

**BEMIDJI AREA SCHOOLS**  
**Read Well by Grade 3**  
**2017–2018 Reading Proficiency Goals and Objectives**

During School Year 2017-2018, Bemidji School district changed our kindergarten and grade 1 testing from AIMSweb to NWEA Primary MAP to have a more consistent districtwide testing system. We will use the following MAP assessment for all students:

- Survey with Goals (MAP) – to measure Multiple Measures

Teachers will also use the following Primary MAP Skills assessments to diagnose students’ reading difficulties:

- Early Literacy Screening – to measure Concepts of Print
- Letter Identification Skills Checklist – to measure Letter Naming
- Manipulation of Sounds Checklist – to measure Phonemic Awareness
- Matching Letters to Sounds Skills Checklist – to measure Letter Sound Correspondence

**Kindergarten**

**Kindergarten Goals:**

1. Kindergarten students will improve their overall Mean RIT score from 140.3 in Fall 2017 to 158.1 in Spring 2018 as measured by NWEA MAP.
2. By May of 2018, 75 % of kindergarten students will correctly read at least 80 % of the words on the Kindergarten Sight Word Checklist (Houghton Mifflin high-frequency words) within 3 seconds when presented in isolation.

**Data Used to Develop Goals:**

1. **Letter Sound Fluency:** In 2016–2017, the following percentages of kindergarten students met the AIMSweb benchmark target (Tier 1). Scores significantly discrepant (below 60% at Tier I) from the norm are shown in red:

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Winter 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>
All Students	57.0%	59.0%	64.0%
American Indian Students	40.4%	45.4%	53.1%
White Students	60.7%	62.4%	66.5%
Students Receiving Free & Reduced Lunch	47.0%	49.0%	53.0%
Students Not Receiving Free & Reduced Lunch	62.6%	66.1%	71.3%
Special Education Students	59.2%	62.0%	55.5%
General Education Students	56.3%	58.6%	64.6%

- If the curriculum and core instruction are effective, at least 80% of students should be meeting the target. Data over the past three years indicates that students are not achieving at expected levels in letter sound fluency.

2. **2017-2018 MAP Reading RIT Scores:** The table below indicates the average MAP RIT Scores for Fall, Winter, and Spring 2017-2018 for all kindergarteners. Scores significantly discrepant (more than 3 points) below the norm are shown in red. Kindergarten performed well Fall 2017 despite the students' lacking the technical ability to take a computerized test.

	Fall 2017		Winter 2018		Spring 2018	
	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT
<b>2017 MAP Reading RIT</b>						
All Kindergarten Students	140.3	141.0		151.3		158.1

- The 2017-2018 Kindergarten percent proficient on the NWEA MAP Reading, according to Test Performance (Average, High and 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile combined) on Viewpoint Data Warehouse:

Fall 2017 Percent Proficient	Winter 2018 Percent Proficient	Spring 2018 Percent Proficient
72.6%		

3. **Sight Word Knowledge:** The district Sight Words Assessment is based on Houghton Mifflin Journeys high frequency words. Proficiency is determined by the number of students who have 32 of 40 kindergarten sight words correct. We determine the results for all students and do not consider subgroups. These results have improved each year and are as follows for the 2016-2017 school year:

Kindergarten Sight Word	Fall 2016	Winter 2017	Spring 2017
All Kindergarten Students	2.1%	22.5%	<b>76.5%</b>

- The Kindergarten Sight Word Goal was exceeded Spring 2017.

## First Grade

### First Grade Goals:

1. Grade 1 students will improve their overall Mean RIT score from 155.3 in Fall 2017 to 177.5 in Spring 2018 as measured by NWEA MAP.
2. By May of 2018, 80% of first grade students will correctly read at least 80% of the words on the First Grade Sight Word Checklist (Dolch word lists) within 3 seconds when presented in isolation.

### Data Used to Develop Goals:

1. **Oral Reading Fluency:** In 2016–2017, the following percentages of first grade students met the benchmark target (Tier 1) in the winter. Scores significantly discrepant (below 60% at Tier I) from the norm are shown in red and strengths (over 75% at Tier I) in green:

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Winter 2016</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>
All Students	46.1%	63.4%
American Indian Students	32.0%	45.7%
White Students	49.1%	67.6%
Students Receiving Free & Reduced Lunch	29.5%	47.6%
Students Not Receiving Free & Reduced Lunch	59.3%	76.2%
Special Education Students	45.4%	50.0%
General Education Students	46.0%	64.0%

- If the curriculum and core instruction are effective, at least 80% of students should be meeting the target. Data over the past three years indicates that students are not achieving at expected levels in oral reading fluency.
2. **2017-2018 MAP Reading RIT Scores:** The table below indicates the average MAP RIT Scores for Fall, Winter, and Spring 2017-2018 for all Grade 1 students. Scores significantly discrepant (more than 3 points) below the norm are shown in red.

	<b>Fall 2017</b>		<b>Winter 2018</b>		<b>Spring 2018</b>	
	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT
<b>2017 MAP Reading RIT</b>						
All Grade 1 Students	155.3	160.7		171.5		177.5

- The 2017-2018 Grade 1 percent proficient on the NWEA MAP Reading, according to Test Performance (Average, High and 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile combined) on Viewpoint Data Warehouse:

Fall 2017 Percent Proficient	Winter 2018 Percent Proficient	Spring 2018 Percent Proficient
51.4%		

3. **Sight Word Knowledge:** The district Sight Words Assessment is based on Dolch word lists. Proficiency is determined by the number of students who have 32 of 40 grade 1 sight words correct. We determine the results for all students and do not consider subgroups. These results have improved each year and are as follows for the 2016-2017 school year:

<b>Grade 1 Sight Words</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Winter 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>
All Grade 1 Students	10.9%	62.3%	94.4%

- The Grade 1 Sight Word Goal was exceeded Spring 2017.

## Second Grade

### Second Grade Goal:

- Grade 2 students will improve their overall Mean RIT score from 169.7 in Fall 2017 to 188.7 in Spring 2018 as measured by NWEA MAP.

### Data Used to Develop Goal:

- MAP Reading RIT Scores:** The table below indicates the average Spring MAP RIT Scores for 2015, 2016, and 2017 for all 2<sup>nd</sup> graders and various subgroups of students. Scores significantly discrepant (more than three points) below the norm are shown in red.

Grade 2 MAP Reading Spring RIT Scores					
	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2018	NWEA Norm RIT
All Students	186.9	188.6	188.1		188.7
American Indian Students	181.2	183.6	182.6		188.7
White Students	188.6	190.5	190.3		188.7
Free & Reduced Lunch Students	182.6	182.9	185.4		188.7
Special Education Students	170.6	175.0	175.0		188.7

- 2017-2018 MAP Reading RIT Scores:** The table below indicates the average MAP RIT Scores for Fall, Winter, and Spring 2017-2018 for all Grade 2 students. Scores significantly discrepant (more than 3 points) below the norm are shown in red.

	Fall 2017		Winter 2018		Spring 2018	
	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT
2017 MAP Reading RIT						
All Grade 2 Students	169.7	174.7		184.2		188.7

- The Grade 2 percent proficient on the NWEA MAP Reading, according to Test Performance (Average, High and 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile combined) on Viewpoint Data Warehouse from 2014 to 2017:

Fall 2014-15	Spring 2014-15	Fall 2015-16	Spring 2015-16	Fall 2016-17	Spring 2016-17
51.9%	65.3%	56.3%	67.7%	54.4%	67.5%

- The 2017-2018 Grade 2 percent proficient on the NWEA MAP Reading, according to Test Performance (Average, High and 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile combined) on Viewpoint Data Warehouse:

Fall 2017 Percent Proficient	Winter 2018 Percent Proficient	Spring 2018 Percent Proficient
53.9%		

## Third Grade

### Third Grade Goal:

- Grade 3 students will improve MCA Reading percent proficient from 51.7% in Spring 2017 to 56.7% in the Spring of 2018.

### Data Used to Develop Goal:

- MCA-Reading Data:** The table below shows the percentages of proficient Grade 3 students enrolled October 1 and disaggregated by various subgroups, on the All Students Reading Assessment Accountability trend report:

All Grade 3 Reading Accountability Test (MCA & MTAS) Proficiency	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
All Students	54.8%	61.1%	56.7%	49.6%	51.7%	
American Indian Students	32.9%	40.8%	21.4%	32.7%	38.7%	
White Students	60.7%	66.8%	65.7%	55.7%	54.5%	
Students Receiving Free & Reduced Lunch	48.6%	52.8%	43.7%	38.3%	38.9%	
Students Not Receiving Free & Reduced Lunch	57.4%	69.6%	77.6%	62.4%	66.5%	
Special Education Students	34.7%	30.6%	36.7%	35.1%	27.5%	
Non-Special Education Students	58.0%	65.5%	60.6%	52.1%	56.4%	

- The percent proficient on the MCA Grade 3 Reading has dropped from 2014 to 2016.

- MAP Reading RIT Scores:** The table below indicates the average Spring MAP RIT Scores for 2015, 2016, and 2017 for all 3rd graders and various subgroups of students. Scores significantly discrepant (more than 3 points) below the norm are shown in red, strengths (more than three points) above the norm are in green.

Grade 3 MAP Reading Spring RIT Scores					
	Spring 2015	Spring 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2018	NWEA Norm RIT
All Students	199.4	197.3	197.9		198.6
American Indian Students	192.4	190.9	194.5		198.6
White Students	201.7	199.6	199.4		198.6
Free & Reduced Lunch Students	194.3	191.8	193.3		198.6
Special Education Students	184.5	180.6	183.6		198.6

- 2017-2018 MAP Reading RIT Scores:** The table below indicates the average MAP RIT Scores for Fall, Winter, and Spring 2017-2018 for all Grade 3 students.

	Fall 2017		Winter 2018		Spring 2018	
	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT	Average RIT	Norm RIT
2017 MAP Reading RIT						
All Grade 3 Students	185.4	188.3		195.6		198.6

- The Grade 3 percent proficient on the NWEA MAP Reading, according to Test Performance (Average, High and 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile combined) on Viewpoint Data Warehouse from 2014 to 2017:

Fall 2014-15	Spring 2014-15	Fall 2015-16	Spring 2015-16	Fall 2016-17	Spring 2016-17
69.4%	71.8%	61.9%	68.3%	62.7%	68.6%

- The 2017-2018 Grade 3 percent proficient on the NWEA MAP Reading, according to Test Performance (Average, High and 95<sup>th</sup> Percentile combined) on Viewpoint Data Warehouse:

Fall 2017 Percent Proficient	Winter 2018 Percent Proficient	Spring 2018 Percent Proficient
61.1%		

### **Current K-3 Practices, Concerns, and Hypotheses Related to Low Performance and Growth:**

**Current Practices** (We will maintain all of these practices.)

- Kindergarten through grade 3 teachers are following the whole group lesson plans in the core reading series.
- More teachers are using the small group lessons than three years ago, and we will continue providing Guided Reading training to help more teachers be successful.
- Title I, AOM, and Special Education programs serve students, mainly in small groups.
- The Indian Education academic support staff members provide support for American Indian Students Reading Well by Third Grade.
- MN Reading Corps tutors use scientifically-based reading interventions to work with the students who are just below proficient.
- The school district has been implementing Response to Intervention (RtI) for eight years. RtI Teams are well established in each building to use data to determine interventions and progress. We have developed a Reading Intervention Cookbook and provided training to teachers in using these interventions. Title II supports an RtI Reading and an RtI Math Specialist.
- The Title I schools have provided their kindergartners with kindergarten packets that include reading and math resources for students to use with their parents at home. Since 2015-2016, District Title I provides these packets for all kindergartners with reading and math materials including: two reading books, sight words, and letters.
- When we replaced our reading curriculum, Title I provided every kindergarten teacher with a Phonemic Segmentation Kit to help them better address this skill that was lacking in their reading curriculum.

- In 2014, we organized a Ready for Kindergarten committee composed of early childhood teachers, Community Education coordinator, elementary principals, MARSS Coordinator, Director of Special Education, and Director of Curriculum. We will continue to meet in 2017-2018.
- In 2014-2015, the district trained additional teachers to be Reading Recovery teachers. They focus on the lowest 20% of first grade students to provide intensive reading and writing interventions.

### **Concerns**

- Teachers feel that at least half of the district's kindergarteners enter school unprepared to understand and learn from the core curriculum at the level and pace of instruction expected (i.e. half of the kindergarteners cannot rhyme in the fall, only half of them reach the fall benchmark target in Letter Naming Fluency, etc.)
- Since our kindergarteners struggle mastering the Grade K curriculum and over half don't reach benchmark targets by the end of that grade, they enter first grade unready to meet the demands of that curriculum.
- About 30% of our first graders struggle with the Grade 1 curriculum and don't reach benchmark targets by the end of that grade. They enter second grade unready to meet the demands of that curriculum.
- About 30% of the district's second graders struggle with the Grade 2 curriculum and don't reach benchmark targets by the end of that grade. They enter third grade unready to meet the demands of that curriculum.
- Teachers feel the district curriculum does not provide enough practice in letter sounds/phonics for children to gain accuracy and automaticity.
- Teachers feel that the core curriculum moves too quickly for most students and assumes more student knowledge than what the students actually have.
- Due to the high levels of poverty and low levels of vocabulary and oral language skills of many students, they do not possess the background knowledge and schema to adequately comprehend or interact effectively with core curriculum text.
- For many children entering kindergarten, their classroom is the first structured learning experience they have had. Many children do not understand expected social and "school" behavior.
- Some special education IEPs are not standards-based, and some special education materials are not aligned with the core.

### **Hypotheses**

- Many students are not learning at an appropriate pace with the core curriculum because they don't have the phonological skills, letter naming skills, concepts of print skills, and other background needed to be successful.

- Parents and caregivers may not know the social, behavioral, and academic skills children need to be ready for kindergarten; therefore, children are not ready for the rigor in the curriculum.
- Some teachers are spending an inordinate amount of time with classroom management, which is taking away from time that could be spent with academics, causing lower assessment scores.
- More emphasis may need to be placed on small group and individual interventions with struggling students.

### **Action Plan**

1. Assess all kindergarten students in age-appropriate phonological awareness skills (Concept of a Spoken Word, Rhyme Recognition, Rhyme Completion, Rhyme Production, Syllable Blending, Syllable Segmentation, Syllable Deletion, and Phoneme Isolation of Initial Sound) three times yearly within benchmarking windows.
2. Continue the kindergarten and first grade sight word assessment three times a year.
3. Continue to fully implement an RtI model of assessment, intervention, and progress monitoring.
4. Increase small group instruction opportunities, with continued assistance from Title I, AOM, and Reading Recovery with increased assistance from Indian Education and Minnesota Reading Corps, to address phonological skill, letter sound, and sight word skill needs based on assessment.
5. Re-design core instructional practice in reading in the fall to “frontload” the following in order to have students reading CVC words and brief sight word phrases by the end of November:
  - Phonological awareness skills (20 hours in the fall)
  - 15 letter sounds, including at least 2 short vowels
  - 10 sight words
6. Increase knowledge about kindergarten readiness among parents and caregivers by:
  - Providing a “Readiness for Kindergarten” checklist online, during spring kindergarten orientation, and in the community.
  - Providing a list of online resources, games, and activities for use at home (Kindergarten Packets).
7. Initiate conversations with Community Education personnel responsible for early childhood programming to develop a plan to increase the number of students age 4 and below who participate in preschool screening (Ready for Kindergarten Committee).
8. Ensure that IEPs are standards-based.

9. Ensure that special education teachers are using materials that are aligned to the district's core program and to ELA standards.
10. Continue Responsive Classroom training and support to improve classroom management. Responsive Classroom was introduced during the 2015-2016 school year. From 2015 to 2016, schools reduced the number of assaults from 152 to 99, a 34.9% decrease. Schools reduced the number of fights from 90 to 49, a 45.6% decrease.