

Idaho Literacy Task Force Report

November 19, 2014

Introduction

In June 2014, the Idaho Literacy Technical Advisory Committee gathered to review existing early literacy legislation, the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act, and create recommendations for revisions to submit to the State Board of Education. The committee's approximately 20 members from across the state included K-3 teachers, principals, professors of education, state legislators, business representatives, librarians, and other advocates of early literacy.

Over the course of six months, the committee developed a common understanding of the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act (ICLA) of 1997, including its requirements at the school, preservice, and inservice levels. At the school level, requirements include using the Idaho Reading Indicator to screen every K-3 student, providing at least 40 hours of intervention to students identified as most in need, and public reporting of school-level results. Preservice requirements include aligning college coursework with the ICLA, stipulating that K-8 teacher candidates pass an assessment demonstrating their knowledge and skills, and reporting yearly on the number of preservice teachers who took and passed the assessment. For inservice requirements, K-8 teachers need to pass a three-credit reading instruction course in order to maintain certification.

Within six years of the legislation passing, the state experienced successes and challenges related to the ICLA. While reading achievement improved statewide, concerns were raised in regards to aspects of the educational system that were not addressed, such as the importance of teacher collaboration, the role of instructional leadership, the need for high quality instructional materials, the practice of tracking students rather than having flexible intervention systems, and the need for more resources in professional development and intervention beyond third grade. The early 2000s brought changes to early reading in Idaho, including implementation of the federal Reading First Initiative and shifts in the assessment measures of the Idaho Reading Indicator. Further changes occurred in 2009 and after as the state budget became tighter and when the resources and professional development offered by Reading First expired with no further federal funding. (Underwood)

Considering the substantial history of early literacy efforts in Idaho, and in order to make well informed decisions, the committee engaged in collective learning about the components of a comprehensive assessment system, the early literacy policies of other states, understanding dyslexia (including instructional and policy implications), and the research on proven ways to bring effective practices to scale across a state. Schools representing Idaho's diverse students and a broad range of learning challenges presented the strategies they have employed which have been effective in raising early literacy achievement. Based on the strategies presented, Idaho's most effective schools share the following characteristics:

- Every teacher is expected to be a reading expert
- The principal and/or reading specialist provides strong schoolwide literacy leadership
- Teachers exhibit strong collaboration
- Early intervention is targeted and sufficiently funded
- Interventions are research-based, explicit and systematic
- Schools engage families by teaching them strategies to support their students
- Schools have processes to consistently use specific schoolwide data and evidence

Given that successful schools exhibit these characteristics, the committee sought to establish sound methods for creating a policy environment that cultivates such practices. After careful consideration, discussion, and debate, the committee agreed upon the following recommendations to the State Board of Education.

Recommendations and Rationale

A. ASSESSMENT

A1. Recommendation: The Idaho Reading Indicator shall be used to screen K-3 students.

Rationale: Screening is a cost- and time-efficient method of predicting reading success and identifying struggling readers. Screening all students fosters early reading intervention because it enables educators to catch struggling students early and to begin making crucial decisions about instructional interventions. **(Gersten)**

A2. Recommendation: The Idaho Reading Indicator shall not be used for accountability at the student, teacher, or school level. Progress monitoring may be used for this purpose, as it measures student growth over time.

Rationale: While the committee understands the importance of accountability and educator evaluation, the Idaho Reading Indicator was designed to inform decision making before instruction, not to examine the effectiveness of an instructional program after its conclusion. Using a screening tool for accountability has the potential to compromise test administration and encourage teaching to the assessment, which in turn invalidates the results and undermines the purpose of the assessment. **(Francis)** To maintain a proper focus on early identification, prevention, and remediation of student learning challenges, it is important that state policy foster an appropriate culture of assessment among educators.

A3. Recommendation: The Idaho Reading Indicator shall be reviewed to address concerns about its technical adequacy and to explore alternative measures.

Rationale: The Idaho Reading Indicator has been provided by different vendors and has changed over the years. A study conducted by Drs. Kristi Santi and David Francis raised

several concerns about the current version of the Idaho Reading Indicator, including its technical adequacy, the lack of reading comprehension questions, and questions about the purposes of the assessment. The current version was created for sole use by the state and may not provide the predictive validity necessary to screen students accurately. The committee believes it would be prudent to examine what changes may be necessary to ensure the best screening practices possible. **(Francis)**

A4. Recommendation: The Idaho Department of Education shall provide screening and progress monitoring tools to LEAs.

Rationale: The Department of Education plays a key role in supporting LEAs and ensuring consistent statewide practice by vetting, purchasing, and distributing assessments. Under a previous vendor for the Idaho Reading Indicator, progress monitoring assessments were provided at no cost to schools. This encouraged widespread use and met the intent of the ICLA. The committee agreed that with the known availability of low- and no-cost progress monitoring tools, the state should provide specific tools that schools can access and use freely. **(Fuchs)**

A5. Recommendation: LEAs shall continue to screen and monitor progress of students beyond third grade until students who are not meeting grade-level proficiency have mastered grade-level expectations.

Rationale: The state has a vested interest in the success of students' literacy skills beyond third grade. Screening and progress-monitoring data are key tools to guide instructional decisions for students who need continued instructional support and intervention. If LEAs are expected to continue progress monitoring in literacy, it increases the focus on continued intervention for struggling students in later grades. **(Stecker)**

A6. Recommendation: The Idaho Department of Education shall provide K-3 diagnostic assessments in early reading to LEAs.

Rationale: Current state policy is ambiguous regarding how to target literacy interventions to students' specific learning needs. While screening assessments are brief and give general outcomes, diagnostic assessments are more in-depth and are used to pinpoint areas of student need and efficiently determine appropriate curriculum, instruction, and intervention needs. The state would benefit from providing diagnostic assessments at no cost to schools that can be used efficiently to narrow instructional focus for students who are identified as being at risk on the screening assessment.

B. CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

B1. Recommendation: The state shall remove the requirement to provide 40 hours of intervention to any student receiving a score of 1 on the IRI.

Rationale: This requirement was a well intended effort in 1997 to ensure students receive intervention. However, this requirement is too rigid for the current state of Idaho schools and does not account for students who reach grade-level expectations before receiving 40 hours of intervention, nor does it consider students who make very slow growth and need much more time.

B2. Recommendation: IRI intervention funds shall be allocated to provide evidence-based literacy interventions to students identified as at risk. The selection of interventions shall be at the discretion of the school and district. At-risk status should be defined in relation to end-of-year expectations.

Rationale: Existing intervention funds target students who get the lowest score (1) on the Idaho Reading Indicator. Schools must intervene with all students who are not on track to meet end-of-year expectations, which includes other students, such as those who score a 2. The committee agreed that the state should fund intervention efforts for all students who are at risk, not just the lowest. Professional judgment and local context should be considered when determining the most appropriate intervention approach for students with an at-risk status.

C. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

C1. Recommendation: The Idaho Department of Education shall provide professional development in the administration and analysis of assessment data, to include the Smarter Balanced Assessment.

Rationale: Existing requirements under the ICLA do not require educators to be trained in data utilization. Proper training in test administration is essential to test validity and reliability. Professional development in analysis ensures that test results are correctly interpreted and used to make accurate decisions about instruction and resource allocation. **(Killion)**

C2. Recommendation: The Idaho Department of Education shall evaluate the expectations and implementation of the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Course every two years.

Rationale: As policy, research, and practice evolve, the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Course must change to reflect emerging best practices. Regular, formal review and evaluation of this course will ensure that it is current and consistent. **(McColskey)**

C3. Recommendation: The Idaho Department of Education shall provide professional development in the delivery of effective, evidence-based literacy instruction and intervention.

Rationale: Existing requirements of the ICLA include one foundational course in literacy. However, this is insufficient to make every teacher an expert in teaching reading. In order to maintain and apply best practices in literacy instruction and intervention, educators require ongoing, high-quality professional development. **(Killion)**

D. POLICY, EVALUATION AND FUNDING

D1. Recommendation: The Idaho State Board of Education shall reauthorize the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act every five years.

Rationale: Currently, there is no mechanism to cause the state to stop and reflect on needed changes to the ICLA. As research and practice evolve, the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act must change to reflect emerging best practices. A five-year reauthorization cycle, required by statute, must be implemented to guarantee that policy is not a hindrance to progress. The committee recommends five years specifically to mitigate for election cycles. The policy should be subject to best practice research and should be modified based on evaluation findings. It should not be subject to reauthorization during a two- or four-year cycle, which could be affected by election politics. **(McColskey)**

D2. Recommendation: The Idaho Department of Education shall conduct ongoing reading initiative program evaluations with formal reports due every two years.

Rationale: The state intends to impact educator practices and student learning through its literacy policy. Significant time, effort, and financial resources are dedicated to this goal. As such, it is essential to understand if and how the goals are being met. Ongoing program evaluation by an external party with no vested interest in the policy enables Idaho policymakers to analyze trends, make program decisions, and deploy resources based on current data. Program evaluation is essential to fostering public trust and ensuring appropriate use of tax dollars. **(McColskey) (Fixsen)**

D3. Recommendation: The state legislature shall revise the support-unit divisor for Kindergarten from 1::40 to 1::30.

Rationale: Under current statute, Idaho does not require students to attend kindergarten, but the legislature funds half-day kindergarten at a ratio of 1 support unit for 40 students. This is compared to the ratio of approximately 1 to 20 for first grade and higher. Districts

that are effectively intervening early in Idaho are providing full-day kindergarten to students who are at risk of academic challenges, but in so doing must find creative funding to make their efforts work. The committee agrees that the state should not require full-day kindergarten, but that it would be in the state's interest financially to fund kindergarten at a higher level to incentivize early intervention for all students. The committee's recommendation would channel funding for districts to be funded at a 1 support unit to 30 student ratio, thereby increasing their ability to systematically create kindergarten intervention processes through extending a full-day kindergarten offering to the students who need more instruction and support to be ready for first grade. Districts shall use these funds to target extended reading interventions for students identified at risk. The funds shall not be used for class-size reduction in other grade levels. Recognizing the fiscal impact, the committee understands that a multi-year phase in may be necessary and recommends such a phase in be no longer than five years (e.g., 1::38, 1::36, 1::34, etc.). (Fixsen)

D4. Recommendation: Given the critical relationship between literacy and academic success, the committee recommends funding for the Idaho Reading Initiative be restored to ()

Rationale: In reviewing the history of the ICLA, the committee found that the funding for the Idaho Reading Initiative has been cut from approximately \$4 million per year to less than \$2 million per year, while costs associated with assessment and intervention have increased. The committee's intent in this recommendation is to ensure the state provides dedicated funding to early literacy interventions in grades K-3 in order to meet the state's goals of proficiency by the end of third grade.

Conclusion

A strong early literacy system is one of the best investments a state can make in its future. According to research from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, "Reading proficiently by the end of third grade is a crucial marker in a child's educational development. Failure to read proficiently is linked to higher rates of school dropout, which suppresses individual earning potential as well as the nation's competitiveness and general productivity." Knowing how to read proficiently enables a student to read and learn content in other subject areas.

In enacting the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Act of 1997, Idaho was and is a leader in early literacy policy. However, given what has been learned in the research literature in the years since and given both the successes and challenges of existing policy, it is critical that the state make key adjustments. The committee agrees that the recommendations included in this report are the most prudent actions the state can make at this time to improve student outcomes through statewide early literacy policy.

The Idaho State Board of Education has a timely opportunity to rejuvenate the focus on early literacy through updated policy and strategic investment in proven practices in assessment, instruction, and professional development. The early literacy stakeholders represented on the Idaho Literacy Task Force call on the state board to act upon the recommendations above on behalf of the students of Idaho.

DRAFT

References

- Barr, R. D., & Flachbart, M. (2003). *Idaho Reading Initiative: Status report 1999–2003*. Retrieved from Idaho State Department of Education website: https://www.sde.idaho.gov/site/literacyTech/docs/june/IdahoReadingInitiative_StatusReport_2003.pdf
- Barr, R. D., Flachbart, M., & Stewart, R. (2002). *Idaho Reading Initiative: Status report 1999–2002*. Retrieved from Boise State University, Center for School Improvement & Policy Studies website: <http://csi.boisestate.edu/wp-content/uploads/2011/08/IdahoReadingInitiative2002.pdf>
- Fixsen, D., Blase, K., Metz, A., & Van Dyke, M. (2013). State implementation of evidence-based programs. *Exceptional Children*, 79(2), 213–230.
- Francis, D., & Santi, K. (2007). *Idaho Reading Indicator technical adequacy review*. Unpublished manuscript, Idaho Department of Education.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2001). *What is scientifically-based research on progress monitoring?* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED502460)
- Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. D. (2009). *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades* (IES Practice Guide, NCEE 2009-4045). Retrieved from U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, What Works Clearinghouse website: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practice_guides/rti_reading_pg_021809.pdf
- Hattie, J. A. C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Killion, J. (2013). *Professional learning policy review: A workbook for states and districts*. Retrieved from Learning Forward website: <http://learningforward.org/docs/commoncore/professionallearningpolicyreview.pdf>
- McColskey, W., & Lewis, K. (2007). *Making informed decisions about programs, policies, practices, strategies, & interventions*. Retrieved from SERVE website: <http://www.serve.org/uploads/files/Making%20Informed%20Decisions.pdf>
- Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward an R&D program in reading comprehension*. Retrieved from RAND website: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1465.html

Stecker, P. M., Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2008). Progress monitoring as essential practice within Response to Intervention. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 27(4), 10–17.

Underwood, S. M. (2013). *The Idaho Statewide System of Support: Scaling up whole-system reform in a rural western state* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.boisestate.edu/td/351>

DRAFT