# Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

Local Educational Agency Name: Pajaro Valley Unified School District

Program Lead: Rich Moran Email/Phone: <u>rich\_moran@pvusd.net</u> (831)

Fiscal Lead: Jenny Im Email/Phone: jenny im@pvusd.net (831)

Eligible Participating School(s):

1. Amesti Elementary	6. Select to enter text.
2. Calabasas Elementary	7. Select to enter text.
3. Radcliff Elementary	8. Select to enter text.
4. Select to enter text.	9. Select to enter text.
5. Select to enter text.	10. Select to enter text.

**Supporting Agency or Agencies:** (i.e. Early Literacy Support Block Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): Sacramento County Office of Education

**Background:** Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

**Directions:** For Implementation Year 3 (2023-24), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below and submit this form to <a href="mailto:ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov">ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov</a> by **July 31, 2024**.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

# **Section I: Annual ELSB Report Requirements**

**Requirement:** By checking the boxes below, I am certifying the LEA and schools have submitted this annual report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified in the literacy action plan to:

The	school site council at each eligible school
<b>✓</b>	List the <b>school names</b> and <b>dates</b> of the school site council meetings where the annual ELSB report was provided: Amesti: August 22, 2024 Calabasas: September 11, 2024 Radcliff: September 11. 2024
$\checkmark$	The governing board or body of the LEA
	Provide the date of the governing board meeting: June 26, 2024
$\checkmark$	Publicly posted on the LEA's website, which may be found at the following URL:
Pr	ovide URL
he	re: <a href="https://www.pvusd.net/Departments/Educational-Services/Elementary-Education/index.htm">https://www.pvusd.net/Departments/Educational-Services/Elementary-Education/index.htm</a>
Sect	ion II: How ELSB Funds Were Spent in Year Three
	tions: Please use the check boxes to note which of the following categories the expended ELSB grant funds on and list which school sites used funds for those uses:
□ Cat	egory 1. Access to high-quality literacy teaching, including which of the following:
<b>✓</b>	Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.
<b>✓</b>	Please enter the relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabasas, Radcliff, Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction.
<b>✓</b>	Please enter relevant school sites: Select to enter text.  Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils.
<b>✓</b>	Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the

curriculum framework for English language arts adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE)

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

pursuant to Section 60207 of the Education Code and the use of data to support effective instruction.

Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabasas, Radcliff Comments (optional): ☐ **Category 2:** Support for literacy learning, including which of the following: The purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the English language arts content standards and the curriculum framework for English language arts adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials. Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments. Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Comments (optional): The purchase of a literacy screener to support teacher understanding of student foundational skills needs occurred in the year 2021-22. DIBELS and IDEL created by the University of Oregon and supported through Amplify learning management system has been used by all three sites since the onset of the ELSB grant. ✓ Category 3. Pupil supports, including which of the following: Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction. Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction. Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school. Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice. Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff Expanded access to the school library. Please enter relevant school sites: Select to enter text. Comments (optional): Select to enter text.

✓ Category 4. Family and community support, including which of the following:

# Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

$\checkmark$	Development of trauma-informed practices and support for pupils and families.	
	Please enter relevant school sites: Amesti, Calabas, Radcliff	
$\checkmark$	Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning.	
<b>✓</b>	<b>Please enter relevant school sites:</b> Select to enter text.  Strategies to implement multitiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach.	
<b>✓</b>	Please enter relevant school sites: Select to enter text.  Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home.	
<b>✓</b>	Please enter relevant school sites: Select to enter text.  Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs.	
	Please enter relevant school sites: Select to enter text.	

Comments (optional): Select to enter text.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

## Section III: LEA Support for Eligible Participating School Sites

**Directions:** LEAs that are not eligible for participating school sites should complete this section.

1. What supports did the LEA provide to eligible participating school sites in Year 3 of implementation?

All sites have been provided with the following supports from the District support level: monthly administrators meetings to review grant goals and provide continuing supports, monthly coaches meeting for coach training and site training logistics supports, monthly trainings for support staff such as instructional assistants and intervention teachers to support foundational skills practices, monthly K-3 ELA and ELD training for all three site staff and SIPPS visits from CORE consultant with coaching and feedback.

2. How have the supports impacted the goals noted in the school sites' Literacy Action Plan(s)?

The SMARTe goals created by site ELSB leadership teams were supported through the intentional crafting of site-level professional development sessions on ELD both integrated and designated as well as a focus on distributive practices for foundational skills to close student gaps before they grow. Site coaches supported the implementation of core curriculum for ELA including SIPPS and Benchmark Universe on a daily basis. Site leaders were supported in monthly meetings to address progress toward SMARTe goals throughout the year. A backward map of goals was created for the final grant year of 2023-2024.

3. In what ways will the LEA continue to support and sustain the work begun through the ELSB grant program?

Each site has started a backward map for the school year of 2023-2024. They have common goals such as continuing with professional development around writing, ELD and foundational skills for Tier 1 and Tier 2. Part of this will be fewer trainings by a consultant and more support from the site coach to work with teachers on a weekly basis to plan and implement strong Tier 1 ELA instruction to all students. Evidence of teachers having a strong understanding of state standards and how to achieve the instruction needed to address these standards through lesson study and the intellectual preparation process were a primary focus.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

4. What has the LEA learned as a result of the ELSB grant work that can be applied to current and future support of all school sites?

All three sites are continuing work with Data Review Team meetings after district screener windows to support teachers' understanding of this assessment and how to use it to create intervention plans for students who are at-risk. Diagnostic data will be used alongside this data to support progress monitoring cycles to ensure a reasonable rate of growth is being made by each student. The Lesson Study process fostered a strong degree of grade-level collaboration and specific discussion regarding adjustments to instruction. Continued efforts to support K-3 families through family literacy nights were addressed at each school site as well.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

# Section IV: Statement of Goals, Implementation Year Three Progress, and Course Corrections

**Directions:** For each eligible participating school, please respond to the six questions. Please copy and paste the questions for LEAs with more than three school sites.

#### Eligible Participating School #1: Amesti

1. What are the "big picture" goals stated in the Literacy Action Plan? These can be located in Section 2: Literacy Action Plan Components.

**SMART Goal #1:** We will improve our TK/K-3 collection of valid, predictive & reliable data by administering and analyzing DIBELS and other assessment data three times a year as measured by the assessment calendar, data collection forms, and a data conference schedule by June 2022.

**SMART Goal #2**: We will improve our skill in Distributive Practice instruction and interventions in each Tier of MTSS to support student growth in oral language development, print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics, sight words, fluency, and comprehension based on site literacy data, artifacts from Intentional Learning Communities, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, District assessment calendars, and site leadership meeting agendas by June 2022.

**SMART Goal #3:** We will improve student comprehension instruction using high quality, on-grade level, complex texts by receiving training on strong Tier 1 implementation of Benchmark Advance/Adelante as measured by NWEA MAP, DIBELS/IDEL, Benchmark formative assessments, and MTSS learning goals by June 2023.

2. What are the actions the LEA and school site have taken to progress toward those goals in Year 3 of the grant?

**SMART Goal #1** Amesti takes the DIBLES/IDEL screener three times a year based on the assessment calendar they create and maintain and hold regular PLC data meetings as grade levels to discuss data and make necessary shifts. Those shifts include moving students based on targeted phonics levels. Students are monitored on an annual site spreadsheet for growth and MTSS needs. We also meet with the district Early Literacy Coordinator about site progress.

**SMART Goal #2** We have done everything noted in our SMART Goal including focusing on oral language fluency using EL Dictado teaching our staff about the ELPAC exam and how to incorporate the English language components into the daily core curriculum giving our students a better chance at being successful at reclassification.

#### Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

**SMART Goal #3** We have improved our levels of comprehension using our district-adopted materials and shifting our focus of instruction to student participation and comprehension. Our dual-language classrooms incorporate GLAD English Language Development strategies, phonics, and fluency into science, the English part of the day, to build student vocabulary and comprehension in English. Spanish fluency and comprehension has grown with the use of EL Dictado, Benchmark Advance/Adelante, the use of Fonetica/SIPPS in Kindergarten, first and second grade, and the use of Hegerty for phonological awareness in English classrooms.

3. What are the metrics the LEA and school site are using to measure progress on growth (student data) and/or actions (implementation)?

Amesti uses SIPPS and Fonetica mastery lessons to track student progress and make shifts to instruction according to that data. We also use DIBELS/IDEL at each trimester to make larger shifts to students' focus grouping based on their screener data.

Include Year 3 quantitative results for kindergarten through grade three. In the table below, record the local literacy assessment used and the percentage of students scoring in the proficient (at or above standard) range in each of these grade levels.

Grade Level	Local Literacy Assessment	Current % of Students At or Above Standard
Kindergarten	DIBELS/IDEL	69% / 56%
First Grade	DIBELS/IDEL	36% / 47%
Second Grade	DIBELS/IDEL	40% / 28%
Third Grade	DIBELS/IDEL	28% / 19%

4. Please provide an analysis of the metrics and specifically if the metrics are demonstrating progress towards goals. Compare baseline student data to current student data.

Students in SEI Kinder classrooms went from 35% proficiency as marked by the end of year DIBELS to 69% this school year, a gain of 17%. In each of the three years the Kindergarten, first, and second grades have made gains in end-of-year proficiency scores.

- 5. What has been the most notable change as a result of the site's ELSB grant work?
  - The most notable change is the literacy community. Teachers are working together to meet student needs and are willing to try new concepts and structures of learning. Teachers share students and have regular data meetings to move students to the best placements for targeted needs. As a result students are making literacy gains.
- 6. In what ways will the site continue to support and sustain the work begun through the ELSB grant program?

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

This site will continue to have a district coach to help structure, support, and lead teachers through the LCRSET grant. The goal is that the coach will build sustainability within the site for data meetings, student movement, and teacher-continued education to help the school community continue to grow. Additionally, creating more learning-based literacy events to build parent background on ways to successfully encourage and aid their children with reading and teaching them what to expect and advocate for their needs.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

#### Eligible Participating School #2: Calabasas

1. What are the "big picture" goals stated in the Literacy Action Plan? These can be located in Section 2: Literacy Action Plan Components.

**SMART Goal #1** We will improve our TK/K-3 collection of valid, predictive & reliable data by administering and analyzing DIBELS and other assessment data three times a year as measured by the assessment calendar, data collection forms, and a data conference schedule by June 2022.

**SMART Goal #2** We will improve our skill in Distributive Practice instruction and interventions in each Tier of MTSS to support student growth in oral language development, print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics, sight words, fluency and comprehension based on site literacy data, artifacts from Intentional Learning Communities, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, District assessment calendars and site leadership meeting agendas by June 2022.

**SMART Goal #3** We will improve student comprehension instruction using high quality, on grade level, complex texts by receiving training on strong Tier 1 implementation of Benchmark Advance/Adelante as measured by NWEA MAP, DIBELS/IDEL, Benchmark formative assessments and MTSS learning goals by June 2023.

2. What are the actions the LEA and school site have taken to progress toward those goals in Year 3 of the grant?

**SMART Goal #1**: All students in grades K-3 engaged in the DIBLES screener during Fall, Winter, and Spring. The DIBLES screener expanded in grades K-1 to include the composite screener to help teachers see student needs. The screener helped teachers determine at-risk students and small group needs.

**SMART Goal #2**: SIPPS facilitators were able to model and coach in areas of weakness for classroom and reading intervention teachers who volunteered, which is reading fluency.

**SMART Goal #3:** Teachers in K-3 participated in the Benchmark ELA lesson study cycle with 2 modeled lessons and feedback.

3. What are the metrics the LEA and school site are using to measure progress on growth (student data) and/or actions (implementation)?

DIBELS Predominate measures DIBELS Composite Measures

Include Year 3 quantitative results for kindergarten through grade three. In the table below, record the local literacy assessment used and the percentage of students scoring in the proficient (at or above standard) range in each of these grade levels.

Grade Level	Local Literacy Assessment	Current % of Students At or Above Standard
Kindergarten	DIBELS	55%

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

First Grade	DIBELS	56%
Second Grade	DIBELS	39%
Third Grade	DIBELS	52%

 Please provide an analysis of the metrics and specifically if the metrics are demonstrating progress towards goals. Compare baseline student data to current student data.

**DIBELS Kindergarten:** End of year proficiency is 55%, a loss of 4% compared to end of year Kindergarten 22-23. However over the three years of the ELSB grant we saw year one end at 17% proficient, 59% by the end of year 2 and a slight loss of 55% by year three. This demonstrates that Heggerty is effective in moving students prepared for phonics. The fluency focus helped to increase student practice using phonological and phonics skills. This growth also demonstrated the Benchmark lesson study aided teachers in their ability to teach concisely and focus on capturing the core of the lesson with more focus on student oracy and practice.

**DIBELS First Grade:** End-of-year proficiency was 56%, a gain of 19% from last year. Over the three years of the grant the end of year went from 27% in 21/22, to 375 to 56% an overall the three year gain of 29%. This grade level was assessed using the full composite battery as a model. The mid-year composite had 52% of students at proficiency and beyond. That continued to grow to 56% at the end of the year but was assessed using predominate at the end of the year. Teachers also participate in optional fluency SIPPS coaching and Benchmark lesson study. Teachers were able to learn, practice, and discuss data to make movement which teachers then attribute their student growth to those additives.

**Second Grade:** End-of-year proficiency was 39%, a gain of 5% from last year's ending data. Over the three years of the grant Teachers also participate in optional fluency SIPPS coaching and Benchmark lesson study. Teachers were able to learn, practice, and discuss data to make movement which teachers then attribute their student growth to those additives.

**Third Grade:** End-of-year proficiency was 52%, a gain of 4% from last year. Additionally, this cohort ended at 34% proficiency in second grade last year but continued to improve to 52% at the end of third grade from 48%. Over the three years in the program 3rd grade improved from 31% proficient by the end of the school year on the DIBELS predominate measure assessments to 52% a gain of 21% over the three years of the grant Teachers also participated in optional fluency SIPPS coaching and Benchmark lesson study which aided in the growth of student achievement and helped teachers focus on the targeted student needs.

What has been the most notable change as a result of the site's ELSB grant work?

Three years of continued growth in literacy as determined by DIBLES screeners. That growth has been due to a focus on literacy in the classroom and community. This includes family literacy events, data discussion, focused literacy interventions, and more

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

administration oversight and management. This site needed help with maintaining a coach in the role. A coach kept teachers working on building fluency into daily practice and held family literacy nights to engage the community. This was available and lasted after the coach left the site. A coach is key to improving this site but may need a coach to build a community among the staff to be open to change and continued literacy learning.

5. In what ways will the site continue to support and sustain the work begun through the ELSB grant program?

This site will continue in the LCRSET grant to hire a site coach, continue regular PLC meetings, increase family literacy events, and make shifts to literacy schedules so the focus stays on targeting student needs so students can be placed in correct groups, moving students regularly to reduce long term intervention., The largest need at this site is educating the staff in meaningful ways so children are the focus of literary decisions. This site can make growth but shifts in practices need to occur to reach student proficiency levels.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

#### Eligible Participating School #3: Radcliff

1. What are the "big picture" goals stated in the Literacy Action Plan? These can be located in Section 2: Literacy Action Plan Components.

**SMART Goal #1:** We will improve our TK/K-3 collection of valid, predictive & reliable data by administering and analyzing DIBELS and other assessment data three times a year as measured by assessment calendar, data collection forms, and a data conference schedule by June 2022.

**SMART Goal #2**: We will improve our skill in Distributive Practice instruction and interventions in each Tier of MTSS to support student growth in oral language development, print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics, sight words, fluency and comprehension based on site literacy data, artifacts from Intentional Learning Communities, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, District assessment calendars and site leadership meeting agendas by June 2022.

**SMART Goal #3:** We will improve student comprehension instruction using high quality, on grade level, complex texts by receiving training on strong Tier 1 implementation of Benchmark Advance/Adelante as measured by NWEA MAP, DIBELS/IDEL, Benchmark formative assessments and MTSS learning goals by June 2023.

2. What are the actions the LEA and school site have taken to progress toward those goals in Year 3 of the grant?

Progress towards goal #1:

**DIBELS/IDEL Benchmark Screener:** All students in grades K-3 engage in the DIBELS/IDEL screener during the Fall, Winter, and Spring. DIBELS/IDEL Screener helped teachers see students who were strategic and at risk. It was good to see how teachers identified the importance of closing the gap on a moving target. They began to use progress monitoring and truly analyze the correlation between attendance and the intentional focus it takes to see just how important monitoring student-teacher touch points of targeted interventions are. The Spring data report and analysis will inform student groupings and instruction for the coming school year.

**Progress Monitoring:** During the 2023-2024 school year we continued to use progress monitoring and truly analyze the correlation between data and the intentional focus it takes determine the value of monitoring student-teacher touch points of targeted interventions are. We found that we refined our ability to offer the support students needed when they needed it. DIBELS and NWEA MAP data were used for progress monitoring students focusing on students scoring in the strategic and at-risk bands. We were able to see success for several students through our progress-monitoring efforts.

**DRT's:** Teachers are invested in the data review process. This process has helped them see the need to focus on the Literacy Framework and identify what part of the framework is missing and the

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

need to provide targeted and intentional support for the efficiency of student success. They know that they need to continue to work to close the gap on the moving target, and that can only happen with strong core instruction, a sense of urgency, and progress monitoring with intentional effective tier 2 distributive practice that yields results reflected in the data. Teachers were released to attend DRT meetings which leadership facilitated to ensure teachers learned to review their data and dig deeper into the raw scores to understand error analysis.DIBELS screener was used to determine at-risk students and students who scored in the strategic band. We continued to use SIPPS diagnostic Mastery Tests to determine interventions for small groups and individual students.

#### **Progress Towards Goal #2:**

**Heggerty:** All teachers were provided continued training and support as well as opportunities to participate in a coaching cycle to improve routines maximizing the acquisition of phonemic awareness skills.

**SIPPS Lesson Study:** Each site participated in 2 lesson studies supported by CORE Literacy Consultant to ensure best practices were utilized in every classroom.

**Site Level Coaching Support for Goal #2:** Site-level literacy coach supported with a variety of professional developments, lesson studies, training for support staff, and coaching cycles to ensure students were receiving the maximum opportunity for success.

MTSS Process: Leadership continued to train staff on the MTSS process. They continued to utilize processes they had created (a computer file to ensure no paperwork would be lost and that any system and instruction put in place for students would be tracked to the upcoming teacher) to continue to foster fidelity to the process and student success. They provided ongoing training to support best practices within the MTSS process.

**Reading Intervention:** The literacy coach has assembled and helped analyze data to ensure that the Intervention students receive instruction that directly addresses their immediate needs

**Progress Towards Goal #3 Again**, all teachers participated in 3 days of lesson study, focusing on tier I reading comprehension strategies. After these lesson study days, the literacy coach had a variety of coaching cycles. The second-grade team participated in co-teaching the unit 3 writing lessons for two weeks. All teachers participated in 2 half-day virtual PD sessions focused on tier 1 supports around ELD and writing. Kindergarten teachers participated in co-teaching & debriefing the next writing unit with the literacy coach. Third-grade teachers used the Benchmark unit assessments as formative assessments.

.

3. What are the metrics the LEA and school site are using to measure progress on growth (student data) and/or actions (implementation)?

Ask Brooke for a copy of this year's current dashboard.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

Include Year 3 quantitative results for kindergarten through grade three. In the table below, record the local literacy assessment used and the percentage of students scoring in the proficient (at or above standard) range in each of these grade levels.

Grade Level	Local Literacy Assessment	Current % of Students At or Above Standard
Kindergarten	DIBELS	59%
First Grade	DIBELS	31%
Second Grade	DIBELS	47%
Third Grade	DIBELS	28%

 Please provide an analysis of the metrics and specifically if the metrics are demonstrating progress towards goals. Compare baseline student data to current student data.

#### Radcliff:

#### **DIBELS**

In kindergarten, the number of students needing intensive support dropped from 68% to 20%. This is important for two reasons. Kinder students began the year in better condition ( 68% at intensive vs 80% in 2022) than in previous years and made the greatest amount of progress since 2021. Students in Core or Core Plus More increased from 22% to 59%, representing a 37% increase. The number of students needing strategic support increased from 0% to 32%. This means our instruction was effective for a lot of the most struggling students. We will continue to focus on strong Tier One instruction so that this level of progress can be realized by all learners, in all grade levels.

In first grade, the number of students needing intensive support dropped from 85% to 38%. The number of students at Core and Core Plus More increased from 8% to 31%. Although fewer students reached these performanc bands, a greater number of students were able to demonstrate growth and move out of the intensive band (in 2022 50% needed intensive support at the end of the year vs 38% in 2023.) First grade has made significant progress in instruction since the inception of the grant in 2021. That being said, we will continue to focus on strong Tier One instruction so that this level of progress can be realized by all learners, in all grade levels.

In second grade, the number of students needing intensive support decreased from 60% to 43%. Although this was a marked improvement from the previous year, this cohort of students still requires attention. Additionally, the number of students requiring strategic support remained constant at 10%. Conversely, the number of students in the core and core support bands increased from 29% to 47%.

In third grade, there was a decrease of 16% in the number of students needing intensive support, from 71% to 38%. The number of students needing strategic support doubled from 10% to 20%. Furthermore, the students in Core and Core Plus More grew from 13% to 28%.

Implementation Year 3: 2023-24

Even though this number is a bit lower than last year (34%,) the overall distribution and growth of students in the 3rd grade was more equitable: benefiting a greater number of students across the bands.

Once again we saw the biggest decrease in students needing intensive support in kindergarten. We attributed that growth to the implementation of the Heggerty curriculum and the strong support occurring in that grade level by the instructional assistants. All grade levels decreased the percentage of students needing intensive support. The percentage of students scoring in core and core support increased by 14% during the 2023-24 school year.

5. What has been the most notable change as a result of the site's ELSB grant work? The following have been identified as the most significant changes as a result fo the site's ELSB grant work...

There has been a shift in instructional practice. We have shifted how we deliver curriculum, how we use staffing, and how we monitor progress. Additionally, our ability to administer universal screeners, analyze data, and modify instruction has also grown significantly. Finally, our ability to collaborate as grade levels, and as a site has improved and has served as a source of energy and urgency in regards to improving student achievement.

6. In what ways will the site continue to support and sustain the work begun through the ELSB grant program?

Radcliff Elementary will continue to refine our instruction, our use of data-based decisions, and overall collaboration. We will also continue to bolster (through coaching, professional learning, master scheduling, and collaboration) our ability to deliver the strongest Tier 1 instruction, maintaining fidelity to curricula, and ensuring equitable access to all learned.