

**Public Awareness Subcommittee
Special Reading Subcommittee (Joint Meeting)**

Monday, January 27, 2014
10:00 a.m.
Blatt Building, Room 433

A G E N D A

I. Welcome and introductions
Ms. Barbara Hairfield, Chair

II. Action: Approval of PA subcommittee minutes – May 20, 2013

III. Action: Approval of Reading subcommittee minutes – May 20, 2013

IV. PK-20 Reading Initiative Update – *Rainey Knight and Dana Yow*

V. Communications / Public Relations Plan FY 2012-13 Update -- *Dana Yow*

VI. 2014-15 Communications Plan Discussion

VII. Other Business

J. Phillip Bowers

Anne H. Bull

Mike Fair

Margaret Anne Gaffney

Barbara B. Hairfield

Nikki Haley

R. Wesley Hayes, Jr.

Alex Martin

John W. Matthews, Jr.

Daniel B. Merck

Joseph H. Neal

Andrew S. Patrick

Neil C. Robinson, Jr.

J. Roland Smith

Patti J. Tate

John Warner

David Whittemore

Mick Zais

Public Awareness Subcommittee Members

Ms. Barbara Hairfield, Chair

Sen. Mike Fair

Mr. Alex Martin

Rep. Andy Patrick

Mr. John Warner

Mr. David Whittemore

Special Reading Subcommittee Members

Ms. Barbara Hairfield, Chair

Mr. Philip Bowers

Sen. Mike Fair

Mr. Alex Martin

Mr. David Whittemore

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Public Awareness Subcommittee

Minutes of the Meeting

May 20, 2013

Subcommittee Members Present: Barbara Hairfield, Rep. Andy Patrick, and David Whitemore,

Staff Present: Melanie Barton, Dana Yow, and Regina King

Guest Present: Vladimir Patrick

I. Welcome and introductions

Ms. Hairfield called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes from the January 28, 2013, Public Awareness subcommittee meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Reading Public Awareness Campaign

Ms. Yow discussed a statewide public awareness campaign focused on reading, which will continue the focus that the EOC has put on literacy for almost a decade. The committee looked at a billboard design that will begin running around the state on June 1. Outdoor advertising will be placed in the following locations: three on I-85; one on I-20 near Aiken; one in the Columbia area; one in the Charleston area; one in Sumter; two along the I-95 corridor; and two in the Pee Dee area. The billboards will run as public service announcements and will be placed through the SC Outdoor Advertising Association. The EOC will be responsible for materials and labor; the space will be provided free of charge. The billboards will run for at least one year.

Subcommittee members also looked at a draft of a reading brochure that is being developed for the SC Baptist Convention, a group considering adopting literacy as a statewide platform. Subcommittee members discussed the design of the brochure and discussed potential distribution points. Once the draft is complete, EOC staff will forward to a group of instructional leaders for review and community groups to develop an initial print run.

III. Teacher Appreciation Campaign

Ms. Yow discussed an outdoor advertising campaign that is currently running to thank teachers for all they do for SC students. The boards are running in celebration of Teacher Appreciation Month. Digital boards are running the following locations: Irmo/Harbison (Columbia); Northeast Columbia; Downtown Columbia/Vista; Indian Land/Fort Mill; Lexington; Charleston; Anderson; and Florence.

IV. 2013-14 Family Friendly Standards

Subcommittee members looked at the draft of the SC Family Friendly Standards website, which will be located at www.scfriendlystandards.org. When the Spanish version of the site is loaded and domain issues are resolved, the site will be announced and made available to schools and districts before the end of the year. It also includes family-friendly material for Common Core published by the Council of Great City Schools. Subcommittee members discussed the book lists on the site, which were published in an Appendix of the Common Core State Standards. To alleviate concern from parents that the list would be required, EOC staff was asked to further refine the language on the site about the suggested reading lists. The subcommittee also viewed a three-minute video developed by the Council of Great City Schools that explains Common Core in very simple terms. The video is located at <http://cgcs.org/Page/380>.

V. Other Business

Ms. Hairfield recognized the staff for *The Reading Performance in South Carolina* document, published by the EOC in Feb. 2012, which was recognized recently as a 2012 Notable State Document. The award, one of four notable documents, was presented to the EOC on May 13 by the SC State Library.

Subcommittee members discussed strategies related to assisting struggling readers with SCDE staff in the audience at the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
Special Reading Subcommittee

Minutes of the Meeting

May 20, 2013

Subcommittee Members Present: Barbara Hairfield, Philip Bowers, Sen. Mike Fair, Alex Martin, and David Whittemore

Staff Present: Melanie Barton and Dana Yow

I. Call to order

Ms. Hairfield called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. The minutes from the March 18, 2013, Special Reading subcommittee meeting were approved as submitted.

II. Review of pending legislation

Ms. Barton updated the subcommittee on the status of Read to Succeed legislation and distributed a potential amendment to S.516. There are two bills currently in the House and one in the Senate. The legislation is not expected to pass this session; therefore, the EOC is planning work for the interim that will both communicate the intent of the legislation to those affected and strengthen sections of it. Subcommittee members discussed the upcoming work as well as the amendment.

III. Survey of school districts

Subcommittee members reviewed results of surveys from 16 districts who responded to a survey on the legislation sent out from the EOC. Districts were asked to provide their general observations of the bill and specify any questions they have about the legislation.

Subcommittee members discussed the results of the survey and asked that staff keep them updated during the interim.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Update to the EOC on the
P-20 Initiative to Improve
Reading Performance



**SC EDUCATION
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE**

PO Box 11867 | 227 Blatt Building | Columbia SC 29211 | WWW.SCEOC.ORG

Development of State Early Literacy Plan

The EOC has been working with Dr. Baron Holmes who is developing a plan that challenges stakeholders to improve early literacy by focusing on what abilities must be focused on with very young children and who should be charged with nurturing these skills.

On November 14, a group of early childhood leaders met to discuss how family literacy programs, family services programs, center-based programs, and community organizations could collaborate to provide services designed to promote high levels of early literacy. A follow-up meeting in early 2014 is being planned.

The EOC is also working with Bud Ferillo at the USC Children's Law Center on producing a video on the development of reading skills throughout a person's life. Through interviews with experts and practitioners, the final product will look at the importance of language and reading on the brain development of infants, the need for K-12 students to have access to materials and teachers trained in diagnosing and intervening when students have reading difficulties, as well as the role reading has on the economic development of SC. The video is scheduled to be available in February 2014 to coincide with the release of SC's progress toward the 2020 Vision.

Stakeholders involved:

Leigh Bolick, SC Dept. of Social Services

Callee Boulware, SC Reach Out and Read

Bill Brown, University of SC School of Education

Penny Danielson, SC Dept. of Education

Mary Lynne Diggs, SC Head Start

Tim Ervolina, United Way Association of SC

Baron Holmes, University of SC

Sara Beth King, Nurse Family Partnership

Mary Anne Matthews, SC First Steps

Lynne Noble, Columbia College

Karen Oliver, United Way of the Midlands

Debbie Robertson, SC First Steps

Bunnie Ward, United Way of the Midlands

Early Childhood Literacy Draft Discussion Paper

Prepared by Baron Holmes and Liyun Zhang

Introduction

The Read to Succeed legislation challenges SC stakeholders to improve early literacy dramatically by answering and then acting on the following: a) What literacy abilities must be cultivated; b) For whom; c) When; d) Addressed by which programs; e) Addressed how; therefore: f) What must be done by whom and how they must do it.

What literacy abilities must be cultivated: oral language (receptive & expressive), written language skills, interactive & independent reading, reading comprehension, motivation to read, and writing.

For whom: young children demonstrating low language and literacy ability & skills predictive of being unable in school to “substantially demonstrate reading proficiency”. Research shows widening language deficits beginning as early as when children begin to talk and substantial deficits soon afterward in their literacy development.

When: as early as the children and their serious deficits can be identified accurately.

Addressed by: center-based early care & education (ECE) programs, Head Start, and schools; and parents receiving support from Family Literacy services.

How: through evidence-based literacy development programs and practices with proven effectiveness for enhancing language and literacy skills.

What must be done and how: promote receptive and expressive language skills, print awareness, and emergent literacy skills, including early writing. These skills should be promoted through substantial interactive dialogue of increasing complexity, reading to and with the child, encouraging and guiding inventive writing and emergent spelling skills, and nurturing development of both comprehension skills and ability to express understandable and increasingly complex thoughts, information, and explanations.

What must be done and how they must do it: Parents and family members should engage each child in: extensive dialogue and interactive discussion to build increasingly complex inquiry and expressive skills; exposure to print through interactive reading; and development of rudimentary writing which expresses ideas and messages of growing clarity.

What must be done and how they must do it: Center-based programs, because of their challenging child-to-adult ratios, generally must pursue language & literacy development through small and large group reading, through productive child-to-child dialogue, and during literacy-infused play. Since most adult dialogue in center-based programs with an individual child is inevitably intermittent and of short duration, the dialogue must be used purposefully to build skills of expression, analysis, and persuasion involving increasingly complex language and thoughts. Staff must be creative and organized in promoting child language and literacy through shared peer projects and collaborative activities, such as during center-time activities.

What must be done and how they must do it: Community Literacy Collaboratives can promote language and literacy through diverse opportunities for family, child, and community

interaction. Community programs can bring together families with their young children for a wide variety of activities that enhance language and literacy development. These programs can be sponsored by such organizations as churches in which families of young children are already members or through specially created programs emphasizing literacy development or simply infusing child literacy as part of a broader array of offerings. An explicitly literacy-focused program might be a book fair with story-character plays & puppet theater, all organized around specific books which parents and family read with their children before and after the book fair.

The early literacy challenge: Although families have most of the contact time with children up to age 5, the dearth of conclusive evaluation evidence on family literacy programs as typically implemented thus far provides little assurance that these programs will enable families to improve their children's language and literacy substantially. However, much research has been done on early literacy development through small, well-planned interventions and observational studies. These studies found promising early literacy growth results that could and should be replicated by family literacy, center-based, and community language and literacy development programs.

Which major programs serve and can thus provide access to how many children (or families) of what ages (before 5 will be what most programs would be able to identify): [to be determined for the following]

- Family literacy = PAT, NFP, PCHP, Healthy Families, Healthy Steps, Early Start
- Family services: pediatricians and other primary care, WIC, TANF, SNAP, Parts C&B
- Center-based programs: child care, Head Start, Early Head Start, and 4K preschool
- Community: libraries, churches (child care and Sunday school), and United Ways

Which of the programs serving young children address literacy and how? [Summarize briefly in this discussion document the currently delivered literacy promotion efforts. Then ask each of the organizational contacts to summarize succinctly how much is done for how many of which children; their longer summaries can be presented as appendices to the report.]

Literacy deficits: Literacy deficits have typically been publicized for 3rd grade reading proficiency when standardized testing begins with the high stakes consequences of retention in grade, referral to special education, and stigma for teachers and schools with large numbers of students failing to achieve proficiency. The most widely used reading data comparable across states comes from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, which is administered first in the 4th grade. This carefully constructed assessment is administered in every state. The 2013 NAEP in South Carolina found that only 28% of 4th graders tested proficient in reading, but 40% scored below basic and the remaining 32% scored at the basic level. For the US overall, 34% were proficient in reading and 33% were below basic. Subgroup disparities have been alarmingly large in SC. The 2013 NAEP rates of 4th graders scoring below basic were: 51% vs. 21% for poor vs. not poor children, 53% vs. 28% for black vs. white students, and 43% vs. 35% for males vs. females. The rates scoring proficient in 4th grade were: 17% vs. 46% poor vs. not poor, 13% vs. 39% black vs. white, and 35% vs. 31% female vs. male. These substantial deficits and achievement gaps did not develop primarily in grades 3&4 but rather through limited

language and literacy experiences at home and in center-based programs starting from infancy. The limited data available in SC is presented below.

On the last SC Readiness Assessment, teachers rated as “not consistently ready” one-quarter of kindergarten and 1st grade students in reading and writing and one-third in their communication skills. The Stanford Reading First test in the fall of 1st grade determined that in high-poverty schools 54% needed substantial intervention, while only 20% of students had reading skills at grade level.

SCRA 2008	Reading (% not consistently ready)	Writing (% not consistently ready)	Communication (% not consistently ready)
Kindergarten	24%	20%	32%
1 st grade	25%	28%	33%

Stanford Reading First 2004-2008	At Grade Level	Needs Substantial Intervention %
1 st grade	20%	54%
2 nd grade	36%	31%
3 rd grade	26%	47%

Children who are slow in becoming capable readers:

- **Reached school far behind in language and literacy skills, primarily because of family literacy deficits.** High-risk children constituting one-quarter of all 4-year-olds were found by the DIAL screening assessment to have low language skills as compared with national norms: 19% below 95% of all students nationally; 30% below 90% nationally; and 50% below 75% nationally.
- The Stanford Reading First test found that 41% of students entering 1st grade in high poverty schools have Speaking Vocabulary which needs substantial intervention, while only 37% have Speaking Vocabulary at grade level of national norms.

DIAL Language at entry to 4K preschool		
(% SC students scoring at national percentiles)	Percent	Ratio
At or below 5 th percentile	19%	4:1

At or below 10 th percentile	30%	3:1	
At or below 25 th percentile	50%	2:1	

Stanford Reading First Speaking Vocabulary in Fall of 1st grade (at risk schools 2004-2008):	
At grade level	37%
Needs additional intervention	22%
Needs substantial intervention	41%

- Exhibited serious phonological or other reading difficulties:** The Stanford Reading First test found that one-third of children entering 1st grade in high poverty schools need substantial intervention for phonemic awareness and phonics.

Stanford Reading First Phonemic Awareness (at risk schools in Fall of 2004-2008):	1 st grade	2 nd grade	3 rd grade
At grade level	56%	65%	78%
Needs additional intervention	11%	21%	15%
Needs substantial intervention	33%	14%	6%

Stanford Reading First Phonics (at risk schools in Fall of 2004-2008):	1 st grade	2 nd grade	3 rd grade
At grade level	28%	9%	8%
Needs additional intervention	42%	35%	26%
Needs substantial intervention	30%	56%	66%

A matrix profile of students with serious reading problems in 3rd grade was created by linking disadvantaged children from a 1995/96 birth cohort to their outcomes on the Stanford Reading First (SRF) test for grade 3. These children were predominately low income (75% free & reduced lunch) and non-white (77%), mainly from lower SES school districts which participated in the Reading First program. The chart below shows the SRF rates of very low performance (below the national 20th percentile classified as Needs Substantial Intervention = NSI) for a variety of risk groups listed in the first column. Most of these risk groups have been identified as disproportionately having the worst educational and risk-taking (teen pregnancy, juvenile justice) outcomes as compared with the full SC population of public school students. Grade 3 is the point at which the frequently repeated “truism” is said to require a major shift from “learning to read” to “reading to learn”. Thus the Reading Comprehension column is an important reflection of which risk groups with a predominately low income, minority population are most in need of substantial reading intervention services, not only in the 3rd grade and beyond but more importantly previously during early childhood and grades K-3. Overall 31% of the students in the Reading First schools needed substantial intervention for their reading comprehension, as compared with 22% for those with none of the 3 highest risk factors. The children with these risk factors had the highest rates of needing substantial intervention for reading comprehension deficits: a) 41% for low literacy family (mother with less than a high school degree); b) 43% for disabled children; c) 43% for having an emotional-behavioral problems identified by the kindergarten teacher. Of students with 2 of these 3 risk factors, 49% needed substantial intervention. For demographic groups, 39% of minority males, 28% of minority females, 23% of white males, and 21% of white females needed substantial intervention. The NSI rates for other reading competencies are shown in the table below. Overall the highest rate was for Phonics (51%), followed by vocabulary development (36%), Reading Comprehension (31%), Oral Reading (30%), and Reading Fluency (29%). The lowest NSI rates were for 21% for Speaking Vocabulary and for Phonemic Awareness. As an approach for targeting and screening young children with the high risk of serious reading problems, the risk factor characteristics from this cohort analysis would provide a starting point. The young children to be targeted could include those: 1) born into low literacy families such as a mother who did not complete high school; 2) having speech and language disability; 3) having emotional-behavioral and executive functioning deficits; and with other somewhat less predictive risk factors such as low income, male, English as a second language, and lack of family support and stability (including abuse, neglect, & foster care). These factors should be used only to identify children for screening. Decisions about selection for language and literacy intervention should be based on the screening and then on further diagnostic assessment to determine verifiable language and literacy needs to be addressed through appropriate services.

Thus the rows of the matrix table specify For whom and the columns present What reading deficiencies must be addressed. Not presented in the table are How and By which programs the reading deficits should be addressed. However, the various sections of this paper will review research and data that explain Which programs address What reading competencies and How they must be addressed at home and through center-based services.

[Present any additional language and literacy data available before 4K (use ECLS-B&K); then any school district data from MAP, etc., PASS 3rd grade ELA, NAEP reading 8th, TEC reading scores, etc.]

Early identification: It has been 13 years since the passage of the First Steps to School Readiness legislation, 24 years since Family Literacy programs were created through the 1989 Target 2000 legislation, and 29 years since preschools for 4-year-olds were initiated by the EIA of 1984. Despite the passage of several important legislative acts and despite of the passage of decades of implementation, there is still little data assessing needs, determining progress, and evaluating effectiveness of our early childhood efforts. This is certainly the case for early literacy. It is now time to: 1) decide what assessments should be administered to whom, 2) collect representative sample data to reflect the statewide picture for priorities such as early language & literacy, and 3) identify the children with serious language & literacy deficits requiring services, training, and supports. To remedy the rarity of formally recorded and reported early identification and the consequential limited data, what additional data should be gathered by whom for which children? All potential reporting sources could be asked to receive training for performing initial language & literacy screenings. The trained screeners would report into a literacy skills bank the deficits data and contact information for each child with low language and literacy skills. The data would be used to assure attention in all programs' admission decisions and to alert programs to a child's potential need for receiving such language and literacy support as may be available. The data could also be used to guide child-find recruitment by Head Start, 4K preschool, disability programs, community services, family literacy, book distributions, etc. Additional trained assessors could be designated in each larger community or region to perform more reliable literacy assessment on children identified through the screening as potentially at-risk. The assessors could also train program personnel how to perform their own language and literacy assessments more reliably.

Literacy competency components: The eight competencies listed below were identified through detailed examination of three dozen journal articles on early literacy development, but do not constitute a definitive list.

1. Oral language: a) expressive (vocabulary, spoken sentence structure, communication content and coherence); b) receptive (vocabulary, listening comprehension, phonemic awareness)
2. Written language skills: (alphabet knowledge, print concepts/awareness, invented spelling, early decoding, word recognition, concepts about book reading, decontextualized language, literacy register, sentence structure, grammar, syntax)
3. Writing: individual words, phrases, sentences, spelling, text content and coherence
4. Comprehension
5. Motivation to read
6. Child participation during reading:
 - a) Reading to an adult,
 - b) Listening to the adult reading,
 - c) Responding to adult reading,
 - d) Answering questions,

- e) Labeling,
 - f) Narrating the story
 - g) Interpreting,
 - h) Predicting,
 - i) Drawing on own experience
7. Effects on adult language and literacy behaviors resulting from child speech, reading ability, & comprehension strengths
 8. Independent reading

The eight literacy competencies listed above should be compared with the competencies identified by the National Early Literacy Panel report based upon an exhaustive set of meta-analyses.

Two recent documents provided consensus or narrative summaries of a portion of the research literature concerning the relationship between early precursor skills and later conventional literacy skills. Snow, Burns, and Griffin (1998), in their report of the National Research Council’s panel on preventing reading difficulties in young children, identified weaknesses in oral language, phonological awareness (PA), and alphabet knowledge (AK) as prime targets of intervention to prevent the occurrence of significant reading problems. Similarly, Whitehurst and Lonigan (1998) identified skills in the domains of oral language, print and letter knowledge, and phonological processing as encompassing two aspects (outside-in and inside-out skills) of emergent literacy that are related to later conventional forms of reading and writing. Whereas these two documents provided the beginnings of a structure to understand those skills that may serve as the developmental precursors to reading and writing abilities, neither document was based on a comprehensive summary of the published literature.

Summary of Primary Analyses: *When measured in kindergarten or earlier, several variables are moderate to strong predictors of later outcomes in conventional literacy. A summary of the results of the three meta-analyses and a summary of findings from multivariate studies are shown in Table 2.4 for literacy-related variables with at least a moderate zero-order [correlational] relationship with at least one conventional literacy outcome. Strength of relationship is based on the following ratings (0–0.29 = small; 0.30–0.49 = moderate; ≥ 0.50 = strong). Ten variables meet this criterion. Of these 10 variables, six variables [alphabet knowledge (AK), phonological awareness (PA), rapid naming of letters and digits, rapid naming of objects and colors, “writing or writing name,” phonological short-term*

Table 2.4. Summary of Meta-Analytic and Multivariate Results for Literacy-Related Predictor Variables with Moderate to Strong Relationships with Conventional Literacy Outcomes

Predictor Variable	Decoding	Reading Comprehension	Spelling	Multivariate Significance
AK	++	+	++	Yes
PA	+	+	+	Yes
Concepts about print	+	++	+	Sometimes
RAN letters and digits	+	+	NA	Yes
RAN objects and colors	+	+	+	Yes
Writing or writing name	+	+	+	Yes
Oral language	+	+	+	Sometimes
Phonological STM	—	+	+	Yes
Visual perception	—	—	+	No
Print awareness	—	+	NA	NA

Note: ++ = strong relationship based on zero-order correlations; + = moderate relationship based on zero-order correlations; — = weak relationship based on zero-order correlations; NA = no relevant data available for analysis.

memory (STM)] were consistently related to later conventional literacy outcomes, and these six variables continued to be predictive when other variables were controlled in multivariate analyses. Most of these findings are the result of a relatively large number of studies that included a large number of children. Consequently, these relationships between these variables and later conventional literacy outcomes not only are sizable, but they are likely to be highly reliable and stable.

Overall Summary: *These results provide compelling evidence as to what some of the important early developing precursor skills are to reading, writing, and spelling development. Across three different outcome domains—decoding, reading comprehension, and spelling—a consistent collection of predictor variables emerged that possess moderate to strong relationships to these important outcomes. In many cases, these variables provided significant prediction of later literacy outcomes even when other variables were controlled. Based on these findings, there is strong evidence for the importance of AK, PA, rapid naming tasks, “writing or writing name,” and phonological STM as predictors of later reading and writing skills. Less consistent evidence exists for the importance of oral language and concepts about print as predictors of later reading and writing skills, mainly because these variables do not always continue to predict literacy outcomes once other variables, such as AK or PA, are controlled.*

The important predictor variables continued to have moderate to strong relationships with later measures of literacy regardless of the age at which the predictor variable was assessed (e.g., preschool versus kindergarten) or the age at which the outcome variable was assessed (e.g., kindergarten versus first or second grade). Although there were some minor differences involving age of assessment of the predictor variable, age did not influence the strongest predictor variables. Greater differences were observed depending on when the outcome assessments were administered; generally, there were higher correlations with kindergarten outcomes than with first- or second-grade outcomes. However, this is most likely due to the closer time proximity of these assessments than to age differences, per se.

Implications for Research and Practice: *The results suggest a need for more careful study of the role of oral language in literacy development. Some aspects of oral language were clearly more strongly related to later literacy outcomes than were other aspects of oral language. Notably, measures of simple vocabulary knowledge were fairly weak predictors of later decoding and reading comprehension, and these measures tended to not remain significant when other variables were included in multivariate analyses. In contrast, more complex aspects of oral language, such as grammar, definitional vocabulary, and listening comprehension, had more substantial predictive relations with later conventional literacy skills. These results suggest that an instructional focus on vocabulary during the preschool and kindergarten years is likely a necessary but insufficient approach to promoting later literacy success.*

The value of these variables for predicting later literacy success is without question, and future research could help to provide systematic investigation into which combinations of predictors would work best in various contexts. There is less certainty that teaching these variables early on will result in later achievement improvement. This is because these studies provide correlational data, and such data are not sufficient for determining a causal connection between these factors and later learning.

Results from the analysis of findings related to PA appear to have instructional implications for early childhood educators. These findings suggest the importance of attending to children’s progress along a developmental continuum of PA, rather than an emphasis on particular PA skills. These analyses did not reveal important differences in phonological memory, synthesis, or segmentation. However, they do suggest an order to the development of all of these skills across a progression of smaller and smaller units of sound. Rather than trying to teach any particular

skill (such as phonological STM), it may be of greater value to ensure that progress is occurring and that children are becoming progressively more able to deal with smaller and smaller units of sound (e.g. words, syllables, onset rimes, phonemes).

How literacy components should be promoted: Common to family, center-based, and community literacy development programs are 7 proven-effective or promising approaches:

- 1) training program workers and parents/family to carry out the following six literacy development approaches effectively;
- 2) strengthening oral language through high quality talk/dialogue to build vocabulary, sentence complexity, communication of coherent thoughts, interactive give & take discussion skills, comprehension of ideas, and habits of curiosity and courtesy in exploring ideas;
- 3) helping the child learn to read and understand environmental print;
- 4) making widely available many attractive books and other written materials appropriate for the children, and promoting reading them extensively throughout each day;
- 5) taking advantage of opportune times and activities for dialogue or reading to occur, including not only independent reading but also adult-child literacy interactions during meals, travel, dressing, and play;
- 6) assuring that reading experiences are high quality, including a) reading to or with the child, b) listening to the child reading and then responding; c) frequent reading; d) repeated readings of the same book; e) teaching & engagement techniques (questions, labeling, responses and feedback to the child, positive reinforcement, paraphrasing, variation of the “demand level” according to child language and ability level);
- 7) tutoring the child in developing reading skills of types and levels appropriate for the child (including letter knowledge, phonemic awareness, word recognition, print concepts, comprehension, and writing).

The NELP meta-analyses investigated the effectiveness of the primary program approaches, instructional strategies, and practices thought to be effective in enhancing “*conventional literacy and its predecessor skills in early childhood*”. Effectiveness was based on calculation of Effect Sizes [ES] for each intervention which are categorized as: small = 0.30 – 0.49, moderate = 0.50 – 0.79, and large = 0.80 or greater. The significance of an effect size is also calculated by taking into account the number of studies available from the intervention.

Instructional Practices That Enhance Early Literacy Skills: *The panel also set out to identify studies that employed experimental or quasi-experimental methods to determine the effectiveness of instructional strategies, programs, or practices in imparting conventional literacy skills or any of these precursor skills to young children. The panel did not set out to find evaluations of previously identified programs or interventions but searched for all such studies that had been published in refereed journals in the English language. The panelists then grouped*

the identified studies into five analytical categories. The categories of intervention and the number of studies within each category included the following:

- Code-focused interventions (n = 78): Interventions designed to teach children skills related to cracking the alphabetic code. Most code-focused interventions included PA instruction.
- Shared-reading interventions (n = 19): Interventions involving reading books to children. These interventions included studies of simple shared reading and those that encouraged various forms of reader-child interactions around the material being read.
- Parent and home programs (n = 32): Interventions using parents as agents of intervention. These interventions may have involved teaching parents instructional techniques to use with their children at home to stimulate children's linguistic or cognitive development.
- Preschool and kindergarten programs (n = 33): Studies evaluating any aspect of a preschool or kindergarten program. Ten studies in this category concerned one particular intervention (the Abecedarian Project). Other studies evaluated effects of educational programs, curricula, or policies, such as extended-year experience, on kindergartners.
- Language-enhancement interventions (n = 28): Studies examining the effectiveness of an instructional effort aimed at improving young children's language development.

The code-focused instructional efforts reported statistically significant and moderate to large effects across a broad spectrum of early literacy outcomes. Code-focused interventions consistently demonstrated positive effects directly on children's conventional literacy skills. Book-sharing interventions produced statistically significant and moderate-sized effects on children's print knowledge and oral language skills, and the home and parent programs yielded statistically significant and moderate to large effects on children's oral language skills and general cognitive abilities. Studies of preschool and kindergarten programs produced significant and moderate to large effects on spelling and reading readiness. Finally, language-enhancement interventions were successful at increasing children's oral language skills to a large and statistically significant degree. Together, these findings suggest that there are many things that parents and preschools can do to improve the literacy development of their young children and that different approaches influence the development of a different pattern of essential skills.

There is great interest in the idea of providing age-appropriate interventions. However, there were few important differences among these categories of study with regard to age; one important exception was in the area of language interventions, which showed greater effectiveness early on. Otherwise, when age-level comparisons were possible, the large and significant effects of the various interventions were obtained with groups of both younger and older children. This means that most of the types of instruction that are effective in kindergarten are very similar to those that can be used in preschool. Unfortunately, there have not been direct tests of age differentiation in early literacy instruction across kindergarten and preschool, and

there are still too few studies of preschool literacy instruction to provide comparison results that can be embraced with a high degree of certainty.

Few interventions improved conventional literacy skills or the precursor skills most related to later literacy growth, the exception being code-focused interventions. One reason so few interventions were found to foster improvement in these measures is that few intervention studies with young children included measures of such outcomes. Generally, code-focused intervention studies included such measures, while studies of other instructional approaches did not. It is possible that some of these other approaches may also be effective in improving early literacy skills, but that can only be determined through studies employing such measures. Code-focused programs, book sharing, programs for parents to use at home, and language-enhancement instruction all improved children's oral language skills. The panel wanted to determine whether any child characteristics influenced the effectiveness of the instructional interventions. In most cases, the panel could not determine the role of children's characteristics because of reporting limitations in the original studies. In general, however, variables, such as age, SES, and race, did not seem to alter the effectiveness of the various interventions, and it will take future research to determine whether certain interventions would be effective with particular groups of children.

It should be noted that the interventions that produced large and positive effects on children's code-related skills and conventional literacy skills were usually conducted as one-on-one or small-group instructional activities. These activities tended to be teacher-directed and focused on helping children learn skills by engaging in the use of those skills. Almost all of the code-focused interventions included some form of PA intervention. These PA activities generally required children to detect or manipulate (e.g., delete or blend) small units of sounds in words. Few of the interventions used rhyming activities as the primary teaching approach. Teaching children about the alphabet (e.g., letter names or letter sounds) or simple phonics tasks (e.g., blending letter sounds to make words) seemed to enhance the effects of PA training.

Of the five NELP chapters on interventions, the oral language chapter is more readily understood by persons lacking knowledge of advanced statistics and of the reading terminology such as phonological awareness, decoding, and phonological STM. Oral language is defined in NELP as: *the ability to produce, comprehend, or both aspects of spoken language, including semantics, syntax, or both; often measured by a standardized test, such as the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test or the Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals.*

Thus language development addressing primarily oral language is an easier topic for reading research novices to start on deciphering the NELP analyses. Also it provides a smooth transition into the issues regarding Family Literacy programs which are addressed immediately after the Language Development chapter findings.

Language Development (NELP Chapter 7)

Description of the Language-Enhancement Studies: The studies of language-enhancement interventions used various outcome measures to evaluate the effectiveness of these approaches. All of these studies included some measure of oral language development—most often a vocabulary

measure—while others evaluated the effects of language-enhancement efforts on phonemic awareness; cognitive ability; decoding; memory; print knowledge; rapid automatic naming (RAN); general readiness; and reading. No studies evaluated alphabet knowledge (AK), spelling, visual motor skills, or writing. Although these studies considered many different learning outcomes, there were usually too few studies to allow for analysis of the overall impact of language interventions on these variables (there had to be three studies that measured a particular construct to allow the results to be meta-analyzed). Table 7.1 includes the average effect sizes (ESs) presented in alphabetical order, numbers of studies, and significance of the interventions on the various outcomes.

Table 7.1. Estimates of Effect Sizes Across Outcome Domains for Language-Enhancement Interventions

Dependent Variable	Fixed ES	Random ES	95% CI		N of Studies	p for ES
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Cognitive ability	0.85	0.85	0.27	1.42	1	0.004
Oral language	0.61	0.63	0.42	0.84	19	0.0001
PA	0.55	0.57	0.01	1.14	2	0.05
Print knowledge	0.81	0.81	0.20	1.41	1	0.009
RAN	0.54	0.54	-0.05	1.13	1	0.075
Readiness	0.62	0.62	0.08	1.16	1	0.024
Reading	0.20	0.36	-0.38	1.10	2	0.343

Note: CI = CI based on random-effect model.

To be included in the analyses reported in this chapter, studies had to consider the

Table 7.3. Distribution of Outcome Measures Used in 19 Language-Enhancement Studies

Outcome Assessments	Percentage of Studies
Language output (e.g., mean length of utterance, frequency of word use)	15
Gains in specific words or grammatical structures	10
Composite language scores	26
Complexity of multiword utterances	26
Listening comprehension	16
Literacy outcomes	15

effectiveness of some instructional effort implemented to improve young children’s language ability and skills. The 19 studies varied considerably in outcomes measured, intervention durations, and ages of the children. About 70 percent of the studies included preschoolers or kindergarten children, with the rest considering the language growth of infants and toddlers (only one study included infants below one year of age). About half of the studies involved a relatively short intervention (less than 10 weeks), and, of those with longer interventions, the length was still usually no more than a few months, with a couple lasting for an entire school year. About 40 percent of the studies focused on children with language and learning delays. Most of the studies used random assignment of children to conditions (68 percent), with outcomes measured soon after the end of the intervention (79 percent). Only four of the 19 studies evaluated sustained effects at some later point after the completion of the intervention. The person administering the intervention ranged from a researcher or clinician (53 percent of the studies) to teachers (26 percent) or parents (16 percent), and, in one study, a computer administered the intervention. To measure the interventions’ effectiveness on children’s learning, a broad range of outcomes was included in these 19 studies. These are summarized in Table 7.3. There was a great deal of variability across the 19 studies in the type of intervention implemented. In general, interventions differed on such factors as amount of direction or structure provided, the social context of the intervention, feedback to the child, and the type of language skill targeted for change. A typical intervention evaluated here might be referred to as focused-stimulation interventions (26 percent). These were usually conducted within a naturalistic context in which the child heard specified language input (e.g., vocabulary, question types) often in game-like or play activities within their daily routines. Another frequent approach had children engaged in language activities, such as responding to wh questions or talking about similarities and differences in pictures (21 percent). Two other categories of language interventions were similar in the direct training of components of language, such as phonology (16 percent) or sentence structure (16 percent). Some studies did not easily fit into any of these categories. For example, only single studies examined the following approaches: the use of computer feedback to train vocabulary; building language through motor exercises; and building listening comprehension through exposure to stories read aloud.

Do Language-Enhancement Interventions Improve Children’s Language and Literacy Learning?

The studies that looked at oral language development outcomes were grouped into three overlapping clusters for analysis. The first cluster,

general oral language enhancement, included any measures of oral language, and this cluster included all 19 studies. A second cluster of eight studies, language composite, was drawn from these 19 studies and looked at composite or general measures of oral language development. Finally, a third group of 10 studies, oral language (vocabulary enhancement), focused specifically on vocabulary improvement alone.

General Oral Language Enhancement as a Function of Language Intervention: *These 19 studies attempted to improve young children's performance on a wide variety of oral language outcomes, including expressive or receptive vocabulary skills and grammatical development. The interventions were delivered in differing ways but usually in a small-group format. Parents, teachers, graduate trainees, speech-language clinicians, or trained home visitors delivered the interventions. These interventions were varied and included efforts to teach specific words, phonology, or morpho-syntax, incidental teaching, enriched play experiences, and encouragement of creative thinking. Children with and without language problems were included, as were gifted kindergarten children and children in low- and middle-income families.*

The evaluation of language-enhancement interventions across these 19 studies showed that such interventions successfully improved children's oral language development. The average ES for these 19 studies is 0.63 (using a random-effect model), which is considered to be a moderate-sized effect.

Oral Language (Language Composite) Enhancement as a Function of Language Intervention: *Eight studies contributed to the analysis of a mixed set of language outcomes (hence the term language composite). Among these, children with language delays or atypical communication skills were included in four of the studies, and toddlers or preschoolers were included as subjects in six of the studies. The interventions varied considerably, from focused or direct training methods to training contextualized in adult-child interactive play or storybook-reading sessions to a motor-skill or physical-education context to which enriched language was added. For example, an interactive, child-centered stimulation program delivered by speech-language pathologists and focusing on vocabulary expansion and two- and three-word combinations was the enhancement delivered in one study of late-talking 21- to 30-month-olds. In a second study of children with language delays or deviant communication skills, adult-child dyads with carefully scripted adult roles moved from imitation of child play toward more mature cooperative interactions, thus promoting an interpersonal context for communication instead of one directed more pointedly at speech production and comprehension. The comparison group received a more traditional, language-focused intervention. A third study provided language-enhanced physical-education activities for the treatment group, while the comparison group engaged in physical-education activities without language enhancement, with children in special education, typical pre-kindergarten and Head Start pre-kindergarten classes, in 24 sessions in an eight-week time frame. Yet another study varied instructional-unit size for kindergartners in the training of listening comprehension, using story reading in each intervention session, and comparing 1:1, 1:7, and 1:15 teacher-to-child ratios. Although diverse in their intervention methods, agents, target areas of language enhancement, and rationales, the studies share the characteristic of casting a rather broad net of assessments as outcomes of interest. Virtually all of the studies were conducted in a center-based or school-based context, with the exception of one reporting that the enhancement sessions took place uniformly in*

one locale for each child, either at the child’s preschool or at home. The evaluation of language enhancement versus control across these eight studies yielded a significant result for the dependent measure, oral language (language composite). It is therefore worthwhile to report the measures represented in the composite group. These included measures of expressive vocabulary, oral language, verbal IQ, listening comprehension, language skills (not otherwise specified), phonemic awareness, concept of word, memory, oral-expression composite, RAN graphological and RAN non-graphological, reading comprehension, and visual motor skill.

Oral Language (vocabulary enhancement) as a Function of Language Intervention: *The 10 studies included in this cluster were an array of language enhancements, usually delivered in small-group format in several sessions over several weeks, and almost all guided by teachers, graduate trainees, or speech-language clinicians. Two of the studies used parents as interventionists, and one employed computer-based training of vocabulary. The focus of language enhancement ranged from specific target-word learning to incidental teaching to encouragement of enriched play experiences or enhancement of creative thinking to training via phonological intervention or morpho-syntax intervention. The oral language and vocabulary outcomes included expressive or receptive vocabulary skills and additional oral language abilities. Children with and without language problems were sampled in the mix of 10 studies, as were gifted kindergartners. The evaluation of language enhancement versus control across the 10 studies yielded a non-significant result for the dependent measure, oral language–vocabulary. Again, this finding is limited by the strict inclusion criteria applied to all studies examined in the NELP report and by the intervention versus no-treatment comparison methodology required for this analysis. See Table 7.4 for a comparison of outcomes by type of language measure used (simple vocabulary measures versus composite measures of language).*

Table 7.4. Effect Sizes of Oral Language Interventions on Measures of Simple Vocabulary and Composite Measures of Oral Language

Measures	Mean ES	SE	95% CI		t	N ^a	p
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Vocabulary	0.54	0.13	0.28	0.79	4.14	10	< 0.0002
Composite	0.80	0.22	0.37	1.22	3.68	8	< 0.0002

^a One of the 19 studies included in this analysis contributed both measure and is reflected in the total n.

Even though it is impossible to provide further analysis of those outcome measures that were used in fewer than three studies, it is important to note that various non-oral language outcomes were examined in several studies and often with good results. For example, two studies considered the impact of oral language interventions on children’s phonological awareness (PA) and found significant improvement. Similarly, there were significant and sizable gains evident in individual studies that considered cognitive ability, print knowledge, and reading readiness. With more language-intervention studies that include these types of outcome measures in the future, it will be possible to determine whether other aspects of literacy-related learning are enhanced.

Are Interventions That Target Children Younger Than Three Years Old More Effective Than Those with Older Children? Four intervention studies tested the

effectiveness of a language intervention for children younger than three years old; three included toddlers (25.6 to 31 months), and one targeted infants (9–15 months). These four interventions varied somewhat, but all were toy centered, three were child directed with an emphasis on giving language stimulation in response to the child's interest, and the one with infants involved provision of different approaches to encourage vocal sound and word approximations. The four interventions ranged in duration from one to three months and so were relatively brief in nature. These four studies were contrasted with the other 15 interventions that had targeted children older than three years of age (range 3.5 to five years). These 15 interventions also varied greatly on many dimensions (e.g., duration, intervention approach, person providing the intervention). Significant differences were found between the two groups of studies with greater effectiveness found for the interventions that included children younger than three years of age. These results suggest that intervening earlier versus later is advantageous for enhancing children's language development.

Does the Effectiveness of Language Interventions Depend on the Agent (e.g., teacher, parent, computer) Who Delivers It? *There were inadequate numbers of studies to make comparisons with regard to intervention agents. It was not possible, for instance, to determine whether teachers were as effective as speech-language pathologists. Some studies involved both parent and professionals as agents of intervention. However, there were adequate numbers of studies to compare teachers to parents. Three of the studies used teachers as interventionists, while four used parents. All three of the teacher-interventionist studies took place in kindergartens, without particular note of language delay or impairment in the samples studied; two of these included explicit teacher training in the program package or method of question generation that was the target of intervention. In the third, pre-service teachers conducted the intervention sessions by reading prepared stories and instructions for the questions asked about the stories. In contrast to the studies using teachers as agents of intervention, those that employed parents as interventionists included children both at and younger than kindergarten age, with half of the four studies including samples of children with language difficulties or delays. The comparison between intervention agents—teacher versus parent—yielded no significant difference in outcomes. It did not seem to matter who delivered the interventions, as children benefited in either case. Again, the small study set in this contrast limits its utility, as does the marked differences in the types of interventions being implemented by teacher versus parent as agent.*

Are Interventions That Are Structured Such That Feedback Is Given to the Child After He or She Responds More Effective Than Those That Do Not Provide Feedback? *This question was possible to address because four of the intervention studies were similar in terms of providing some form of feedback to a child based on the type of response the child gave. These four studies were contrasted with eight intervention studies that did not give any form of systematic feedback following a child's response. No significant differences were found in intervention effectiveness as a function of the provision of feedback following a child response.*

Are Interventions That Require a Child to Respond More Effective Than Those That Do Not Have This Requirement? *Seven intervention studies were designed to require a child*

receiving the intervention to provide a response. In all seven studies, the child was required to respond in a range of ways, such as (1) answer a question (e.g., “What is this called?” while the interventionist points to or shows a picture or object), (2) repeat a modeled utterance, (3) describe characteristics of objects or ask questions about them, or (4) provide the name of a toy after hearing its name. Thus, for all seven of these interventions, the interventionist provided a certain degree of structure that might be expected to facilitate greater language learning. Five were carried out with five-year-olds, and two interventions targeted two- and three-year-olds. Six intervention studies that did not require a child to give a response were contrasted with the seven studies that did. All six of these were also included as part of the eight studies in the previous section that did not provide feedback to a child’s response. When these two groups of studies were examined for differences in effectiveness, no significant differences were found ($Q[1,11] = 0.35, p = 0.56$).

Summary and Conclusions: *Interventions designed to improve young children’s oral language skills have been effective. These interventions enhance oral language when it is defined as a diverse set of outcomes, such as expressive and receptive language skills, phonemic awareness, and verbal intelligence. It might be expected that oral language–enhancement interventions would work better with children who struggle with language or have some form of language impairment, but these analyses suggest this not to be the case, though differences might emerge from a larger sample of studies. The one difference that did seem to matter in the effectiveness of language-enhancement interventions concerned the children’s ages. Older children, between three and five years of age, did not get as big a language boost from these interventions as did the younger children. It would appear that intervening earlier rather than later is advantageous, although the exact process of this impact is not addressed here. Similarly, there seemed to be no key features to these interventions that consistently gave an advantage. All of these programs seemed to work. In fact, of the 19 studies, 18 had individual outcome effects that were moderate to large. There is a set of questions of both pressing practical significance and enormous theoretical importance that could not be addressed in these analyses. These are challenging questions that, if answered, would inform the field about teaching materials or strategies that provide maximum benefit for children’s language growth in the birth-to-five-year-old age range.*

Among those questions are the following:

- *Is there benefit to the adoption of specific approaches to teaching in language interventions (e.g., direct instruction versus naturalistic or milieu-based interventions)?*
- *Can we comment on the effectiveness of specific curricula developed for the birth-to-five-year-old population (e.g., computer software-based curricula, commercially available curricula with instruction delivered through teachers and curricular materials, researcher-mounted curricula delivered through teachers, parents, or researchers)?*
- *Is there information on best practices for delivering language interventions for specific populations of children (e.g., children with language impairments, children who are English-language (or whatever the language of school instruction is) learners, children in low-income families)?*
- *Does success vary as a function of the agent of intervention (e.g., researchers, speech-language pathologists, other professionals)?*
- *Does outcome differ with the intensity of the intervention (e.g., frequency of applications per week, group size, group versus individual training)?*
- *How shall we conceptualize the interaction of intervention strategy, frequency of application, and age group?*

Considerations for Future Research: *The following areas of research are suggested as a starting point for generating a better understanding of what interventions work and for which children, as well as the aspects of early language and literacy development that they enhance:*

- *examinations of language curricula and programs addressing the ages at which they are most effective.*
- *more replication studies of the interventions that show positive effects.*
- *attention to large cohort studies that examine programs that might show efficacy in enhancing specific aspects of language development. These include expressive and receptive language for vocabulary, syntax, semantics, and pragmatic skills.*
- *attention to the need for a more unifying terminology of characteristics of children at risk for language problems and those identified as language impaired.*
- *more longitudinal research that provides information on the sustainability of the effectiveness of intervention programs.*

The importance of addressing these questions is clear, and the information we lack precludes making careful and precise statements to guide practice. While an unsatisfying conclusion, this is nonetheless a highly pertinent one; gaps in systematically collected data (that is, the studies meeting criteria for the evaluation of language interventions) leave us with only a sketchy response to extremely important curricular and intervention questions.

Efforts of Family Literacy programs: Promotion of language and literacy by family literacy programs currently is neither extensive nor intensive. [present NFP & PAT language & literacy practices] These programs annually serve approximately 2% of all children under age 5. If only children and their parents from low income and language families (approximately one-third) are considered the target group, then perhaps 6% of those targeted are served each year; thus, roughly 10-15% of the target group is being served for at least a year or two before kindergarten. This means that more than five of every six families anticipated to need training and coaching on literacy promotion will not receive the needed assistance from family literacy programs. It should be noted that children spend approximately 80% of their waking hours before kindergarten in the care of their family or relatives. Families are able to provide one-on-one language and literacy interaction with their children, though their available time must be spread across the number of children in the family. Since parents have four times the hours available and typically only one-fourth to one-half as many children to work with as compared with center-based teachers, it seems logical to engage and train as many families as possible to cultivate the language and literacy of their own children. In providing the needed parent training and support, family literacy programs should partner with center-based programs, especially Head Start and preschool programs which have greater literacy programming capacity than the majority of child care programs. However, most contact of Head Start and preschools is with four-year-olds, starting after language and literacy development have been determined for three or four full years by the cultural habits of families.

The literacy promotion habits of families with young children in SC have neither been recorded nor reported, despite more than two decades of family literacy programs since being initiated

through the Target 2000 legislation enacted in 1989. For most of the two decades, parenting/family literacy programs were primarily Parents as Teachers plus a few Parent Child Home programs, and in recent years the Nurse Family Partnership. These programs have gathered very little data on the quantity and quality of family literacy practices such as the number of times parents read to and with their children each week, what they read, how engaged the children are, or what skills the children have developed. PAT programming decisions are typically decentralized, with the content and methods being decided by each family in consultation with the home visitor. Little data on child literacy growth has been generated, thus literacy results accountability is not possible. Programs managed by the SCDE and First Steps have gathered participation data in the past, but only the 2009 High/Scope evaluation has provided any evaluation data on literacy skills growth. Data from the Adult-Child Interactive Reading Inventory (ACIRI) reported to First Steps by its county-sponsored programs show improvement in the literacy practices of both parents and their children increasing during participation in interactive reading promoted by family literacy programs. Evaluation data from national studies of the family literacy programs has been limited in amount, methodological rigor, and findings on program impact, though with a few gratifying exceptions. The findings for language and literacy growth have been even scarcer, since the parenting, family literacy, and family support programs usually address a wide variety of outcomes other than literacy, as determined jointly by the family served and the program worker (often a home visitor). PAT has sponsored a number of evaluations using correlation analysis that found modest positive results. However, a control-experimental evaluation by SRI International for PAT in Northern California found no impact on vocabulary development (near-zero effect sizes of 0.02 and 0.06 for the PPVT at age 3). NFP has carried out randomized trials to evaluate subsequent academic outcomes for the children it served, though its service is from late in pregnancy only to age 2. Its modest effect size of 0.3 or less for early language development and later academic skills including reading was achieved without the opportunity to impact the potential for early reading and language development occurring after the 2nd birthday. Overall, the national family literacy evaluation findings are at best quite limited, and most of the results for literacy are in the small to moderate range.

Language development is one of the primary foundations for literacy which can be readily understood by most persons, as contrasted with phonics, phonemic awareness, memory retrieval, and other skills which are typically unfamiliar concepts. Language skills such as vocabulary, listening skills, and expressive ability are related to important literacy competencies, especially reading comprehension and writing which become the primary focus of literacy after decoding has been mastered, usually by grade 3. The NELP analysis had access to very few longitudinal studies past 1st and 2nd grades, thus provides little perspective for the impact of language abilities on reading comprehension and writing proficiency in grades 3 and above (i.e., “reading to learn” and “writing to inform”). Excerpts from the NELP report indicate

that as much or more remains to be learned about language and literacy as what can be verified now from “evidence-based” and “proven-effective” programs and practices.

Reading Skills Development: Numerous published studies of the literacy practices of family members and center-based workers have focused on interaction methods between adult and child while sharing books and other literacy materials, as well as adult-child dialogue. Some of the studies are simply observational (no comparison group), with the adult and child reading or talking, usually together, but sometimes for the child reading and writing alone. Many other studies are experimental with a child and an adult or just a child reading & writing in one or more ways that are compared with similar children and adults not involved in applying the specified literacy approaches. These studies have addressed the following practices:

1. Reading: a) adult reading to or with child, b) listening to child reading and then responding; c) reading frequently; d) repeated readings of a book; e) teaching & engagement techniques (questions, labeling, responses & feedback to the child, positive reinforcement, paraphrasing, variation of demand level according to child language level and overall ability).
2. Parent tutoring/teaching the child to acquire reading skills such as letter knowledge, phonemic awareness, word recognition, etc.
3. Learning from environmental print
4. Dialogue/talk
5. Location/activity of talk or reading: with family during a) eating; b) dressing; c) bath; d) toy & other play, e) car travel; and in center-based programs through a) whole group; b) small group; c) individualized; d) in activity centers; and e) meals;
6. Availability of books
7. Parent beliefs about reading & literacy development of their children
8. Dialogic reading

Most of the evidence from these studies is correlational, while a much smaller number of evaluations used comparison groups, some few of which were randomized at the program, classroom, or child level. The findings are both extensive and revealing, thus provide useful guidance for what should be done to enhance language and literacy growth. These findings will be presented first as summarized through meta-analyses and reviews of the research.

Summaries of the research findings are helpful, but their limitations must also be considered because of numerous substantive and methodological concerns. At the simplest level, the summaries all find that parent support for literacy has been effective for various competencies. In a meta-analysis of 33 studies, Bus & colleagues found that *“parent-preschooler reading is related to outcome measures such as language growth, emergent literacy, and reading achievement. The overall effect size of $d = .59$ indicates that book reading explains about 8% of*

the variance in the outcome measures. The results support the hypothesis that book reading, in particular, affects acquisition of the written language register. The effect of parent-preschooler reading is not dependent on the socioeconomic status of the families or on several methodological differences between the studies. However, the effect seems to become smaller as soon as children become conventional readers and are able to read on their own." The effect size overall was 0.59: (0.67 for language skills, 0.58 for emergent literacy, and 0.55 for reading achievement, all indicating a moderate level of impact). However, the studies reviewed in the meta-analysis varied substantially for the types of interventions. Even though the sole intervention variable used in the Bus meta-analysis was frequency of joint book reading, this in effect lumped together all types of joint book reading practices and all ages ranging from 26 to 96 months at the time of the outcome analysis. Also, only 9 of the 33 studies were experimental, with the other studies correlational, longitudinal, or retrospective. The largest effect size was for language skills, showing that joint book reading was substantially successful in developing the "written literacy register" of books for grammar, syntax, and a variety of sentence forms. For early emergent literacy versus later reading skills, the impact of book reading frequency was similar, thus indicating that *"preschoolers who are already ahead in literacy proficiency maintain their position relative to other children"*. The benefit from joint reading was smaller for older children, probably *"because the school environment or independent reading by the child may compensate for the lack of family reading experiences. However, book reading seems to make the start at school easier. This is particularly important for children from low socioeconomic status families. The [declining] age effect [of joint book reading] is reduced for children from lower class families. This is because these children are less stimulated to read independently."* Therefore joint book reading at home appears to remain important for their literacy development. This speculation, however, was based on only two studies.

A second meta-analysis was performed by Senechal & colleagues using only experimental studies to investigate family literacy interventions in grades K-3. Their meta-analysis investigated three types of family literacy activities. *"The first category consists of studies in which parents were asked to read to their children. Another category includes interventions in which the parents were asked to listen to children read books. The final category includes those interventions in which parents were trained to do literacy exercises with their children."* The meta-analysis produced effect sizes of 0.65 overall, 1.15 for tutoring a child to read, 0.52 for listening to a child read, and only 0.18 for reading to a child. The insignificant result for parents reading to their children appears to provide some confirmation for Bus' finding that joint parental reading with children declines with age; however, the Senechal meta-analysis for grades K-3 found that listening to the child read is significant, whereas reading to the child is not. One important qualification is that Senechal omitted oral language as an outcome. So it

appears likely that such oral language benefits as vocabulary development continue to result from reading to a child as well as from listening to a child read during the early school years.

Neither the Bus nor the Senechal meta-analyses generate results identified and evaluated at a detail level, for example the benefits from listening to a child read gained by “*providing corrective feedback, encouraging the child to use context clues to aid in comprehension or praising and reading alone with the child to promote self-confidence and motivation.*” Such specific practices analysis must be extracted from individual research reports and then summarized overall, a very laborious and confusing undertaking. However, there is extensive evidence that reading to and with young children has been shown effective in building oral language, comprehension, literacy register, print awareness, and other written language skills. But just because it was shown in published research studies that these skills can be improved does not explain how these skills can best be cultivated through the use of specific effective practices. Understanding these effective practices and helping families and center-based workers to adapt and carry them out with fidelity is the enormous challenge facing early childhood literacy development efforts, both local and statewide, as envisaged by the Read to Succeed legislation. Moreover, parents must be coached and supported by well-trained workers who themselves understand and can communicate the specifics of the effective practices. Achieving significant improvement in the language and literacy skills of young children, especially those from families with low income and limited education, requires support and guidance for the families to adopt and carry out effective literacy practices. Moreover such guidance and coaching depends on well-trained home visitors and other family literacy workers. Similar training and guidance is likewise necessary for center-based workers to cultivate the language and literacy skills and nurture the interests of young children at-risk of low language, literacy, and reading proficiency.

Research findings such as those reviewed by Bus, Senechal, and Scarborough were subjected to rigorous statistical investigation through the NELP meta-analyses. The NELP report found benefits from parent and home literacy activities, especially for oral language development. However, the NELP meta-analyses revealed huge gaps in rigorous research for most facets of literacy development through parent and home literacy efforts.

Home and Parent Programs (NELP Chapter 5)

Overall Estimates of Intervention Impacts: *As can be seen in Table 5.1, home and parent programs had statistically significant effects on measures of oral language (small) and cognitive ability (moderate to large). There were two other statistically significant effects of home and parent programs (i.e., memory, writing); however, each of these effects was based on a single study, which represents too few studies to allow unambiguous interpretation. Examination of the confidence intervals (CIs) for the oral language and cognitive ability ES estimates shows that they were overlapping. Hence, the effects of home and parent programs were statistically equivalent on these*

two outcomes. Overall, the results reported in Table 5.1 indicate that home and parent intervention programs included in these studies had a statistically significant and positive impact both on young children's oral language skills and general cognitive abilities.

Table 5.1. Estimates of Effect Sizes Across Outcomes for Home and Parent Literacy Programs for Each Dependent Variable

Dependent Variable	Fixed ES	Random ES	95% CI		N of Studies	p for ES
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
AK	-0.03	-0.03	-0.31	0.24	1	0.81
Cognitive ability	0.65	0.92	0.22	1.62	6	0.01
Memory	1.17	1.17	0.50	1.84	1	0.0006
Oral language	0.28	0.37	0.18	0.55	18	0.0001
PA	0.22	0.21	-0.12	0.54	2	0.21
Reading	0.28	0.28	-0.12	0.68	1	0.17
Reading readiness	-0.05	0.05	-0.33	0.22	1	0.71
Spelling	0.09	0.09	-0.18	0.37	1	0.51
Writing	0.52	0.52	0.23	0.81	1	0.0005

Note: CI = CI for random-effect model.

Analysis of Intervention Effects by Type of Intervention: The 18 studies that included oral language as an outcome were diverse in the focus, content, and duration of intervention studied. Two studies examined the effect of training parents to use dialogic reading (DR) (see Chapter Four). Six studies used a home visiting program to either teach parents general stimulation activities for their children or teach parents more focal oral language stimulation activities. Five additional studies taught parents similar general stimulation or language interaction strategies in a university or clinic setting. One of these studies was the Abecedarian project, in which parents received training and support for more than four years. Two studies taught parents to act as speech-language clinicians for their children with speech-language disorders. Two studies investigated the impacts of having parents engage in activities coordinated with activities occurring in their children's kindergarten or preschool. Finally, one study examined the impact of an intervention program that included both parent training and weekly parent-child sessions at the children's preschool.

Given the variability in the types of interventions (e.g., from general stimulation programs for infants to parents acting as speech-language therapists for their children with speech-language disorders) as well as the relatively low number of studies in this group, it was difficult to identify meaningful subgroups of studies to examine possible moderators of ES estimates. More than half of the studies yielded moderate to large positive ESs. Interventions in the six studies that yielded near zero to negative ESs seemed not to share any obviously meaningful characteristic. One of the studies was the Abecedarian project which included one of the more focused and intensive parent interventions. One of the studies examined the effects of a general home-visiting program by paraprofessionals and nurses. One study examined the effects of teaching parents to encourage and support children's

narratives. Two studies concerned the impact of parents acting as intervention agents for their children with speech-language disorders, and one study examined the impact of adding a parent-based intervention component to a center-based program.

Summary and Conclusions: *Results from this meta-analysis of the impacts of home and parent programs on the literacy skills of young children indicate that these interventions yield a moderate to large effect on oral language outcomes and general cognitive abilities. These effects appear to be robust to variations in children's ages and demographic characteristics of families. Additionally, the effects of these programs on children's oral language skills were consistent across measures of simple vocabulary and measures of more complex oral language skills. Although home and parent programs could impact other aspects of literacy, only a handful of studies included these other outcomes, and no other outcome was included in more than two of these studies (for example, alphabet knowledge [AK] was included in only one study, and phonological awareness [PA] in only two). Therefore, it was not possible to determine whether there were other effects of home and parent programs.*

The commonality across all of the programs examined by this group of studies is that they somehow involved parents as the agents of intervention for children. Nevertheless, these programs varied greatly in potentially important ways. For example, some of the programs had more general goals (such as trying to improve children's health, behavior, or cognitive functioning); others aimed at more specific literacy goals (such as improving language skills). Because of the great amount of variation evident in these approaches, it is not yet possible to point to one or two examples of replicated models of successfully involving parents in enhancing their children's developmental outcomes. Additional research on identification of key aspects of home and parent programs is needed.

It was not possible to examine the question of the additive effects of home and parent programs in the context of high-quality center-based education programs. A few of the studies contrasted the effects of PI combined with an early childhood program with early childhood programs alone. In some cases, there was an additive effect of the parent program, and, in some cases, there was not. Many of the interventions included in this group of studies involved frequent home visits or one-on-one parent-training sessions. With the growing availability of universally available, federal- or state-funded early childhood education programs, understanding the impact of home and parent programs in the context of high-quality early childhood education deserves attention.

Ultimately, attention to the nature, quality, and scope of home and parent intervention programs is required to identify those likely to be successful and those less likely to be successful. In the majority of studies examined in this meta-analysis, the interventions were delivered to parents by the developers of the intervention or by those who were supervised closely by the developers. Whether such interventions could be taken to scale—implemented broadly by individuals with limited or no contact with the developers—is yet unknown.

Finally, it is important to recognize that none of the more commonly used programs of enhancing PI in young children's literacy development (e.g., Chicago Child-Parent Centers, Parents as Teachers) was evaluated in the set of studies reviewed. Consequently, the results of this meta-

analysis do not confirm effectiveness of these specific programs. Notably, only one study included in the analysis involved the typical model in which parent education, parenting education, and parent-child time was evaluated. Whereas this study yielded a moderate ES (0.74), the degree of PI was relatively intensive. In addition to participating in parent education and parenting classes, each mother worked as a teaching assistant in her child's classroom. In this context, the program was effective. Knowing whether all of these components and this level of intensity are required to achieve a positive outcome are questions that need to be addressed by future studies.

Shared Reading Interventions (NELP Chapter 4):

Shared reading in a one-on-one relationship is primarily a family activity rather than a routine center-based learning support, since the pupil-teacher ratios in preschool make individual and even small group reading difficult to schedule routinely. This was learned by Whitehurst and colleagues in their dialogic reading research at child care centers. Their small group (1:5 ratios or less for 3 year-olds) dialogic reading program was discontinued in all centers as soon as the research on dialogic reading was completed. The discontinuation occurred because the child care teachers felt that the daily small group sessions were impractical to schedule. One-on-one shared reading in child care programs seems unlikely, perhaps impossible without the expensive services of a reading interventionist instructor or volunteer. The possibilities in Head Start and public school preschool must be determined.

Shared-reading practices—a parent reading a picture book with a toddler or a teacher reading a book to a class of preschoolers—are reading practices that are widely recommended to promote language and other skills related to early literacy development. Shared-reading activities are often recommended as the single most important thing adults can do to promote the emergent literacy skills of young children. Scarborough and Dobrich (see also Bus, van Ijzendoorn, & Pellegrini, 1995) provided a summary of studies that examined the effect of shared reading on young children's emergent literacy skills, and their results called into question the positive effects often claimed for reading or sharing picture books with young children.

Accordingly, the National Early Literacy Panel (NELP) examined the effects of interventions that primarily or entirely focused on shared reading. These shared-reading interventions included those that involved parents, teachers, or the combination of parents and teachers implementing some form of shared reading with children individually or in groups. The studies included in NELP's analysis of shared-reading interventions differ from those included in the earlier Scarborough and Dobrich and Bus et al. reports in a number of ways. NELP's analysis considered only those studies that had undergone some independent scientific review, included studies of both preschool and kindergarten children, and included only studies that evaluated the effects of interventions. NELP subjected the studies to a more rigorous set of screening criteria to increase the likelihood that the effects were causally interpretable, and finally, NELP included studies that had not yet been published at the time of the earlier review.

Children, in most of these studies, were exposed to some kind of a short-term (i.e., one to six months) shared-reading intervention that either represented a substantial increase in frequency of shared-

reading activities or a change in the style of shared-reading activities (such as engaging the children actively in telling the story rather than being passive listeners). There were many variations on these procedures, with some delivered by teachers and others by parents. Some studies examined whole-class interventions; one study examined the impact of providing books and information to parents during well-baby pediatrician visits; and two other studies examined the impact of computerized storybook interventions. Children in the comparison groups in these studies usually received less exposure to shared reading than did the children in the experimental group, and the shared reading they did receive rarely involved more than the adult just reading books to children. In most cases, the researcher did not specify or control what the children experienced in the comparison-group condition, meaning that these children’s exposures to shared reading were to the usual practices of their teachers or parents. Consequently, these studies provide comparisons of some kind of intensified or improved effort to read to children with the usual kinds of shared reading that children commonly experience.

Overall Estimates of Intervention Impacts: Most of the shared-reading intervention studies measured the impact of the interventions on oral language skills (16 studies). Fewer studies examined the impact of these interventions on phonological awareness (PA) (two studies), general cognitive ability (one study), alphabet knowledge (AK) (two studies), print knowledge (four studies), reading readiness (one study), or writing (one study).

These studies indicate that shared-reading interventions can have a significant, substantial, and positive impact both on young children’s oral language skills and on young children’s print knowledge. Shared-reading interventions appear to have no impact on young children’s PA skills or their AK; however, there have been too few studies using these—or other—outcome measures to provide a reliable estimated ES.

Table 4.1. Estimates of Effect Sizes Across Outcome Domains for Interventions Involving Shared Reading or Sharing Books with Young Children for Each Dependent Variable

Dependent Variable	Fixed ES	Random ES	95% CI		N of Studies	p for ES
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
AK	-0.06	-0.06	-0.47	0.35	2	0.78
Cognitive ability	0.10	0.10	-0.21	0.41	1	0.52
Oral language	0.66	0.73	0.27	1.20	16	0.002
PA	0.11	0.11	-0.15	0.35	2	0.42
Print knowledge	0.51	0.50	0.28	0.73	4	0.0001
Readiness	-0.14	-0.14	-0.64	0.36	1	0.58
Writing	0.52	0.52	0.23	0.81	1	0.0005

Note: CI = CI for random-effect model.

The largest impact of shared reading was on oral language outcomes, with an average ES of 0.73. This result means that, on average, children who received a shared-reading intervention scored, on

oral language, more than 0.7 of a standard deviation higher than children who had not received such instruction. To put this in context, if the average children who were not read to in the enhanced format scored 100 on a standardized test of oral language (with a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15), then the average children who were read to in these enhanced or extended ways would score 111 on the test (i.e., the difference between scoring at the 77th percentile versus scoring at the 50th percentile).

Children’s early childhood education teachers, children’s parents, and combinations of teachers and parents have conducted shared-reading interventions. Table 4.9 lists the ES estimates from interventions in which teachers, parents, or both teachers and parents provided the shared-reading intervention (or the computerized intervention was used). There was no statistically reliable difference in ESs depending on how the shared reading was delivered. Comparison of the studies involving parents reading to their children and studies involving both parents and teachers doing the reading did not have statistically reliable differences in ESs (the CIs overlap). When the ROR study (involving parent reading) was excluded from the analysis, the estimated ES for parent-provided reading was reduced to 0.57 ($p = 0.16$). [The ROR study was excluded because the researchers did not directly assess language development but asked parents to estimate their children’s vocabulary performance.]

Table 4.9. Effect Sizes for Oral Language Outcomes for Study Classification Based on Agent of Intervention

Agent of Intervention	Mean ES	SE	95% CI		t	n	p
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Parent	1.35	0.40	0.56	2.14	3.36	3	0.006
Teacher	0.84	0.32	0.21	2.60	2.60	5	0.023
Parent and teacher	0.29	0.30	-0.29	0.88	0.99	6	0.34
Computer	0.36	0.50	0.61	1.34	0.73	2	0.48

Summary and Conclusions: Results from this meta-analysis of the impacts of shared-reading interventions on the early literacy skills of young children indicated that these interventions yielded moderate effects on oral language skills and print knowledge. For oral language skills, these effects were robust across variations in the type of shared-reading intervention and the children’s ages or their risk status. Although it is possible that shared reading could affect other aspects of children’s literacy and language development, only four studies even included print knowledge as an outcome variable, and even fewer studies included any other variable. Therefore, it was not possible to determine whether there were other benefits of shared reading.

Given the ubiquity of both the practice of and the recommendation for shared reading in early childhood education settings, it is somewhat surprising that more studies have not investigated the impact of these practices. Although it is clear that shared reading improves oral language skills and print knowledge, there is not yet evidence that shared reading promotes the development of other emergent literacy skills, and there is no evidence that shared reading promotes any improvement in conventional literacy skills. Although it is often claimed that reading to children improves their reading ability, too few studies have been conducted with emergent literacy outcome measures (such as PA, AK, readiness, and writing) or conventional literacy outcome measures (such as decoding,

reading comprehension, or spelling) to provide statistically reliable evidence that shared reading improves such skills (and, if so, which ones). Given these important gaps in what is known about the effectiveness of shared reading, it seems prudent to conclude that shared reading alone would not be a sufficient response to the literacy learning needs of young children. This would be particularly true for those at risk or who show weaknesses in those specific emergent literacy skills that have not been shown to improve due to reading to children (such as PA or AK).

Despite any analytical limitations, these studies indicate that shared-reading interventions provide early childhood educators and parents with a useful method for successfully stimulating the development of young children's oral language skills. For some reason, the impact of shared-reading interventions is larger for vocabulary outcomes than for more complex aspects of oral language (such as grammar, narrative understanding, or listening comprehension) or broader measures of oral language that include aspects of both vocabulary and more complex oral language skills. Whether this is due to real differences in outcomes or to the nature of the shared-reading interventions that have been studied and the outcome measures used so far is as yet unknown. Additional research will be needed to better explain this finding.

Future research needs to examine the types of shared-reading interventions that have been studied and how these interventions have been delivered. Interventions that used an interactive style of shared reading, such as dialogic reading (DR), produced larger effects on children's oral language outcomes than did non-interactive interventions, but these differences did not reach statistical significance. However, only studies using DR resulted in an average ES that was statistically significant. Direct studies of the contrast between interactive shared reading and non-interactive shared reading could help to clarify the meaning of this difference. For the existing studies, there were no significant differences in outcomes due to who delivered the shared-reading interventions, whether books were provided as part of the intervention, or how much the adults read to the children. It is important to note that statistical significance is not the only issue of importance in the context of a meta-analysis. Statistical significance—that is, the determination that an effect is sizable enough that it would unlikely have occurred by chance or normal variation—is affected by both the size of a difference and the number of observations (in the case of meta-analysis, the number of studies). The sizes of the differences found here for DR, agent delivering the intervention, amount of reading, and book availability were large enough to be of educational importance but were simply not found across a sufficiently large sample of studies to achieve statistical significance.

For studies conducted in preschool or kindergarten classes, the teacher or other adult most often read to children in small groups. Notably, the estimated ESs for shared reading do not reflect the impact of the typical program of shared reading conducted in early childhood settings (e.g., whole-group shared reading during circle time), which was typically the comparison condition in studies of shared reading in schools. Consequently, the results of this analysis do not provide evidence that typical early childhood education classroom practices promote the development of oral language and print knowledge skills.

Overall, the evidence supports the positive impact of shared-reading interventions that are more intensive in frequency and interactive in style on the oral language and print knowledge skills of young children.

Efforts of center-based programs: Despite wonderful opportunities in center-based programs to cultivate the language and literacy development of young children, little data and too few reports have been generated to describe, evaluate, and celebrate their impact on the literacy of children served, though many other perspectives on these center-based programs have been studied and reported thoroughly. Now is the time for literacy practices and results to be given the same critical scrutiny. There are approximately 300,000 children under the age of 5 in SC. As stated above, roughly four-fifths of their waking hours before kindergarten are spent with their family members. During the remaining 20% of waking hours, the children are in the care of non-family services, primarily in center-based programs or with family childcare providers. A survey of parents sponsored by the ABC program a decade ago determined the shares of waking hours for each of the caretakers other than family. Of the hours in out-of-family care, children in low income families below 185% of poverty spent their overall waking hours before age 5 as follows in: child care centers (11.4%), family child care (4.4%), Head Start (1%), and 4K preschool (2%). Of the non-family hours, over half were center-based childcare, and roughly 30% of the hours were with family childcare providers, leaving less than 20% split between Head Start and 4K preschool. Even taking into account possible bias in reported hours, it is obvious that the providers most difficult to work with have the preponderance of the waking hours.

Since parents and relatives have roughly 80% of all the hours and childcare providers have over 80% of the non-family hours, children are spending the least amount of their time in the care of the two provider systems that are easiest to work with in organizing higher quality literacy promotion. Both Head Start and public schools have education requirements for their teaching workforces and both have support and supervision systems with some capacity to train, guide, and assist their teachers, at least at a minimally adequate level. Whether these two systems actually provide the support and training will be reviewed later, but they do have the potential. Since family childcare providers are very small, they would be the most difficult to work with, as would many small childcare centers. Therefore, simple logistics would suggest that only half of the non-family hours of children (10% or less of all hours) offer plausible prospects for providing effective partners in literacy promotion. All the other children must be reached through several thousand family childcare and small center-based childcare providers; or through more than 100,000 families and their relatives. This clearly implies that the early literacy promotion campaign must be strategic, targeted, and networked through all potential support systems. As stated previously, targeting is necessary to focus efforts to assist those young children least likely to become proficient readers and writers. Children from families with low income and limited education can be targeted for screening. Center-based providers such as Head Start, 4K preschool, and those childcare providers with a large numbers of children receiving ABC vouchers or SNAP/food stamps should be engaged as active partners in performing the

screening necessary to identify children with the lowest oral language and print awareness. The children identified with the lowest language and literacy should be served through such center-based and family literacy programming as can be made available. Ideally the center-based programs would engage families in their own literacy development efforts at home for the higher risk children, with training, guidance, and support from teachers and others. Such an approach would simply follow the standard Family Literacy model but with continuing support to facilitate the application of proven-effective practices both at home and at the centers in a coordinated manner.

Serving the highest-risk children (through childcare, Head Start, & 4K preschool) [to be determined are the following]:

- How many providers have how many children of which ages?
- What literacy services do they provide?
- What specific literacy programs or approaches are being used to serve the most children and families?
- What support do they receive to strengthen their literacy services and from whom?
- What workforce literacy training is being provided to whom, by whom, and for what facets of language and literacy?
- How can we gauge the receptiveness of providers to work seriously on language and literacy development?
- What data on language & literacy services and results are available?
- What national studies are most informative regarding the content & results of literacy programming for each type of provider (Head Start, 4K, etc.)?
- Who has the best expertise on early literacy in SC? Elsewhere?

The findings from NELP's review of all rigorous evaluations of the effect of preschool and kindergarten programs on early literacy skills is perplexing at the least and very discouraging if the findings are what they suggest. First, there were only 33 studies that met the NELP criteria and just 24 when the 10 Abecedarian studies are counted as a single program evaluation. One would expect more studies, given the widespread enthusiasm for center-based early childhood interventions. This expectation especially applies to those programs following the Perry Preschool and Chicago CPC model of serving 4-year-olds that is widely seen as the most effective path to school readiness and which one would assume includes reading readiness. One would also expect stronger proof of effectiveness. The NELP analyses found that preschool and kindergarten had a significant and substantial impact only on readiness and spelling. Readiness was measured as a composite assessment of alphabet knowledge (AK), concepts of print, vocabulary, memory, and phonemic awareness (PA). Moreover, these positive readiness results

appear to occur primarily in kindergarten rather than during the preschool years. The preschool Effective Size for oral language was a negative 0.03 as compared with a small 0.28 in kindergarten. For reading, the preschool ES was a small 0.33 as compared with a large 0.88 in kindergarten. Most advocates promoting preschool have assumed that the 17:1 benefit to cost ratio of Perry Preschool includes dramatic improvement in school readiness, especially for the critical competency of early literacy. The fact that the Abecedarian program had no impact on oral language, despite the training and support provided to its parents for more than four years, is especially troublesome.

So did these preschool programs neglect literacy development altogether? Or if the programs did address early language & literacy, were their approaches poorly designed? Or was the problem a lack of training or ineffective training for the preschool teachers? The NELP review does not answer those troubling puzzles. However, these findings and resulting questions appear to impose a heavy obligation on center-based preschool providers, whether serving 4-year-olds or much younger children such as those who were served by the Abecedarian program for 4 years, starting before their 1st birthday. The obligation must involve: designing their literacy programming based on best practices, training the staff thoroughly, and monitoring results continuously to refine approaches until substantial positive results are demonstrated. Considering 1) the lack of evaluation proof of effectiveness in developing early literacy skills, 2) the small share of waking hours spent by young children in center-based services away from family, and 3) the even smaller share of waking hours spent in center-based programs with the size and support needed for effective programming design and training, all these combine into a strong challenge for these programs to implement early literacy programming based on proven-effective language & literacy practices.

Preschool and Kindergarten Programs (NELP Chapter 6):

A variety of early childhood programs have been studied since the early 1960s to determine their effectiveness in improving social and academic outcomes for young children. For example, Perry Preschool Project and the federally funded program Head Start, along with a variety of state preschool programs, have been the focus of research, as have other programs such as the Abecedarian project, the Chicago Child-Parent Center, and a plethora of early prevention efforts.

The National Early Literacy Panel (NELP) examined the effectiveness of several of such preschool and kindergarten programs and interventions aimed at the development of early literacy and conventional literacy skills. (Unfortunately, the studies of some of the widely known programs have either not been reported in refereed journals or have not focused on literacy-learning outcomes, so they could not be examined here). The panel set out to determine whether such programs confer children with an advantage in literacy learning or in the development of early skills that predict later literacy success. The studies included in this chapter met the selection criteria established by the panel for the meta-analysis including (1) group design using either a randomized control trial

(RCT) or a quasi-experimental design (QED) with initial group equivalency, (2) an intervention that measured effectiveness on early literacy or conventional literacy skills, and (3) sufficient data to calculate an effect size (ES). A total of 33 studies met these criteria. Ten of these studies evaluated the effectiveness of the Abecedarian project, and, since nine of these studies involved the same sample of children longitudinally, the results of these nine studies were combined and treated as a single group.

Overall Estimates of Intervention Impacts: Table 6.1 provides a summary of the overall effects of the various preschool and kindergarten interventions across all the different outcomes. The majority of the studies in this category provided effects for oral language (12 studies) and reading (nine studies). Fewer studies examined the impact of these interventions on alphabet knowledge (AK) (four studies), cognitive ability (four studies), readiness (three studies), spelling (three studies), phonological awareness (PA) (two studies), memory (two studies), print knowledge (two studies) and writing (two studies). Although cognitive ability *per se* did not arise in the predictor study, this variable is closely aligned with the various measures of IQ that were found to have predictive value in that earlier analysis. For that reason, the cognitive ability outcome is examined here.

As indicated in Table 6.1, preschool- and kindergarten-based interventions resulted in large, statistically significant outcomes for readiness measures (1.23) and small to moderate effects on spelling measures (0.34). Although statistically significant effects also were found for memory (0.47) and print knowledge (1.00), these outcomes were measured in too few studies to allow for a reliable determination of the impact of preschool and kindergarten experiences on these skills. It should be noted that readiness tests do not represent a single skill; they are composite measures encompassing many early literacy predictors, including AK, concepts of print, vocabulary, memory, and PA.

Although the average ESs for preschool and kindergarten programs were large enough to be of educational importance for several literacy variables (such as reading, writing, and AK), these differences did not reach statistical significance for the small numbers of studies combined in these analyses. Perhaps as more studies are completed with these kinds of outcomes, it would be possible to conclude that kindergarten and preschool interventions have a general ability to improve student literacy performance. However, the oral language outcomes were both statistically insignificant and so small as to be of questionable importance, though preschool and kindergarten efforts with a more explicit focus on oral language development may have very different results.

Table 6.1. Estimates of Effect Sizes Across Domains for Interventions Involving Preschool and Kindergarten Programs for Each Dependent Variable

Dependent Variable	Fixed ES	Random ES	95% CI		N of Studies	p for ES
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
AK	0.31	0.23	-0.18	0.64	4	0.27
Cognitive ability	0.30	0.35	-0.11	0.80	4	0.13
Memory	0.47	0.47	0.15	0.79	2	0.004
Oral language	0.10	0.13	-0.06	0.31	12	0.17
PA	0.08	0.08	-0.15	0.31	2	0.49
Print knowledge	1.00	0.98	0.25	1.70	2	0.008
Readiness	1.23	1.22	0.05	2.38	3	0.04
Reading	2.05	0.75	-0.38	1.89	9	0.19
Spelling	0.34	0.34	0.07	0.60	3	0.01
Writing	0.72	0.67	-0.14	1.48	2	0.11

Note: CI= CI based on random-effect model.

Summary and Conclusions: *Preschool and kindergarten programs do affect young children’s development of conventional literacy skills as well as important emergent literacy skills. Results of the meta-analyses examining the overall effects of preschool and kindergarten programs across outcome measures revealed two main findings. The largest impact of the preschool and kindergarten programs was on the composite measure of readiness, indicating that they were highly effective in preparing children for school entry. The other main effect was a small to moderate impact of programs on spelling outcomes. Although the ES for spelling was smaller than that for readiness, it is significant that only kindergarten programs improved spelling. This might have resulted from the possibility that kindergarten programs were more likely to focus on spelling; such skills are rarely expected of preschoolers. Early spelling work is often proposed as a valuable component of beginning reading instruction because it involves the integration of phonemic awareness skills with AK. The studies that contributed to this finding also included literacy-focused curricula, including teacher PD, further reinforcing the importance of these variables for effective implementation.*

A number of the other outcome variables had sufficient numbers of studies to allow for a meta-analysis of the results. For example, oral language had 12 studies, reading had 9 studies, and AK and cognitive ability had 4 studies each. Yet, none of these outcome variables reached statistical significance. As has been explained earlier, in a meta-analysis magnitude of difference is as important as statistical significance. In this case, the oral language outcomes seem particularly modest, meaning that the range of preschool and kindergarten programs examined here would not be expected to exert much impact on this outcome. But contrast this with the large ES for reading outcomes; although, again, this difference did not reach statistical significance, the size of the difference is so large as to be of educational importance. These findings suggest that kindergarten and preschool programs can have an impact on children’s reading development.

The RCT reflected greater impacts for reading outcomes, although these findings may also reflect differences in whether teacher PD was included in the study. These findings suggest a need in future research for the characteristics of preschool and kindergarten programs to be explicitly compared.

The most commonly measured outcome in all of the NELP intervention categories was oral language. Nine of the 33 preschool and kindergarten program studies included a composite measure of oral language skills, a measure of vocabulary, or both. The estimated ESs for programs on oral language and for vocabulary tended to be small, and these effects were not statistically reliable.

The impacts of three types of preschool or kindergarten program characteristics were examined: literacy-focused curricula, PD for teachers, and parent involvement (PI). The presence of literacy-focused curricula and the availability of PD for teachers both strongly affected the reading outcomes for children in kindergarten programs. However, with the studies' inclusion of both literacy-focused curricula and PD for teachers, it is impossible to separate the effects of the curriculum from the provision of teacher PD. Additionally, the studies contributing to this finding all focused on kindergarten children only; there is a clear need for research that examines such efforts with preschool children.

Studies involving preschool and kindergarten programs with PI did not yield significant findings or sizable effects. Such findings had not been expected because of the reported effectiveness of high-profile preschool and kindergarten programs with strong PI (e.g., Abecedarian project, Chicago Child-Parent Center Study, Head Start, and the Perry Preschool Project). It appears that, although PI in preschool or kindergarten programs has been strongly encouraged in the field, the specific impacts of such PI on early literacy outcomes have not been widely studied, and there is not yet a clear, empirically proven best way to use this involvement toward improved literacy performance for young children. There is great interest in the impact of instructional programs on the learning of different racial, ethnic, linguistic, and economic groups of children. The data on preschool and kindergarten programs simply were not adequate to permit this kind of analysis. Future research will need to explore this issue more directly.

Code-focused Interventions (NELP Chapter 3)

The code-focused section has the most studies (83) to analyze and the most outcome variables (5) addressed by ten or more studies: PA 51, reading 36, AK 24, spelling 15, and oral language 14. The five outcomes all had significant effect sizes: PA 0.82, spelling 0.61, reading 0.44, AK 0.38, and oral language 0.32. Forty seven of the studies were for children in kindergarten but only thirteen for preschoolers. Most of the studies for preschoolers were for PA only. Since many persons who work on early childhood issues have little or no acquaintance with phonological awareness (PA), readers should note that the NELP report defines PA as *the ability to detect, manipulate, or analyze components of spoken words independent of meaning. Examples include detection of common onsets between words (alliteration detection) or common rime units (rhyme detection); combining syllables, onset rimes, or phonemes to form words; deleting sounds from words; counting syllables or phonemes in words; or reversing phonemes in words. PA is often assessed with a measure developed by the investigator, but sometimes assessed with a standardized test, such as the Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing.*

The preschool interventions reviewed by NELP investigated larger speech units such as syllables and onset-rime awareness more frequently than the small phoneme units. Given the strong correlations of PA with decoding (.40), reading comprehension (.44), and spelling (.40) and also the large effect size (0.87) for PA in preschool, EC advocates and program managers need to become more knowledgeable about PA and the code-focused components of early literacy.

The National Early Literacy Panel (NELP) identified 83 studies that examined the effectiveness of various interventions that attempted to teach children code-related skills. Interventions in this category focused on teaching aspects of the alphabetic principle (i.e., the knowledge that letters in written words represent the sounds in spoken words). This was the largest collection of intervention studies that the panel reviewed, and it included interventions aimed at the development of phonological awareness (PA), alphabet knowledge (AK), and early decoding skills (i.e., phonics).

Virtually all studies in this category of interventions included some form of PA training. These interventions involved training children either individually or in small groups to identify sounds in words (e.g., match words with the same initial sound) or, more often, to manipulate sounds in words (e.g., combine sounds to form words, segment or delete parts of words). In some studies, these PA training activities were combined with other code-focused training activities, forming two broad categories of combined interventions. One category of combined interventions included studies in which the activities included both PA training and training activities designed to teach children AK, such as letter names or, occasionally, both letter names and letter sounds. The second category of combined interventions included studies of training activities that combined PA instruction and instruction in some aspect of phonics or decoding. Often, this phonics training involved teaching children about letters and simple decoding tasks involving the use of letter sounds. There were also three studies that evaluated the effectiveness of alphabet instruction alone (all three of these studies in this category examined the impact of exposure to Sesame Street–like video materials).

Overall Estimates of Intervention Impacts: *A large number of studies in this category examined the impacts of the interventions on outcome variables reflecting PA (51 studies), AK (24 studies), reading (36 studies), spelling (15 studies), and oral language (14 studies). Fewer studies of these interventions examined the impacts on outcome variables reflecting general cognitive ability (2 studies); memory (9 studies); print knowledge (5 studies); rapid automatic naming (RAN) (8 studies); reading readiness (3 studies); and writing (5 studies). None of these studies considered the impact of the interventions on visual or perceptual processing as an outcome variable. It should be noted that, although specific tests of cognitive ability or memory per se were not identified in Chapter Two as being particular predictors of later literacy achievement, such measures are clearly implicated in various IQ tests, which were identified as significant predictors in Chapter Two.*

Table 3.1. Estimates of Effect Sizes Across Outcome Domains for Interventions Classified as Code-Focused for Each Dependent Variable

Dependent Variable	Fixed ES	Random ES	95% CI		N of Studies	p for ES
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
AK	0.31	0.38	0.18	0.58	24	0.0002
Cognitive ability	-0.47	-0.41	-0.78	-0.01	2	0.04
Memory	0.20	0.27	0.06	0.48	9	0.01
Oral language	0.27	0.32	0.09	0.56	14	0.008
PA	0.76	0.82	0.68	0.96	51	< 0.0001
Print knowledge	0.44	0.47	0.18	0.76	5	0.0013
RAN	0.35	0.38	0.08	0.69	8	0.013
Reading readiness	0.20	0.20	0.02	0.38	3	0.034
Reading	0.41	0.44	0.27	0.60	36	< 0.0001
Spelling	0.55	0.61	0.43	0.80	15	< 0.0001
Writing	0.43	0.61	0.18	1.04	5	0.006

As can be seen in Table 3.1, code-focused interventions usually had moderate to large effects both on measures of conventional literacy (i.e., reading, spelling) and on measures of precursor literacy skills (e.g., PA, AK). ESs of the interventions across all outcome variables were statistically reliable (i.e., $p < 0.05$). In all but one case, the average ESs for code-focused interventions were positive. Consequently, the results reported in Table 3.1 indicate that code-focused interventions have a significant, substantial, and positive impact both on young children’s conventional literacy skills and on early skills that predict later literacy achievement. The largest impact of code-focused interventions was on PA, with an average ES of 0.82. This result means that, on average, children who received a code-focused intervention scored 0.82 of a standard deviation higher on measures of PA than did children who did not receive a code-focused intervention. To put this in context, if the average children not receiving a code-focused intervention scored 100 on a standardized test of PA that had a mean of 100 and a standard deviation of 15, the average children receiving a code-focused intervention scored 112 on the test (i.e., the difference between scoring at the 50th and 79th percentiles).

A summary of the estimates of ESs of code-focused interventions for preschool-age and kindergarten-age children separately is shown in Table 3.3. There were no statistically significant differences in the ES estimates for PA, AK, oral language, reading, and spelling. ESs were somewhat larger for studies that included preschool children than for those that included kindergarten children for AK, reading, and spelling outcomes; these differences were not statistically reliable. The separate ESs for preschool- and kindergarten-age children continued to be statistically reliable (except for the ES estimates for these interventions with oral language outcomes).

Table 3.3. Summary of Effect Sizes for Outcome Variables for Study Classification Based on Age of Children in Study

Age Group	ESs for Outcome Variable and (n) of Studies Contributing to ES				
	PA	AK	Oral Language	Reading	Spelling
Preschool	0.87*** (10)	0.67** (5)	0.26 (3)	0.75** (4)	0.78** (2)
Kindergarten	0.81*** (38)	0.32** (18)	0.34* (11)	0.43*** (30)	0.58*** (13)

Note: ESs based on random-effect model. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Overall, these sub-analyses indicate that the strong, positive, and statistically significant impacts of code-focused interventions on children’s skills in the domains of PA, AK, oral language, reading, and spelling reported for the overall analyses hold regardless of the age of the children included in the studies and, for most outcomes, the prior literacy levels of the children included in the studies. These findings are important because they indicate (a) that it is possible to affect substantially those skills that are most predictive of later decoding, reading comprehension, and spelling for preschool-age children; (b) that these interventions show positive effects on reading and spelling skills (presumably mediated, in part, by the positive impacts on PA and AK); (c) that these results can be obtained with preschool-age children as well as with kindergarten children; and (d) that these substantial impacts are consistent regardless of children’s existing early literacy skills.

The results of these analyses indicate that the impacts of most code-focused interventions are positive, moderate to large, and statistically reliable across a broad range of key early literacy and reading indicators (i.e., PA, AK, reading, spelling). Not surprisingly, the interventions that did not include a print-focused component (i.e., those with PA training only) had a significantly weaker effect on print-specific outcomes (i.e., AK). Regardless, the results were generally consistent across outcome domains, indicating that interventions that include variations of PA training affect not only PA skills but also measures of reading and spelling. In addition to examining the relative impacts of different types of code-focused interventions, the relative impacts of variations in the nature of the PA interventions were examined. PA varies along at least two independent dimensions: level of linguistic complexity and cognitive operation. Level of linguistic complexity refers to the size of the sound unit on which PA is demonstrated, and it ranges along a continuum from word-level units to phoneme-level units. The target skill of different PA interventions is sometimes one point on this continuum and sometimes multiple levels of this continuum. A common theoretically relevant split on this continuum is phoneme-level tasks or targets (i.e., phonemic awareness) versus sub-phonemic tasks or targets (i.e., syllable awareness, onset-rime awareness). Cognitive operation refers to the type of task performed on these linguistic units and can involve identity (e.g., rhyme oddity detection), synthesis (e.g., blending or putting linguistic units together to form new linguistic units, typically words), or analysis (e.g., separating a linguistic unit from a larger linguistic unit through deletion or counting), with analysis tasks often considered the more developmentally advanced cognitive operation.

Summary and Conclusions: *Results from this meta-analysis of the impacts of code-focused interventions on the early literacy and conventional literacy skills of young children indicate that these interventions yield a moderate to large effect on the predictors of later reading and writing (i.e., PA, AK) and on measures of reading and writing. These effects were robust to variation in the type of code-focused intervention, to variation in children's ages or developmental levels, and to variations in methods of teaching young children PA. At this time, few studies allow fine-grained analysis of other population variables, such as SES, ethnicity, or population density. However, existing studies provide no evidence that the effects of code-focused interventions are altered by these sample characteristics. The majority of code-focused interventions involved some form of PA training activity. Consequently, most of the substantially positive impacts on children's early literacy skills need to be interpreted in this context. That is, these analyses show that some form of PA training, either alone or in combination with more or less complex instruction related to print knowledge (i.e., letter-name instruction, instruction in early decoding skills) is likely to yield growth in children's skills related to later reading and writing achievement. Whereas the literature contains both debate and findings concerning the type of PA training required to produce positive impacts on reading skills, the results of these analyses did not reveal any statistically reliable differences between variations in PA interventions. Categorizing the nature of PA training according to two theoretically relevant dimensions, the level of linguistic complexity that was the focus of the training and the nature of the cognitive operation taught in the PA training, did not indicate that one form of training was more or less effective than another form of training across a range of outcome measures. Importantly, there was no evidence that the effectiveness of code-focused interventions was influenced by age or developmental level of the children. That is, the impacts of code-focused interventions were observed in children whether they were preschool age or kindergarten age, and these interventions were equally successful across a range of levels of prior literacy knowledge (from minimal AK to being able to read). These findings indicate that there is not a point along either an age or a developmental continuum at which code-focused interventions become more or less beneficial to children's early literacy skills. The findings also suggest that there is no preexisting level of knowledge or skill that children must attain before these interventions can be used successfully.*

Most of the code-based interventions tested here are not available commercially. The majority of interventions included in these analyses were designed and implemented by researchers, and there was a great deal of variability in the specifics of the various interventions. This suggests that some instructional variations may be more effective than others, so, ultimately, it will be important and necessary to distill the specific components of these interventions to determine what types of intervention activities produce the most positive effects on children's early literacy skills. It is not sufficient to merely label interventions as PA training, phonics, or code focused for them to be effective. Successful code-focused interventions will likely include all or most of the components of the interventions noted in this meta-analysis; thus, interventions should include PA training with activities involving higher-level PA skills, such as actively engaging in analysis or synthesis of words at the syllable, onset-rime, or phoneme level with feedback on correct and incorrect responses. Although PA training can be conducted alone, the results of this meta-analysis suggest that there

may be an advantage of combining such training with activities designed to teach children about specific aspects of print, such as letter names and letter sounds.

The majority of the code-focused interventions summarized by this meta-analysis were conducted as either individual-level or small group-level interventions. There was no evidence that whole-class or large-group code-focused interventions will produce similar-sized effects on children's reading-related skills. While it is not the case that research has shown whole-class or large-group implementation of code instruction to be ineffective (such approaches were not tested at all), it would be a mistake to assume that teachers could successfully implement these interventions with large groups. Extant studies do not allow an adequate examination of the relative effectiveness of code-focused instruction for specific subpopulations of children. To their credit, most studies included mixed samples of children from different socioeconomic backgrounds, ethnic groups, and living environments (e.g., population density).

Unfortunately, the data in these studies were usually not reported in a way that differential effectiveness could be studied. Although the early childhood education field is interested in specific questions about which interventions will work best for children living in poverty, children from traditionally underrepresented ethnic groups, children who are English-language learners, or children growing up in rural or urban environments, there are not yet studies focusing on these specific subpopulations or that allow examination of these subpopulations to answer these questions. Given the clear success of code-focused instruction with these mixed populations, it seems prudent to make such instruction available to all populations of young children, at least until research more directly addresses this question.

Conclusions:

Recommendations:

Development of Model District Reading Plan

On November 12, a work group completed their four-month effort on the model statewide, comprehensive district reading plan. Dr. Rainey Knight, former superintendent of Darlington County Schools, led the group of instructional leaders in K-12 and higher education on developing the plan that is required in the proposed legislation. Currently, 12 districts have agreed to pilot the reading plan. The purpose of the pilot will be for districts to continue to guide the EOC in the development of the plan by assembling a district literacy team whose responsibility will be to create a plan using the model developed. Pilot districts will submit plans beginning in January 2014 using a web-based text entry system.

Additionally, Dr. Knight was asked to develop a guidance document for school districts about the funding districts will receive to begin offering summer reading camps in summer 2014.

Stakeholders involved:

Rhonda Allen, Reading Specialist/Instructional Facilitator, Congaree-Wood Early Childhood Center, Lexington 2

Stacey Bannister, Teacher, Darlington County Schools

Tara Dean, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction, Laurens 55

Carrie Daniel, Teacher, Greenwood 51

Becca Doswell, Office of Instructional Practices and Evaluation, SC Dept. of Education

Angela Enlow, Teacher, Richland One

Dr. Marcella Heyward-Evans, Chief Instructional Officer, Lexington School District 2

Grace Griffin, Teacher, 4th Grade, Sandy Run School

Michael Guliano, Lexington School District 5

Patti Hammel, Executive Director for Student Performance and Federal Programs, Georgetown County School District

Katty Hite, Reading Specialist/READ 120 Teacher, Davis Early Childhood Center for Technology

Dr. Baron Holmes, University of SC

Sheila Huckabee Quinn, Assistant Superintendent, Administrative Services, Clover School District

Jacqueline Jamison, Executive Director of Academic, Orangeburg School District 5

Harriet Jaworowski, Associate Superintendent, Rock Hill School District 3

Neely Kelly, Elementary Curriculum Coordinator, Fairfield County School District

Nancy Lind, Principal, Meadow Glen Elementary School, Lexington One

Dr. Jane Clark Lindle, Professor, Clemson University

Michelle Martin, Augusta Baker Chair for Childhood Literacy, University of SC

Christina Melton, Chief Instructional Officer, School District 5 of Lexington and Richland Counties

Dr. Heidi Mills, University of South Carolina

Barbara Nesbitt, Early Childhood, Elementary and Instructional Technology Coordinator, Pickens County School District

Dr. Kevin O'Gorman, Chief Academic Officer, Berkeley County School District

Felicia Oliver, Literacy Coordinator, Spartanburg School District 2

Dr. Mildred Rowland, Director of Instruction and Assessment, York School District 1

Angela Rush, Director of Professional Development and Standards, Horry County School District

Angi Sandy, Reading Specialist/Instructional Facilitator, Congaree-Wood Early Childhood Center, Lexington 2

Donna Selvey, Principal, Barnwell Primary School, Barnwell 45

Diane Sigmon, Darlington County School District

Dr. Diane Stephens, University of SC

Gloria Talley, Chief Academic Officer, Lexington School District 1

Jennifer Thomas, Teacher, Hollywood Elem. School, Saluda School District

Jennifer Young, High Progress Literacy Associates

Members of the SCASA Instructional Leaders Roundtable *(25 members responded to request to offer feedback to the model district reading plan following a request made on October 17.)*

Meeting dates:

August 27, 10 AM-2 PM

October 1, 10 AM-2 PM

November 12, 10 AM-2 PM

South Carolina Read to Succeed Draft District Reading Proficiency Reading Plan

Revised Draft – as of January 9, 2014

Goal:

**Ensure that 95% of students are reading on grade level
by 2020**

(2020 Vision adopted by the Education Oversight Committee in 2009)

District Reading Proficiency Plan Guide

Introduction

Reading proficiency is a fundamental life skill vital for the educational and economic success of our citizens and the State. Every student should develop and sustain high levels of reading proficiency prekindergarten through grade 12 (4K-12). Every student should be able to read, write and think at or above grade level and be prepared to pursue careers and college after graduation from high school. This helps ensure that the state of South Carolina has a highly employable population and a highly educated workforce.

Based on the 2013 state reading data, however, only 82.9 % of students meet the third grade reading standard (Level 3 or above) as measured by the state's summative assessment, the Palmetto Assessment of State Standards (PASS). PASS data indicate the percentage of students who meet the grade level reading standard generally declines each year as students progress from elementary to middle school.

To ensure that, by 2020, 95% of all students will be reading on grade level legislation is pending in the South Carolina General Assembly that proposes a statewide reading initiative, *Read to Succeed*. The legislation is a comprehensive and systemic approach to improve the reading proficiency for students in public schools prekindergarten through grade 12.

Purpose of the District Reading Proficiency Plan Guide

The proposed *Read to Succeed* legislation will require the state to develop a state reading plan. In addition, districts would be required to develop a comprehensive, systemic district reading proficiency plan (Plan). This Guide is in draft format and is intended to provide support and assistance to districts and schools by promoting critical thinking, discussion, and reflection among educators as they develop, implement, sustain and refine their plans. (Based on the final legislation and feedback from districts, the Plan will be modified.)

Rationale for the District Reading Proficiency Plan

By providing direction, guidance and coordination to its schools, school districts play a critical role in improving the reading proficiency levels of its students. Districts not only take the lead in the development and implementation of a reading plan; they are also responsible for ensuring the progress of students as readers and writers, monitoring the impact of the Plan and using data to make improvements to the Plan in subsequent years.

Essential Components of District Reading Proficiency Plan

The District Reading Proficiency Plan is divided into four components: (1) Curriculum Instruction and Assessment; (2) Instructional Leadership; (3) Professional Expertise and (4) Planning and Evaluation. Each component is designed to develop and support reading proficiency at all grade levels. Each component lists action statements, which reflect the intent of the proposed *Read to Succeed* legislation. Questions then expand upon the intent of the action statement. Districts are required to provide detailed answers to all questions and to do so in a manner consistent with the legislation. The cumulative responses should detail how:

- measurable student achievement goals are clearly established and clearly described.
- data analysis is an ongoing process that drives decisions.
- research-based, data-driven reading instruction is provided for all students.

- a supplemental, research and data-based support system is provided to all students who cannot yet comprehend grade level text.
- professional learning is meaningful and systemic.
- district and school leadership are actively involved in the planning, implementing and monitoring of the district and school plans.

Role of the District in the Development of the Plan

Districts should create a District Literacy Team whose responsibility is to provide the leadership, support, direction and guidance in the development and implementation of the District Reading Proficiency Plan. The District Literacy Team should reflect members who represent all grade spans (early childhood, elementary, middle and high) and include members with responsibilities in the areas of reading, writing, exceptional education, etc. Each District’s Reading Proficiency Plan should be individualized to reflect the strengths and needs of its educators and students. The district should view schools on an individual basis and distribute resources based on the students’ and teachers’ strengths and needs. The district should design a method to distribute and communicate the Plan throughout the district including students, teachers, parents, and community. The Plan should be a guide to help all educators understand the importance of and urgency for students to attain higher levels of reading proficiency.

Timeline for Submitting Plan

The District’s Reading Proficiency Plan narrative will be completed through a web based text entry system. Plans are due to the Read to Succeed office by _____ , _____ for a preliminary review. The Read to Succeed office will review all district plans online and districts will receive feedback on their plans through an online comment process. Either an approved or a revised status will be submitted to districts by _____ , _____. Plans requiring revisions must be received by the Read to Succeed Office by _____ .

South Carolina *Read to Succeed*

District Reading Proficiency Plan Template

Part I. Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

The district should base its district reading proficiency plan and reading instruction on the South Carolina English/language arts standards. The standards are located at: <http://www.ed.sc.gov>. The reading materials a district selects should be research-based and support high quality classroom instruction. Resources and materials used in the reading program should include a diverse selection of grade-level texts written on a wide range of reading levels matched to the reading and interest levels of students.

In grades 4K-5, there should be at least 90 minutes of uninterrupted instructional time for reading that includes a balance of whole group and small group differentiated instruction. In addition across all grades, students should spend at least 60 minutes a day engaged in reading, writing, and viewing texts in English Language Arts, social studies, mathematics, and, as applicable, art, career and technology education, and physical and health education. Teachers should help students understand the discipline-specific features or content-area print and non-print texts. They should help students learn vocabulary, including the content-area vocabulary, understand the various genres, purposes, audiences and conventions of print and be able to use specialized literacy skills and strategies (e.g., morphemic analysis). Teachers should also help students make sense of information, which is new to them, provide opportunities for students to question and discuss print and non-print texts with peers to deepen understanding. Students must focus on reading as meaning making rather than on reading at the word level, stop when something does not make sense, and problem-solve at the text, chapter, and paragraph and word level.

To achieve these goals, all curricular and instructional decisions for in-classroom and supplemental support should be grounded in text-based formative

assessments. In all classrooms, teachers should use the data from such assessments to make decisions about whole group instruction, to flexibly group students and inform one-on-one conferences. Data should also inform instruction in all supplemental settings.

In all classrooms, teachers should provide high-quality instruction, which supports students as readers, writers, speakers, listeners and viewers of print and non-print texts. Teachers should ensure that, without supplement support, 80% of the students in a heterogeneous group yearly make at least a year's progress on a text-based measure of comprehension. Students who begin the year not yet able to comprehend texts with which have a grade equivalent of six months or more lower than the students' grade level should receive intervention services both from the classroom teacher and a reading interventionist (in both cases, via small group or one-on-one instruction). Reading interventionists who have a literacy teacher add-on endorsement are responsible for providing supplement support. With support from both the classroom teachers and reading interventionists, students receiving supplement services should make, on average, a year and a half growth each year. (For some of these students, progress might be slow at first and then accelerate, e.g., a year's growth the first year and two year's growth the second). The goal is to have students independently comprehend grade-appropriate text and be discontinued from intervention services.

All teachers should periodically reassess curriculum, instruction and engagement of students to determine if they are helping each student progress as a proficient reader and writer. Teachers should make modifications as appropriate so that all students will be able to comprehend grade-appropriate print and non-print texts in all content areas.

Part I. Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

Section for Elementary Schools (grades 4K-5)

Action #1: Ensure that all 4K-5 students are provided with at least ninety minutes of daily uninterrupted reading and writing instruction and that there are high volumes of reading and writing in all content areas.

1. How will your district and school ensure that students have this amount of uninterrupted reading and writing time?
2. How will this time be structured to ensure that all students are fully engaged as readers and writers during this time?

Action #2: Ensure that information from text-based measures informs instruction

1. How will your district ensure that all the members of district and 4K – 5 school-literacy teams (classroom and interventionist teachers, school and district administrators with expertise in reading, other support staff, as applicable) are able to administer and interpret text-based assessment measures and use the results to inform and differentiate instruction?
2. What steps will your district take to intervene to improve instruction in 4K – 5 classrooms and supplemental/intervention settings if students are not making adequate progress?

Action #3: Ensure high quality text-based and research-based Tier One Instruction and Intervention for all 4K – 5 students.

1. How will your district ensure that 4K – 5 school staff are making effective research-based and text-based decisions grounded in data from students' responses to instruction?
2. List the grades 4K – 5 research-based reading materials to be used in Tier 1 instruction.
3. How will your district ensure 4K – 5 teachers emphasize complex text and provide opportunities for students to progress along a continuum of increasing text complexity in their reading?

4. How will your district ensure teachers and reading staff are incorporating effective instructional strategies into daily instruction?
5. How will your district periodically reassess their 4K – 5 curriculum, instruction and engagement of students to determine if they are helping each student progress as a proficient reader and a proficient writer and make modifications as appropriate?

Action #4: Document student readiness/achievement.

Part A: Early Childhood Readiness

1. How will the district ensure there is a process at each 4K-K school that addresses the readiness screening for each 4K-K student? How will the district be assured each 4K-K student is assessed by the 45th day of school?
2. How will the district ensure the school has a plan in place for each student whose readiness assessment indicates the student is below the national standard for school readiness?
3. How will the district ensure each 4K-K school provides the results of the readiness assessment, in writing, to the parent/guardian?

Part B: 4K - 5 Achievement

1. Describe your district plan to monitor, analyze and share the reading progress of grades 4K – 5 students using text based assessments.
2. What assessments will your district implement for grades 4K – 5 for screening, for diagnostics and for progress monitoring? Include information about alternate assessments for students with disabilities, LEP students, etc.

Action #5: Determine eligibility for Tier Two Intervention

1. How will your district use state guidelines to determine which 4K - 5 students are not yet able to comprehend grade-level, print and non-print texts and are therefore eligible for Tier Two intervention during the school year and/or in the summer reading camps?

2. What is the process for ensuring that parents/guardians are notified in writing that the student is not able to read grade level text and is eligible for intervention services?
3. How will your district ensure that all 4K - 5 students who are not able to comprehend grade level material are provided with supplemental support?
4. What before-school, after-school, summer reading camp activities and mentoring activities will be utilized to support and encourage reading and writing for 4K – 5 students outside of school? Include how these activities will be linked to school instruction.
5. How will the district ensure schools report the results to the district of the initial assessments and follow up progress monitoring results for each student who is substantially not demonstrating proficiency in reading?

Action #6: Provide at least 30 minutes daily of supplemental Tier Two Intervention for 4K-3 students

1. How will your district ensure that 4K – 5 students' individual strengths and needs are the primary consideration for grouping students for supplemental instruction?
2. What modifications will be made to the daily schedule to accomplish this task?
3. What research-based materials will be used for grades 4K – 5 reading interventions during the school year and as part of the summer reading camps?
4. What are the district expectations as to the design of the summer reading camps? Include the schedule, personnel, student/teacher ratio, description of instruction, progress monitoring of students, interventions planned, etc.

Action #7: Track progress in Tier Two Intervention

1. How often does your district expect school personnel to conference and share progress monitoring data with parents/guardians of grade 4K- 5 students?

2. When students who are receiving supplemental support do not make, more than a year's growth in a year, how will your district seek support within and outside the district to ensure students are making the necessary growth?

Action #8: Review of Grade 3 Student Reading Results

1. How will the district ensure schools notify parents, in writing, at the beginning of grade 3, if the student is substantially not meeting reading proficiency and may be retained at the end of the grade 3? How will the district ensure schools continue to provide parents notification of the student's progress each month and at the end of each grading period? (Written notification should include interventions, suggestions for assistance to be provided at home student progress using formative assessments, classroom grades, observations, tests, etc.)
2. How will the reinforcement/enhancement class for a retained grade 3 student be structured to accelerate his/her learning and address the specific needs of the student? Include personnel, student/teacher ratio, time scheduled for reading, curriculum, instructional strategies, interventions, progress monitoring, etc.)

Section for Middle Schools (grades 6-8)

Action #9: Ensure that there are at least 60 minutes of reading and writing across all content areas in grades 6 – 8 daily.

1. How will your district ensure all students in grades 6 – 8 have a total of 60 minutes of reading and writing time across all subjects daily?
2. How will all teachers develop and incorporate reading into all content areas in grades 6 – 8 to extend and build discussions of text in order to deepen understanding of concepts?

Action #10: Ensure that information from text-based measures informs instruction

1. How will your district ensure that all the members of district and grades 6 - 8 school-literacy teams (classroom and interventionist teachers, school and

district administrators with expertise in reading, other support staff, as applicable) are able to administer and interpret text-based assessment measures and use results to inform and differentiate instruction?

2. What steps will your district take to intervene to improve instruction in grades 6 - 8 classrooms and supplemental/intervention settings if students are not making adequate progress?

Action #11: Ensure high quality text-based and research-based Tier One Instruction and Intervention for grade 6 - 8 students.

1. List the grades 6- 8 research-based reading materials to be used in Tier 1 instruction.
2. How will your district ensure all grade 6 - 8 teachers emphasize complex text and provide opportunities for students to progress along a continuum of increasing text complexity in their reading?
3. How will your district ensure teachers and reading staff are incorporating effective instructional strategies into daily instruction?
4. How will your district periodically monitor and reassess their grade 6- 8 curriculum, instruction and engagement of students to determine if they are helping each student progress as a proficient reader and a proficient writer and make modifications as appropriate?

Action #12: Document student readiness/achievement

Part A. Not Applicable

Part B: Grades 6- 8 Achievement

1. What assessments will your district implement in grades 6 - 8 for screening and progress monitoring? Include information about alternate assessments for students with disabilities, LEP students, etc.
2. Describe how your district will monitor, analyze and share grade 6 - 8 student data student progress with parents/guardians, students, teachers and administrators?

Action #13: Determine eligibility for Tier Two Intervention for Grades 6 - 8

1. How will your district use state guidelines to determine which grade 6 - 8 students are not yet able to comprehend grade-level, print and non-print texts and are therefore eligible for Tier Two intervention during the school year?
2. What is the process for ensuring that parents/guardians are notified in writing that the student is not able to read grade level text and is eligible for intervention services?
3. How will your district ensure that all grade 6 - 8 students who are not able to comprehend grade level material are provided with supplemental support?
4. What before-school, after-school, summer activities and/or mentoring activities will be utilized to support and encourage reading and writing for grade 6 - 8 students outside of school? Include how these activities will be linked to school instruction.
5. How will the district ensure schools report the results to the district of the initial assessments and follow up progress monitoring results for each student whom is substantially no demonstrating proficiency in reading?

Action 14: Provide at least 30 minutes daily of supplemental Tier Two Intervention for grades 6 – 8.

1. How will your district ensure that students receive effective Tier Two intervention customized to the individual needs of students?
2. What modifications will be made to the daily schedule to accomplish this task?

Action #15: Track progress in Tier Two Intervention

1. How often does your district expect school personnel to conference and share progress monitoring data with parents/guardians of grade 6 -8 students?
2. When students who are receiving supplemental support do not make, more than a year's growth in a year, how will your district seek support within and outside the district to ensure students are making the necessary growth in reading?

Section for High Schools (grades 9 - 12)

Action #16: Ensure that there are at least 60 minutes of reading and writing across all content areas in grades 9 - 12 daily.

1. How will your district ensure all students in grades 9 - 12 have a total of 60 minutes of reading and writing time across all subjects daily?
2. How will all teachers develop and incorporate reading into all content areas in grades 9 - 12 to extend and build discussions of text in order to deepen understanding of concepts?

Action #17: Ensure that information from text-based measures informs instruction

1. How will your district ensure that all the members of district and grades 9 - 12 school-literacy teams (classroom and interventionist teachers, school and district administrators with expertise in reading, other support staff, as applicable) are able to administer and interpret text-based assessment measures and use results to inform and differentiate instruction?
2. What steps will your district take to intervene to improve instruction in grades 9 - 12 classrooms and supplemental/intervention settings if students are not making adequate progress?

Action #18: Ensure high quality text-based and research-based Tier One Instruction and Intervention for grade 9 - 12 students.

1. List the grade 9 - 12 evidence-based reading materials to be used in Tier 1 instruction.
2. How will your district ensure all grade 9 - 12 teachers emphasize complex text and provide opportunities for students to progress along a continuum of increasing text complexity in their reading?
3. How will your district teachers and reading staff are incorporating effective reading strategies into daily instruction?

4. How will your district periodically reassess their grade 9 -12 curriculum, instruction and engagement of students to determine if they are helping each student progress as a proficient reader and a proficient writer and make modifications as appropriate?

Action #19: Document student readiness/achievement

Part A. Not Applicable

Part B: Grades 9 - 12 Achievement

1. What assessments will your district implement in grades 9 - 12 for screening and progress monitoring? Include information about alternate assessments for students with disabilities, LEP students, etc.
2. Describe how your district will monitor, analyze and share grade 9 - 12 data about student progress with students, teachers, administrators and parents/guardians?

Action #20: Determine eligibility for Tier Two Intervention for Grades 9 -12

1. How will your district use state guidelines to determine which grade 9 - 12 students are not yet able to comprehend grade-level, print and non-print texts and are therefore eligible for Tier Two intervention during the school year?
2. What is the process for ensuring that parents/guardians are notified in writing that the student is not able to read grade level text and is eligible for intervention services?
3. How will your district ensure that all grade 9 - 12 students who are not able to comprehend grade level material are provided with supplemental support?
4. What before-school, after-school, summer activities and/or mentoring activities will be utilized to support and encourage reading and writing for grade 9 - 12 students outside of school? Include how these activities will be linked to school instruction.
5. How will the district ensure schools report the results to the district of the initial assessments and follow up progress monitoring results for each student whom is substantially no demonstrating proficiency in reading?

Action 21: Provide at least 30 minutes daily of supplemental Tier Two Intervention for grades 9 - 12.

1. How will your district ensure that students receive effective Tier Two intervention customized to the individual needs of students?
2. What modifications will be made to the daily schedule to accomplish this task?

Action #22: Track progress in Tier Two Intervention

1. How often does your district expect school personnel to conference and share progress monitoring data with parents/guardians of grade 9 -12 students?
2. When students who are receiving supplemental support do not make, more than a year's growth in a year, how will your district seek support within and outside the district to alter that trajectory? How will student progress be monitored?

Section for All Grade Levels (4K – 12)

Action #23: Increase access to texts students can comprehend

1. How will districts ensure that all classrooms have books on high-interest topics, written at a range of grade levels?
2. How will districts ensure that all students have access, across all content areas to a wide selections of print and non-print texts over a wide range of genres and written on a wide range of reading levels which match the reading levels of students?

Action #24: Increase the volume of engaged reading and writing students do in and out of school.

1. How will districts ensure they increase the amount of time 4K – 5 students spend during the school year in engaged reading and writing (a) in school? (b) out of school (including homework and voluntary reading)?

2. How will districts document and report reading and writing volume in and out of school?

Action #25: Help parents/guardians understand how they can support the student as a reader and writer at home.

1. How will parents/guardians be informed about the school's reading goals/programs, the status of their student's progress towards his/her goals, and what the school is doing if the student is not substantially meeting his/her goals?
2. How will districts ensure that all parents/guardians are fully informed about what they can do at home to support their student as a reader and writer?
3. What materials/information/resources will the district provide to parents to support students as readers and writers?

Action #26: Develop partnerships “with county libraries, volunteers, social and community organizations, faith-based organizations, pediatric/family practice medical personnel and school media specialists to promote reading.”

1. What are the out-of-school agencies and organizations your district will coordinate with to promote community literacy? Include how each partner will assist and support your district reading plan.
2. Who is responsible at the district level for coordinating partnerships in the communities? How will the district ensure schools develop and implement partnerships?

Part II. The Role of Instructional Leadership

At both the school and district levels, district and school leaders play a critical role in planning, implementing and monitoring of the District Reading Proficiency Plan. As such, district and school leaders need the knowledge and skills to understand and support the needs of classroom teachers, coaches and interventionists in this endeavor. Strong literacy leadership at both the district and school levels is essential to the success of a district and school reading plan and ultimately to the progress of the students.

Each district should create a district literacy team whose responsibility is to plan and design the district reading proficiency plan; to provide support to schools in the implementation of the Plan; to guide and provide appropriate professional learning and to monitor and provide feedback to schools regarding implementation of the Plan. The district literacy team should continuously monitor, assess, review and revise all aspects of the Plan on a periodic basis and provide feedback to schools. In addition, the district leadership team should devise a mechanism for receiving feedback from schools regarding their needs and concerns during implementation in order to update and make changes to the district plan.

At the school level, the principal should oversee the reading program and work collaboratively with teacher leaders, coaches, interventions and others on a school literacy team. The school literacy team should take the lead on developing a school plan which accesses the expertise of all educators in the building. They should solicit feedback on the school plan from parents and other stakeholders. Community partnerships and resources will be necessary for the plan's success. The more opportunities the plan has for exposure to its stakeholders the greater chance all perspectives will have been considered for inclusion in the plan and thus a greater degree of ownership in the school plan.

The school plan should be consistent with the state and district plan and, as such, include a system for ensuring that in all classrooms, students have ample time to read, access to books they can read and instruction (whole-group, small group and one-on-one) which helps them develop their ability to comprehend grade level texts. The school literacy team, working collaboratively with classroom teachers, should monitor the reading growth of all students, determine if supplemental support is needed and oversee supplemental instruction to ensure that student needs and strengths are being addressed in a manner that leads to reading growth. Finally the school literacy team should coordinate resource support so that student needs are met in a cohesive and consistent manner.

Part II. Role of Instructional Leadership

Action #1: Ensure that all district and school administrators excel as literacy leaders.

1. How will your district ensure that principals and district leaders have the knowledge base needed to be literacy leaders who provide appropriate support to teachers?
2. How will your district ensure that principals are regularly in classrooms observing and consulting with teachers about the progress of the students?
3. How will your district ensure that principals are using their literacy knowledge effectively to support teachers?
4. For teachers whose students are not making adequate progress in reading, how will the district assist and support teachers in improving reading instruction and assessment practices?
5. For principals whose schools are not making adequate progress in reading, how will the district assist and support principals in making improvements in reading instruction and assessment practices?

Action #2: Ensure that all staff is aware of their responsibilities relative to the literacy growth of students.

1. How will your district ensure that all district and school staff understand their particular responsibilities relative to helping all students comprehend grade level texts?
2. How will your district form school and district data/literacy teams to ensure consistency of approach across service providers (e.g., reading interventionists, speech teachers, regular education teachers, school psychologists, exceptional education teachers, reading coaches, ESOL teachers)?
3. Until all teachers gain their literacy teacher endorsement, how will your district ensure that only teachers who hold an add-on certification as a Literacy Teacher provide interventions?

4. If your district employs literacy coaches, how will the district ensure that only teachers who hold an add-on certification as a Literacy Coach serve in that role?
5. If your district employs literacy coaches, how will the district provide leadership and support in defining the role of a coach and communicating that to staff?

Action #3. Ensure that all staff, parents, and guardians understand the state, district and school plans.

1. How will your district ensure that all teachers and administrators in the district understand the content and expectations of district and school plans?
2. How will your district share this information with staff and parents/guardians?

Part III. Ensuring Professional Expertise

High quality, sustained professional learning opportunities based on the needs of teachers and principals ensures that students receive the kind of instruction that leads to improved student achievement. The literature suggests that effective learning opportunities are long term, site-based, work-embedded, and strongly supported by school leaders, including the school principal. Professional learning provided for the implementation of the Plan is a multi-year endeavor, which progressively builds on the previous year's results to strengthen, assist and support the knowledge base and practices of all participants.

Districts are expected to develop a professional learning plan for all teachers, reading coaches, interventionists, school psychologists and school-based administrators as well as district office staff whose responsibility it is to assist with the reading proficiency. This plan should be grounded in an assessment of the strengths and needs of all these individuals. All involved individuals should know how to:

1. Utilize and interpret formative assessments.
2. Use student data to guide instruction.

3. Understand and implement research-based reading practices.
4. Understand and implement the response to intervention (RTI) model,
5. And understand and utilize in-class and supplemental interventions for struggling readers.

Administrators and teacher leaders should be provided opportunities to understand the implementation of the district reading proficiency plan including effective monitoring of the Plan, importance of classroom observations and follow-up discussions by district and school literacy teams, the role of the district and school literacy teams and the role of the coaches and interventionists.

Part III. Ensuring Professional Expertise

Action #1: Ensure that all teachers and administrators have their required add-on certifications and course work

1. What is your district plan to ensure that all current teachers and administrators have their required add-on certifications and course work within the time frame required by the law?

Action #2: Provide Professional Learning

1. How will the district ensure educators in the district have access to comprehensive, sustained and intensive professional learning needed to ensure the district and school plans are implemented effectively?
2. What professional learning will content area teachers receive related to improving reading instruction in the content areas?
3. Provide the upcoming year's district schedule for professional learning that will build district capacity in literacy for all stakeholders: paraprofessionals, teachers, coaches, principals, and central office personnel.
4. How will the district and schools ensure that teacher and administrator needs, including student assessment data, guide professional learning?
5. How will your district monitor and determine the effectiveness of professional learning? How will modifications be made as needed?

Part IV. Planning and Evaluation

Planning and evaluation are part of a continuous cycle the district should use to plan, develop, implements, assess, refine and evaluate the district reading proficiency plan. The Plan is a roadmap created by each district to guide and direct the actions of the district and schools in implementing its reading plan. It is also a working document that should be reviewed and refined on an ongoing basis. The strengths and challenges of the Plan as evidenced during implementation should initiate discussions among district and school staff. These discussions along with student data and teacher needs identify areas for improvement year to year.

The district literacy team along with input from the schools should establish a series of incremental goals that move the district towards meeting the state vision of 95% of students reading on grade level by 2020. The goals should be in the SMART (Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Realistic and Timely) format. It is expected that incremental goals will be written for each grade level (4K through grade 10) to cover the three-year period of 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18.

Part IV. Planning and Evaluation

Action #1: Design, Secure Funding for, and Implement a District Plan

1. Who in your district is the contact person for the district reading plan? Contact address? Contact email? Contact phone number?
2. How will your district literacy leadership team develop, implement, monitor and sustain the district reading plan?
3. How will your district fund its reading plan? (*Sample format to be provided.*)

Action #2: Design and Secure Funding for Plans for Individual Schools

1. How will your district oversee the development of the school plans?
2. How will the schools with the greatest needs receive the greatest support?

3. What are the district expectations for the development of the school literacy teams?

Action #3: Annually report student progress toward the district's reading proficiency goals.

1. What are your district's measurable student achievement goals for reading for 2015-2106? For 2016-17? For 2017-18? Establish reasonable, incremental goals over these three years. Keep in mind the 2020 state goal is 95% of students will meet reading proficiency. Include goals for grades 4K - 10. (Ensure goals are in SMART format. Format to be provided.)

Action #4: Annually review all aspects of the district plan, addressing its effectiveness and making any needed modifications

1. What data will your district use to determine the effectiveness of your district literacy plan? Include data such as formative assessment, summative assessment, teacher effectiveness, professional learning quality and implementation, etc.
2. How and when will this analysis of the effectiveness of the Plan be carried out?
3. How will the district ensure that the district and school leadership communicates on a regular basis concerning program progress, program challenges and successes to appropriate stakeholder groups?
4. How will decisions be made about where additional support is needed?

Action #5: Address the effectiveness of school reading plans.

1. What data will each school use to determine the effectiveness of their school literacy plan? Include data such as formative assessment, summative assessment, teacher effectiveness, professional learning quality and implementation, etc.)

Proposed Plans for Piloting the Draft District Reading Proficiency Plan

In anticipation of the South Carolina Legislature adopting legislation to create a statewide, comprehensive reading plan, *Read to Succeed*, the Education Oversight Committee (EOC) has been charged with developing a draft of a District Reading Proficiency Plan. It is anticipated the District Reading Proficiency Plan would guide districts in their thinking, discussion and reflection as they develop, implement, sustain and refine their plans.

During the fall of 2013, the EOC established a District Reading Plan Committee, composed of school and district level instructional leaders, district and school administrators, and higher education faculty whose charge was to provide guidance and direction for a District Reading Proficiency Plan template. The Committee met several times and provided invaluable expertise and suggestions in the creation of a draft District Reading Proficiency Plan template. In addition, the Committee shared recommendations and considerations for developing and implementing the Plan, including professional learning needs, funding concerns, and resource allocations.

In order to provide for additional feedback and input from local districts, the EOC is piloting the draft District Reading Proficiency Plan in twelve school districts across the state in the spring of 2014. These districts are: Anderson 2, Anderson, 3 Barnwell 45, Darlington, Florence 1, Georgetown, Greenwood 50, Orangeburg 5, Pickens, Spartanburg 2, Williamsburg, and York 1. The purpose of the pilot will be for districts to continue to guide the EOC in the development of the plan by assembling a district literacy team whose responsibility will be to create its district reading plan using the District Reading Proficiency Plan template. Pilot districts will submit their plan using a web based text entry system.

Each district will be provided support in this initiative with face-to-face meetings, telephone conferences and electronic meetings, as needed. The timeline for the pilot is January through March. Districts have the flexibility to complete the plan by any means that works for them.

The deliverables for the pilot will include a completed District Reading Proficiency Plan including questions, comments and concerns expressed by districts regarding the questions in the plan, the format of the plan, the materials needed for implementation of the plan, the personnel needed for implementation of the plan, certification requirements for educators, and the overall funding needs for the plan. The EOC will also ask districts to document the total time required to complete the plan.

The feedback received from the districts regarding the creation of their Plan will assist the EOC in making the necessary revisions to the Plan template as well as to the overall implementation of the proposed *Read to Succeed* legislation pending in the S.C. General Assembly.

Proposed Guidelines for 2014 Summer Reading Camps

In 2013, the South Carolina Legislature funded the 2014 Summer Reading Camps to support and assist third grade students with reading difficulties. The purpose of the summer reading camps will be to provide opportunities for students who scored Not Met 1 on the Palmetto Assessment State Standards (PASS) to improve and advance their reading skills. During the summer reading camp experience, high quality reading instruction will be provided in order for students to achieve the goal of reading on grade level.

For the summer of 2014, districts should follow district policy/guidelines regarding retention for grade 3 students. The 2014 Summer Reading Camps are meant to provide an additional opportunity to struggling readers in preparation for grade 4. In addition, a district may offer summer reading camps for students who are not exhibiting reading proficiency in prekindergarten through grade 2 and may charge fees based on a sliding scale pursuant to Section 59-19-90 of the 1976 Code. Priority seats for the summer reading camps should be given to third grade students with reading difficulties.

Funding for the 2014 Summer Reading Camps was determined by the number of students who scored Not Met 1 on the reading portion of PASS in 2013. In the spring of 2014, districts should carefully review all students' progress in third grade reading for the 2013-14 school year to determine which students are substantially not demonstrating reading proficiency at the third grade level. A variety of data points should be included in the student review such as teacher observations, teacher grades, progress monitoring results, and benchmark assessment results to determine if a student is substantially not demonstrating reading proficiency. (Note: PASS scores will not be available prior to the start of the reading camp.)

Students who are not substantially demonstrating reading proficiency should be invited and encouraged to attend the summer reading camp for the purpose of improving their reading skills, however, students are not required to attend.

Districts must adhere to the following requirements for its summer reading camps.

1. The reading camp must be six to eight weeks in length.
2. The reading camp must be four to five days per week and include at least five and one-half hours of instructional time daily.
3. The reading camp classes must be taught by compensated, licensed teachers who have demonstrated substantial success in helping students comprehend grade level texts.

Districts should consider the following recommendations in implementing its reading camps.

1. Create a program designed to: a. teach students strategies to assist them in understanding the meaning of what they have read as opposed to reading words; b. make the reading experience pleasurable for students, building upon the interest of students in the program; and c. promote the belief in students that they can be successful readers, developing and building their self-efficacy.
2. Establish partnerships to provide mentors, tutors and/or instructional assistants with community-based organizations such as the Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCA, PTOs, county libraries, parent volunteers, etc.; faith-based organizations; local colleges/universities; nonprofits such as Save the Children and Children's Defense Fund Freedom Schools.
3. Establish class sizes of no more than 15 students per licensed teacher.
4. Licensed teachers should have expertise in tailoring instruction to meet the individual needs of students as well as in accelerating student learning.
5. Ensure the focus of the camp is on intensive reading intervention.
6. Utilize evidence-based instructional materials in the reading program to include components of learning to read, i.e., oral language, phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.
7. Utilize a response to intervention system for each site. Administer a progress monitoring assessment to each student within the third day of the reading camp and establish appropriate intervention(s) immediately. Periodically re-assess each student to determine the progress of the student and the effectiveness of the instruction.
8. Establish a data system to record the reading progress of each child.
9. Plan to actively involve parents/guardians in supporting their child in developing his/her reading skills during the camp participation such as creating a Read to Parent Day, sending home daily reading activities parents can do with their child, signing up for a library card, etc.
10. Provide access to the media center for use in schools as well as necessary technology and computer labs.
11. Ensure the onsite camp administrator/supervisor monitors instruction daily.
12. Develop a system to communicate with parents throughout the camp experience and consider integrating a family night or other opportunity to promote family literacy and showcase the work of the students.

13. Consider funding sources in addition to the state allocation such as IDEA, Title 3, Title 1, etc.
14. Consider providing each child with a certain number of books to take home at the end of the camp to reinforce reading strategies.
15. Consider a thematic approach to the camp structure such as careers, arts, animals/nature, local history, etc.

2014 Summer Reading Camp Data Collection

(Note: It is anticipated this form will be available for districts to submit online.)

District Contact:

Contact Phone:

Contact Email:

Camp Sites: (List sites of camp sites in district)

Total Number of Students Expected to be Served:

Dates of Camp: (Start/End Dates)

Days of Camp: (Mon-Fri)

Hours Per Day: (Hours of Daily Operation)

Hours of Instruction Per Day: (Hours of Actual Daily Instruction)

Estimated Student/Classroom Teacher Ratio: (Ratio of students to classroom teacher)

Media Center Available: (Yes/No)

Computer Access for Students: (Yes/No)

Camp Schedule: (Provide schedule for an expected week of instruction)

Partnerships for Camps: (List partnerships for each site and what role the partner will play)

List Main Reading Intervention Program(s):

List Primary Instructional Reading Materials:

List Progress Monitoring Tools:

Plan for evaluating individual student performance:

Student data will be collected as a result of the summer reading camps. Districts will flag students in PowerSchool as participants in the district reading camp. Data points in PowerSchool will indicate the 2013 Reading PASS level of the student, the pre/post

assessment data and whether student was promoted to next grade level. Instructions will be provided to school districts on the method to record the information.

Draft

Summary of trip to Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) at Florida State University

On October 24-25, Dr. Rainey Knight and Dana Yow, EOC staff, travelled to Tallahassee, Florida to learn how Florida officials have implemented reading policies for over a decade. An emphasis on literacy and quality reading instruction is embedded in the culture of Florida public schools and is no longer questioned. Despite political pressures, a lack of leadership devoted to reading at the top levels of state government, and a scarcity of funding (compared to previous years), teachers in Florida we met with are bolstered by the progress being made by their students and how their training helps them assist students to be successful.

Primarily, our time in Florida was spent with Kevin Smith of the REL Southeast and formerly Deputy Director of Just Read Florida!; Barbara Foorman, Director of the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR); Bev Simpkins of FCRR; and Laurie Lee, from Just Read Florida! We also met with administrative leaders and teachers at two schools: Sabal Palm Elementary School, a Title 1 school in Leon County School District designated as one of the 100 lowest performing Florida schools in reading as well as the Florida State University School, a K-12 Charter School in Tallahassee.

“The most powerful common denominator in education”

In 2001, Florida Governor Jeb Bush established Just Read, Florida! to ensure all Florida students would be able to read at or above grade level by the year 2012. Bush recognized reading as “the most powerful common denominator in education and paramount to an individual’s success.” Since that time, a number of statewide policies have been implemented in Florida to maintain the former Governor’s commitment to high reading achievement creating a comprehensive and systemic approach to reading that involve key, systemic components:

1. A focus on supporting advanced literacy and intervention early, preventing the literacy achievement gap from starting;
2. enhanced pre-service and in-service training in literacy at the teacher and administrator level;
3. an end to social promotion of students who read far below grade level in third grade and a commitment to explicit, comprehensive, intensive, and supportive instruction of students at risk for reading failure;
4. sustained intervention aligned with district plans; and
5. an emphasis on data-driven decision making and a statewide structure committed to reading.

Focus on supporting advanced literacy and intervention early, preventing the literacy achievement gap from starting

As is emphasized in the Florida Dept. of Education Statewide Literacy Plan, “it is easier to prevent literacy achievement gaps from starting during the early literacy years than it is to close achievement gaps once they have emerged.”

Focus on the family before kindergarten

Florida officials learned lessons in the area of early literacy from Kennewick School District in Washington. The district’s Reading Success Model set a goal of 90 percent of their students reading on grade level. After safety, reading proficiency was established at their highest priority for students. In Kennewick, the single most cost effective thing they tried to do in the district was change the

Incentive for Pre-K programs to have children ready for Kindergarten

The Florida Department of Education/State Board of Education is required by law to calculate a kindergarten readiness rate every year for each private or public school VPK Provider of either the School-Year (540-hour) or Summer (300-hour) program.

The **VPK Provider Kindergarten Readiness Rate** measures how well a VPK provider prepares four-year-olds to be ready for kindergarten based upon the Florida Early Learning and Developmental Standards for Four-Year Olds (2011). The VPK Standards describe what four-year-old children should know and be able to do by the end of their prekindergarten year. The VPK Provider Kindergarten Readiness Rate is based on the screening results of children who attended and completed VPK. The screening is administered by public and private schools. For the 2012-13 kindergarten screening, the FLKRS included a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS™) and, two measures from the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Letter Naming and Phonemic Awareness that provide a probability of reading success score. Readiness for Kindergarten has been determined to be the following: ECHOS™ scores: Consistently Demonstrating or Emerging/Progressing and FAIR score: Probability of reading success score at or above 67 percent. The percent of children ready for kindergarten on both measures is calculated by dividing the number of children substantially completing the program who score ready on both measures by the number of children substantially completing the program and screened on both measures.

A Provider on Probation is a VPK provider whose readiness rate is at or below the minimum set by the State Board of Education. Providers on Probation are required to submit and implement an improvement plan. A Provider on Probation cannot begin instruction for a new VPK class or program and will not receive funding for VPK until an Improvement Plan has been submitted and approved.

<https://vpk.fldoe.org/>

perception of parents by focusing on one question: how would entering kindergarten knowing very few basic skills affect a child's success in school? The majority of parents in Kennewick, no different from other locales, believe their child will catch up within a year or two. Once in public schools, however, most students make *annual* growth. Educators in Kennewick knew that catch-up growth was very difficult to achieve. "It can be a product only of quality of instruction in great quantity." When students leave kindergarten three years behind in reading, they must make six years of growth in three years to catch up by third grade. That is two years of growth in each first, second, and third grades to catch up. If the majority of students could enter kindergarten with grade level language and literacy skills, schools would only need to create annual growth.

In Kennewick, 22,000 parents were served by 2009 with Ready for Kindergarten programs, which were developed through a partnership with local, community-based Children's Reading Foundations. Seventy-eight percent of students whose parents attended entered with at or above level grade level skills.¹

Voluntary Pre-K

School readiness is promoted statewide as Florida currently enrolls 70% of the 4-year-olds in Florida in a Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK) in approximately 6,000 private and public providers. Eighty percent of the programs are private providers. The state funds a four hour per day program. Students can be served longer but the state does not provide the funding past the four hours per day.

¹ Lynn Fielding, "The Kennewick Model: Annual Growth, Catch-up Growth" (presentation, May 2009).

Mandatory Readiness Assessment

Florida statute requires that a statewide kindergarten readiness screening be administered within the first days of kindergarten in all public schools; the screening assessment is mandatory. The Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening (FLKRS) is designed to gather information on a child's overall development and to "specifically address the readiness of each student for kindergarten based on the VPK Education Standards.² All Pre-K programs have to administer FLKRS three times a year and it measures language development, early math, and early sounds.

“It is common to find within a kindergarten classroom a five-year range of children’s literacy-related skills...(some) may have skills characteristic of the typical three-year-old, while others might be functioning on the level of they typical eight-year-old.” – *Dr. Jeni Riley, University of London as quoted in a joint position statement of the NAEYC and IRA.*

Enhanced pre-service and in-service training in literacy at the teacher and administrator level

Before the implementation of the third grade retention policy, Florida had made significant systemic changes to better equip teachers for the level of intervention required to help students in danger of reading failure. Multiple tiers of reading intervention, along with daily core reading instruction, are required to help these students succeed. Measures were put in place to make certain that pre-service teachers were provided with adequate literacy instruction and that teachers in the classroom were provided adequate professional development.

K-12 Reading Endorsement

In 2001, Florida created a K-12 reading endorsement for teachers. The endorsement, or K-12 Certification in Reading, is required for secondary teachers who teach reading and for reading coaches. The standards set forth in the competencies, focus on strategic instruction that support student achievement in reading, and are currently incorporated into all teacher preparation programs in Florida. In 2011, the endorsement was “re-framed” to include a greater emphasis on oral language.

Florida K-12 Reading Endorsement Requirements	
Reading Endorsement Competency (courses)	In-service hours required
Foundations of Reading Instruction	60
Application of Research-Based Instructional Practices	60
Foundations of Assessment	60
Foundations and Applications of Differentiated Instruction	60
Demonstration of Accomplishment (practicum)	60

² Florida Department of Education State Literacy Plan, 2011-2012, Accessed September 11, 2012. <http://www.justread-florida.com/pdf/StrivingReaders.pdf>.

Professional Development

Teachers in grades 6-12 are currently required to become proficient in applying scientifically-based reading strategies through their content areas. The professional development in Florida is known as Content Area Reading Professional Development (CAR-PD) and Next Generation Content Area Professional Development (NGCAR-PD). Teachers who are not certified in reading or endorsed in reading must complete one of the two professional development packages if they provide reading intervention to Level 2 students who do not need instruction in decoding or text reading efficiency in content area classes. Although neither professional development package fulfills the requirements for the Reading Endorsement, both require 60 hours of face-to-face professional development as well as a 30 hour practicum. NGCAR-PD is a train-the-trainer model and according to the teachers at the Florida State Laboratory School, the professional development focuses on vocabulary and comprehension.

An end to social promotion of students who read far below grade level in third grade and a commitment to *explicit, comprehensive, intensive, and supportive* instruction of students at risk for reading failure

Florida students are eligible to be retained in third grade if they score a Level 1 (of five performance levels) on the FCAT Reading Achievement Test. As specified by statute, students qualifying for retention can be promoted if they qualify for one of six “good cause exemptions.” The exemptions include:

- students with disabilities whose Individual Education Plans (IEPs) indicate that the state test is not an appropriate measure of performance;
- students with disabilities who were retained twice previously in third grade; Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students;
- students retrained twice previously; and
- students who can demonstrate proficiency through an alternative assessment or portfolio of their work.

According to documents received in Florida, in school year 2003-04, 45,577 students (20% of test takers) scored Level 1 on the FCAT. Of those students, 22,411 were not retained because of good cause exemptions. A total of 23,166 students (10% of test takers) were retained. By contrast, in school year 2011-12, 35,860 students (16% of test takers) scored Level 1 on the FCAT. Seven percent of students were retained in the same grade at the end of the school that year.

Retention at Sabal Palm Elementary

Sabal Palm Elementary handles retained students in a 3rd-4th transition class (“transitional instructional setting” allowed by state statute.) Currently, the class size is about 14 students. They teach the students using 4th grade content. However, the students receive daily reading intervention. Intervention involves the components of reading instruction used with all students: phonemic awareness and phonemic decoding skills; fluency in word recognition and text processing; construction of meaning; vocabulary; spelling; and writing. Students who need intervention because they are at risk of reading failure need the same instruction that is more explicit, comprehensive, intensive, and supportive in small-group or using individual instruction.

Sustained interventions aligned with District Plans

Districts must write a K-12 Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan each year outlining how they plan to spend their allocated funds. Some of the interventions include:

Literacy Coaches

Districts can choose to hire literacy coaches for schools determined to have the greatest need based on student performance data; experience and expertise of the school's administration and faculty in reading assessment, instruction and intervention; and receptiveness of administration and faculty to the coaching model. Reading/Literacy coaches are required to be endorsed or K-12 certified in the area of reading, or working toward that status by completing a minimum of two reading endorsement competencies of 60 in-service hours each or 6 semester hours of college coursework in reading per year. All schools utilizing a reading/literacy coach must implement the reading/literacy coach model developed by Just Read Florida! Officials in Florida are trying to get an instructional coach endorsement but they have been meeting resistance.

Summer reading academies

The majority of Florida school districts choose to offer summer reading camps/academies for students who score at Level 1 on FCAT Reading. Districts are required to submit a plan to the Just Read! office prior to implementation.

At Sabal Palm Elementary, the summer academy runs four days a week for five weeks at five hours per day. Although they try to make the academies fun and interesting, they were described as largely "skills-based and fast-paced." Currently, Sabal Palm focuses summer academies on first and third graders. First graders are those students who have been identified as having an issue early that is holding them back from making progress. Students in third grade are most likely in the summer academy to avoid retention. For a third grader to be promoted to fourth grade, they can either earn a passing grade on a reading portfolio (a series of assessments) or pass the SAT-10. Students in the Sabal Palm Summer Academy receive at least two lessons per day. They rely heavily on technology, using SuccessMaker and regular benchmark testing.

Leon County School District has five summer sites fed into by 24 schools. They employ 50 teachers for the district's summer academies, all hand-picked by the district. They also employ paraprofessionals and interns from colleges and universities. If summer academies are at Title 1 schools, district can use Title 1 money to pay for the academies.

Lesson study and state-level professional development

Lesson study is a form of professional development that is designed to assist schools in developing capacity. It is job-embedded and brings teachers together in a team approach focused on formulating lessons that focus on how students think and learn. The state also provides professional development, many of which are online, for many different audiences focused on literacy. Two resources, the FAIR Student Center Activities Search Tool, and the Literacy Essentials and Reading Network (LEaRN) provide teachers with examples of activities and videos they can access to support learning in literacy. Both resources were created by The Just Read! Office and the Florida Center for Reading Research.

Emphasis on data-driven decision making and a statewide structure devoted to reading

Monitoring and improving reading instruction is something that happens at the system, district, school, and classroom level in Florida. A Reading Leadership Team works within each school to analyze data which drives decisions and appropriate research-based instructional materials and strategies used to address individual student needs. This team also works on the district reading plan. At the FSU lab school, the leadership team encourages teachers to read for pleasure and model how reading instruction should occur.

In 2002, Just Read, Florida! and the Florida Center for Reading Research created a web-based data management system that focuses on the reporting of student progress in reading. The Progress Monitoring & Reporting Network (PMRN) produces data reports at the class, school, district, and state levels on FAIR and other assessments.

In 2009, Just Read, Florida! and the Florida Center for Reading Research created the Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) and make these available to schools and districts for free. Ninety percent of districts in Florida use FAIR, and the data is available on PMRN. FAIR was created as a replacement for DIBBELS since DIBBELS does not have a comprehension component.

Leon County Schools, where Sabal Palm Elementary is located, does not use FAIR. Grade level teachers do their own progress monitoring every 10 days using aimsweb, a Pearson product which assesses reading fluency up to 8th grade. District officials said that they chose aimsweb because it offered national norms and was easy to use. Children in Grades K-3 are assessed using aimsweb three times a year. Students in grades 4 and 5 are only monitored if they are receiving intervention.

State funding for reading

Florida currently invests **\$130 million in statewide funding just for reading**. School districts receive funding based on a per-pupil formula but there is a minimum allocation of \$100,000 per district. It is important to note that Florida's public school population is *three times* the size of South Carolina's student population. EIA funds in South Carolina expended for students at risk for school failure totals \$136 million.

Sabal Palm Elementary

- Sabal Palm Elementary School is a Title I school in Leon County School District, considered a mid-size district in Florida with 34,000 students.
- Sabal Palm is also one of the lowest 100 performing FL schools in reading.
- The principal Ray King, in his first year at the school, has a reputation for turning schools around using innovative techniques.
- Ray King believes coaching teachers as well as modeling are critical. Also feels it is imperative that teachers feel valued and they are confident they can help bring about success for all students.
- Reading/literacy coaches at Sabal Palm teach 3 periods a day and coach the remaining 3 periods.
- In Leon County Schools, Title 1 schools have full-time reading coaches; non-Title 1 schools have half-time coaches.
- King also uses Exceptional Education teachers, or Special Education teachers, to help students struggling to read. If a child hits below the 30th percentile, they get reading intervention with an Exceptional Education teacher. If there is room for a student in a small group of literacy instruction, he plugs them in.
- He also “repurposes” paraprofessionals in his schools who have proven to have success connecting with children and motivating them to read. He refers to it as an “all hands on deck” approach.
- The school is heavily committed to Accelerated Reader and STAR, which links up to AR and assesses vocabulary and comprehension. STAR assessment is given four times a year. They also use SuccessMaker for Reading and Math in K-8. Waterford is used in PK. Achieve 3000 is used at the middle and high school levels

Florida State University School

- At FSU School, they use a reading strength coach who pulls students out to work with them on raising reading skills.
- They only had 2 children in the summer academy this summer and they rarely have to retain.
- Class size limits in FL: 18 student cap in K-3rd grade; 22 student cap in 4th-8th grade
- They want students to be literacy experts in whatever subject they are learning.
- Guided reading is not enough with low-level readers; Level 1 readers are in Intensive reading classes.

Development of Teacher Training/Higher Education Plan

Dr. Tony Johnson, former Dean of the College of Education at the Citadel, has been working with the EOC to create a plan for the in-service and pre-service training and professional development of teachers and other school personnel. The current legislation outlines guidelines for additional coursework and add-on endorsements.

On November 12, the EOC hosted a meeting of reading faculty and deans representing 18 postsecondary institutions to begin discussions on enhancing the pipeline of teachers and better preparing both in-service and pre-service teachers to assist struggling readers. Dr. Johnson's draft proposals involve a high level of cooperation between local school districts and post-secondary teacher preparation programs.

Stakeholders involved:

Ann Aust, North Greenville Univ.
Jennifer Barrett-Mynes, College of Charleston
C.C. Bates, Clemson University
Shirley Carr Bausmith, Francis Marion University
Barbara Gilbert, Lander University
Kathy Headley, Clemson University
Susan Henderson, Coker College
Ashlee Horton, Lander University
Vanessa Lancaster, Morris College
Cheryl Mader, Winthrop University
Kathryn McColskey, North Greenville Univ.
Shelly Meyers, Limestone College
Lisa Midcalf, Bob Jones University
Kavin Ming, Winthrop University
Jennifer Morrison, Newberry College
Lynne Noble, Columbia College
Jennie Rakestraw, Winthrop University
Ginger Riddle, Newberry College
Windy Schweder, University of SC Aiken
Emily Skinner, College of Charleston
Diane Stephens, University of SC
Renarta Tompkins, USC Beaufort
David Virtue, University of SC
Margaret Walworth, Anderson University
Kim Welborn, Southern Wesleyan University

DRAFT # 4

Teacher Preparation in Literacy

For

Pre-service Teacher Candidates and Practicing Professionals

(The Role of Higher Education)

The following proposals assume an effective working partnership between local districts and higher education teacher preparation programs:

Pre-Service Programs

1. Beginning with the 2015—2016 school year all pre-service teacher education programs (including MAT degree programs) require all candidates seeking licensure at the early childhood or elementary level complete a 12 semester credit sequence in literacy that includes a school-based practicum and ensures that candidates grasp the theory, research and practices that support and guide the teaching of reading. The components of the reading process identified by the International Reading Association and those established by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards provide the focus for this sequence to ensure that all teacher candidates are skilled in diagnosing a child's reading problem and capable of providing an effective intervention.

Professors Tom Gill of Appalachian State University and Kevin Flanagan of West Chester University continue to use this approach providing undergraduate teacher candidates in early childhood and elementary education programs with the knowledge and skills necessary for assisting all children in becoming effective readers. The ideal is for teacher candidates to enroll as a cohort in two literacy courses (e.g. Foundations of Reading and Assessment and Instructional Interventions in Reading and Language Arts) during the fall semester of their junior year. In partnership with an area school district—preferably one with students experiencing reading difficulties—each course is offered on-site with the first course meeting on Tuesday mornings and the second on Thursday morning at the same location for three hours.

During the first five weeks of the 15 week semester, the college or university instructor presents literacy as a developmental process demonstrating the basics of literacy instruction with children from the school and modeling assessment techniques and intervention strategies. Emphasis is placed on ensuring that

teacher candidates understand the significant benchmarks of literacy development and how to assist children in becoming effective readers. During the first five weeks of approximately thirty hours of instruction and modeling, teacher candidates learn how to diagnose a child's reading ability. Once teacher candidates are able to identify the child's reading level and his/her reading problem, the focus shifts toward differentiated instruction and using the most appropriate strategy for addressing a particular reading problem. During the remaining ten weeks, teacher candidates are assigned in pairs to tutor a child experiencing reading difficulties under the careful supervision of the college or university instructor. For the remainder of the semester on Tuesday and Thursday mornings, each session is divided into approximately one hour of instruction and modeling by the college or university instructor, one hour devoted to teacher candidates working in pairs with a student on specified tasks, and the final hour debriefing with the college instructor and planning for the next session's activities.

During the spring semester, teacher candidates are placed in the same or similar school setting for a more comprehensive 6 semester credit practicum. Employing a similar format, university or college faculty will continue to model appropriate literacy instruction for teacher candidates. Under the supervision of the college or university instructor, candidates will interact in more substantive ways with students experiencing reading difficulties. During this semester long practicum, teacher candidates are expected to engage in one on one tutoring, instruction of homogenous groups, and using increasingly sophisticated assessments to more effectively determine the needs of groups and individual students.

It is important to note that the 12 semester credit pre-service teacher training requirement in literacy described above integrates the theory, research and practices identified by the International Reading Association and others as necessary for ensuring that all teacher candidates develop the knowledge and skills necessary to assist all children in becoming effective readers. Using this exemplary program as a guide, all literacy teacher preparation programs are to be approved by the Read to Succeed Office to ensure that teacher education candidates possess the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively assist all children in becoming proficient readers.

2. Beginning with the 2015-2016 school year all pre-service teacher education programs (including MAT degree programs) require candidates seeking licensure at the middle or secondary level complete a 6 semester credit sequence in literacy that includes a course in the foundations of literacy and a course in

content area literacy preferably taught by a content area faculty member. These two courses are to include a carefully selected school based practica to ensure that middle and high school teacher candidates understand reading as a developmental process and possess the knowledge and skills to assist struggling readers to more effectively read content material. In addition, student teaching or internship placements are to be carefully assigned to compliment the practica experiences incorporated into these two courses. All middle and secondary teacher preparation programs are to be approved by the Read to Succeed Office to ensure that all teacher candidates possess the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively assist all adolescents in becoming proficient readers. The purpose of the Read to Succeed Office's review of these teacher preparation literacy programs is to ensure that all teacher candidates possess the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively assist all adolescents in becoming proficient readers.

3. While it may be possible in the future for programs to document in different ways that their candidates possess the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively assist all students in becoming proficient readers, our current assessment instruments are not sufficiently sophisticated to ensure that teacher candidates have mastered the necessary competencies. Also, it may be possible to develop add-on literacy licensures at the undergraduate level but doing so will further segregate the have and have-not districts and dilute the statewide impact of this literacy initiative.

Practicing Professionals

To ensure that practicing professionals possess the knowledge and skills necessary to assist all children and adolescents in becoming proficient readers, multiple pathways are needed for developing this capacity.

The preferred path is for extant licensed teachers to enroll in and complete either the master's degree in literacy or the required coursework for the literacy teacher add-on endorsement. To the extent possible the coursework for the degree and/or literacy add-on endorsement are to be provided by higher education institutions (IHE) with nationally recognized (International Reading Association) programs. Currently, four institutions of higher education (Clemson, The Citadel, University of South Carolina –Columbia, and Winthrop University) provide these nationally recognized programs. Since it is not possible for these four institutions to provide the programs necessary for all professional educators to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to assist all children and youth in becoming proficient readers, other institutions—both

public and private—are encouraged to develop masters’ level programs in compliance with the standards of the International Reading Association.

More programs are needed to meet the demand for ensuring all professional educators are capable of assisting all children in becoming proficient readers. Until more nationally recognized programs are developed, the IHEs with nationally recognized programs need to partner with area school districts and neighboring higher education programs to deliver the graduate level coursework required for this add-on endorsement and degree. For example, literacy faculty from the College of Charleston could partner with The Citadel in delivering The Citadel’s nationally recognized program to professional educators in the Lowcountry. In similar fashion, faculty from Newberry College could assist USC-Columbia in expanding its graduate programs in literacy to districts in the middle of the state. Similar partnerships could be developed between Winthrop and Clemson Universities and other IHEs throughout the state. In collaboration with the Commission on Higher Education and the state Department of Education, the Read to Succeed office is charged with facilitating the development of these partnerships and is responsible for implementing them. In order to effectively impact the quality of literacy instruction throughout the state, tuition assistance for practicing professionals from the state is necessary.

To augment this preferred pathway, school districts, higher education institutions, and the Read to Succeed Office will collaborate in identifying the essential competencies required of all educators to enable all children and youth to become proficient readers. Once these competencies are identified in detail (Florida has taken the lead here), districts—in collaboration with higher education institutions and the Read to Succeed Office--can develop professional development for all professional staff focused on these essentials of instructional literacy.

In fostering a statewide model of professional development for enabling all practicing professionals to develop the essential competencies for effective literacy instruction, the Read to Succeed may consider implementing a modified version of the cohort approach currently employed by the University of South Carolina College of Education.

For this to work, it is necessary for the Read to Succeed office to establish and coordinate a consortium of IHEs and local school districts to offer graduate level literacy courses throughout the state, empowering practicing professionals to assist students of all ages in becoming proficient readers. The syllabi for these graduate offerings are developed by regular or adjunct faculty hired by the IHE granting credit for these courses. The Read to Succeed office is charged with reviewing the credentials of the IHE faculty (typically, a doctorate in literacy or

related field) to ensure that they are capable of overseeing instructors with masters degrees capable of delivering the course content to cohorts of area teachers. The regular or adjunct professors serve as instructors of records for these cohort courses and could supervise multiple cohort sections each semester.

By employing this modified cohort approach along with the more traditional option for obtaining a master's degree or add-on certification in literacy, the Read to Succeed office could enable all practicing teachers to qualify for an add-on literacy teacher or literacy coach licensure and enable school administrators to acquire the necessary literacy competencies for becoming effective instructional leaders.

Whatever model that the Read to Succeed office chooses to embrace, funding to support the necessary professional development is needed. Should the Read to Succeed office embrace the USC model, the contract rate for the on-site courses offered by masters level instructors must be negotiated with the IHE granting the credit. In addition, the Read to Succeed office must collaborate with State Department of Education to ensure that the courses offered meet the requirements for the add-on licensure.

Since practicing professionals are likely to pursue the add-on licensure or literacy degree by enrolling in the professional development coursework offered by IHEs on-site in their district, and by enrolling in the more traditional route of IHE based courses, the Read to Succeed office must creatively pursue multiple ways of supporting practicing professionals. For example, The Citadel in collaboration with area school districts offers its masters' degrees in literacy and leadership to cohorts of teachers selected by the district. The cost of the program is shared equally with the teacher paying a third, the district paying a third, and The Citadel reducing the tuition by a third.

Everyone wins from this arrangement. It is cost effective for the IHE since a cohort of twenty or more students generates more revenue than it costs to provide the courses. The district wins by developing a teacher corps capable of assisting all students in becoming proficient readers, and the practicing professional wins by enhancing their professional skills and credentials.

***For more information about this cohort model, see the documents developed by Dr. Dianne Stephens, the Swearinger Professor of Education at The University of South Carolina.**

For all non-practicum courses, teachers and administrators have the option – subject to availability –of taking web-based courses or taking them at an IHE. Some districts may choose to partner with an IHE and offer the courses on-site in

their districts. Practicums would be conducted at school sites and could involve children enrolled in after-school programs or summer reading camps. As noted earlier, the Read to Succeed Office will work with IHEs and school districts to provide the coursework at a cost effective rate for practicing professionals.

Teacher Qualifications

For

Retained Third grade Students

Third grade students retained must have a reading improvement plan and an assignment with a teacher with at least one year of teaching experience and either an add-on literacy teacher license or demonstrated competency as an effective teacher of literacy.

Recommendations for PK-20 Literacy Initiative

Early Literacy Recommendations

1. Revise state law to include a statewide mandatory readiness screening for all students entering 5K kindergarten or state-funded 4K programs (including CDEPP) beginning with 2014-15 school year. The assessment would be given three times throughout a year and would measure language development, early math, and early sounds. The results of these screenings will be used to determine the readiness of children entering kindergarten for the first time, to inform classroom instruction, and provide useful information to parents.
2. Establish an Early Provider Readiness Rate compiled from the screening results of children who attended and completed state-funded 4K programs (including CDEPP). Providers must have readiness rates above the minimum set by the State Board of Education before they are granted provider status. Existing CDEPP providers whose readiness rate falls below the minimum set by the State Board of Education will be placed on probation and required to submit and implement an improvement plan before receiving future state funding.
3. Require child care personnel in center-based programs, large family child care homes, and family day care homes to complete 5 hours or 0.5 Continuing Education Units (CEUs) of approved in-service training in early literacy and language development of children from birth to 5 years old. To be administered by DSS Division of Child Care Services.

Note: According to Penny Danielson at the SCDE: The TEACH program, designed for early childhood educators who are currently working in the field, in either private centers or district CDEPP classroom, revised their ECD 101 course to update the literacy section to be more comprehensive. Assistant teachers in CDEPP classrooms are required to complete ECD 101.

4. Coordinate within existing initiatives to develop a parent education curriculum for families who have young children from birth to 5 years old that emphasizes essential early literacy skills such as oral language development and print awareness.
5. Establish a statewide Task Force on Early Literacy to create public private partnerships designed to promote higher levels of early literacy in programs and homes. Include representatives from family literacy programs, family service programs, center-based programs, and community organizations (i.e., Head Start, DSS, SCDE, First Steps, Reach Out and Read, United Way, etc.)

Note: Good examples include the Washington State Dept. of Early Learning partnership with Reach Out and Read and Massachusetts public-private partnership with IBM.

K-12 Recommendations

1. Place qualified reading/literacy coaches in elementary schools based on the percentage of students scoring at the lowest levels of PASS Reading in grade 3. These coaches would provide daily support to classroom teachers, coaching and mentoring them in differentiated instruction and training them to provide intensive literacy intervention to students. Consideration should be given to K-2 schools where students feed into schools where higher levels of students score at the lowest level of PASS in grade 3.

2. Require retention for students who score at the lowest level of PASS ELA during their third grade year, provided they don't qualify for one of four "good cause exemptions" outlined in Read to Succeed legislation. The reading instruction of students during the "reinforcement" year would be intensive, explicit, comprehensive, supportive, and provided daily by teacher who has shown proven effectiveness in teaching reading and who has the literacy teacher endorsement.
3. Require students in middle school scoring Not Met 1 on PASS ELA or any high school student who has not passed HSAP to receive explicit, systematic, and direct literacy instruction from a teacher who has shown proven effectiveness in teaching reading and who has the literacy teacher endorsement during a daily intensive reading course. These students will be frequently progress monitored.
4. Require all school districts complete a K-12 Comprehensive Research-Based Reading Plan annually outlining how they intend to provide intervention to students who struggle in reading.
5. Require all school districts to create a District Literacy Team or consortium of multiple districts whose responsibility is to provide the leadership, support, and guidance in the development and implementation of the District Reading Plan. Each school will have a School Literacy Team and the principal must be a team member.
6. Require districts to offer skills-based summer reading camps/academies for students who score at the lowest level of PASS ELA during their third grade year. Summer academies should be staffed by teachers highly qualified in literacy. Students earning a passing grade on a selected assessment or who earn a passing grade on a reading portfolio (a series of competency-based benchmarks) will be promoted to fourth grade.

Higher Education and Continuing Education for Practicing Professionals

1. *Add-on Literacy Endorsement for pre-service teachers:* Beginning with the 2015-16 school year, mandate that all pre-service teacher education programs (including MAT degree programs) will require all candidates seeking licensure at the early childhood or elementary level complete a 12 semester credit sequence in literacy that includes a school-based practicum and includes courses in theory, research, and practices that guide and support the teaching of reading.
2. *Add-on Literacy Endorsement for pre-service teachers:* Beginning with the 2015-16 school year, mandate that all pre-service teacher education programs (including MAT degree programs) will require all candidates seeking licensure at the middle or secondary level complete a 6 semester credit sequence in literacy that includes a course in the foundations of literacy and a course in content area literacy as well as a school-based practicum experience.
3. Work with CHE and the State Board of Education to relax current regulations that would allow more postsecondary institutions to develop and offer masters' level reading programs in compliance with International Reading Association standards.
4. By the 2018-19 school year, all in-service teachers will be required to have the literacy endorsement, courses which will be part of their re-certification. To accomplish this, a network of school districts and postsecondary institutions will be established to coordinate graduate level literacy coursework throughout the state to be used as in-service professional development for teachers and administrators.

System-wide recommendations

1. Develop coordinated early childhood, K-12, and postsecondary data systems to include a statewide progress monitoring system, to support sustained improvement (i.e., CDEPP child-level data systems should be linked to K-12 longitudinal data systems and when possible, postsecondary data systems)
2. SCETV, in collaboration with other groups and agencies, will create and maintain an online literacy essentials and reading resource bank to support learning in literacy. The online tools will be geared toward audiences in K-12, afterschool programs, child care programs, as well as parents and families. The network can also be used for online professional development offerings for practicing professionals.

EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Subcommittee: Public Awareness Subcommittee

Date: January 27, 2014

REPORT/RECOMMENDATION

2012-13 Communications / PR Plan Update

PURPOSE/AUTHORITY

This plan is designed as an ongoing effort to educate various audiences about three main objectives:

1. Enhance understanding and impact of the accountability system by focusing on the 2020 Vision and the goals of student reading proficiency, innovation and college readiness
2. Implement a public engagement plan focused on the 2013 Cyclical Review of the Accountability System
3. Advocate for the utilization of data published on the annual school and district report cards to be used as tools for improvement.

CRITICAL FACTS

This plan has been updated with the status of each of the strategies outlined in the FY 2012-13 Communications Plan. Deliverables and accountability measures have been included for both.

TIMELINE/REVIEW PROCESS

Fiscal year 2012-13

Review: January/February 2014

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Cost:

Fund/Source:

Public Awareness funds

ACTION REQUEST

For approval

For information

ACTION TAKEN

Approved

Amended

Not Approved

Action deferred (explain)

Communications / Public Relations Plan FY 2012-13
Updated January 14, 2014

FY 2012-13 Objectives:

1. Enhance understanding and impact of the accountability system by focusing on the 2020 Vision and the goals of student reading proficiency, innovation and college readiness
2. Implement a public engagement plan focused on the 2013 Cyclical Review of the Accountability System
3. Advocate for the utilization of data published on the annual school and district report cards to be used as tools for improvement.

Audience	Objective / Tactic	Deliverable / Accountability Measures
General Public & Media	1.1. Write and design publication communicating SC's progress toward achieving 2020 Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printed 3,000 copies of <i>World Within Our Reach</i> brochure; sent by mail to key audiences. Remaining copies used for events throughout year
	1.2. Press Event releasing SC's progress toward reaching 2020 Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • February 11, 2013 press event held in lobby of SC Statehouse • Eight members of local press corps present at event. • News release and media packet prepared for and distributed to attendees • Coverage of release: ABC Columbia; WLTX Columbia; WACH Fox, WIS-TV; WSPA; WBTW; Sun News; Rock Hill Herald; Charlotte Observer; The State
	1.3. Outdoor Advertising (Mass Media) – focus on reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOC continues to run an outdoor advertising campaign focused on reading for pleasure. The 12 “Kids Who Love Reading Live Happier Ever After” billboards are located in various locations around the state. • Through an arrangement with the Outdoor Advertising Association of SC, the billboard space was donated and the EOC paid for production and installation. • The billboards will remain up until June 17, 2014
	1.4. Update Progress Report on EOC Website	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOC staff updates website to include information about the status of the 2020 Vision, including links to stakeholder websites. • http://www.eoc.sc.gov/reportsandpublications/2020Vision/Pages/default.aspx

	1.5. Dramatically increase use of social Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOC updates daily established Facebook and Twitter pages. • Began presence on Pinterest focused on innovation. • Started tumblr page (www.sceoc.tumblr.com) using hashtags created for Teacher Appreciation Month in May 2013. • Facebook: 136 likes; Twitter: 741 followers; LinkedIn: 500+ connections; Google+: 16 in our circle; and Pinterest: 51 followers • Hosted Twitter talk on reading following TransformSC innovation summit.
	1.6. Spread the news via radio & TV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie Barton taped an episode of <i>Connections</i>, a public affairs program on SCETV. EOC staff responded to press inquiries via radio throughout the year.
	1.7. Target Education Reporters / Editorial Bd. members/writers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hosted conference bridge for the statewide release of school and district report cards. Ten education reporters and editorial board members attended the call. • Barbara Hairfield and Melanie Barton met with <i>Greenville News</i> editorial board on August 7, 2013 to discuss reading legislation and EOC Retreat.
	1.8. Reach out to regional business publications (Midlands/Upstate/Low country Biz)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent quarterly <i>At-A-Glance</i> to business editors of regional business publications.
	1.9 Develop a poster about 2020 Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not print posters; printed reading brochures for wide dissemination.
	1.9.1. SC ETV's "Speaking of Schools" Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Radio/podcast segment scheduled for February 2014 on release of 2020 Vision progress
	1.9.2. Work with ETV on development and implementation of innovation PR campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-branded EOC and ETV ed news bulletin was distributed electronically to 4,500 recipients. EOC submits information about reports and released to ETV monthly. • Working with ETV on developing web-based literacy essentials and a reading resource bank to support learning in literacy. Project first to focus on 12 school districts piloting reading proficiency plan.
	2.1. Solicit broad public input on the recommendations of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fifty-seven individuals attended the three stakeholder meetings in Columbia, Charleston and Greenville with half of the members of the cyclical review panel in attendance along with representatives of the State Board of Education, business and industry, public

	broad-based stakeholder group performing cyclical review of accountability system	<p>education, higher education, parents, and community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cyclical review panel composed of 35 individuals.
	3.1. Develop focus briefings on results of school and district report cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EOC developed focus briefings related to the results of the school and district report cards, released in November 2013. EOC hosted a conference bridge prior to the release of the results. Participation exceeded capacity as all 25 ports were used. News media, district superintendents, and public information officers participated in the call.
	3.2. Meet with Editorial Boards of SC daily newspapers to discuss results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hosted conference bridge for the statewide release of school and district report cards. Ten education reporters and editorial board members attended and participated in the call. • All major news outlets in the state covered release of report cards.
Audience	Tactic	Deliverable / Accountability Measures
Parents of school-aged Children	1.1 Mobilize school districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Printed 3,000 copies of <i>World Within Our Reach</i> brochure; sent by mail to key audiences. Remaining copies used for events throughout year, including dissemination to statewide School Improvement Council.
	1.2 Reach out to school boards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melanie Barton presented before SC School Boards Association as well as SCASA meeting.
	1.3. Use social media to communicate with parents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Began re-posting articles of interest to parents of school-age children as well as reading materials and link to family-friendly standards site. • Facebook: 136 likes; Twitter: 741 followers; LinkedIn: 500+ connections; Google+: 16 in our circle; and Pinterest: 51 followers
	1.4 Hold a student video contest focused on innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middle and high school participated in video contest answering the following question: “How would I change schools to prepare me and my fellow students to be innovative” OR “How is my school already preparing me and my fellow students to be more innovative?” • 84 students participated in the contest. Five outside judges chose four winners which were announced in December 2012.

	1.5. Communicate with parents through SC PTA, SIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2020 Vision brochure and information about updated family-friendly standards disseminated to statewide School Improvement Council.
	1.6. Develop and disseminate “Tips for Parents and Families” document focused on summer reading loss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designed and created a brochure to assist non-profit organizations, faith-based, community, county libraries, etc. in ways to volunteer and assist in improving reading proficiency among SC students and reduce summer reading loss. Printed 50,000 copies of brochure. All have been distributed based on requests from schools and organizations. Staff is maintaining a waiting list for those requesting a second printing.
	1.7. Revise and distribute Family Friendly Standards to reflect new state standards in ELA and Math. Publish 4K Family-Friendly Standards as a tool.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worked with SCDE staff to create online family-friendly standards at www.scfriendlystandards.org. The site is updated to include material for the Common Core standards in ELA and Math
	1.8. Update online Family-Friendly Standards tool to include more grades and subject areas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Worked with SCDE staff to create online family-friendly standards at www.scfriendlystandards.org. The site is updated to include material for the Common Core standards in ELA and Math and includes K-12 content in English and Spanish.
	2.1. Four parents (one of whom is the parent of a child with special needs) to serve on cyclical review stakeholder group.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Twelve parents served as participants in focus groups in Columbia, Charleston, and Greenville. Three parents served on the cyclical accountability review panel acting in that capacity.
	3.2 Develop online materials for parents on understanding and using the school and district report cards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site developed: http://www.eoc.sc.gov/reportsandpublications/2012reportcards/Pages/default.aspx Regina King working with SC Interactive to ascertain analytics for specific web pages.

Audience	Tactic	Deliverable / Accountability Measures
Educators	1.1 Posters to schools for staff lounges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not print posters; printed reading brochures for wide dissemination.
	1.2 Draft article for newsletters of all education associations and content organizations in SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided article and news release on the 2020 Vision to education organizations in the state.
	1.3 Notify schools of 2020 Vision Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superintendents, instructional leaders, and public information officers received 2020 Vision update via mail as well as electronic mail.
	1.4 Send thank you notes to educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placed nine electronic billboard in Columbia and Charleston during the month of May “Teacher Appreciation Month” using private funds.
	1.5 Develop “tips for educators” document focused on innovation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using electronic software, provided <i>Tips for Education Engagement</i>, research-based and innovative strategies for engaging students in reading and writing. • Sent to 2,987 recipients. Analytics for each issue: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Motivating Students to Read</i> (Williamsburg County Magnet School of the Arts): 1,995 visitors (3 arrived via Facebook, 12 accessed outgoing links) 2. <i>Using Blogs in the Classroom</i> (Charleston School of the Arts): 713 visitors (12 accessed outgoing links) 3. <i>Engaging Middle School Students in Reading</i> (Alcorn Middle School): 1,170 visitors (22 accessed outgoing links) 4. <i>Using Dogs to Help Motivate Students to Read and Improve Reading Proficiency</i> (New Providence Elementary School): 1,162 visitors (19 arrived via Facebook; 3 via Twitter; 2 accessed outgoing links)
	1.6 Follow up with Teachers during Teacher Appreciation Week	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent out daily messages about appreciating teachers during May. • Started tumblr page (www.sceoc.tumblr.com) using hashtags created for Teacher Appreciation Month in May 2013.
	1.7. Partner with SCDE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked with SCDE staff to create online family-friendly standards at www.scfriendlystandards.org. The site is updated to include material for the Common Core standards in ELA and Math

	2.1. Cyclical review group to include 2012 SC State Teacher of the Year, two members of local school boards, three district superintendents, two school district employees, and two individuals representing post-secondary education.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review group included 2012 Cyclical review group included 2012 SC State Teacher of the Year, two members of local school boards, three district superintendents, two school district employees, and two individuals representing post-secondary education.
	3.1. Distribute focus briefings on results of school and district report cards to educators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All superintendents, instructional leaders, teachers received briefings via email and PIO listserv
Audience	Tactic	Deliverable / Accountability Measures
Legislators and other Elected Officials	1.1. – Develop one-page printed piece on 2020 Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All members of the General Assembly and legislative staff received the 2020 Vision brochure.
	1.2. E-blast for legislators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the General Assembly electronically receive quarterly <i>At-A-Glance</i> publications
	1.3 Engage EOC members to share information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EOC members share information with their legislative delegation
	1.4 Provide talking points for legislators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of the General Assembly and legislative staff receive talking points on the report card release, reading, and other issues upon request.

	1.5 Meet with key legislative staffers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Melanie Barton meets in person and by phone with staff weekly, even daily
	2.1. Cyclical review group to include Governor or her designee, SC State Superintendent of Education, and four legislators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review group included SC State Superintendent of Education and two legislators. The Governor did not attend or specify a designee.
	3.1. Distribute “personalized” focus briefings on results of school and district report cards to legislators and legislative staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Every member of the General Assembly received a focus briefing on the results of the school and district report cards. This year, legislators received historical ratings information about every school and district in the state.
Audience	Tactic	Deliverable / Accountability Measures
Business community	1.1. – Engage business community on the importance of the 2020 Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members and staff participated in two major events organized by TransformSC, an initiative spearheaded by prominent business leaders designed to infuse innovation into the public school system. Melanie Barton serves on the board of TransformSC
	2.1. Cyclical review group to include ten individuals representing business and industry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review group included 11 individuals representing business and industry. Nine business members participated in the three regional focus groups.