Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes

Technical Report on Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts

Randy I. Dorn
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

July 2014
OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at (360) 725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.
Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes

Technical Report on Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts

Prepared by
Gayle Pauley, Director of Title I/LAP and Consolidated Program Review
Liisa Moilanen Potts, Director of K–12 English/Language Arts

Special Programs and Federal Accountability
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dr. Gil Mendoza, Assistant Superintendent

Teaching and Learning
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Jessica Vavrus, Assistant Superintendent

______________________________
Randy I. Dorn
Superintendent of Public Instruction

______________________________
Ken Kanikeberg
Chief of Staff

______________________________
Alan Burke, Ed.D.
Deputy Superintendent, K–12 Education

July 2014
# Table of Contents

**Executive Summary** ........................................................................................................... 6  
**Background** .................................................................................................................. 9  
  Learning to Read and Reading to Learn in Washington ............................................... 9  
  2013 Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946—Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes ................................................................. 12  
  Companion Legislation ................................................................................................ 12  
**Learning Assistance Program (LAP) Overview** .................................................. 13  
**Allowable Program Activities and Services** ......................................................... 14  
**2013–14 Usage of LAP Service Categories** .......................................................... 15  
**What Stays the Same** .......................................................................................... 16  
**ELA Expert Panel** ............................................................................................... 17  
**Panel Review Process** ........................................................................................ 18  
**Menu of Best Practices and Strategies** .............................................................. 20  
  **Overview** ............................................................................................................. 20  
**Tutoring** ............................................................................................................... 22  
  Adult Tutoring ........................................................................................................ 23  
  Peer Tutoring ....................................................................................................... 26  
**Extended Learning Time** ................................................................................ 29  
  **Extended Day—Out of School Time** ................................................................ 30  
  **Extended Year—Academics (Summer Programs)** ........................................ 31  
**Professional Development** ................................................................................ 33  
  Targeted Professional Development ................................................................. 33  
**Consultant Teachers** .......................................................................................... 38  
  Instructional Coaches ............................................................................................ 38  
  Instructional Coaches—Literacy Coaches .......................................................... 40  
  Instructional Coaches—English Language Development Coaches ................ 42  
**Outreach Activities** ............................................................................................ 44  
  Family Involvement Outside of School ............................................................ 44  
  Family Involvement at School .......................................................................... 46  
**Community Partnerships** .................................................................................... 48
# Table of Contents

- Community Based Student Mentoring .......................................................... 48
- Instructional Frameworks and Models ............................................................ 50
- Direct Instruction ......................................................................................... 52
- Constructivism ............................................................................................. 53
- Services Under RCW 28A.320.190—Extendend Learning Opportunities Program .......................................................... 57

## Promising Practices ..................................................................................... 58
- Extended Learning Time ............................................................................. 59
  - Additional Instruction Time ...................................................................... 59
  - Summer Book Programs .......................................................................... 60
- Professional Development .......................................................................... 62
  - Professional Learning Communities ....................................................... 62
- Services under RCW 28A.320.190—Extendend Learning Opportunities Program .......................................................... 64
  - Credit Retrieval ..................................................................................... 65
- Outreach Activities ...................................................................................... 67
  - Transition-Based Family Involvement ..................................................... 67
- Instructional Models ................................................................................... 69
  - Multi-Tiered System of Support Framework (MTSS) ............................. 69
- Other Promising Practices .......................................................................... 72
  - Language Development for English Language Learners ...................... 72
  - Content Acceleration ............................................................................. 75
  - Oral Language Focus ............................................................................. 77

## Conclusion and Next Steps ........................................................................ 80
- Next Steps .................................................................................................. 80

## Bibliography ................................................................................................ 82

## Appendices .................................................................................................. 104
- Appendix A: Expert Panel Members ............................................................. 104
- Appendix B: Panel Session Topics ............................................................... 111
- Appendix C: Acknowledgements ................................................................. 114
- Appendix D: List of Acronyms .................................................................... 117
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946,1 passed the state Legislature in 2013. It required the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to convene an English language arts (ELA) panel of experts. This panel developed a menu of best practices and strategies to help students in grades K–4 as well as low-achieving students in grades K–12 served by the state’s Learning Assistance Program (LAP), to improve their ELA performance.

In addition to ELA, the Legislature also requested that OSPI convene panels of experts to develop menus of best practices and strategies in math and behavior for low-achieving students served by LAP in grades K–12. Those menus will be released in 2015.

The ELA menu is designed to support districts as they:

- help students who struggle with reading to reach grade level by the end of fourth grade;
- improve the reading and literacy of English language learners (ELL); and
- strengthen systems to improve reading instruction for all students.

The ELA panel of experts determined that the work required for ELA in section 106 and 203 of the bill should be combined. They agreed that the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies would contain many, if not all, of the same ELA best practices and strategies for instruction of all students in grades K–4 and low-achieving students in grades K–12. Specific considerations for grades K–4 are included within each of the best practice and strategies sections.

School districts in Washington are expected to use practices from this menu starting with the 2015–16 school year. If they don’t they must provide data that show the practices they are using instead are effective.

The ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies builds on state and federal investments since the early 2000s that have sought to increase early and adolescent literacy.

---

1 Also see Chapter 28A.165 RCW and WAC 392-162.
skills [e.g., Reading First (federal), and Washington Reading Corps (state), Striving Readers (federal)], the state has provided supplemental funds via LAP to districts for many years to provide supports for struggling students. However, since outcomes have been uneven across the state, this 2014 menu of best practices and strategies, focused on K–12 ELA, seeks to identify proven practices that strengthen student outcomes for all students in the state. The ELA Panel collaborated with the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) in the development of the menu. As required in separate legislation WSIPP will provide a companion report which identifies research-based and evidence-based practices, strategies and programs that are shown to improve student outcomes. Many of the best practices and strategies identified for inclusion in the panel’s menu will also be included in the WSIPP report. In addition, the WSIPP companion report will identify an average effect-size for identified interventions and perform a cost-benefit analysis.

It is important to note that the existence of an ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is not sufficient to ensure all students will succeed. Instruction and intervention are complex. Not all instructional strategies work all the time with all students. The expert panel, in their deliberations, strongly voiced the importance of ensuring that each of the instructional strategies and best practices described in the menu be designed to meet the diverse needs of all students. Furthermore, the panel expressed the importance of integrating the linguistic and cultural needs of English language learners (ELL) students into all instructional and professional development offerings described in this document; and that instruction should be provided to ELL students in their primary language whenever feasible.

Finally, the expert panel offered three significant and critical success factors that must be considered with every instructional strategy and best practice:

1. **Fidelity of program implementation within a multi-tiered system of support framework that addresses core reading instruction for every student (in their primary language) and that strategically targets interventions based on data for students that need additional support.** Even the most proven intervention strategy can fail to achieve outcomes if it is implemented poorly.

2. **Degree of improvement expected or obtained from implementing an intervention can vary—and sometimes interventions take more time than expected to show results.** There are potentially many effective practices that are not on the menu. Districts that use

---

**Fidelity of implementation is the #1 success factor**

According to the expert panel, even the most proven intervention strategy can fail to achieve outcomes if it is implemented poorly.
practices not on the menu should be sure they align with the criteria used for considering the practices within the menu.

3. Support for students through initial instruction, assessment processes, and interventions should be provided in their primary language, whenever possible.

Districts can continue to use other intervention strategies, but they must provide data that describes the effectiveness of interventions not on the ELA menu, starting with the 2015–16 school year.

Educators must engage in a process of observation, analysis, and take informed action in their classrooms regardless of the interventions chosen. This action research helps solve problems as they arise, and can ensure that the interventions chosen by the teacher or district have a greater chance of succeeding.

This ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is organized by type, based upon the currently allowed LAP service categories. The report also contains a section describing promising practices—those practices identified by the ELA panel of experts as showing signs of effectiveness, but lacking sufficient research to be considered a “best practice” as of June 2014. OSPI is charged with updating the menu annually by July 1st, and will seek input from districts and the expert panel on newly identified research on both best and promising practices.
BACKGROUND

Learning to Read and Reading to Learn in Washington

Washington’s literacy-teaching landscape is as diverse as the 1.1 million children in our 295 public school districts. Across the state, educators work diligently to provide support in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language for all children. OSPI and statewide partners work to support literacy instruction by continually revising and improving the supports and systems available for building strong literacy skills in schools.

OSPI’s vision for education is for every student in the state to be ready for careers, college, and life. To achieve this vision, the State must provide a robust system for reading and literacy support throughout K–12 starting in the early years.

Washington’s Birth through 12th Grade Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP) defines literacy as an on-going cognitive process that begins at birth. It involves the integration of listening, speaking, reading, writing and critical thinking. Literacy also includes the knowledge that enables the speaker, writer or reader to recognize and use language appropriate to a situation in an increasingly complex literate environment. Active literacy allows people to think, create, question, solve problems and reflect in order to participate effectively in a democratic, multicultural society (p. 2, CLP 2012).

The overarching goal of the CLP is grounded in state learning standards for all students, and is based on the foundation that literacy encompasses all developmental phases. We must address the different abilities and needs of children through instruction, assessment, and intervention in each student’s primary language. The CLP and its associated resources recognize student diversity by incorporating strategies that are relevant to cultural and linguistic differences, as well as different learning styles.

In July 2011, Washington adopted the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts (CCSS-ELA) to replace the state’s 2005 Reading,
Writing, and Communication Learning Standards (Grade Level Expectations or GLEs). The CCSS-ELA are built on an intentional progression of the skills and knowledge necessary for all students to be ready for careers, college, and life when they exit high school. For kindergarten through grade four students, the CCSS-ELA provides targeted focus on learning to read and reading to learn across all grade levels. [For more information on this approach, see Chall’s foundational *Stages of Reading Development* (1983), which found that children first learn to read and then read to learn.]

Focus of instruction for students in these grades is based upon the findings of the National Reading Panel Report, *Teaching Children to Read*. Students must be provided instruction in their early years that addresses phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary development, and comprehension. The CCSS set the Reading Standards: Foundational Skills for grades K–5 which build upon the National Reading Panel’s findings. These standards are directed at building a student’s ability to read and to comprehend what is read. The menu of best practices and strategies includes a specific focus on supporting K–4 students in meeting these standards, and is informed by scientifically supported, foundational practices for teaching reading to students in kindergarten through fourth grade. Evidence-based teaching practices for effective K–4 reading instruction include explicit instruction, modeling and scaffolding instruction, dynamic and flexible grouping, increased reading time, discussion, oral and silent reading practice. – Jones, et al., 2012

In addition to the CCSS-ELA as the state’s learning standards for ELA, OSPI adopted new English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for Washington in December 2013 that were developed in 2012 and 2013 to address the increased rigor and language demands of these career and college ready standards and
that align with the CCSS-ELA and CCSS for Mathematics. ELL students make up nine percent (9%) of the student population in Washington. That’s more than 94,000 students are in the process of learning a new language while simultaneously engaging in content to meet rigorous career and college ready standards. With both the ELL specialist and the content area teacher in mind, the 2013 ELP standards provide the language bridge to move students toward full engagement and academic success. The 2013 ELP standards make it clear that language learning and literacy encompass more than just grammar and vocabulary, and that they include refocus on receptive, productive, and interactive modalities for instruction of ELLs. With the revisions in the 2013 ELP standards, English language development goes hand in hand with our state’s 2012 expanded definition of literacy as found in Washington’s CLP, giving a greater emphasis on instruction in student’s primary language, cognitive processes, and integration of skills. Such integration will take our students beyond the classroom and into career and college ready to face the challenges of their future.

With the adoption of the CCSS-ELA and associated ELP standards as Washington K–12 Learning Standards for ELA and English Language Proficiency and the refinement of the state’s CLP, state literacy partners are poised to provide comprehensive and coherent professional learning for educators to better support improved student learning outcomes. OSPI and literacy experts (including experts in K–4 literacy) in each of the nine Educational Service Districts (ESDs) have jointly developed professional learning opportunities (common across all regions) to support strong implementation of the CCSS-ELA and early literacy instruction. ESSB 5946 provides additional targeted resources to each ESD region to improve K–4 ELA support for teachers and students. The work of these “regional literacy coordinators” is grounded in the CCSS-ELA, the CLP, and will serve as an excellent support system for districts as they consider and integrate the best practices and strategies identified within the expert panel’s ELA menu.
Washington’s 2013 Legislature passed ESSB 5946 in the 2nd Special Legislative session in June 2013. The overall bill sets forth a vision for improving educational support systems for every student in grades K–12. The first Section of Part 1 references the importance of collaborative partnerships essential to supporting students; using research and evidence-based programs for all students, especially in the early years for grades K–4; and providing statewide models to support school district in implementing a multi-tiered system of support. Part 2 of the bill references the LAP’s focus on evidence-based support for students struggling in reading (with primary emphasis on grades K–4), mathematics, and behavior across grades K–12. The thread that binds together the bill is the expectation set forth that OSPI will convene “expert panels” that will develop menus of best practices and strategies for ELA (K–4 and K–12), mathematics (K–12), and behavior (K–12). As articulated in the bill, the ELA menu will be specifically designed to:

- help students who struggle with reading to reach grade level by the end of fourth grade;
- improve the reading and literacy of ELL students; and
- strengthen systems to improve reading instruction for all students.

The ELA expert panel determined that the work required for ELA in both sections 106 and 203 of the bill should be combined. They agreed that the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies would contain many, if not all, of the same ELA best practices and strategies for instruction of all students in grades K–4 and low achieving students in grades K–12. Specific considerations for grades K–4 are included within each of the best practice sections.

Portions of the bill specifically related to the ELA panel of experts and ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies are highlighted in Appendix A. See ESSB 5946 for the full text of the bill.

Companion Legislation
In addition to direction to OSPI per ESSB 5946, the 2013 Legislature also directed the WSIPP to “prepare an inventory of evidence-based and research-based effective practices, activities and programs for use by school districts in the learning assistance program” (Senate Bill 5034, Section 610). The WSIPP report will classify LAP strategies as evidence-based, research-based or promising according to average effect-sizes for identified interventions, a cost-benefit analysis, and other criteria.
Both OSPI and WSIPP consider the two reports to be companion pieces, and are coordinating to ensure that the content of both reports are consistent while still adhering to the unique directives given to each agency.

WSIPP Assistant Director Annie Pennucci and Research Associate Matt Lemon are key participants in the expert panel sessions as non-voting members. They are providing important research references to the panel members, and soliciting panel member input regarding effective practices.

Both agencies collaborated on identifying topics for consideration for best practices and strategies. The two agencies then followed different, complimentary processes for identifying practices for the WSIPP inventory and best practices and strategies for inclusion in the Menu of Best Practices and Strategies for ELA. WSIPP, as noted above, conducted a rigorous meta-analysis of each potential practice, and identified evidence and research-based practices for the WSIPP report according to the average effect-size and a cost-benefit analysis of each practice. The identification of best practices and strategies in the OSPI report was informed by WSIPP’s findings and ultimately determined by the Expert Panel. OSPI will include notation indicating whether the menu practices are evidence-based and/or research-based, as determined by WSIPP. The items noted with an asterisk in the menu have been identified by WSIPP as evidence-based or research-based (see Table 2). Additional practices and strategies are included in the menu based on research reviewed by the ELA panel.

**Learning Assistance Program (LAP) Overview**

LAP provides funds for school districts to provide interventions to struggling students. With regard to reading, LAP has the following purposes.

1. **Focus on K–4 reading**—Districts must first focus on K–4 students who struggle with reading or who do not have the readiness skills that will improve their ability to read. Districts must comply with this new requirement beginning with the 2014–15 school year. Every school where 40 percent or more students scored at basic or below basic on the third grade state ELA assessment in the previous school year, must integrate intensive reading and literacy best practices and strategies—across grades K–4.

2. **Use data to inform program development**—Districts must use student data to develop effective programs that help underachieving students and reduce disruptive behaviors in the classroom.

3. **Integrate effective best practices and strategies**—OSPI will convene panels of experts to develop menus of best practices and strategies able to a) guide districts toward effective practices—ELA and mathematics—designed to support supplemental instruction/services that target underachieving students; and b) reduce disruptive behavior in the classroom.
Allowable Program Activities and Services

According to Section 204 of ESSB 5946, districts must expend LAP funds on activities and services consistent with Section 106 of ESSB 5946. These activities and services must be based on best practices and strategies—demonstrated through research—to increase student achievement.

- Extended opportunities for learning that occur:
  - Before or after regular school hours.
  - On Saturday.
  - Beyond the regular school year.

- Services under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program.

- Professional development for certificated and classified staff that focuses on:
  - Needs of a diverse student population.
  - Best practices and strategies for reading literacy, and mathematics content and instruction.
  - Use of student work to guide effective instruction.

- Consultant teachers able to assist classroom teachers integrate effective instructional practices that meet the learning needs of LAP-served students.

- Tutoring support for LAP-served students:
  - Able to provide instructional support to LAP-served students who participate in extended learning opportunities—for example, push-in/pull-out interventions and opportunities for learning that extend regular school hours.

- Outreach activities and parental support, which could include employing parent and family engagement coordinators.

- Districts can use up to five percent of their LAP allocation to develop partnerships with community-based organizations, ESDs and other local agencies. These partnerships must be able to deliver academic and non-academic support to LAP-served students at risk of not meeting local and state graduation requirements. Districts should focus their partnership goals and activities on these three priorities:
  - Reduce barriers to learning.
  - Increase student engagement.
  - Enhance readiness to learn.
The expert panel offered additional considerations to OSPI with regard to specific priorities within the parameters of allowable LAP funding, specifically that the linguistic and cultural needs of ELLs be integrated into all of the LAP-approved instructional and professional development offerings described in this document; and that LAP services be provided to ELL students in their primary language whenever feasible.

2013–14 Usage of LAP Service Categories
The following table shows how districts are currently using LAP funds to provide services to struggling students.
Table 1: Number and Percent of Districts Using Various LAP Service Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice/Strategy</th>
<th>Number of Districts Reporting</th>
<th>Percent of those Instituting Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Time</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teachers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring Support</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Activities to Support Parents</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Learn</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Stays the Same

- LAP remains supplemental to core instruction. Districts can use LAP money to provide supplemental reading, writing, mathematics, as well as readiness interventions that serve these core subjects.
- LAP can fund supplemental instructional services across K–12, and fund academic support programs for students in grades 8, 11, and 12 who are at risk of not meeting local and state graduation requirements.
ELA EXPERT PANEL
Panel members were appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Panel applicants were solicited through several professional channels. Candidates were nominated from OSPI, Educational Services Districts, school districts, and state educational associations. Educators were drawn from existing OSPI advisory groups, such as the Curriculum Advisory and Review Committee, the Bilingual Education Advisory Council, and the Special Education Advisory Committee. Nominations were collected and reviewed by OSPI's Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes Team. OSPI sought leaders nationally and within Washington possessing expertise and experience with multi-tiered systems of support frameworks (such as Response to Intervention), state learning standards (CCSS-ELA), and broad assessment systems that use data to make instructional decisions.

Candidates were nominated and selected based on evidence of their expertise in one or more of the following criteria:

- ELA classroom and/or district leadership experience.
- Classroom and system expertise in supporting struggling readers K–4.
- Classroom and system expertise in supporting struggling readers K–12.
- Educational research expertise and experience in implementing new strategies.
- Knowledge of research best practices and strategies in working with diverse student populations, including ELLs and students with disabilities.
- Representatives from high poverty school districts that range in size from urban to rural with large populations of struggling ELA students.
- Representatives that reflect the diversity of the state's student population.
- Involvement with national ELA research on and implementation of effective instruction.

After a review of all candidates, OSPI’s team recommended panel candidates to the state superintendent for his consideration. See Appendix A for a list of panel member biographies.

The cross-disciplinary panel reflects a wide range of experience and professional expertise within the K–20 environment. The state Legislature has charged the panel to “assist in the development of a menu of best practices and strategies that will provide guidance to districts as they work to impact student ELA academic achievement.”
PANEL REVIEW PROCESS

There were five work sessions held over a five month period in 2014. Three were face to face sessions held in the SeaTac area. The other two sessions were interactive webinars, typically lasting four or more hours. Significant research, writing and collaboration happened outside the formal panel meetings. OSPI provided a project SharePoint site and discussion group to help facilitate collaboration and access to information.

The following work plan outlines the work of the expert panel over the five scheduled sessions. Panelists were asked to find and/or review research literature in advance of each session, and to share that research with the whole group. The panelists received selected articles before each session. WSIPP maintained a folder of selected research articles on the OSPI SharePoint site related to effective practices and strategies within the allowable LAP service categories.

Panelists provided written descriptions of the proposed practices, citing evidence of effectiveness. See Bibliography for the articles reviewed and used by the expert panel in the course of their work.

In the figure below, the two gray boxes (February 21 and April 18) represent web-based meetings, and the blue boxes represent face-to-face work sessions.

Figure 2: High-Level Work Plan for the Expert Panel
The work sessions were organized around the framework of the currently allowed LAP service categories, with one key addition of identifying emerging or promising practices that might not fit into the currently allowed categories, as shown below.

Figure 3 indicates currently allowed LAP practices (shown in gray), with examples noted. The graphic also includes a focus on promising practices (shown in red). Districts may select a promising practice as long as they can demonstrate a positive outcome on student achievement.

**Figure 3: Currently Allowed LAP Practices**
MENU OF BEST PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES

Overview
Over the five sessions convened by OSPI, the expert panel worked together to develop a comprehensive menu of best practices and strategies based on the most current evidence and rigorous research available. Additional best practices and strategies will be identified during 2014–15 as the ELA panel reviews the 2013–14 ELA menu. (It was not possible to determine in some instances whether or not a practice was evidence- or research-based by the initial report deadline.) WSIPP was charged with making that determination, which they did by carefully and systematically evaluating the quality of the aggregate work and ensuring that the studies had valid comparison groups and measure outcomes of interest, such as test scores and graduation rates. Each entry indicates whether the practice is evidence-based and/or research-based.

Panelists concurred with WSIPP to use the following definitions for evidence-based and research-based studies.

Evidence-based
- Multiple randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluations, or one large multiple-site randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluation.
- Where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates sustained improvements in outcomes: ELA test scores.
- When possible, has been determined to be cost-beneficial.

Research-based
- Tested with a single randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes.

The ELA menu lists evidence based practices and strategies that have been shown to support reading/literacy improvement for struggling learners. Many of these strategies and practices are used in commercially available supplemental programs that districts can acquire and use. It is important to note that the work of the expert panel was to identify proven general practices and strategies, not specifically branded programs that might employ those practices. Districts that are contemplating acquisition or use of one or more branded programs are encouraged to determine if the strategies and practices included in the menu are utilized by the branded programs.

The table below shows a quick summary of the practices that are proven to be effective in strengthening student educational outcomes, as determined by the expert panel. Each practice is described in more detail later in the report.
Table 2: Menu of Best Practices and Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice/Strategies</th>
<th>Evidence-Based</th>
<th>Research-Based</th>
<th>Panel Opinion</th>
<th>K–4</th>
<th>K–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tutoring*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Tutoring*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day–Out of School Time*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Year(^2) - Academics (Summer Programs)*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Professional Development*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coaches(^3)*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement at School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Student Mentoring*</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These practices have been identified by WSIPP as evidence-based or research-based.
\(^2\) Extended Year includes Summer Programs, Saturdays, use of school breaks and an extension of the standard school year.
\(^3\) Instructional Coaches also includes Literacy Coaches and English Language Development Coaches.
Tutoring

Tutoring is defined as any interaction with a trained individual using an explicit, well-designed program or practice that is match to a student’s needs. The administrator of a tutoring program should provide training to the tutors that include error correction procedures, student response protocols, and engagement practices for content and instruction. Successful tutoring programs begin with clearly defined goals, which use consistent schedules of formative assessment and on-going progress monitoring. As an instructional delivery model, tutoring is considered a best practice when training is provided, small group or individual instruction is used, and the data is monitored in a systematic way.

Tutors specializing in the ELA can include educators, paraeducators, parents, and both same age peers and cross age peers, or volunteers who are interested in furthering the literacy development within a school. In literacy development, volunteers must be familiar with concepts associated with the critical components of reading such as: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (Birsch, 2005). For example, early literacy tutors should be trained to provide instruction with respect to alphabetic sounds, both consonants and vowels; word recognition skills, blending letters, and decoding unfamiliar words (Birsch, 2005). Tutors must also be well-versed in strategies to engage students in dialogue about reading and error correction processes, as well as strategies for redirecting off-task behavior, and supporting the classroom teacher. Tutors can also play an essential role in supporting literacy learning via primary language instruction.

Tutors are valuable to the system when they are involved in instructional practices that improve reading skills for students. A strong system-wide process that exemplifies organization can be effective in helping the tutors collect important data that helps monitor the progress of the students. In turn, the data can be used to facilitate goal-setting by the student and the teacher; continual development of reading skills, a schedule for assessing and reviewing student progress.

Adult Tutoring

Adult tutors, who receive specialized instruction in facilitating reading are an asset to the development of a comprehensive literacy program. Carefully selected adult tutors can include specifically trained teachers, intervention specialists, paraeducators, other classified personnel, and volunteers. Research has consistently shown that tutoring programs contribute to the academic growth
of students if it is well-structured and includes professional training centered on the best practices in literacy development.

It would be ideal for each school to have specifically trained teachers to work with students who have difficulties in reading; however, since the teachers who have the credentials usually work with large groups of students, the tutoring usually utilizes paraeducator, other classified personnel or adult volunteers.

Paraeducators or other adult volunteers can be as effective as experts with advanced degrees if they receive trainings that support scientifically researched principles of reading instruction (Glaser, 2005; Elbaum et al., 2000). The tutoring sessions should be provided in conjunction with the regularly scheduled core classroom instruction. Shorter sessions, multiple times a week allow the students who need more intensive instruction to become proficient in the relevant concept or topic. With evidence-based, reliable, and replicable interventions specific to the diagnostic information provided by assessments administered at the beginning and throughout the program, the students in the tutoring program have been known to improve their reading skills. From one-to-one instruction to small group instruction the tutors can build literacy skills in areas that present difficulties. Through carefully orchestrated processes and organized system-wide structures students who require more intensive literacy instruction will develop proficiency.

Students who require the most intensive instruction would benefit from one-to-one adult tutoring. The next best scenario would be small group tutoring consisting of three (3) to six (6) students (Glaser, 2005; WSIPP ELA Inventory, 2014). This practice will require the program administrator to thoughtfully organize student groupings in order to facilitate increased instructional time on-task, peer interaction and grade-level literacy skills. Benefits are greater when the students receive instruction that is based on their needs, which a trained and skilled tutor can administer.

**Adult Tutoring—Intervention Specialists**

Literacy Intervention Specialists working in one-on-one and small group contexts supplemental to core classroom instruction must be highly trained and pursue continuing professional development. If we want to accelerate struggling readers' development, we must plan our interventions so that the teachers who are experts on reading instruction deliver those lessons. Expecting less well trained adults in the school to provide powerful instruction to the most difficult-to-teach students has little basis in theory or research. Good teaching is adaptive teaching. A reading specialist with advanced training in reading theory and instruction, specific diagnostic assessment, and matching targeted lessons to the identified needs of students, lessons the need to use highly scripted, commercial
instructional programs because the expert adult can construct effective, tailored intervention activity settings. Scripted instructional packages cannot always attend to learner differences and provide instruction informed by the child’s responses. Good teachers take charge of extensive professional knowledge, manipulate it, and adapt it to changing instructional situations (Allington, 2002). Though procedures and routines within a predictable structure are crucial to success, no two lessons will be identical, because all students are different even within a small group. This teaching requires a deep knowledge of content, instructional pedagogy, and the concepts embedded in various practices. Reading intervention specialists must be able to draw on their discipline-specific expertise to intentionally select those practices that best match the needs of the specific reader or readers and the learning goals. They must be able teach for the transfer of skills and strategies necessary for successful classroom achievement. Our students who are served in intervention deserve no less that the absolute best instruction that is available and there is no substitute for specialized teacher expertise.

K–4 Considerations

- All literacy tutors and adult volunteers must be trained to provide literacy instruction based on the needs of the children they are serving. Studies have indicated that trained, noncertified tutors can improve reading fluency which will result in improved comprehension (Elbaum et al., 2000; Shinn, Deno & Fuchs, 2002).
- One-to-one and small group tutoring, consisting of three (3) to six (6) students is instrumental in improving grade-level reading among struggling readers.
- Literacy interventions should focus on the foundational reading skills that include phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (Birsch, 2005).

Implementation Success Factors

- Select a scientifically research based tutoring program that utilizes individualized, short diagnostic tests to design appropriate developmental lessons for students (Gordon, 2007).
- Design and implement a highly structured program where knowledge is constructed from the integration of previously learned and newly acquired skill sets (Gordon, 2007).
- Teach tutors observation and correction techniques. Tutors should utilize consistent error correction, and adherence to the program protocols to improve student growth in literacy.
- Provide tutors with professional development opportunities and specialized training to ensure that students are supported at all levels of learning (Gordon, 2007).
- Ensuring an educational atmosphere or setting plays an important role in the results of tutoring programs (Gordon, 2007). A quiet, well-lit area
that provides ample seating for the participants and the leader is essential. Ensuring a setting were minimal distractions occur is essential for helping the tutor understand each child’s learning ability (Gordon, 2007).

- Throughout the tutoring the tutor must collaborate with the classroom teacher or program administrator to demonstrate short term and long term improvement (Gordon, 2007). A continuation of communication should extend to each stakeholder in the individual child’s education including the parents/guardians.
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Peer Tutoring

Peer tutoring can be classified in a number of ways. Peer tutors includes students who are the same class or age group, in the same small reading group, reciprocal literacy groups, or cross-age tutors. Peer tutoring is a comprehensive, instructional approach based on turn-taking in which the whole group is actively engaged. Like adult tutors, peer tutoring can be effective if the peer is trained in practices such as following directions, using prompting and reinforcement, providing effective feedback, and systematic error correction (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009). The practice of peer tutoring is widely supported, including by the expert panel, because it improves the learning for both the tutor and the student receiving the tutoring (Topping, 2008). As Hattie notes, research demonstrates that peer tutoring has numerous “academic and social benefits for both those tutoring and those being tutored” (Hattie, 2009; Cook et al., 1985). Peer tutoring is in fact especially effective in improving peer relationship, personal development, and motivation (Topping, 2008). As noted in the What Works Clearinghouse evaluation of a model of peer tutoring detailed in Fuchs, Fuchs, Kazdan, & Allen (1999) and Mathes & Babyak (2001), in effective peer tutoring programs, students “work in pairs on reading activities intended to improve reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Students in the pairs—who alternately take on the role of tutor and tutee—read aloud, listen to their partner read, and provide feedback during various structured activities.” (What

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Significant evidence exists that adult, one-to-one tutoring, when implemented with fidelity, is one of the most effective ways to provide intervention to struggling students and increase academic outcomes.</td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The best adult tutor is generally a person highly trained and certified in the field of study. There are concerns about using teachers outside the disciplinary area being taught, paraeducators, or trained volunteers. Tutors must have effective supervision by the teacher to ensure quality of delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Works Clearinghouse, 2012). In such a program, students are trained in strategies such as: “passage reading with partners, paragraph ‘shrinking’ (or describing the main idea), and prediction relay (predicting what is likely to happen next in the passage)” (What Works Clearinghouse, 2012). As noted by Greenwood, Kamps, Terry and Linebarger (2007), research indicates that peer tutoring programs that implement these strategies have a positive impact on the achievement of a wide range of students, including those in kindergarten through 4th grade.

In addition to one-to-one peer tutoring or cross-age peer tutoring, in which the roles of tutor and tutee are static and defined by ability or age, reciprocal peer tutoring can also be used to increase the learning time and opportunities within a classroom. It is an intervention strategy where students alternate between the tutor and the tutee. Whenever reciprocal peer tutoring is used, keeping the group small is important. The lead teacher or tutor should determine the selection of tutoring groups based on the goal of the activities, the activities, and the daily schedule. Most importantly, when implementing reciprocal tutoring arrangements administrators should combine organized structures, foundational skills in reading instruction, and group-reward contingencies to experience positive results (Fantuzzo and Rohrbeck, 1992).

K–4 Considerations

- If peer tutors are carefully placed, according to the program administrator, they can help foster a relationship with another student that can lead to improved peer relationships, personal development, and motivation (Topping, 2008).
- Utilize a variety of students of different ages and different abilities working together for greater results.
- Practice time for both the tutor and the tutee is increased when consistent tutoring schedules are adhered to (Bixby et al., 2011).
- Trained adult supervisors should be in control of constructing the peer partnerships. Direct leadership on behalf of the program coordinator must be exercised to ensure the peer tutoring is meeting literacy goals.
- It is recommended to use peer tutoring with upper-level elementary students.

Implementation Success Factors

- As with adult tutors, peer tutors must receive opportunities for developing their skills as a tutor. Peer tutoring can be effective if the peer is trained in practices such as following directions, using prompting and reinforcement, providing effective feedback, and systematic error correction (Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009). They must be versed in content, skills, and cultural competencies (Bixby et al., 2011; Barley et al., 2002; Center for Prevention Research and Development, 2009).
- Programs that use peer tutors, or students teaching other students, must be facilitated with structures that are put in place by a qualified teacher or trained coordinator.
- Student tutors should be trained to model study skills, communication skills, work habits, questioning skills, and other helpful educational behaviors.
- Tutors should be trained not only in reading skill implementation, but also in social behaviors that allow for an appropriate, effective learning environment.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Works with students of different ages and abilities.</td>
<td>- Students must be trained in tutoring to be effective, otherwise it may be detrimental to academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can be used in multiple content areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Beginning readers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Extended Learning Time**

Extending learning time encompasses multiple facets of educational learning opportunities designed to provide pathways for continual learning. Extending learning time may consist of before or after school programs, longer school days, year-round school, summer school, and/or a combination of programs.

For the intent of this report, the LAP allowable practices for extended learning under consideration are shown below.

1. Summer School
2. Before/After School
   a. Instructional After School
   b. Homework Club
   c. Book Programs
   d. Computer-Based/Online
   e. Saturday Programs
3. Extended Time
   a. School Day
   b. School Year

Research indicates that achieving success with extended learning involves several key components: teacher quality and pedagogy, effective use of data, curriculum that addresses student ability, and explicit and systematic implementation. Extended learning is not more of the same, but emphasizes more time on specific student needs as determined through assessment. Evidence tells us that expanding time during the day and over the academic year, particularly in high-poverty and low-performing schools, can improve student achievement (McCombs, 2012). Additionally, numerous studies correlate summer learning with reading outside of school and improvements in general reading ability (Anderson, Wilson & Fielding, 1998).
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Extended Day–Out of School Time
Extended Day is defined as time for students outside the regular instructional day. It could include a longer day by adding instruction time before or after school, or use of break times during the day.

K–4 Considerations
- The amount of time needs to be adjusted to the age of the student.
- Instruction needs to include activity to engage students beyond the school day.
- Staff need to be consistent.
- Align to regular day curriculum and assessment.
- Amount of time needs to be consistent; over a significant amount of time.
- Individual/group data should be used to target instruction.

Implementation Success Factors
All work during the extended day should be closely aligned to the Washington State standards which form the core learning targets for students. Collaboration time among teachers must be provided to develop clarity and coherence among the general education teachers and the staff members providing the extended learning time for students to meet the State standards. The intervention team (all the adults serving the student) will determine the instructional and assessment plans for each student to meet the instructional targets. Students should be able to articulate the purpose for learning.

Ongoing progress monitoring and student self-assessment should be conducted during any extended learning time aligned to the Washington State standards and the ELA standards. Refer to the best practices and strategies regarding one-to-one and small group tutoring.

Students should receive services until they meet the targets identified for them by the instructional team.
Extended Year–Academics (Summer Programs)

Summer programs serve multiple purposes for students, families, educators, and communities. Summer programs may be designed to promote students who have failed or been retained, accelerate learning, prevent future academic problems, improve student and parent attitudes towards school performance, and provide academic enrichment. Borman’s research indicates that summer learning may be the primary intervention through which educators prevent the cumulative widening of the reading achievement gap (Borman, 2000, p. 24). Local schools and districts should use data to design, develop, and evaluate programs. Programs must be designed to serve different student groups, including ELLs and/or students with disabilities at various grade levels from entering kindergarteners through 12th grade. Research conducted by Roderick, et al. (1999), demonstrates that participation in a summer program, in addition to the regular academic school year’s curriculum, provides students with at least a short-term gain in standardized test scores (Roderick, Bryk, Jacob, Easton, & Allensworth, 1999).

According to Duffy (2001), summer school programs have the potential to accelerate the reading development of struggling readers in particular. In this study by Duffy (2001) of second grade students in a summer school program, students improved in word identification, fluency, comprehension, perceptions of themselves as readers, attitudes toward reading, and instructional reading levels. This summer school program was implemented according to the constructs of balanced literacy instruction, literacy acceleration, and responsive teaching. Duffy (2001) warns, though, that summer school as a short-term intervention should not be viewed as a quick fix for all struggling readers. Some students will need ongoing support to meet grade-level goals and sustain their learning.
**K–4 Considerations**

- Capture enough time every day for multiple weeks to make a difference.
- Align to regular year curriculum, assessment, and evaluation.
- Follow the progress of these students intentionally; make adjustments to program based on this information.
- Provide transportation, breakfast, and lunch.
- Intentionally engage parents.
- Promote the love of reading.

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Summer programs should support connection to core instructional strategies and content, which in turn must be articulated within the system.
- Summer programs must be staffed by highly qualified and trained staff.
- Students must have access to materials that match instructional levels.
- Program evaluation is a critical component to ensure the summer program is effective at improving student outcomes (Newhouse, et al. 2012). Evaluations should use observational data; youth, parent and staff input; and student academic data. Evaluations should measure quality, engagement, student academic and behavioral outcomes, and how well the gains are sustained.
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### Majority Opinion

- Summer programs may address multiple components of the education of the whole child—behavior, attendance, motivation, sense of belonging—depending on the focus of the program.

### Minority Opinion

None noted.

---

**Professional Development**

*Targeted Professional Development*

Research suggests that targeted professional development can positively impact student outcomes. In fact, according to one study (Scanlon, et al., 2009), extensive, targeted professional development for teachers on reading instruction was shown to have a greater impact on student achievement in reading than one-on-one tutoring. As a recent review of the most current research on best practices in professional development “Professional Learning in the Learning Profession,” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009) notes, professional development is most effective when it is targeted to address specific content that has been explicitly tied to goals for student achievement and school improvement.

Professional development shown to improve student achievement is focused on “the concrete, everyday challenges involved in teaching and learning specific academic subject matter, rather than focusing on abstract educational principles or teaching methods taken out of context” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 10). Further, effective professional development should be aligned to learning standards and/or instructional strategies and must be aligned to the needs of learners. Data analysis should be utilized to help define a clear set of learning goals. Evidence suggests that, in order to positively impact student achievement, professional development must be contextualized and sustained; that is, effective professional development must be provided as an ongoing, systematic process informed by evaluation of student, teacher, and school needs, and embedded within a comprehensive plan for school improvement (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Yoon et al., 2007; Garet et al, 2001). As noted by McREL’s (Snow-Renner & Lauer, 2005) report “Professional Development Analysis,” professional development that is long-lasting, content-focused, and based on student and teacher performance data, takes more time and effort to implement when compared to less effective types of professional development. But as Garet et al. state (2001), “[a] professional development activity is more likely to be effective in
improving teachers' knowledge and skills if it forms a coherent part of a wider set of opportunities for teacher learning and development” (p. 927).

As a group, adult learners are self-directed, ready to learn, experienced, task-centered, and intrinsically motivated (Knowles, 1983). As Knowles notes, “professional development should engage an educator in an ongoing cycle of reflection and ultimately, support the transfer of new knowledge into the classroom and daily practice.” Effective professional development for teachers supports teacher motivation and commitment to the learning process. It combines the needs of individuals with school or district goals. According to Joyce and Showers (2002), professional development should consist of a continuum in which participants receive a presentation of the theory, see demonstrations, practice and receive feedback around an applied practice, and are ultimately provided with coaching or other classroom supports to self-evaluate with the goal of positive growth (Joyce, 2002). Professional development may be supported by activities such as courses, workshops, institutes, networks, or conferences. It may be delivered in-person or through an online format.

Best practices in professional development must be ultimately focused on improving student achievement. As Knowles (1983) suggests, effective professional development involves teachers in shared learning opportunities that are job-embedded, focused on instruction, and ongoing.

*Professional Development on the Use of Data to Guide Instruction*

A number of recent studies have demonstrated that professional development on the use of student data to guide instruction has a positive impact on student achievement. This research suggests that it is essential that teachers are trained to collect data on student performance and use this data to develop learning goals and inform instructional practices. Professional development that is focused on supporting teachers in these kinds of practices has been shown to make instruction more effective and improve student learning. For example, in Al Otaiba et al. (2011), a randomized controlled study demonstrated that teachers provided more effective differentiated instruction after being trained to use data to develop and provide individualized instruction. According to the study, this improved instruction resulted in higher student achievement. Another large scale study, involving randomly selected 59 districts in seven states, by Slavin et al. (2013), reported that a long-term, systematic effort to train district and building leaders, as well as teachers, in the use of state data to guide instruction resulted in positive effects on reading outcomes in the participating districts. Further, WSIPP’s meta-analysis of all available studies found an overall positive effect of this practice on student academic outcomes.
**Coaching**
Coaching is a LAP allowable form of professional development. For more on coaching as a best practice, see the section on Consultant Teachers.

**Mentoring**
Richard Ingersoll and Michael Strong (2011) reviewed 15 empirical studies on the effects of induction programs for beginning teachers. Their review and analysis suggests that assistance for beginning teachers had a positive impact on teacher commitment and retention, instructional practices, and student achievement (Ingersoll and Strong, 2011).

**Washington State Induction Phase for the Beginning Teacher**
As with all states, Washington has laws that designate activities that a new teacher must complete to earn a Professional Certificate (WAC 181-78A-505). These activities include assistance by mentor teachers who will provide a source of continuing and sustained support, develop a Professional Growth Plan, and demonstrate a “positive impact on student learning and meet provisional status” (RCW 28A.405-220).

**K–4 Considerations**
When determining the professional development needs of teachers the following topics need to be given specific consideration:

- Needs of diverse learners, to include ELLs and students with disabilities.
- Content specific to the needs of K–4 ELA standards.
- Instructional strategies to support struggling learners.
- Use of data and student work guide instructional planning and decision making.

**Implementation Success Factors**
Planning for professional development should be systematic, explicit, and based upon rigorous data analysis. Effective professional development should be job-embedded, which provides context and focus for the learning (Knowles, 1983). Collaborative teaming structures, such as professional learning communities, may support teachers’ professional learning goals.

Effective professional development is:

- Of considerable duration—time spent in theory, demonstration, practice and feedback, and classroom support (Yoon et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
- Focused on specific content and/or instructional strategies rather than a general approach (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
• Part of a coherent program clearly aligned with school improvement goals and student achievement standards (Yoon et al., 2007; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
• Focused on the modeling of strategies for teachers and opportunities for "hands-on" work that builds knowledge of content (Yoon et al., 2007; Garet et al., 2001; Supovitz, Mayer & Kahle, 2000).
• Collaborative; it involves building of relationships among teachers (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure, coherence and consistency are going to make a difference for teacher learning.</td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consultant Teachers

In most of Washington’s 295 school districts, there exist staff members who support reading and literacy instruction for students in addition to the core classroom teacher. There is no standardized identifying title, classification, nor name for these educators; they may even be identified by different titles within a district (e.g., consultants, coaches, instructional coaches, literacy coaches, literacy specialists, reading expert, and others). Knowing this, schools and districts are encouraged to correlate their reading “support staff” using the definitions outlined, rather than relying solely on the heading, as they make choices around this section. For the purpose of this menu, literacy coaches and English Language Development coaches are categorized as types of instructional coaches, as generally described in the following entry.

LAP funds may only be used in support of students identified for LAP funds. However, a consultant teacher’s role may extend to include non-identified students in concert with LAP-identified students.

*Instructional Coaches*

Instructional coaches focus on personalized and team-focused professional learning development, often embedded in teachers’ school days. To increase student achievement, coaches support staff and leadership identification of needs around components of the school day (e.g., instructional materials choices, data analysis/formative assessment, technology integration, instructional/pedagogical strategies…).

Coaching may be in a 1:1 setting with small groups, or in larger cross-content groups. Coaching may include modeling best practice with students and classes, conducting learning walks, engaging in book studies, or other focused actions that reflect the data-driven needs for the learners in the building.

*K–4 Considerations*

The Instructional Coach should be knowledgeable and proficient with K–4 standards, instructional practices, programs, and assessments to the degree to which they can plan lessons and model lesson with teachers (Biancarosa, 2010). Strong knowledge of the Reading Foundational Skills, diagnostic assessments, differentiation, and methods for acceleration are critical to support teachers working with struggling readers.

*Implementation Success Factors*

To ensure credibility with novice as well veteran teachers, an Instructional Coach should have demonstrated a successful teaching history. Along with the requisite
knowledge of standards, instructional practices, and assessments, an Instructional Coach must also have a deep understanding of the components of effective coaching (L'Allier et al., 2010; Shanklin, 2006). The knowledge, skills, and dispositions of coaching specifically for Instructional Coaches is strongly recommended (Biancarosa, 2010).

To ensure a successful Instructional Coaching model, the building principal intentionally structures a professional learning culture to support Instructional Coaching. The principal closely monitors the role of the Instructional Coach to ensure the activities support teachers in improving their practice. “[S]tudies suggest that coaching may need to be embedded in broader efforts to build professional knowledge if it is to be most useful” (Darling-Hammond, et al. 2009, p. 12).
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Instructional Coaches—Literacy Coaches

Student success in reading and writing improvement is dependent on teachers’ ability to employ reading strategies and interventions that meet the differentiated needs of all learners. The National Reading Panel describes this simply as “a complex task” that necessitates much professional training. The term “literacy coach” refers to one who has specialized knowledge/training in literacy instruction, which may encompass specific intervention with reading and/or writing instruction. The focus of work is to support acceleration of student achievement in literacy, via working with the classroom teacher and collaborating with teams.

Literacy coaches must have specialized knowledge that goes beyond teaching reading. Literacy coaches must know how to work well with adults. These coaches should spend a majority of their time with teachers observing, modeling,
conferencing, and co-teaching. Literacy coaches must be skilled at building collaborative and trusting relationships that honors confidentiality and effective communications. Literacy coaches should support a core set of literacy activities that deepens understanding of literacy and foundational reading skills and teachers’ instructional practice. Finally, literacy coaches must help set the goals and direction of the literacy program and support the structural changes necessary for buildings/districts to achieve increased literacy outcomes (L'Allier, 2010).

**K–4 Considerations**

Literacy coaches at the K–4 level need an in-depth knowledge of reading foundational skills, learning progressions for reading development, and diagnostic skills to pinpoint gaps in students’ learning. These professionals should also be adept at developing and supporting instructional activities that are developmentally appropriate.

**Implementation Success Factors**

According to the International Reading Association, “Reading [Literacy] coaching is a powerful intervention with great potential; however, that potential will be unfulfilled if reading coaches do not have sufficient depth of knowledge and range of skills to perform adequately in the coaching role” (International Reading Association, 2004, p. 4).

To have positive impact on student achievement, Literacy Coaches will have deep training and experience in research- and evidence-based literacy instruction, including intervention and assessment strategies. Additionally, Literacy Coaches will work with teachers most of the time, in order to impact the maximum number of children. Literacy coaches are collaborative members of the larger faculty, and work cohesively among staff to provide rich support for struggling readers.

School and district leadership will provide support and guidance regarding the short- and long-term planning of Literacy Coaches. Ensuring that the work is aligned to the broader vision of the school and the multi-tiered supports in the building, school leaders provide the foundation upon which the Literacy Coach can improve, enhance, and develop teachers’ efficacy in reading instruction.
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**Instructional Coaches—English Language Development Coaches**

Like other instructional coaches, English Language Development (ELD) coaches collaborate with classroom teachers to maximize student learning and achievement. Specific details surrounding the general professional duties of coaching are outlined above in the section on “Instructional Coaches.” That said, ELD coaches are also faced with a variety of unique demands that aren't typically encountered by content specific coaches. Examples of such demands include (but are not limited to):

- Designing instructional approaches within a framework of second language acquisition processes.
- Assessing students’ language needs according to the English language proficiency standards.
- Identifying techniques for supporting students from varying language proficiency levels.
- Accommodating the needs of students from multiple linguistic and cultural backgrounds.
- Working with teachers from multiple content areas and grade levels.
- Finding resources for primary language support.
- Acting as cultural brokers between home and school interactions.

Stemming from these demands, ELD coaches are best supported when provided with explicit professional development opportunities that cater to their professional contexts (Burkins & Ritchie, 2007). Specific areas for ELD coaching professional development include:

- Explicit English Language Learner (ELL) instruction techniques (Hill & Flynn, 2006).
- Effective language scaffolding methods (Gibbons, 2002).
- Language demands across content areas (Egbert & Ernst-Slavit, 2010).
- Sheltering instruction for increased comprehension (Echevarria et al., 2012; Hanan, 2009).
- Establishing effective collaborations with colleagues (West, 2012).
- Increasing knowledge of differentiated instruction techniques (Bean & Isler, 2008).
- Creating meaningful language opportunities (Freeman & Freeman, 1998).
- Integrating primary language instruction (Thomas & Collier, 1997).
- Family engagement strategies (Auerbach, 2012).
- Building on ELL students' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez et al., 2005).
Effective ELD coaching also involves working closely with school literacy coaches, though being mindful of supporting ELLs through linguistically and culturally appropriate ways. Of particular importance for ELD coaches is helping classroom teachers draw on their students' cultural background and promote the use of their primary language in learning activities (Escamilla, 2007).
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Outreach Activities

Family involvement in the education of children has been shown to be a modifying factor that has a positive effect on student achievement (Jeynes, 2003; Jeynes, 2013). Several approaches to engaging parents and enhancing family involvement are listed and described below.

**Family Involvement Outside of School**

Schools must recognize that many best practices for supporting family engagement are those which occur outside the walls of the school and the school day and ultimately support increased student achievement (Flamboyan Foundation, 2011). Outside of school activities may include visiting libraries, museums, and family resource centers, and engaging in home learning activities such as shared reading activities.

Academic supports in the early years have long lasting effects on students reading achievement. For example, a family literacy program for migrant families that instructed parents on how to support learning at home for kindergarten students showed significant academic gains for these students at the end of first grade as well as at the end of 5th and 6th grade (St. Clair et al., 2012).

**K–4 Considerations**

According to Henderson and Mapp (2002), family involvement outside of school for elementary students should include helping with reading skills and checking homework, monitoring how students spend their time outside of school, and talking about school and what children are learning.

**Implementation Success Factors**

A Family/Community Liaison can work to explicitly connect and communicate with families the resources within the community. When considering training programs specific to activities tied to academic learning routines and/or support for students, the following elements should be included in the planning and implementation (Epstein, 2005).

- **Leadership**
  - Principal
Family representation
Teacher

Goal Setting
Action Steps
  - Training
  - Follow up
Evaluation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None noted.</td>
<td>While family involvement is critical, the practice is highly varied and it is difficult to show that sufficient evidence of effectiveness is available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Involvement at School
Parents have significant influence on their children. There is compelling evidence that reveals a strong connection between parent and family involvement in schools and a child’s academic achievement, attendance, attitude and continued education (Henderson & Berla, 1994).

Highlights from multiple research studies indicate that:

- Helping children understand the importance of education matters most. These practices include families having high expectation for their child, discussing aspiration for the future, fostering child accountability for learning and talking about the value of education.
- Parenting style, supporting child reading, providing supervision, and engaging in home learning activities are all important in supporting a child’s success.
- Parent and families engage in schools differently. Efforts need to be made to move from traditional forms of involvement like attending school events or conferences to actually interacting with school staff about the academic needs of students. (Flamboyan Foundation, 2011).

K–4 Considerations
- Family involvement in school is critical from the start. This early involvement sets the stage for the rest of a child’s academic career.
- A welcoming environment in the school is an essential component of building relationships that will impact students throughout their time in school and ease the transition to an academic setting.
**Implementation Success Factors**

Factors may impact the successful implementation and ultimately positively impact outcomes include:

- “Relationships: Among family, community members, and school staff that foster trust and collaboration.
- Recognition: Of families’ needs, class, and cultural differences that encourage greater understanding and respect among all involved.
- Involvement: Of all stakeholders in shared partnerships and mutual responsibility that supports student learning” (Ferguson et al., 2008).

**References/Resources**


Community Partnerships

According to the Ohio Department of Education, the “definition of a community partnership includes every formal arrangement a school can make with an individual, association, private sector organization or public institution to provide a program, service or resource that will help support student achievement” (n.d., p. 2). Effective community engagement initiatives must be comprehensive, integrated and developed to address the unique needs of the student population.

Community Based Student Mentoring

Mentoring is defined as a positive relationship between a non-parental adult or older youth to a younger child or youth (Gordon et al., 2009). Mentoring programs may be broadly categorized as school-based or community-based. In school-based mentoring, mentors typically meet with mentees one-on-one during or after the school day and engage in both academic and nonacademic activities. Community-based mentoring occurs outside of the school context. Community-based mentoring sessions are typically longer than school-based mentoring activities and community-based mentor-mentee relationships often are longer in duration than school-based matches (Herrera, 2011).

Mentoring experiences can take many forms. The structure of the mentoring experience is often influenced by the goals of the mentoring program and may include a variety of social, cultural, and academic activities. Activities may include visiting a museum, studying for an exam, watching a movie, or playing a board game. Mentors and mentees may also spend time navigating issues for the mentee such as problems with time management, conflicts with a teacher, relationship issues, or family problems (Larose et al., 2010). The types of activities may vary, however, based on the age and needs of the mentee. “In late adolescents, activities focused on personal and professional identity, autonomy, time and relationship management, and skills development are believed to meet the needs shared by many young people. Mentoring program managers must ensure that the objectives of their programs and the nature of the activities in these programs strongly reflect the developmental needs of their clientele” (Larose et al., 2010, p. 138).
Both school-based and community-based mentoring have been found to have a positive effect on student academic outcomes. In a study of middle school African American students, researchers found an Afrocentric mentoring program to be effective in fostering academic achievement and success in the participating mentees (Gordon et al., 2009). In a five-month Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring program, mentees experienced modest short-term academic gains (Herrera at al., 2011).

K–4 Considerations
- Activities should be developmentally appropriate (Larose et al., 2010).
- Elementary school-based mentor programs should seek parent permission and parents should be informed of the goals of the program and possible activities (Ryan et al., 2002).

Implementation Success Factors
- “Mentors and mentees need opportunities to meet and participate in shared activities on a regular basis over an extended period of time” (Ryan et al., 2002, p. 134).
- Mentoring programs should carefully screen mentors, thoughtfully match mentors and mentees, and provide training for the mentors (Ryan et al., 2002).
- Mentor programs should utilize a paid mentor coordinator who coordinates activities, communicates with families, and recruits/trains/supports mentors (Ryan et al., 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Student mentoring programs need to be highly structured with potential protocols for adults to use. This practice has the potential to have highly variable outcomes if not supported well.</td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Instructional Frameworks and Models**

This section includes description of critical structures and instructional models that impact student learning in positive ways. The instructional models presented must be considered carefully when creating a balanced system for supporting every student. In addition, it is critical that within each model presented, consideration be made to accommodate the needs of all students including those from multiple linguistic and cultural backgrounds.

**Direct Instruction**

Direct instruction is a highly structured approach to teaching that involves chunking content into manageable parts that are presented in a logical sequence (Archer & Hughes, 2011). Direct instruction strategies are efficient and effective for achieving content mastery of fundamental facts, rules, and action sequences essential to future learning (Borich, 2011). Different types of learning require differing degrees of teacher direction, but the key to direct instruction is "the active communication and interaction between teacher and student" (Rupley et al., 2009, p. 127). In practice, direct instruction includes a review of previous work, presentation of new material, guided practice, independent practice, feedback, and review. The direct instruction approach incorporates many components of effective instruction, including connecting new content to previous learning, eliciting student interest, clear explanations, scaffolding, and modeling. Gradually releasing responsibility to the students is an important component of direct instruction and teachers who intervene when students begin to struggle are
more effective than teachers who simply assign additional practice (Rupley et al., 2009).

Direct instruction is well supported by a large body of research. In a meta-analysis of studies reviewing the achievement effects of 29 different comprehensive school reform models, direct instruction was cited as one of models with the strongest evidence of effectiveness (Borman et al., 2003). Direct instruction has also specifically been shown to be effective in “learning and teaching the major components of the reading process—phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension” (Rupley et al., 2009, p. 125-126). Direct instruction practices for reading instruction typically focus on one strategy at a time and may include strategies to identify unknown words with contextual clues, draw inferences, and summarize (Ryder et al., 2006). In a study conducted by Stevens, Slavin, & Farnish (1991), direct instruction involving teacher presentation of comprehension and metacomprehension strategies, and student practice of the strategies with teacher guidance and feedback, resulted in significant positive effects on student achievement. In a study of ELLs, researchers found that reading and reading-related skills improved significantly following direct instruction in sight-word automaticity, vocabulary knowledge, syntactic awareness, and reading comprehension strategies (Van Staden, 2011). “Five years of research on fostering reading growth showed that reading skills and strategies can be taught effectively and efficiently in preschool and elementary school reading programs when instruction is systematic and explicit” (Rupley et al., 2009, p. 126). Direct instruction is also effective for students with dyslexia as these students require language concepts and skills to be presented sequentially (Wadlington, E., 2000). Direct instruction is particularly effective for teaching phonics rules and their applications to students with dyslexia.

K–4 Considerations
Direct instruction strategies have positive effects for students in all grade levels.

Implementation Success Factors
Direct instruction on specific reading comprehensions strategies should be paired with metacognitive monitoring strategies to aid students in selecting appropriate reading strategies (Stevens, Slavin, & Farnish, 1991).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct instruction “has a long history of effective results for at-risk students and students with disabilities…[S]tudents at risk for reading failure tend to differ from their average-achieving peers in the areas of language processing, memory, learning strategies, and vocabulary and, therefore, benefit from intensive, well-sequenced, and teacher-directed instruction” (Shippen</td>
<td>Significant opportunity for practice is a key element of direct instruction; however, some educators, such as Alfie Kohn, have raised concern over the use of repeated practice as this may limit the opportunity for students to construct their own knowledge and develop critical thinking strategies (Archer &amp; Hughes, 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many
Constructivism describes a broad theoretical approach to learning and teaching that informs a range of approaches to instruction such as inquiry learning and problem-based learning. Constructivist learning and teaching stresses that the student herself constructs knowledge through interaction with her environment and the active engagement with that which is to be learned (Kamii et al., 1991). Danielson, in her widely used and cited *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2007), notes that constructivism is “now acknowledged by cognitive psychologists as providing the most powerful framework for understanding how children (and adults) learn” (p. 15).

Constructivist instruction promotes knowledge building through student engagement in learning activities that are contextualized and authentic. A constructivist instructional model incorporates a diverse range of classroom practices designed to facilitate the student’s engagement with and practice of that which needs to be learned, including the use of active modeling, scaffolding, explicit articulation of learning processes, cooperative learning, and problem posing (Hmelo-Silver et al., 2006; Cambourne, 2002; Savery & Duffy, 2002). While constructivist instruction is often seen as the opposite of direct instruction, constructivism is an instructional model that, in fact, includes the use direct instruction, as well as explicit goal setting and scaffolding. In other words, constructivism is commonly misrepresented and misunderstood as a “hands-off,” passive approach to teaching, often termed “unguided discovery” (Hmelo-Silver et al., 2006). Hmelo-Silver et al.’s (2006) work, however, suggests that examples of constructivist pedagogy such as inquiry learning and problem-based learning should not be conflated with “unguided discovery,” because both approaches extensively utilize scaffolding, a key component of constructivist teaching (Wilkinson and Silliman, 2000).

The positive impacts on student achievement of a constructivist approach to instruction have been demonstrated by a number of meta-analyses, including a meta-analysis in *Educational Psychologist* focused on the effectiveness of constructivist approaches generally (Schmidt et al., 2009), as well as meta-
analyses focused on instructional models based on constructivism, such as problem-based learning (Dochy et al., 2003), learner-centered education (Cornelius-White, 2007), and collaborative learning (Springer et al., 1999, Johnson et al., 2002). These findings demonstrate that constructivism is an evidence-based instructional model that can be used to positively impact student learning.

A constructivist approach to reading instruction suggests that language cannot be comprehended outside of the context that surrounds it and that literacy learning must take place via authentic interactions with texts (Kamii et al., 1991; Wilkinson and Silliman, 2000). Brian Cambourne’s (2002) chapter in What the Research Says About Reading Instruction asserts that constructivist literacy instruction must use explicit instruction to make the implicit processes of reading visible to learners. Cambourne (2002) articulates five principles that constructivist reading instruction should follow; these principles are paraphrased below:

- Classroom culture encourages engagement with demonstrations of effective reading behavior.
- Teaching activities are a mix of explicitness, systematicity, mindfulness and contextualization.
- Learning activities should create continuous intellectual unrest.
- Metatexual awareness of processes implicit in effective reading behavior is developed.
- Tasks involve the authentic use of processes and understanding in effective reading behavior (Cambourne, 2002, p. 30).

Cambourne’s work suggests that teachers using a constructivist approach to reading instruction must use explicit instruction and explicit modeling to help students recognize and understand their own learning process (Cambourne, 2002; Wilkinson & Silliman, 2000). Constructivist reading instruction emphasizes engaging students with models and the practice of the effective reading behavior that students must learn. Likewise, Wilkinson & Silliman (2000) note that “supportive scaffolding” is a key feature of effective constructivist language arts instruction. Cambourne (2002) also asserts that constructivist teaching requires a high degree of systematicity; that is, such teaching must be systematically planned (p. 32-33), noting that data indicates that more successful teachers are more systematic in their approach to planning and implementation. Further, he stresses that constructivist teachers must be mindful and reflective, and that they must also contextualize learning “so that it makes sense to the learner” in contrast to learning that is “automatic, rigid [or] mindless” (2002, p. 32-34).

Many of principles of ineffective and effective reading instruction based on research and expert opinion identified in “A Focus on Struggling Readers: A Comparative Analysis of Expert Opinions and Empirical Research
Recommendations,” (Jones et al., 2012) align with the literature on constructivist approaches to literacy education. These constructivist-aligned approaches are based on an extensive analysis of the research and an effort to find common ground among reading experts:

Effective Reading Instruction (Jones et al., 2012, p. 282-286)

- Modeling and Scaffolding Instruction
- Discussion and Dialogue About Reading
- Integrated Instruction
- Student Motivation

Constructivist literacy instruction prescribes the use of modeling and scaffolding (Cambourne 2002, 1995; Wilkinson and Silliman, 2000) and discussion and dialogue about reading (Palinscar and David, 2014). Further, constructivism suggests an approach to literacy that integrates reading instruction alongside the learning and practice of writing, speaking and listening skills (Kamii et al., 1991) and, finally, student engagement and motivation is an essential component of effective constructivist reading instruction (Cambourne, 2002). Further, this analysis of research and expert opinion on literacy instruction noted several approaches that constructivist literature also suggests are not effective for the teaching of reading such as “Isolated Instruction,” “Skill Drill and Mastery,” and “Exclusive Teacher Control” (Jones et al., 2012, p. 278-279). These ineffective approaches are counter to the constructivist approach to education, which insists that learning and teaching must be a contextualized and collaborative process.

K–4 Considerations

- According to the National Reading Panel report (2000), a balance between direct instruction and a contextualized, authentic, and integrated approach to reading instruction is necessary for K–4 reading students.
- Scaffolding and explicit modeling of effective reading behavior are key constructivist approaches to literacy instruction for K–4 learners.
- K–4 classroom culture must encourage engagement with effective reading behaviors.

Implementation Success Factors

- Systematic planning, based on student learning goals, is essential to effective constructivist reading instruction (Cambourne, 2002). Constructivist learning needs to engage the student through the use of highly structured learning activities that include supportive scaffolding, explicit modeling, collaboration, and contextualized, authentic reading practice. Effective constructivist learning should not be unguided or unstructured.
- Development and implementation of constructivist reading instruction must be tied to the articulation and assessment of students on the basis of clearly defined learning goals. Constructivist lessons must involve the explicit articulation of these learning goals to students and opportunities for metacognitive engagement with the learning process (Wilkinson and Silliman, 2000; Savery & Duffy, 1995).
- Reflective teaching is a key component of constructivist teaching and student achievement (Hillocks, 1999; Cambourne 1995, 2002).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None noted.</td>
<td>• There are many instructional models available. Selecting a few for inclusion in the menu does a disservice to other models not included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services Under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program**

See the section on page 64 under Promising Practices for descriptions of identified practices. The services under RCW28A.320.190 are included in that section because they didn’t meet the standards for being identified as evidence-based or research-based.
PROMISING PRACTICES
Promising practices are defined as those practices that do not have research or evidence to show they are best practices and strategies, but still show potential for improving student outcomes. The practices defined in this section are considered part of the menu, and can be used by districts. They are selected and described based upon the professional opinions of the expert panel members.

Districts who choose to use any of the promising practices in this section or any other strategies not on the menu must provide evidence of effective outcomes, starting with the 2016–2017 school year.

It is important to note that this is not a comprehensive list of all emerging or promising practices, but rather a sample of practices that have the potential to be effective.

Table 3: Menu of Promising Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promising Practice</th>
<th>Panel Opinion</th>
<th>K–4</th>
<th>K–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Instruction Time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Book Programs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services Under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities Program</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition-Based Family Involvement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Promising Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development for ELLs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Acceleration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Focus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Extended Learning Time

Additional Instruction Time
Extended content time is defined as additional content time that enhances core instruction within the regular instructional day. An IES (2008) panel’s review of evidence on the use Response to Intervention to support students in students overcoming reading struggles resulted in the recommendation to: “Provide intensive instruction on a daily basis that promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time.” This may include:

- An extra period during the day provided for students to get a more time working on reading skills, with a focus on their specific instructional literacy needs.
- An additional staff member providing targeted literacy support resources during the core instruction time, (e.g. a tutor working with a group of students while the general education teacher works with another group).
- A system-wide multi-tiered assessment and intervention that builds upon core instruction to enhance the achievement of targeted students.

As an example of an extra period during the day for literacy instruction, Mazzolini and Morely (2006) describe such a reading class as beneficial to middle and high school students reading one or more years below grade level. This class regularly utilized a vocabulary activity, a mini-lesson, a read-aloud, and independent reading practice. Students experienced growth in reading achievement and reported increased motivation to read and self-efficacy.

K–4 Considerations
Considerations for younger students would include knowledge of the student’s skill levels, fatigue levels, ability to sustain focused concentration over longer periods, oral language development, ability to follow directions and social skills. Parents or guardians need to be clearly informed of the need for intervention and how they can support their child. Additional considerations would include frequent progress monitoring, use of evidence-based interventions, training for staff members implementing interventions and use of evidence-based interventions.

Implementation Success Factors
All work during the extended time should be closely aligned to the Washington State standards which form the core learning targets for students. Collaboration time among teachers must be provided to develop clarity and coherence among the general education teachers and the staff members providing the extended
content time for students to meet the state standards. The intervention team (all the adults serving the student) should determine the instructional and assessment plans for each student to meet the instructional targets. Students should be able to articulate the purpose for their interaction with their learning, practicing and growing their agency in their own achievement.

Ongoing progress monitoring and student self-assessment should be conducted during any extended learning time aligned to the Washington State standards and the state’s English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards.

Students should receive services until they meet the targets identified for them by the instructional team.
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Summer Book Programs
Summer book programs promote students reading during the days they are not in school. Books are provided to students to read at home and in many cases parents are provided with enrichment activities that they can use with their children. Research shows that children who do not read in the summer can lose
two to three months of reading development while those who do read tend to gain a month of reading proficiency (Allington, McGill-Franzen, 2003). Reading just 5 books over the summer can prevent summer learning loss. (Heyns, 1978).

In a study by Allington et al. (2010), elementary students self-selected twelve books each spring for a voluntary summer reading program over three consecutive years. Students who received books in this study “reported more often engaging in voluntary summer reading and had significantly higher reading achievement than the control group…. [T]he reading gains of students from the most economically disadvantaged families in the study were found to be larger, perhaps because these students have the most restricted access to books” (p. 422).

**K–4 Considerations**
- Primary students who are not independent readers need guided reading or shared reading experiences.
- Student self-selection of books increases reading motivation.
- Students should be encouraged to read a wide selection of genres.

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Engagement of parents/guardians is critical. Effective summer reading programs provide families with meaningful strategies and resources that can be carried over and implemented in their home, which ensures continuity of summer reading programs throughout year, after the intervention has concluded (Timmons, 2008).
- Collaboration with community libraries is important, especially with connecting students with public library summer reading programs.
- External motivators can help with engagement.

**References/Resources**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When structured well this makes a difference for kids.</td>
<td>None noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-up with students during the summer to check that actual reading is occurring, getting books into the hands of children also very important.

### Professional Development

**Professional Learning Communities**

A large body of rigorous research suggests that the most effective professional development should involve relationship-building among teachers. While this research does not involve comparison-group studies, evidence in support of professional learning communities (PLCs) is credible, large-scale, longitudinal, and empirical (Newmann & Wehlage, 1995; Hord, 1997; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009). In fact, in Learning Forward’s (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009) recent review and analysis of the most credible research on effective professional development, “collaboration” is one of four identified characteristics of the kind of professional development that positively impacts student achievement. As the authors of the report write, “[a] number of large-scale studies have identified specific ways in which professional community-building can deepen teachers’ knowledge, build their skills, and improve instruction” (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009, p. 11). The development and utilization of professional learning communities as a strategy for professional development capitalizes on the positive effects of collaborative learning.

A professional learning community, or PLC, can be defined as a group of teachers, administrators, coaches, or school staff (or a combination of people in these roles) that meets on a regular, planned basis with the goal of collaboratively improving practices in the classroom and school in order to improve student learning outcomes. Shirley Hord (1997) provides a simple definition: “[p]rofessionals coming together in a group—a community—to learn.” As Richard DuFour (2008) notes, however, effective PLCs must be developed and implemented on the basis of clearly articulated shared goals for student achievement and school improvement. According to DuFour (2008), an effective professional learning community is more than just a given group of educators. A PLC needs to work collaboratively as part of a coherent, comprehensive improvement plan, developed in response to an evaluation of student learning.
data, focused on a shared vision, and in the service of a clear set of goals for improved student achievement.

**K–4 Considerations**
When establishing and implementing professional learning communities, the following topics need to be given specific consideration:

- Needs of diverse learners, to include ELLs and students with disabilities.
- Content specific to the needs of K–4 ELA standards.
- Instructional strategies to support struggling learners.
- Use of data and student work guide instructional planning and decision making.

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Clear and shared mission, vision, values, and goals (DuFour, 2008): Teachers, paraeducators and administrators share a vision focused on student learning and a commitment to improvement (Reichstetter, 2006).
- Collaborative culture: “A PLC is composed of collaborative teams whose members work interdependently to achieve common goals—goals linked to the purpose of learning for all—for which members are held mutually accountable” (DuFour, 2008, p. 15).
- Focus on examining outcomes to improve student learning: A central component of PLCs is a focus on continuous improvement that is driven by outcome data. Data is continually scrutinized and improvements to teacher practice are made when growth in student outcomes is not demonstrated (Louis, 2006).
- Action orientation: PLCs have a strong focus on bridging the knowing-doing gap. As DuFour (2008) notes, within PLCs, “aspirations are turned into action and visions into reality” (DuFour, 2008, p. 16). Using the continuous improvement model, each action is evaluated for effectiveness. The central question is whether this action resulted in improved outcomes for students.

**References/Resources**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Majority Opinion</th>
<th>Minority Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>This is an important way for teachers to learn if structured well. It is not about teachers just getting together and calling themselves a PLC. Data, student work, goals and instruction must be a part of the PLC work.</em></td>
<td><em>None noted.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Services Under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program**

Services under RCW 28A.320.190 generally fall within the broad category of extended learning opportunities. The law was created for eligible eighth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students who are not on track to meet local or state graduation requirements, as well as eighth grade students who need additional assistance in order to have the opportunity for a successful entry into high school. To the extent funds are available, after meeting requirements for K–4 reading instruction, LAP funds can be used for services outlined under the law, including but not limited to:
1. Individual or small group instruction.
2. Instruction in ELA and/or mathematics that eligible students need to pass all or part of the Washington assessment of student learning.
3. Attendance in a public high school or public alternative school classes or at a skill center.
4. Inclusion in remediation programs, including summer school.
5. Language development instruction for ELLs.
6. Online curriculum and instructional support, including programs for credit retrieval and Washington assessment of student learning preparatory classes.
7. Reading improvement specialists available at the educational service districts to serve eighth, eleventh, and twelfth grade educators through professional development in accordance with RCW 28A.415.350. The reading improvement specialist may also provide direct services to eligible students and those students electing to continue a fifth year in a high school program who are still struggling with basic reading skills.

The following promising practices are examples of services under RCW 28A.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program, but are not an exhaustive list of allowed services.

**Credit Retrieval**
Credit retrieval, or credit recovery, refers to a course that is retaken after a student has completed the course without earning credit for the course on the initial attempt. Reasons for a student not earning credit for a course may include unsatisfactory grades and/or insufficient attendance. Credit retrieval programs are often used to keep students in school and on track for graduation (Watson and Gemin, 2008). Credit recovery courses may be offered at an alternate time, such as after school or during the summer (D'Agustino, 2013). Credit retrieval programs may also be offered in a variety of formats such as online, face-to-face, and through a blended approach.

Online credit retrieval programs may pose challenges for some learners, although the experience of online learning can be valuable. As Franco and Patel (2011) note, "Key features of success for high school students in virtual learning programs are the development of self-regulative strategies and the ability to guide their own learning. Unfortunately, many of the students engaged in online programs have not sufficiently developed these attributes, making it more difficult for them to be successful" (p. 18). Online components of credit retrieval programs, however, can offer benefits to struggling students, as Watson and Gemin (2008) suggest: "The blended approach is important because it provides
expanded student support and face-to-face contact. The online component—whether fully online or blended—provides 21st century skills to a group of students who often have less than average exposure to computers and technology” (p. 15).

K–4 Considerations
These services are not available to K–4 students.

Implementation Success Factors
- Early identification of students who may be at risk of not graduating (Archambault et al., 2010).
- Rolling enrollment in credit retrieval courses (Archambault et al., 2010).
- Counseling services for students in credit retrieval courses (Franco & Patel, 2011).
- Curriculum must be rigorous to ensure that students are learning the material and not simply moving through the course (Watson and Gemin, 2008).
- Diagnostic testing should allow students to demonstrate mastery of the elements of a subject that they learned in their previous attempt to pass the course, and to move on to the parts of the course that they need to master (Watson and Gemin, 2008).
- Strong technological infrastructure for online and blended programs (D’Agustino, 2013).
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Outreach Activities

Transition-Based Family Involvement

Transition is the movement of all students from one school setting to the next, or from out of school into school. School systems can support a successful transition for all students. Involving parents in a meaningful manner at any point at which a student may face additional challenges is important. “Parents gain confidence from helping their children adjust to new schools when schools or teachers reach out to inform and engage parents and children in activities to smooth the transition” (Van Voorhis, et al. 2013). Struggling students often need additional support and care when transitioning.

Changing learning environments present new challenges for parents, families and the student. There are multiple and significant changes that include new academic expectations, different school structures, and new social interactions with peers or adults. This transition can be a time of uncertainty and heightened concern about the unknown. Students transitioning have reported concerns in three areas:

- Academic (new teachers, and expectations, more homework, and difficult coursework).
- Procedural (layout of the new school, developing organization techniques needed to manage multiple classes and teachers).
- Social (new classmates, making new friends and learning the social expectations within the school) (Uvaas and McKevitt citing Akos & Galassi, 2004).

Preparing all stakeholders for changes to the learning environment minimizes lost learning time, increases confidence, and starts the new experience on a positive note.

Support for Transitions

“Work in this area requires (1) programs to establish a welcoming and socially supportive community (especially for new arrivals), (2) programs for articulation (for each new step in formal education, vocational and college counseling), support in moving from programs for students with limited English proficiency, support in moving to and from special education, support in moving to post school living and work, (3) before and after-school programs (including intersession) to enrich learning and provide recreation in a safe environment, and (4) relevant education for stakeholders” (Adelman & Taylor, 2012, p. 39).

The grade level at which this transition support takes place depends on the circumstances of each district or school. For example, in districts that have K–5
and 6–8 schools, the transition support would take place between fifth and sixth grades. A critical transition point is from middle school/junior high to high school, mostly between the 8th and 9th grades in Washington. The other critical transition point that needs to be considered is the youth who has dropped out and reenrolls in a school or diploma program.

**K–4 Considerations**

Student entry into the public school system for the first time is a big transition. Students are leaving their familiar home environments to enter a completely new environment. This demands understanding and patience as children adapt emotionally, behaviorally, and academically.

“When teachers reach out to inform and engage parents and children in activities to smooth the transition from preschool to kindergarten, more parents gain confidence about helping their children adjust to the new school” (Van Voorhis et al., 2013, p. 117).

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Must be initiated early.
- Must be tailored to the cultural, linguistic and learning needs of individual and their families.
- Share academic expectations and child’s assessment data.
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Instructional Models

Multi-Tiered System of Support Framework (MTSS)

MTSS is a term that is being used with increasing frequency across the country as a proactive prevention framework that organizes district and building-level resources to provide early identification of learning and behavior challenges. This early identification allows for timely intervention for students who are at risk for poor learning outcomes. A Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) framework is an integrated, multi-tiered system of instruction, assessment and intervention designed to meet the achievement and behavioral needs of all students. Although not all MTSS structures use three tiers, it is easy to think of “All” (Core) students, “Some” (Supplemental) students and “Few” (Intensive) students. An MTSS framework is an evidenced based process that emphasizes data-based decision making. The instruction, assessment and intervention is delivered to students with varying intensity based upon student need. As an Issue Brief from NCLD notes, “Research and current practices show that schools and districts engaging in aligning resources, promoting greater collaboration, and striving to serve students through a rigorous MTSS when they first struggle academically and behaviorally leads to gains in reading… scores for all students” (p. 1).

Further, a meta-analytic study of four approaches to MTSS (Appleton, et al., 2005) indicated that this kind of instructional framework has a positive effect on student achievement.

Many existing terms and initiatives share the common elements of an MTSS and this has caused some confusion among educators. It is not uncommon for to hear the terms Response-to-Intervention (RTI) and MTSS used interchangeably. Other initiatives that share similar characteristics with MTSS include Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS), and Data-Based Decision Making. Another example is The National Center on Intensive Interventions development of a comprehensive series of professional development activities on Data-Based Individualization (DBI).

Another point of confusion is that, some educators believe that RTI is only designed to deal with academic concerns. This belief has resulted in buildings and districts launching an initiative such as PBIS to address behavioral concerns. Several states have moved to reduce the confusion and lack of common language. Kansas has adopted the MTSS name as their overall term to describe the initiative; Michigan calls their MTSS model, “Integrated Behavior and
Learning Support Initiative.” A review of their respective web sites and resources indicates use of the essential components as outlined below.

**Evidenced-based Practices/Curriculum/Instructional Materials**
An effective MTSS system is grounded in starting with strong core instruction meeting the instructional needs of at least 80% of students. Further, evidence exists that the materials and the instructional methods below have been used successfully with struggling students:

- IES Practice Guides.
- Best Evidence Encyclopedia.
- National Center for Response to Intervention (NCRTI) Tools Chart.
- Florida Center for Reading Research.
- 90 minute block for core reading instruction for K–3.
- Intervention time in addition to the core instruction.

**Data-Based Decision Making**
Decisions are based upon evidence. This includes decisions about individual students and how the MTSS is developed and implemented. There needs to be feedback process developed that routinely reviews the effectiveness of MTSS.

**Comprehensive Assessment System**
A good MTSS includes strong initial instruction with ongoing and frequent monitoring of student progress through a comprehensive assessment system. MTSS components include universal screening (benchmark assessments), progress monitoring, diagnostic assessments, and strong formative assessment processes. For each of these components, it is important that established protocols are followed for all formal assessments, that decision rules are in place for students not making satisfactory progress, and that instructional/data teams receive sufficient training to support for implementing all components of the process and associated assessments. This comprehensive assessment system should include:

- Universal screening.
- Regular progress monitoring.
- Diagnostic assessments of the child’s strengths and weaknesses are in place for students who are not making satisfactory progress.
- Formative assessment processes: As per the National Advisory Panel convened by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, formative assessment, “...is a deliberate process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides actionable feedback that is used to adjust ongoing teaching and learning strategies to improve students’ attainment of curricular learning targets/goals.” The formative assessment process should consist of four critical attributes that
operate in a cyclical process: 1) clarification of intended learning; 2) elicitation of evidence; 3) interpretation of evidence; 4) acting on evidence.

**K–4 Considerations**
- An effective MTSS can be instrumental in the development of a systematic approach to supporting struggling readers.
- MTSS offers a framework for coordinating core and supplemental instruction, based on evidence-based practices, to suit the needs of individual students who are struggling to learn to read.
- MTSS incorporates ongoing evaluation, assessment, and adaptive instruction into all efforts to increase the achievement of students in reading.

**Implementation Success Factors**
- Intervention is well defined.
- Use of a treatment manual.
- Training for implementers.
- Supervision for implementers.
- Measure of fidelity.
- Reliability of fidelity.
- Use of fidelity data (in written report).

Fidelity of implementation addresses the question of whether the intervention/instruction was delivered as it was intended. The components of fidelity include intensity, duration, and frequency. Fidelity has been increasingly emphasized and is now viewed as an essential component in intervention research. Without fidelity, “it cannot be determined whether the outcomes are attributable to the intervention, influences of unknown variables or the failure to implement the intervention as designed” (Dumas et al., 2001). Additionally, there is increasingly clear evidence that interventions implemented with fidelity are associated with better outcomes (Durlak & DuPre, 2008).
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**Other Promising Practices**

*Language Development for English Language Learners*

ELLs are students who have acquired their primary listening and speaking skills in a language other than English. These students encounter greater challenges in school because they are faced with simultaneously acquiring English and learning academic content. To address this challenge, educators need to understand the different levels of language acquisition within oral and literacy language domains. Educators must also be aware of how oral and literacy skills develop across different contexts (both in and out of school) as well as across the different academic content areas. It is important to note that language proficiency levels vary greatly, both across grade levels as well as with the same age/grade level. Given these understandings, ALL teachers need to create learning environments where students are taught and expected to use the appropriate content vocabulary of grade level curriculum. Instruction should have an explicit focus on:

- Conceptual and language development.
- Learning contextualized and grounded in students’ prior knowledge.
- Explicit teaching of academic strategies, expectations, and norms.
- Engaging in collaborative and authentic/meaningful activities (Walqui, 2000b).

To the greatest extent possible, the students’ primary language and cultural background should be integrated into instructional practices to enhance comprehension and conceptual development. When feasible, bilingual instruction programs should be offered to strengthen the students’ literacy skills in both English and the primary language. Recommendations for success for secondary English learners also highlight the importance of student identity, identity groups, and the creation of a community of learners (Faltis & Coulter, 2008; Flores-Gonzalez, 2002; Walqui, 2000b).
**K–4 Considerations**

Of the approximately 107,000 students who are currently learning English in Washington, 68 percent are in grades K–4. It is, therefore, imperative that a solid foundation of English language development be in place for these students in the early grades in order to foster academic success in the English speaking classroom. As students begin school and start to develop literacy in a language that is not their own, it is important to build upon the language strengths that students bring with them from their home language and culture. Fostering an atmosphere of success that acknowledges what students bring to the learning experience is an essential component of long-term success.

As ELLs in the early grades are learning the foundations of literacy alongside their native English speaking peers, they are simultaneously and additionally developing the vocabulary, syntax, and pragmatics of an entirely new language system. As Pauline Gibbons notes “many approaches and mainstream reading programs do not take into account the needs of ELLs, since most are based on the assumption that learners are already familiar with the spoken form of the language” (2009, p. 83). For this reason, developing literacy with ELLs must take into account and address the development of the student’s oral language skills in English. When students lack an oral base to serve as a foundation for literacy development, research has shown that reading interventions have a minimal effect. A study by Klingner and Vaughn (1996) indicated “children with the potential to benefit most from the [reading] intervention had some initial reading ability and fairly high levels of second-language oral proficiency” (In August, et al., 2008, p. 163).

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Draw on student’s background and strengths in their home language to develop English.
- Employ knowledge of the student’s current level of language acquisition.
- Provide ample opportunity for verbal interaction with the target language.
- Provide learning opportunities that integrate language across subject areas thus increasing both depth and frequency of language use.
- Use a variety of visual support, realia, and experiential learning to help build vocabulary.
- Include specific instruction to develop English language skills.
- Utilize collaborative and cooperative learning opportunities that allow students to interact with both native English speakers and English language learning peers.
- Special efforts need to be made to ensure that students do not characterize themselves as an incompetent learner.
• First language and home culture are recognized as strengths and integrated into classroom practices.
• Staff need to know a student’s current language level to make appropriate language development goals to target the needs of the student.
• A distinction must be made between New ELLs and Long Term ELLs.
• Staff use the English Language Proficiency standards in planning.
• Staff use a multi-modal approach to instruction.
• Students hear excellent models of English; including word choice, language structure, and grammar usage in increasingly more complex texts.
• Students are provided multiple opportunities to practice English.
• Students are given sufficient response time. First students must solidify the answer, then consider the appropriate English words to use.
• Specific English Language Instruction may be needed. This Instruction needs to be of sufficient intensity and of long enough duration to achieve accelerated growth.
• A range of learning opportunities should be considered; including online learning, electronic translations, additional one-to-one support, primary language instruction, etc.
• Professional Development and additional collaboration time is needed to address the needs of these students.
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**Content Acceleration**
Content acceleration is a strategy for achieving accelerated learning in which the amount of learning is increased in a given time period. An increase in learning may refer to more learning at a given level of difficulty and/or learning at a higher level of difficulty (Levin, 1988). The goal of content acceleration is to bring students up to grade level via a curriculum characterized by high expectations and objectives rather than “pull out” interventions (Levin, 1987).

Accelerated learning seeks to improve student achievement by providing enriched learning experiences, and deeply engaging students, rather than slowing down instruction via a remediation model. This approach doesn’t necessarily equate to a focus on “faster” learning; Finnan and Chasin (2007) argue that accelerated learning should focus on engagement and depth of coverage as opposed to speed of coverage. In contrast to an approach focused on speed, Finnan and Swanson (2000) define accelerated learning as “learning that is of high intellectual quality; it is substantive, authentic, and relevant. Accelerated learning is continuous and connected; it is grounded in high standards. Accelerated learning occurs when students are active and responsible, involved in intellectual pursuits with other students, and turned on to learning” (p. 11). Acceleration has a long history in gifted education, but evidence suggests positive outcomes for at-risk students as well (Finnan & Chasin, 2007).

As a strategy for improving the achievement of struggling learners, accelerated learning operates in contrast to remedial instruction. Henry Levin, founder of the Stanford Accelerated Schools Project, has found that remediation actually slows students’ progress. Levin’s research suggests that such intervention models reduce learning expectations and marginalize students: once students are assigned to remedial interventions, their learning slows and the achievement gap, therefore, widens (Levin, 1987). Levin notes that the opposite needs to happen: “To close the achievement gap, disadvantaged students must learn at a faster rate than other children. …[S]chooling interventions for the educationally disadvantaged must be based upon principles of accelerating their learning beyond their normal rate” (Levin, 1988, p. 3). In 1986, Dr. Levin founded the Accelerated Schools Project for economically disadvantaged students based on the principle that by “providing equal access to and deeper engagement with enriched learning experiences, schools could alter many students’ rate of learning” (Byrd & Finnan, 2003, p. 49). Accelerated schools are most typically utilized at the elementary level to advance at-risk students to the academic mainstream by the end of elementary school (Byrd and Finnan, 2003; Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991).
**Literacy Acceleration**

Research on defining and assessing the effectiveness of literacy acceleration parallels the literature on accelerated learning. Ann Duffy (2000) defines literacy acceleration “as instruction that enables struggling readers to make rapid progress and read as well as or better than their peers not struggling in reading, as opposed to ‘remedial’ instruction which often slows down and decontextualizes instruction, resulting in struggling readers making little progress” (p. 3). Marie Clay (1993), echoing Levin, notes that the struggling reader has to make faster progress than her classmates in order to become an average-progress reader, and suggests that “Acceleration is achieved as the child takes over the learning process and works independently, discovering new things for himself inside and outside the lessons” (p. 8-9). Approaches to literacy acceleration include one-on-one tutoring (Clay, 1993; Duffy, 2000), small group interventions (Duffy, 2000) and summer interventions (Jacobsen et al., 2002). Each of these models can be deployed in remedial programs of literacy instruction; an accelerated literacy approach is distinguished by its insistence on a shared focus on reaching high standards via reflective instruction, enrichment and engagement (Finnan & Chasin, 2007; Clay, 1991; Duffy, 2000).

**K–4 Considerations**

- Learning acceleration is particularly well suited to the K–4 classroom, as it is most frequently utilized in order to get students up to standard before the end of elementary school (Levin, 1988).
- Accelerated learning strategies and standards for K–4 readers must be informed by the five core components of evidence-based literacy instruction (National Reading Panel 2000).
- As noted above, student engagement is a key to accelerated learning (Levin, 1988; Byrd & Finnan, 2003; Duffy 2000); unique practices and strategies that will effectively engage and motivate young children must be considered.

**Implementation Success Factors**

- Acceleration strategies should focus on ways to increase intrinsic attractiveness of learning activities and extrinsic rewards for putting effort into learning (Levin, 1988).
- Reflective teaching is essential. Accelerated learning “happens when teachers... learn alongside their students and engage in meaningful discussion and dialogue with them. They are reflective in their practice and care about all students” (Finnan and Chasin, 2007).
- Learning acceleration requires a shared commitment to high expectations and quality instruction (Levin, 1988; Duffy 2000). Further, learning acceleration is ideally implemented as a systematic effort involving a unity of purpose that involves administrators, teachers, parents and students “in pursuit of a common vision” (Levin & Hopfenberg, 1991).
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**Oral Language Focus**

Research has demonstrated that oral language ability impacts children’s success in learning to read, as well as in academic success overall (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002). The oral language ability of children as they enter school varies widely and may be impacted by socioeconomic and cultural factors (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000; Crawford-Brooke, 2013).

Factors affecting English oral language development include:

- Limited exposure to language and print.
- A lack of opportunity to expand their background experiences.
- A second language spoken in the home.

Early gaps in reading ability and language development that result from a weak foundation in English oral language can continue throughout a student’s
academic experience (Crawford-Brooke, 2013; Fielding et al., 2007; Juel, Biancarosa, Coker & Deffes, 2003).

Research indicates that oral language is an integral part of learning to read and write (Coll, 2005; Storch & Whitehurst, 2002; Crawford-Brooke, 2013); literacy instruction must therefore incorporate a focus on oral language for ELLs and native English students alike. Beginning readers use their oral vocabulary to make sense of the words they see in print. Older readers must know what most of the words mean before they can understand what they are reading. Thus, students need to have purposeful interaction using oral language; both listening and speaking. Because students’ vocabularies are an essential factor in student success in school and beyond (Beck & McKeown, 2007), students also need to be exposed to a wide variety of words and texts. The goal is that students develop an expansive personal warehouse of words and have a sense of multiple genre structures.

According to Kirkland and Patterson (2005), the development of oral language may be facilitated through an authentic environment for students to engage in conversations and thoughtfully planned oral language activities. For example, classrooms should be print-rich and include student work. Print on the walls should be functional and signs for routine activities, such as marking lunch choices, should be accompanied by picture clues. Time should be scheduled for routine opportunities for students to converse with each other, such as a ritual class meeting at the end of the day for students to discuss challenges and successes of the day. Thoughtfully planned oral language activities may include read-alouds, think-alouds, shared reading, reader’s theater, daily news, and show and tell. “Teachers can no longer afford to squeeze a read aloud book between lunchtime and bathroom break. Because reading aloud is so important to language development, we must systematically and explicitly plan for its use in the daily routine (Kirkland & Patterson, 2005, p. 393).

K–4 Considerations

- Classroom environment is supportive and nurturing.
- Designated time needs to be given for listening and speaking activities starting in kindergarten.
- Students need to talk, talk, talk; using the precise language of the content.
- Students benefit from rehearsing their thinking out loud before attempting to write.
- Development of language needs to be simultaneous to content learning.

Implementation Success Factors

- Students need to hear excellent models of English; including word choice, language structure, grammar usage in increasing more complex text.
- Oral language can be enhanced by exploring and playing with language.
- Oral language can be expanded by the use of quality questions.
- Explicit instruction of targeted vocabulary and frequent exposure to targeted words is critical.
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CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS
This work is significant because it has the potential to improve student outcomes across the state. Historically, even with similar funding levels, student outcomes by district have been uneven. The Legislature, with ESSB 5946, directs districts to use proven ELA practices to help struggling students. Even with proven practices, it is critically important to ensure they are implemented with fidelity because the best practices and strategies, when implemented poorly, can fail to raise student outcomes.

All districts are required to focus first on K–4 reading, because this is a fundamental skill that predicts success not only in other academic pursuits, but throughout life. In the 2015–16 school year, every school in which 40 percent or more students scored at basic or below basic on the third grade state ELA assessment, and/or for any student who received a score of basic or below basic on the third grade statewide student assessment in ELA in the previous school year and every year following—must integrate best practices and strategies proven to increase ELA literacy across grades K–4. The interventions must be selected from the list of best practices and strategies included in the ELA menu.

This menu of best practices and strategies will be refreshed annually, no later than July 1 each calendar year. Interested stakeholders are invited to submit recommendations for intervention practices, along with related research references, for consideration by the expert panel and possible inclusion in subsequent menus. It is important to note that if new research emerges that disproves the effectiveness of a practice that has historically been included in this report, the practice may be removed and no longer be allowed under LAP guidelines. Public comment forms are available on the project web page on the OSPI website, at http://www.k12.wa.us/TitleI/LAP/ELA_Panel.aspx.

Next Steps

The ELA panel of experts recognizes that there are a number of next steps to ensure that the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies are implemented across the state. Following are a list of activities that will be carried out in the 2014–15 school year:

1. The ELA panel will continue their work which includes the following:
   a. Examine proposed best practices and strategies that the committee chose to table for future consideration for placement on the updated July 1, 2015 ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.
b. Address public comments that suggest additional practices and strategies for inclusion in the July 1, 2015 ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.

c. Vet potential ELA best practices and strategies recommended by districts and others.

2. Distribute the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies to stakeholders through a variety of avenues including:

   a. Electronic distribution.

   b. Workshops and trainings provided in partnership with OSPI, Educational Service Districts and districts to educators across the state.

3. Prepare and distribute data collection instruments that districts will be required to submit to meet the reporting requirements within parts 1 and 2 of ESSB 5946.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Expert Panel Members

**Alice Murner**, M. Ed., Principal of Neah Bay Elementary School, Cape Flattery School District. Alice Murner has worked for the Cape Flattery School District since 1997 both as a teacher and principal. She received her Bachelor of Arts in elementary education from Western Washington University with an emphasis in K-12 special education and her Master’s Degree in P-12 administration from City University. Alice has been highly successful as a teacher and administrator on the Neah Bay Campus. Neah Bay Elementary has the distinct opportunity to serve a 95 percent Native American population. Under Alice’s leadership not only have the academic scores reached the state average and above, but she has also been instrumental in working with the community to bring formal Makah Language and cultural classes into the school. The Neah Bay Elementary has a long list of accomplishments under Alice’s leadership including but not limited to: State and National Title I Awards, three School of Distinction Awards, and most recently the 2013 Golden Apple Award.

**Annie Pennucci** has conducted applied policy research for the state Legislature for over 12 years, specializing in education (spanning early childhood, K–12, and higher education topics). In her K–12 studies, she has examined educational services for students who are deaf and hard of hearing, English Language Learners, recent immigrants, and in foster care; the Learning Assistance Program; academic assessments; education finance; and innovative schools in Washington State. She has experience as a fiscal analyst for the K–12 capital budget in the state House of Representatives and as an evaluator for a nonprofit that provides social services to adults. Annie holds a certificate from the Senior Executives in State and Local Government program at Harvard’s Kennedy School of Government and an M.P.A. from New Mexico State University.

**Cheryl Vance**, Capital Regional Educational Service District 113 (CRESDD113). She spent 18 years in rural, elementary classrooms where she taught kindergarten, first and second grades. She received her Master’s in educational technology from City University. Cheryl began her leadership journey by being a part of a statewide literacy group led by OSPI and Margaret Mooney. She left the classroom to work for CRESDD113 in 2000 beginning as a content specialist and now serves as the K4 Regional Literacy Coordinator. She also supports elementary mathematics and science. Cheryl provides on-going technical support to schools in the instructional improvement process. Additionally, she helps provide student-focused data analysis, curriculum adoption support, program implementation, and alignment to CCSS and support for understanding
the new assessment system. Cheryl is a certified LETRS and Early LETRS trainer, DIBELS Mentor, 6 Trait Writing trainer, and has presented at numerous conferences and institutes in Washington State. Cheryl also served as president of WORD, which is the state branch of the International Reading Association. She will be adding a new leadership opportunity next year by co-leading the state Regional Literacy Coordinators.

David Tudor, MAT Special Education, Curriculum Director, Washougal School District. David received his Master’s in special education from Pacific University. He spent seven years in the classroom where he taught students with emotional and behavioral disabilities at the high school level and resource room at the middle school level. David left the classroom to work for OSPI. He was a Program Supervisor in the Special Education department. He supported districts with learning improvement for mathematics and reading. He also served as the RTI coordinator for a year before moving to the School Improvement department. For the next two years, David helped to conduct system and program reviews and provide targeted supports to schools and districts in working with struggling learners. Currently, David works as the Curriculum Director in the Washougal School District.

Debra Knesal, M. Ed., Principal of Central Avenue Elementary, Franklin Pierce School District. Debra has 40 years of experience in K–12 public education. Her first twenty years was spent in the field of special education as a teacher, teacher trainer, and Special Education Director for ESD #114 in Bremerton. Debra has spent the last twenty years of her career working with students at risk for school failure with an emphasis on reading research and translating that research into best practices in the classroom. Under Debra’s ten year leadership of Central Avenue Elementary, they have been recognized for being a School of Distinction for the 2008–2009, 2009–2010, 2010–2011, 2011–2012 school years and recipient of Title I, Part A Improvement Award for 2010 and again in 2011. Central Avenue recently was the recipient of the first ever English Language Acquisition Award from The Washington State Board of Education. This award was recognition of ELL students making the greatest progress toward the goal of becoming proficient in English. Debra has been an Adjunct Instructor for University of Washington-Tacoma and has presented throughout the state on reading, special education issues and RTI (Response to Intervention) in reading, math, and behavior.

Eric J. Johnson, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Bilingual/ESL Education, Washington State University Tri-Cities. Dr. Johnson received his Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology from Arizona State University, where he conducted research on the effects of anti-bilingual education policies on immigrant students and English
Language Learners (ELLs) in public schools. He currently teaches courses on language policy, sociolinguistics, and bilingual education methods in the College of Education at Washington State University Tri-Cities. His areas of expertise include: language policies in K–12 school systems, cultural factors in language and literacy education, parent engagement strategies, poverty and education, funds of knowledge, and immigration policies and education. Dr. Johnson has published multiple research journal articles on these and other topics related to improving educational opportunities for language-minority students and their families. For a current list of publications, see: http://education.wsu.edu/directory/faculty/johnsone

**Erin Chaplin**, M. Ed, Director of Instruction, Yakima School District. Erin received her Master’s and undergraduate degrees from Central Washington University. She spent eleven years in the classroom where she taught first, second, and fourth grades, successfully closing the achievement gap for at risk learners. For the next six years Erin worked for OSPI in the capacity of a Reading First Regional Coordinator. In this work Erin provided on-going site-based consultation and technical support to schools to support in the instructional improvement process. Additionally, she helped provide student-focused data analysis, program implementation, instructional and intervention design. Erin is a certified Regional LETRS trainer, DIBELS Mentor, and has presented at numerous OSPI Summer Institutes. Erin is currently the Director of Instruction for the Yakima School District where one of her many responsibilities is the coordination, implementation and the alignment of the transition to the Common Core State Standards.

**Glenda Sederstrom**, M. Ed, Special Education, Northeast Washington ESD 101, Spokane, Washington where she is the Coordinator for The Center for Special Education Services. Ms. Sederstrom received her degrees from Gonzaga University. She provides technical assistance to the districts within the ESD region for special education practice, collaboration, data analysis, interventions, and compliance as well as Instructional Coaching. She is a certified Right Response De-Escalation Trainer. She is a vetted regional trainer for Response to Intervention and co-developed the Implementation Integrity Rubric Training for the State of Washington based on the National Center for Response to Intervention Integrity Rubric. She served on the evaluation cadre for two state initiatives: Improving Core Subject Instruction for All Students pilot project and Re-tooling Instruction through Response to Intervention. Before coming to the ESD, she worked as a middle school special education teacher for most of her career. She was a self-contained Resource Room teacher, a Behavior intervention teacher and an inclusion model co-teacher. She also worked for five years as an Instructional Coach with the focus of literacy across content areas.
John A. Mitchell, M. Ed., Principal of Oakwood Elementary School, Clover Park School District. John received his master’s degree from Heritage College and undergraduate degree from Rocky Mountain College. He has taught third, fourth and fifth grades and was a district reading specialist prior to becoming a principal. John has worked successfully as a high school and intermediate school principal and is currently a principal in a grade P-5 school. Under John’s leadership, Oakwood Elementary School has been recognized for being a School of Distinction for the 2011–12 and 2012–13 school years and, in December of 2013, was honored with a state award as a Distinguished Title I, Part A School of Distinction for Closing the Gap in reading. For the 2014–15 school year, John will serve as the principal of Southgate Elementary School, preparing for a merge with Oakwood Elementary in the 2015–16 school year. Both schools will relocate to a state-of-the-art, new Four Heroes Elementary School, which is named after the four fallen Lakewood police officers.

Kathy Shoop, Ed.D. earned both her bachelor’s in English/Theater/Speech Education and master’s degree in Curriculum and Instructional Leadership at Western Washington University. Her doctorate in Educational Leadership is from Seattle Pacific University, where her dissertation focus was on self-reflection and its effect on student achievement. She has 32 years’ experience teaching K–12, six years’ experience teaching college-level education classes at the bachelor’s and master’s levels, and has been an Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning at the Northwest Educational Service District. She retains professional memberships in Phi Delta Kappa, ASCD, WSASCD, WASA, and WERA.

Linda Wert earned a Bachelor of Arts in Social Work and a Master’s Degree in Applied Psychology from Eastern Washington University. She holds general and special education teaching certification jointly from Central, Eastern and Washington State Universities. She also received a school counseling certificate from Eastern Washington University, Reading Recovery certification from Seattle University and Comprehensive Literacy and Intervention District Coach Certification from the Center for Literacy at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. She has also been trained by the State of Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in dyslexia and the training modules developed for professional development in intervention best practices. She is currently completing dissertation work for a PhD. In Reading from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock under the Chairmanship of Dr. Linda Dorn. Ms. Wert has been in the field of education for 28 years in multiple capacities within special and general education including teaching, literacy coaching, and intervention for struggling learners. She is currently the district coordinator for K–6 intervention in English and Language Arts for Spokane Public schools in Spokane, Washington.
**Matt Lemon** conducts applied policy research for the state Legislature with a focus in education. His work in K-12 policy includes studies of innovative schools in Washington and the Learning Assistance Program, which provides academic support to struggling students. His work in higher education has examined a scholarship program for foster youth (Passport to College Promise) and the Washington State Need Grant for low-income undergraduate students. In addition to his research, Matt is a member of the K-12 Data Governance group that oversees the development and implementation of an education data system in Washington State. Matt graduated magna cum laude from Western Washington University with a BA in political science and received a M.P.A. from The Evergreen State College.

**Mike Jacobsen** has 32 years’ experience in K-12 public education in Washington in school psychology, special education and central office administration. He was an invited participant to the National Summit on Interventions sponsored by the National Center on Intensive Interventions, Washington DC in February 2014. Mr. Jacobsen is a Past President of the Washington State Association of School Psychologists, as well as School Psychologist of the Year. For the National Association of School Psychologists, he was State Delegate, Western Regional Director and national Ethics Chair. He has been an Adjunct instructor for Seattle University, University of Washington and University of Washington-Tacoma in Educational Research, Assessment in Special Education, Cognitive Assessment, and Curriculum-Based Measurement of Reading. His current position is Director of Assessment and Curriculum for the White River School District. He has Train-the-Trainer status for the Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction (OSPI) in Response to Intervention. He has been on the Executive Board of the Washington Association of Educational Research, (2009-2012) and Conference Co-Chair (2010), and invited member of OSPI’s, State Technical Advisory Committee (2009-current). Author or co-author on the following publications: Stage, S. A., and Jacobsen, M. D., (2001) Predicting student success on a state-mandated assessment using oral reading fluency. School Psychology Review, 30, 407-419; Jacobsen, M. D., Bolton, J., and Hinshaw, G., (2000) Evaluation of reading on a school-wide basis: Implementation of curriculum-based measurement, Curriculum in Context, 27, 6-9; Jacobsen, M. D., (2012) Use of general outcome measures to assess academic growth, The WERA Educational Journal, 4, 13-15.

**Nancy Duffey**, Director of State and Federal Program, Wenatchee School District. Nancy received her BA in Education, specializing in Child Development and a minor in Reading in 1978. A Masters in Education in Curriculum and Instruction with a specialization in Literacy was obtained in 2000. Principal credentials were completed in June 2006, from Washington State University.
Nancy taught 10 years before becoming a Title/Lap Reading Specialist, specializing in Reading Recovery and direct instruction with small groups. Nancy served as a Title/LAP coordinator for 6 years before moving to her current position in 2005. Nancy has been directly involved with the district’s implementation of full day kindergarten, the state 2nd grade oral fluency assessment, summer school & after school intervention programs, collaborations with Headstart and EPIC, planning with schools in improvement as well as overseeing program specific supplemental interventions. Nancy is directly involved with creating and maintaining building and district RTI structures. This includes developing an assessment system, finding and implementing specific intervention resources; tracking district data to monitor program, building effectiveness and individual student growth and providing professional development about struggling learners. In addition, Nancy has been involved in multiple state committees addressing the issues around instruction for struggling learners, instruction for ELL learners and parent involvement.

Pam Pottle, Bellingham School District, has spent her career as an educator in the Bellingham School District developing and refining her knowledge and skills as a highly effective instructional leader. She has taught primary students for twenty two years and a district learning facilitator, coach, Teacher on Special Assignment for ten years. Pam was selected to be part of a statewide literacy group led by OSPI and Margaret Mooney. She continued that work consulting with the Learning Network throughout Washington and the United States. Pam has provided instruction for both City University and Western Washington University educating pre-service teachers in foundations of education, effective literacy practices and critical pedagogy. In addition to her skillful leadership at a building, district and university level, Pam has been President of the North Sound Reading Council. Currently, she is serving as the President of the Washington State Organization for Reading Development (WORD), which is a branch of the International Reading Association. Pam will be continuing in her district-wide leadership role next year with a focus on facilitating student growth collaborations K–8, mentoring new teachers, coaching and facilitating learning of all educators K–8 and attending the University of Washington as Danforth Educational Leadership candidate.

Roger Chow has been in public education for over 15 years. He has served as an 8th grade Reading Specialist for Denver Public Schools and Team Leader for the Cole Middle School “Turn Around Project.” The Turn Around plan was accepted and implemented by the Denver School Board. He also served as Secondary Literacy Coordinator for Denver public Schools helping to align 6–12 curriculums from a failing model to an inquiry based instruction platform. Roger was part of Denver’s district ELL model which transformed static professional
development to a blended on-line learning process. He has served as an administrator for two high schools and implemented unifying strategies to transform both literacy and math instruction by focusing eliminating of teacher isolation and fostering collaborative communities. Currently Roger is the Director of Tacoma Public Schools where he continues to align curriculum and foster collaboration. He graduated from Middlebury College with a BA in American Studies. He is completing master’s work and doctoral studies at City University in Seattle.

**Saundra Hill, JD** has been Pasco School District’s Superintendent since 2002, but her roots in the community reach back three decades. She came to Pasco in 1982 to work as a Migrant Resource Teacher at Longfellow Elementary. She has also served as an instructional coach to support teachers working with migrant and bilingual students, as Migrant Night School social studies teacher, Migrant Summer School principal, Bilingual Program Administrator, Director of Staff Development and Evaluation, and Director of Special Programs. Prior to beginning in Pasco, Saundra taught in Pe Ell, Washington, where she worked as a Reading Specialist and primary teacher and in Bickleton, Washington, teaching a K–2 combo classroom. She has a Bachelor of Arts degree in Education from the University of Puget Sound, a Master of Arts in Education from Central Washington University in reading and literacy, and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Washington School Of Law. In 2010–11 she was chosen by her peers to serve as president of the Washington Association of School Administrators. She was also selected as the 2013 Washington State Superintendent of the Year. A fierce advocate for all students and families, she has been recognized with several awards and honors from various community groups representing Latino and African American students.
Appendix B: Panel Session Topics

Session 1: Orientation
1. Meet participants, understand roles
2. Set norms for group
3. Identify and practice with collaboration tools
4. Identify charge to group
   a. Discuss relationship to WSIPP project
   b. Expert panel can recommend practices beyond research/evidence based list.
5. Identify boundaries and areas of overlap with other programs (Bilingual Education, Title I, Special Education, Office of Student and School Success, etc.)
6. Discuss branded programs versus core strategies
7. Establish framework for identification of best practices
8. Discuss approach to consensus/majority/minority opinions
9. Brainstorm potential universe of practices to consider
   a. Tutoring
   b. Extended learning time

Session 2: Tutoring and Extended Learning Time
1. What will the menu look like? Provide feedback
   a. How will we evaluate potential best practices and strategies for inclusion?
   b. Should we prioritize, rank or rate the best practices and strategies?
2. Acknowledge overlap between ELT and Tutoring
3. Identify and describe potential practices and strategies to be considered
   a. Tutoring
   b. Extended learning time
4. Where branded programs are listed, identify core success strategies/best practices
5. Straw-vote on identified best practices and strategies
6. Clarify majority/minority opinion where appropriate
7. Identify potential practices and strategies to consider within the following categories:
   a. Consultant Teachers
   b. Professional Development
   c. Family Outreach
   d. Special Assistance for 8th/11th/12th Graders

Session 3: K–4 Focus, Research Review
1. Review public comments from Sessions 1 & 2
2. Discuss focus on K–4 reading in the law and how we should address it in the report
3. Solicit feedback on draft report
4. Identify potential practices and strategies to be considered
   a. Professional Development
   b. Family Involvement
5. Identify research-based or evidence-based practices and strategies
6. Develop initial opinions about inclusion in menu
7. Discuss boundaries for innovative, emerging or promising practices to be considered at next meeting
8. Identify potential practices to be considered
9. Identify writing and editing assignments

Session 4: Other Allowable Categories and Promising Practices
1. Review public comments from Session 3
2. Discuss WSIPP preliminary findings and meta-analysis
3. Clarify difference between best and promising practices
4. Discuss best practices for all K–4 students, all struggling students
5. Identify best practices and strategies involving
   a. Professional Development
   b. Family Involvement
   c. Consultant Teachers
   d. Community Partnerships
   e. Services Under RCW 28a.320.190—Extended Learning Opportunities Program
6. Identify and examine practices outside LAP framework that show promise
7. Determine what and how to include promising practices in report
8. Identify writers for selected best and promising practices

Session 5: Comprehensive Review of Best Practices and Strategies
1. Review public comments from Session 4
2. Review recommendations in core categories
   a. Tutoring
   b. Extended Learning Time
   c. Family Involvement
   d. Consultant Teachers
   e. Professional Development
   f. Community Partnerships
   g. Instructional Models
   h. Promising Practices
3. Identify level of support for each recommendation
4. Clarify majority/minority opinion where necessary
5. Discuss strategies for disseminating and implementing the menu, and providing technical assistance to districts
6. Reflect on the process used to develop the ELA menu and provide suggestions for process improvement for developing the math and behavior menus
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## Appendix D: List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSS-ELA</td>
<td>Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLP</td>
<td>Washington State Birth through 12th Grade Comprehensive Literacy Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELD</td>
<td>English Language Development [Coaches]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>English Language Learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELP</td>
<td>Washington State English Language Proficiency Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD</td>
<td>Educational Service District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSB</td>
<td>Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAP</td>
<td>Learning Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTSS</td>
<td>Multi-Tiered System of Support Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSIPP</td>
<td>Washington State Institute for Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>