interventions for 1<sup>st</sup> Grade**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>Assessment Used</b>	<b>Dates of Assessments</b>	<b>Exit Criteria per Assessment From Tier 3 to 2/From Tier 2 to 1</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Observation Survey</b> -Letter ID -Word Test -Concepts about Print -Writing Vocabulary -Hearing and Recording Sounds and Words -Text Reading Level	Late Fall (Oct/Nov)	-Out of the top 5 subtests in the Observation Survey: Stanine 3/Stanine 4 or Higher using beginning Stanine Chart in the Survey Manual  -Text Level 9/Text Level 10
	<b>Observation Survey</b> -Letter ID -Word Test -Concepts about Print -Writing Vocabulary -Hearing and Recording Sounds and Words -Text Reading Level	Mid-Year (Dec/Jan)	-Out of the top 5 subtests in the Observation Survey: Stanine 3/Stanine 4 or Higher using mid-year Stanine Chart in the Survey Manual  -Text Level 12/Text Level 14
	<b>Observation Survey</b> -Letter ID -Word Test -Concepts about Print -Writing Vocabulary -Hearing and Recording Sounds and Words -Text Reading Level	Early Spring (Feb/Mar)	-Out of the top 5 subtests in the Observation Survey: Stanine 3/Stanine 4 or Higher using mid-year Stanine Chart in the Survey Manual  -Text Level 14/Text Level 16
	<b>Observation Survey</b> -Letter ID -Word Test -Concepts about Print -Writing Vocabulary -Hearing and Recording Sounds and Words -Text Reading Level	End of Year (Apr/May)	Out of the top 5 subtests in the Observation Survey: Stanine 3/Stanine 5 or Higher using end of year Stanine Chart in the Survey Manual  -Text Level 16/Text Level 18
	<b>Slosson Sight Word list</b>	Late Fall (Oct/Nov) Mid-Year (Dec/Jan) Early Spring (Feb/Mar) End of Year (Apr/May)	-22 words/32 words -30 words/40 words -35 words/45 words -41 words/51 words

**Exit Criteria from Tiered Interventions for Grade 2**

Grade Level	Assessment Used	Dates of Assessments	Exit Criteria per Assessment From Tier 3 to 2/From Tier 2 to 1
2	Text Reading Level	Late Fall (Oct/Nov) Mid-Year (Dec/Jan) Early Spring (Feb/Mar) End of Year (Apr/May)	-Text Level 12/ Text Level 16 -Text Level 14/Text Level 18 -Text Level 16/Text Level 18 -Text Level 18/Text Level 20
	Slosson Sight Word list	Late Fall (Oct/Nov) Mid-Year (Dec/Jan) Early Spring (Feb/Mar) End of Year (Apr/May)	-52 words/62 words -56 words/66words -65 words/75words -68 words/78words

**Exit Criteria from Tiered Interventions for Grade 3**

Grade Level	Assessment Used	Dates of Assessments	Exit Criteria per Assessment From Tier 3 to 2/From Tier 2 to 1
3	Text Reading Level	Late Fall (Oct/Nov) Mid-Year (Dec/Jan) Early Spring (Feb/Mar) End of Year (Apr/May)	-Text Level 16/ Text Level 20 -Text Level 18/Text Level 22 -Text Level 20/Text Level 22 -Text Level 22 /Text Level 24
	Slosson Sight Word list	Late Fall (Oct/Nov) Mid-Year (Dec/Jan) Early Spring (Feb/Mar) End of Year (Apr/May)	- 76 words/ 86 words -82words/92 words - 88words/98 words -94words/104 words

The text reading level for all grades involves an unseen text. The child must use efficient problem solving strategies (fluent, phrased and expressive reading; reading for meaning; using multiple sources of information, re-reading to gain meaning at point of difficulty; being flexible and making multiple attempts; and breaking larger words into chunks or syllables to decode efficiently) and score above 90% on the running record of that text. Additional criteria for exiting an intervention includes: (1) reading at grade level as determined by STAR or other classroom assessments, (2) achieving a normed score of two test levels behind grade level on the MAP, which is equivalent to one-half school year behind grade level, and (3) documented performance by the classroom teacher.

**Part 3: Implementation of Intervention Part 3:1.1** Since BCES has an existing RTA Program, all of the start-up resources needed for effective implementation of the RR

and CIM Reading Intervention Programs are already in place. The school has a designated intervention classroom for the RR/CIM teacher that provides ample space, materials, furniture, and technology to fully operate the Tier 2 and 3-intervention program. The district also has a RR/CIM training room with a one-way mirror allowing for uninterrupted observations of teacher administration of assessments and instruction. The necessary assessments including the Observation Survey, Slosson, and MAP used in RR and CIM have been purchased. The RTA teacher collaborates with classroom teachers, school administrators, district literacy leaders, other teachers specialized in intervention programs, and with parents. The school also has a highly functioning Rti System of Interventions providing additional collaboration among all the school's stakeholders. The RR/CIM intervention teacher is allowed the recommended time-frames for each aspect of RR/CIM to include assessments; direct intervention time; progress monitoring time; weekly and monthly RTA and Rti meetings; allotted time to record the most recent assessment/intervention data of intervention students' progress as a part of a data file the school maintains that includes entry, mid-year, and end of year scores for all primary students; release time for district professional development among the highly specialized literacy teachers and directors; release time for district and regional RTA meetings; time for scheduled consultations with primary classroom teachers; and parent engagement time. The RTA intervention teacher spends .5 of the instructional day teaching the RR intervention and .5 of the instructional day teaching CIM intervention. As shown in the budget section, pages 22-24, many in-kind services are provided through the district. These resources are used to deliver intensive short-term intervention to small groups of students (one-to-one, or groups of 2-5) through the

implementation of the evidence-based programs, RR and CIM. **Part 3:2.1** BCES involves families of struggling readers in providing updates of student progress. These progress updates are accomplished through weekly newsletters written in the child's native language, regular (every 1-3 weeks) teacher/parent phone calls, and quarterly literacy meetings for parents where student progress is discussed and strategies on early literacy and age appropriate expectations for their children's literacy learning are discussed. The RTA teacher is responsible for establishing meeting goals, preparing the meeting agenda, making the parent contacts, securing meeting location, and obtaining confirmation for between 5-10 attendees each meeting. Via home visits and personal phone contacts, the RTA teacher informs families of the family literacy services and community partnerships in support of literacy. Home visits are conducted as needed by the RTA teacher in conjunction with the school's Family Resource Center Director. The Migrant Coordinator for the district makes home visits to those RTA students who are also identified as migrant or EL, informing them of upcoming parent literacy events. The RR and CIM teachers send leveled books home with students to keep parents updated on their child's progress and to keep parents involved in student learning. Parents are also invited on a regular basis to observe intervention lessons and participate in the parent literacy nights cosponsored with Title I. A substantial partnership between the school and the public library's summer reading program provides parents literacy options when school is not in session. The public library, which consults with the district's literacy staff, organizes thematic reading programs for young readers with an array of literacy experiences. BCES has an organized parent group led by the school's principal that convenes monthly. RTA parents are also invited to discuss the parents'

needs for their struggling readers. **Part 4: Description of the Teacher Selection and Training** Part 4:1.1 The criteria used to select the highly trained/qualified, certified intervention teacher has several components. Since the goal is for at-risk primary children to become proficient readers and writers, careful teacher selection is essential. The teacher must be a certified primary teacher with a minimum of three years' teaching experience in the primary grades and has, or is working toward a Master's degree in Literacy (NOTE: If the teacher has a Master's Degree or National Board Certification in another area and is hired as the RTA Intervention teacher, he/she will receive additional training in early literacy within the first year as a RTA Intervention Teacher). Because the RTA intervention program is Reading Recovery, the school also adheres to RR's 2011 published set of Standards and Guidelines, which serves as a basis for teacher selection. In addition to the candidate's certification requirements, the protocol requires the teacher candidate to demonstrate evidence of adaptability and problem solving; be willing to learn, acquire, and apply new skills and knowledge; show evidence of good interpersonal skills with colleagues; and be screened through an interview and selection process. After a review of applications to determine eligibility, selected candidates are interviewed by a hiring committee at the school, including the districts' RR Teacher Leader and the District Administrator for overseeing the RTA Grant. The purpose of this protocol is to work in a collaborative manner with school principals in the staffing of RR/CIM teachers in their schools. The current BCES RTA teacher is RR/CIM trained, has been with the program for six years, has a Master's Degree in Elementary Education and is a National Board Certified teacher in Early Childhood Generalist, and has 24 years' experience as a primary teacher. Roles and responsibilities of the RTA

Intervention Teacher include: (1) implement the evidence-based reading intervention to improve the skills of struggling readers in the primary program; (2) administer OS and Slosson; (3) serve on the Rti literacy team to review data to determine intervention eligibility and exit criteria for those students in the bottom quartile; (4) provide professional development to classroom teachers as needed; (5) analyze data; (6) coordinate resources (materials and/or personnel) for struggling readers; (7) participate in Professional Learning related to struggling readers including the RR National Conference; (8) develop strategies for effective communication with parents; (9) organize quarterly parent meetings; (10) maintain and formally report program implementation and progress monitoring data on all participants in the RTA intervention; (11) meet all reporting deadlines of the statewide evaluations of the RTA intervention.

The following represents a snapshot of the daily schedule of the RR/CIM teacher:

7:20-8:00 planning	8:00-8:45 RR RR #1	8:45-9:30 RR#2	9:30-10:15 RR#3	10:15-11:00 RR#4	11:00-11:30 Lunch
11:30-12:00 CIM with K small group	12:00-12:40 CIM with Grade 1 small group (Allows 10 minutes for prep time and travel time)	12:40-1:20 CIM with Grade 2 small group (Allows 10 minutes for prep time and travel time)	1:20-2:00 CIM with Grade 3 (Allows 10 minutes for prep time and travel time)	2:00-2:30 Additional CIM group as needed	2:30-2:45 planning/bus and or hallway monitor

**Part 4:2.1** Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) has released Eleven Standards for High-Quality Professional Development. RR and CIM adhere to all eleven standards.

The following are specific examples of how these two interventions meet selected professional development standards: **Standards 1 and 3** call for professional development to be aligned with the school's goals as reflected in its school

improvement plan as well as be aligned to Kentucky's Core Academic Standards.

BCES's school improvement plan lists a priority need as increasing student reading scores by providing professional development on best practices for instruction. RR is a full-year, six-hour university graduate level course that offers most recent research on best practices for teaching literacy. This year-long training takes place once a week after school hours. A specially trained RR Teacher Leader provides instruction. Course content includes (1) observing and recording of children's reading and writing behaviors to build a theory of the reading and writing process; (2) learning a set of procedures that have been shown to be effective in helping struggling young readers; (3) making decisions based on observation and analysis; (4) learning about the implementation of the program in the school; and (5) collecting required data for monitoring and evaluation. During each class session, teachers observe two lessons taught by their peers through a one-way mirror. Participants in the graduate class take turns bringing their students to class in order to demonstrate RR lessons. Collaborative discussion of the lessons is held during and after the observation. Teachers consult records of children's reading and writing behaviors to analyze progress. CIM focuses on these same practices, only in a small-group setting. CIM trains teachers to provide evidence-based literacy interventions that address critical aspects of reading and writing and provides instruction to make teachers responsive to students' changing learning needs using data-based decision making. Once a month, CIM teachers come together with the District Teacher Leader for three hours during the school day, with substitute teacher support supplied from in-kind district funds, to engage in small-group lesson observations and an in-depth study of theoretical foundations for each lesson

component as well as latest research instruction. The CIM teachers observe the lesson, provide constructive feedback, and collaborate on next steps. RR and CIM strategies are aligned with Kentucky's Core Academic Standards, focusing on using continuous text to teach students problem-solving strategies in decoding and understanding what they read as well as integrating writing with reading. **Standards 2 and 4** call for active teacher involvement through "consciously constructed relevant job-embedded experiences". As mentioned earlier, RR training is embedded into the school day, providing active professional development experiences into the day-to-day work of teachers for effective application of teacher learning. **Standard 7** states that professional development fosters an effective ongoing learning community. Following an intense year of training in RR, the RR teacher continues to participate in professional learning through monthly sessions. RR Teachers come together with the District RR Teacher Leader for three hours during the school day to engage in lesson observation and an in-depth study of the components of the RR lessons, the theoretical foundations of those lessons, and discussion of the latest research in literacy education. The District Teacher Leader distributes the proposed dates for the monthly sessions to the RR teachers in August. The RR teachers is released on those dates to attend the monthly meeting. The schedule is flexible so conflicts can readily be remedied. Along with these monthly PLCs, the RTA teacher is encouraged to attend the National RR Conference in Columbus, Ohio annually and the State KRA Conference in Lexington, Kentucky annually. The RTA teacher will also participate in all required webinars sponsored by KDE. Research supports the high quality professional development RR provides (Herman & Stringfield, 1997), with CIM training offering similar strategies, only

for teaching small groups of students. **Part 5: Description of the Budget Process** Part

**5:1.1** Projected costs of the intervention services target one-on-one and small group instruction in literacy development for primary aged students in grades K-3. To ensure success of the program a highly qualified RTA teacher is essential to meet the goals of the grant. The RTA teacher will provide highly motivating, research-based instruction to the identified Tier 2 and Tier 3 students; therefore, the largest percentage of the budget goes to personnel and the fringe benefits of the identified teacher. The RTA teacher salary and fringe benefits are based on the district pay scale. A clear connection between intervention activities and anticipated results and benefits are documented in Part 2: 2.1 and Part 2: 3.1, Pages 11-15. All supplies and assessments purchased will reflect those activities; however, most required materials have been purchased in previous years. Professional learning for program implementation is required for the RTA intervention programs. Funds are allocated for the intervention teacher to receive training in a graduate credit class required for RR teachers and to attend the national and state RR conferences. Analyses of the cost of the project indicate that the costs are reasonable, effective and adequate in relation to the goals and outcomes of the project. The proposed budget of \$65,511 with financial sources of \$48,500 per year from the RTA grant along with \$17,011 of in-kind monies provide for efficient implementation of the RTA intervention program. These in-kind contributions include the Board of Education (BOE) contributions to the RTA teacher salary and teacher fringe benefits, substitute pay, in- and out- of district travel (mileage, per diem, conference registrations fees, overnight accommodations), postage, and supplemental reading supplies (books and leveled classroom readers). In addition, the BOE provides the RTA teacher and program with in-kind secretarial assistance, technology resources, library assistance, use of school's computers, network, Netware, software, and printers, electric, heat/air, custodial supplies, and water. In-kind contributions bring \$ 17,011 to the project in each year of the grant period. The budget reasonably estimates the amount of

other funds needed to support activities related to the program. **Part 5:2.1** Below is an accurate and detailed budget reflecting only allowable costs with matching MUNIS codes necessary to provide diagnostic reading assessments and intervention services for struggling readers.

Bourbon County Schools follow standard accounting procedures and procurement. The District Literacy Teacher and school principal approve all expenditures for assessments and supplies.

All materials are procured using the purchase order process and MUNIS accounting system. A detailed MUNIS report along with status of goals and objectives will be prepared and submitted to KDE at the required dates.

**Read to Achieve  
Budget Summary Form  
2014-2015**

1	2	3	4	5
MUNIS CODE	ITEM	EXPLANATION OF EXPENDITURES	Amt. Of Grant Funds	Source & Amt. Of Matching Funds
110	Certified Personnel	A certified primary teacher with at least 3 years' experience in the primary grades who has , or is working on a Master's degree in literacy. Based on the district salary scale, the estimated salary is \$57,007.	\$48,500	\$8,507 BOE
120	Substitute Teacher	Certified substitute teacher for the RTA's professional leave to include conferences and continuing contact estimated at \$1,100		\$1,100 BOE
222	Medicare	Medicare contribution for the RTA teacher @ 1.45% estimated at \$826		\$826 BOE
231	KTRS	KTRS Employer match @ 2.25% estimated at \$1282		\$1282 BOE
251	Unemployment	Unemployment Insurance for the RTA teacher estimated at \$186		\$186 BOE
260	Workman's	Workman's Compensation for the RTA		\$570 BOE

	Compensation	teacher estimated at \$570		
550	Communication: Postage	Postage and fees associated with mailing family involvement information for all RTA students estimated at \$100		\$100 School General Funds
581	Travel: In District	Mileage @.46 estimated at 500 miles/year for Continuing Contact		\$230 BOE
582	Travel: Out of District	Mileage, hotel, per diem, for RTA teacher to receive professional learning in the RR program. Expenses include: 278 miles @ .46/mile =\$128 (Columbus, Ohio) 28 miles @ .46/miles=\$13 (Lexington, KY); \$120/night hotel/ 2 nights=\$240; 3 days per diem @ \$30/day = \$90; Estimated \$1529 for additional travel RR trainings, coursework		\$2000 BOE and National Innovation i3 grant monies
610	Supplies	Consumable teacher supplies and instructional supplies for classroom estimated at \$200		\$200 SBDM
643	Supplementary Books	Supplementary books and materials for classroom; replacements for leveled readers estimated at \$300		\$300 Title I, PTO
810	Training	Registration, training, membership-HQ training for conferences, coursework, continuing contact estimated at \$1710		\$1710 BOE and National Innovation i3 grant monies
<b>Totals</b>			<b>\$48,500</b>	<b>\$ 17,011</b>

**Part 6: Successful Implementation of Prior RTA Grant Part 6:1.1** For the past seven years, BCES has employed a full-time RTA intervention teacher to work half day with Grade 1 students in RR and half day with K-3 student groups of 2-3 in CIM intervention. The RTA program has been a short-term pull out program taking students from the regular classroom, outside of core reading instruction, for supplemental help utilizing the comprehensive intervention program. From the beginning, the school has

followed the RTA guidelines and mandates by providing a certified teacher who has a Master's Degree and who has completed the RR college course and additional RR/CIM trainings. Student progress has been monitored and documented since the inception of RTA in the school. Results have been so promising that when funds began to diminish, the Board added the needed in-kind amounts to continue offering the highly effective RTA Intervention Program. **Part 6:2.1** There is clear data showing the effectiveness of the RTA grant on student achievement when compared to the rest of the student population. Students who have completed RTA interventions have increased significantly in their reading abilities as a result of receiving RTA services. These data are included in Appendix C, pages 28-29 which includes four charts. Two different assessments (STAR, MAP) represent RTA gains. Chart 1 in Attachment C on page 28 documents 2012-13 reading gains of RTA students based on STAR data while Chart 2 on page 28 shows reading gains on non-RTA students. Results show the RTA students increased their grade level reading at a higher rate as compared to their non-RTA peers at each grade level. The next two charts in Appendix C on Page 29 document not only the current year's reading gains of RTA students compared to reading gains of non-RTA students based on a comparison of MAP fall and winter data, but also shows retention of reading skills over time. The following chart supports that RTA students are sustaining reading and language skills in subsequent primary grades:

**Sustained Gains of BCES Reading Recovery students served in 2011-12 as measured by Fall  
(Beginning of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade) MAP Scores**

	P/D	APPRENTICE	NOVICE	TOTAL ABOVE NOVICE
<b>%ILE RANK</b>	50-100	26-49	1-25	49-100
<b>RIT BAND</b>	179-196+	164-178	<163	>163
<b>Reading Recovery BCES</b>	72%	14%	14%	85%
<b>All School Students BCES</b>	63%	21%	16%	84%
<b>*DISTRICT</b>	54%	22%	24%	76%

This school year is the first year to implement MAP as the universal screener, thus providing the rationale for including this additional data in Appendix C, page 29. This data also reflects success among the RTA students for the first half of the current year as compared to their non-RTA peers. The following chart compares the beginning- and year-end text level of Bourbon County's RR students to the National Random Sample of first grade students:

School Year	Bourbon Co. Entry Text Reading Level Reading Recovery	Entry Text Reading Level Random Sample	Bourbon Co. End of Year Text Reading Level Reading Recovery	End of Year Text Reading Level Random Sample	Bourbon Co. Mean Gain Reading Recovery	Mean Gain Random Sample
2012-2013	1.3	5.4	21.4	20.6	20.1	15.2
2011-2012	1.1	5.2	22.5	20.6	21.4	15.4
2010-2011	0.2	5.1	21.9	20.6	21.7	15.5

The data clearly shows that the Bourbon County's RR students made more gains when compared to the average classroom student from the National Random sample of first graders for the past three years. BCES also has a low number of RR students placed in

Special Education and/or retained for reading difficulties. Over the last three years (2012-13, 2011-12, 2010-11) of the 75 RR students served, only 14.2% of the RR students were placed in Special Education and 0% retained for reading difficulties. The next chart demonstrates sustained gains of the 2008-09 BCES RR students as measured by the State Assessment in reading in their 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> grade years.

**Percent of BCES RR Students Compared to Percent of Same Grade Peers Based on the State Assessment in Reading: 2010-11, 2012-13, and 2013-14**

Grade Level	School Year	Proficient/Distinguished		Apprentice		Novice	
		BCES RR Students	BCES All Other Students	BCES RR Students	BCES All Other Students	BCES RR Students	BCES All Other Students
		3 <sup>rd</sup>	2010-11	13%	95%	75%	4%
4 <sup>th</sup>	2011-12	15%	57%	50%	25%	35%	19%
5 <sup>th</sup>	2012-13	13%	55%	50%	34%	35%	11%

**Part 6:3.1** BCES has identified two programmatic changes moving forward to ensure continued student achievement successes. The school now has an evidence based screening assessment to pair with the teacher ranking system to determine those Kindergarten students who are in the lowest quartile in literacy. Using the school's results on the new state mandated BRIGANCE screening for all Kindergarten students, the RTA position will now be able to place this population as a high priority of students to serve. The second programmatic change will be to replace the STAR assessment with MAP to compare RTA student's reading growth with all other students in the school and district. MAP measures student progress in the foundational skills rather than just providing a grade equivalency in reading.

# APPENDIX C

## BCES RTA STAR Data, 2012-13

GRADE	SCHOOL YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ASSESSMENT NAME(S)	AVERAGE ENTRY SCORE	AVERAGE EXIT SCORE	COMMENTS
K	2012-13	9	STAR	.6	1.7	+1.1
1	2012-13	11	STAR	.4	1.8	+1.4
2	2012-13	6	STAR	.56	1.8	+1.24

## STAR Data for all Other BCES Students

GRADE	SCHOOL YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ASSESSMENT NAME(S)	AVERAGE ENTRY SCORE	AVERAGE EXIT SCORE	COMMENTS
K	2012-13	114	STAR	Br	1.02	+1.02
1	2012-13	86	STAR	.98	2.1	+1.12
2	2012-13	98	STAR	2.2	2.9	+0.7

Additional data may be included.

# APPENDIX C

## BCES RTA MAP Data for the Current Year

GRADE	SCHOOL YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ASSESSMENT NAME(S)	AVERAGE FALL SCORE	AVERAGE WINTER SCORE	COMMENTS
K	2013-14	24	MAP	129	142	+13
1	2013-14	26	MAP	145.5	155.5	+10
2	2013-14	29	MAP	156.2	171.9	+15.7
3	2013-14	16	MAP	169	181.2	+12.5

## MAP Data for all Other BCES Students

GRADE	SCHOOL YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ASSESSMENT NAME(S)	AVERAGE FALL SCORE	AVERAGE WINTER SCORE	COMMENTS
K	2013-14	88	MAP	140.5	149.3	+9
1	2013-14	98	MAP	161	169	+8
2	2013-14	112	MAP	176.5	186.1	+9.6
3	2013-14	89	MAP	193	198.4	+5.4

Additional data may be included.

# APPENDIX D

## MAP Data for BCES Students in Bottom Quartile

GRADE	SCHOOL YEAR	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	ASSESSMENT NAME(S)	AVERAGE ENTRY SCORE	AVERAGE EXIT SCORE	COMMENTS
K	2013-14	24	MAP	129	N/A	Norm = 142.5
1	2013-14	26	MAP	145.5	N/A	Norm = 162.8
2	2013-14	29	MAP	156.2	N/A	Norm = 175.9
3	2013-14	16	MAP	169	N/A	Norm = 189.9