

---

---

## FINAL REPORT

---

---

**TO:** Aaron Bochniak, District Director for Planning and Accountability  
**FROM:** Dean T. Spaulding, Z Score Inc.  
**CC:** Kerri Messler, ELA/Library Coordinator  
**DATE:** October 11, 2017  
**RE:** Schenectady City School District Innovative Approaches to Literacy: Final Evaluation Report for Grant Extension

---

In October 2014, the Schenectady City School District (SCSD) was awarded a two-year literacy grant entitled *Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL)*<sup>1</sup> by the U.S. Department of Education to increase literacy skills of PreK through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in the district by increasing access to books in the home, classrooms, and school libraries. In addition, the grant seeks to expand the capacity of educators to teach literacy in the schools. One of the unique aspects of the grant is to provide training and materials to parents and caregivers to teach literacy to the children in their homes.

On August 16, 2016, Lori McKenna, District Director for Planning and Accountability, requested a 12 month no cost extension to extend the Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant program through September 30, 2017. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix B. An extension was granted by the U.S. Department of Education and Ms. McKenna left her position with the district shortly after. In November 2016, Aaron Bochniak assumed the position as District Director for Planning and Accountability.

From 2014 to 2016 the Schenectady City School District contracted with the Evaluation Consortium at the University at Albany, SUNY, to serve as their external evaluator in order to meet the grant's independent evaluator requirement. In the Fall of 2016 the Evaluation Consortium at the University of Albany, SUNY, disbanded and a new external evaluator, Z Score Inc., was appointed to serve as the external evaluator for the project's extension year (Oct 1, 2016 to Sept 30, 2017). Z Score Inc. is a local evaluation agency that has worked successfully with the district in the past and is currently serving as the external evaluator for the district's 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) grant.

During their time as evaluator, The Evaluation Consortium delivered two reports: a Memorandum Report, March 2016 (see Appendix C) and a two-year program impact report, Summer 2016, (see Appendix D).

As part of the evaluation process the current evaluator, Z Score Inc. reviewed both of the above reports and compared the findings to the goals and objectives put forth in Ms. McKenna's letter of August 16, 2016 (Appendix A).

---

<sup>1</sup> Grant Award Number: S215G140072

For the extension portion of this project one (1) objective needed to be addressed:

Objective 1b:

- # 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students achieving proficiency on NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessments will increase by 10% annually over baseline year.
- # of four year olds attaining one year growth as measured by Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency will increase by 10% annually over baseline year. Target 1a: 10% annual increase in # of 4 yrs. olds meeting standard for one year growth on Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency

Findings for the above objective are presented below in this report (Table 1-3).

**Objective Two: To Document Student Outcomes Related to Literacy Skills**

*Finding: While over the last several years Grade 3 students have maintained the same percentage of proficiency on the NYS ELA assessment, there was not an increase annually of 10% over baseline. However, a 2% increase was noted. While there were several testing and sampling issues in the across time analysis of Aimsweb Letter Sound Fluency data, a 19% increase was noted from the Spring 2015 to Spring 2016 academic year.*

**Table 1.0**  
**Number of District Students Achieving Literacy Goals on NYS ELA \***

Measure	Spring 2014 Baseline Results N = 750*	Spring 2015 Results After Year One N = 730*	Spring 2016 Results After Year Two N = 714*	Spring 2017 Results After Year Three N = 759*	% Increase
NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessments (Grade 3)*	19%	18%	20%	21%	2%

*\*Percentages indicate percent of all students considered proficient in ELA by the New York State School Report Card*

**Table 1.1**  
**Number of District Students Achieving Literacy Goals on AimsWeb \***

Measure	Spring 2014 Baseline Results	Spring 2015 Results After Year One N =630	Spring 2016 Results After Year Two N =578	Spring 2017 Results After Year Three	% Increase
Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency	NA*	47%	66%	NA**	19%

*\*Baseline Data measured with Fountas & Pinnell. In addition, n=28, sample statistically too small to serve as baseline data, thus using Spring 2015 as baseline.*

*\*\* Fall 2017 matched sample statistically too small, n=40. Full sample not available until late November.*

*Finding: Overall, the percentage of third graders proficient on the NYS ELA assessment district wide has increase 2%, from 2016-17 compared to the baseline data of 2013-14. When examining the impact across subareas: females increased by 5% and African American students by 2% percent.*

**Table 2**  
**Number of 3<sup>rd</sup> Graders Proficient in Achieving Literacy Goals in SCSD\***

	2013-14			2014-15				2015-16				2016-17			
	Baseline			Year 1				Year 2				Year 3			
	N	# proficient	% proficient	N	Actual #	% proficient	% Change in number of students over baseline	N	Actual #	%	% Change in number of students over 2014-15	N	Actual #	% proficient	% Change in number of students over 2015-16
SCSD all 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade students	750	142	19%	730	129	18%	-1%	714	145	20%	+1%	759	156	21%	+2%
<b>Gender</b>															
Female	369	81	22%	333	67	20%	-2%	355	85	24%	+2%	347	92	27%	+5%
Male	381	61	16%	397	62	16%	0%	359	60	17%	+1%	412	64	16%	0%
<b>Ethnicity</b>															
African American	261	39	15%	246	28	11%	-4%	216	29	13%	-2%	227	38	17%	+2%
Hispanic/Latino	156	20	13%	143	20	14%	+1%	152	21	14%	+1%	29	4	14%	+1%
White	206	51	25%	182	39	21%	-4%	170	49	29%	+4%	288	61	21%	-4%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>															
English Language Learner	24	3	13%	28	0	0%	-13%	28	0	0%	-13%	39	0	0%	-13%
Economically disadvantaged	652	107	16%	591	89	15%	-1%	600	102	17%	+1%	647	112	17%	+1%

*Finding: In an analysis of individual buildings overtime, seven (7) out of 10 buildings showed an increase in the percent of third graders proficient on the NYS ELA assessment.*

**Table 3**  
**Percent Proficient by School, Gender, Ethnicity, and LEP/Poverty**

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2017
<b>Hamilton</b>								
All students	76	11%	74	20%	74	22%	76	28%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	36	11%	35	23%	34	29%	47	30%
Male	40	10%	39	18%	40	15%	29	24%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	30	0%	31	13%	25	16%	27	19%
Hispanic/Latino	16	6%	09	22%	17	18%	4	25%
White	--	--	18	28%	14	21%	29	17%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	--	--	--		--	--	5	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	66	20%	68	22%	71	28%
<b>Lincoln</b>								
All students	30	23%	56	14%	49	18%	53	9%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	16	25%	23	13%	25	20%	19	16%
Male	14	21%	33	15%	24	17%	34	6%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	12	25%	24	21%	15	7%	25	8%
Hispanic/Latino	10	30%	11	0 %	18	17%	1	0%
White	--	--	08	13%	--	--	14	14%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	--	--	--	--	7	0%	2	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	56	14%	--	--	50	10%

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2017
<b>Pleasant Valley</b>								
All students	65	11%	69	17%	78	17%	63	13%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	30	7%	25	24%	36	22%	23	13%
Male	35	14%	44	14%	42	12%	40	13%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	18	11%	25	8%	30	10%	20	0%
Hispanic/Latino	--	--	17	17%	15	13%	8	0%
White	15	20%	--	--	--	--	13	23%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	--	--	15	33%	5	0%	3	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	54	13%	73	16%	59	10%
<b>Van Corlear</b>								
All students	66	17%	76	8%	71	24%	73	18%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	35	17%	36	8%	37	32%	36	25%
Male	31	16%	40	8%	34	15%	37	11%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	17	18%	21	0%	18	1%	17	24%
Hispanic/Latino	--	--	18	6%	12	17%	2	50%
White	32	22%	29	14%	24	38%	45	13%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	0%
Free/reduced lunch	53	13%	61	8%	61	21%	61	15%
<b>Keane</b>								
All students	45	4%	47	11%	56	4%	63	19%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	21	5%	23	17%	32	0%	25	24%
Male	24	4%	24	4%	24	8%	38	16%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	22	5%	14	14%	20	0%	10	40%
Hispanic/Latino	7	14%	9	11%	13	0%	0	0%
White	--	--	12	0%	--	--	22	5%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	45	4%	47	11%	--	--	0	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	41	12%	51	4%	56	20%
<b>Woodlawn</b>								
All students	65	25%	60	32%	58	29%	61	33%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	35	20%	30	27%	23	26%	28	43%
Male	30	30%	30	37%	35	31%	33	24%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	17	6%	15	27%	19	16%	18	28%
Hispanic/Latino	14	21%	13	15%	11	27%	0	0%
White	23	39%	19	37%	21	38%	23	48%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	0	0%	0	0%	--	--	3	0%
Free/reduced lunch	50	18%	46	22%	46	22%	46	24%

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2017
<b>Yates</b>								
All students	39	10%	47	11%	35	14%	75	23%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	11	18%	17	18%	17	18%	32	28%
Male	28	7%	30	7%	18	11%	43	19%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	12	8%	18	6%	12	17%	23	22%
Hispanic/Latino	14	14%	16	13%	13	23%	2	50%
White	--	--	8	0%	5	0%	32	19%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	0	0%	--	--	--	--	7	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	--	--	--	--	67	21%
<b>Paige</b>								
All students	47	38%	36	22%	58	24%	74	20%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	28	50%	18	22%	27	26%	32	22%
Male	19	21%	18	22%	31	23%	42	19%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	8	63%	12	17%	9	22%	14	21%
Hispanic/Latino	6	17%	--	--	--	--	4	0%
White	27	37%	15	33%	31	32%	30	20%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	7	14%	--	--	--	--	11	0%
Free/reduced lunch	34	35%	23	17%	36	8%	53	11%
<b>Dr. Martin Luther King</b>								
All students	80	40%	80	23%	47	26%	105	15%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	52	40%	39	23%	26	31%	46	20%
Male	28	39%	41	22%	21	19%	59	12%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	34	29%	37	16%	17	24%	35	17%
Hispanic/Latino	17	47%	--	--	8	13%	6	17%
White	--	--	15	7%	--	--	30	13%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	72	18%	40	23%	97	13%
<b>Zoller</b>								
All students	68	19%	49	16%	52	19%	61	30%
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	28	21%	24	21%	26	31%	33	33%
Male	40	18%	25	12%	26	8%	28	25%
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African American	18	22%	9	0	9	22%	12	0%
Hispanic/Latino	16	0	10	30%	14	7%	1	0%
White	25	24%	19	16%	18	28%	33	36%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>								
LEP	0	0%	--	--	--	--	0	0%
Free/reduced lunch	54	13%	30	17%	38	13%	44	25%

## **Summary**

While the percent of third graders proficient on the NYS ELA assessment did not meet the target 10% increase annually over the baseline year overall a 2% increase was noted district wide for the third-grade level. In addition, when examined by subareas district wide, the percentage of females proficient increased 5% and African American students 2% overtime. Seven (7) out of 10 buildings (70%) showed an increase in the percentage of third graders proficient on the NYS ELA overtime. There were several testing and sampling issues in the across time analysis of Aimsweb LSF data; however, despite these issues a 19% increase was noted from the Spring 2015 to Spring 2016 academic year on student performance on the Aimsweb LSF subtest.

Appendix A:

---

---

## MEMORANDUM REPORT

---

---

**TO:** Aaron Bochniak, District Director for Planning and Accountability  
**FROM:** Dean T. Spaulding, Z Score Inc.  
**CC:** Kerri Messler, ELA/Library Coordinator  
**DATE:** April 6, 2017  
**RE:** Schenectady City School District Innovative Approaches to Literacy:  
Formative Report

---

### Summary of IAL Project to Date

In October 2014, the Schenectady City School District (SCSD) was awarded a two-year literacy grant entitled *Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL)*<sup>2</sup> by the U. S. Department of Education to increase literacy skills of PreK through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in the district by increasing access to books in the home, classrooms, and school libraries. In addition, the grant seeks to expand the capacity of educators to teach literacy in the schools. One of the unique aspects of the grant is to provide training and materials to parents and caregivers to teach literacy to the children in their homes.

To address literacy across the district, the IAL has supported professional learning opportunities for teachers of students in PreK through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. The focus of the activities during the first year of the grant, 2014-2015, was to provide all K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade teachers in the district with literacy training. The four-session programs for each grade modeled the incorporation of research-based literacy practices into classroom pedagogy. In addition, the summer program DREAM BIG READ offered intensive literacy instruction for almost two dozen struggling readers in grades 1-3 during the summer of 2015 and summer 2016

For Year 2, strategies to support literacy across the district have included purchasing books to expand access to age appropriate books in elementary classrooms and school libraries in the district. In order to meet grant goals, the SCSD, in collaboration with its district partners and local family organizations, developed workshops for local parents or caregivers and children in their care. The purpose of these workshops was to increase literacy exposure and reading practices to district children who are not yet enrolled in Kindergarten and also to children in early elementary grades. Trained literacy professionals presented lessons to the adults so that they could infuse literacy activities into daily routines, using environmental print, literacy through play, read-alouds, and technology.

On August 16, 2016, Lori McKenna, District Director for Planning and Accountability, requested a 12 month no cost extension to extend the Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant program

---

<sup>2</sup> Grant Award Number: S215G140072

through September 30, 2017. A copy of this letter can be found in Appendix A. An extension was granted by the US Department of Education and Ms. McKenna left her position with the district shortly after. In November 2016, Aaron Bochniak assumed the position as district director for planning and accountability.

From 2014 to 2016 the Schenectady City School District contracted with the Evaluation Consortium at the University at Albany, SUNY, to serve as their external evaluator in order to meet the grant’s independent evaluator requirement. In the Fall of 2016 the Evaluation Consortium at the University of Albany, SUNY, disbanded and a new external evaluator, Z Score Inc., was appointed to serve as the external evaluator for the project’s extension year (Oct 1, 2016 to Sept 30, 2017). Z Score Inc. is a local evaluation agency that has worked successfully with the district in the past and is currently serving as the external evaluator for the district’s 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) grant.

During their time as evaluator, The Evaluation Consortium delivered two reports: a Memorandum Report, March 2016 (see Appendix B) and a two-year program impact report, Summer 2016, (see Appendix C).

As part of the evaluation process the current evaluator, Z Score Inc. reviewed both of the above reports and compared the findings to the goals and objectives put forth in Ms. McKenna’s letter of August 16, 2016 (Appendix A). Results from this analysis found that some of the objectives had already been met by the evaluation report. Presented below in Table 1.1 is an overview of those objectives that have been met and those that will be focused on during the project’s extension period.

Table 1.1  
Overview of Objectives to be Addressed with One Year No Cost Extension

<b>Goal 1: To Increase Literacy Skills</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
<u>Objective 1b:</u> # 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade students achieving proficiency on NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessments will increase by 10% annually over baseline year. # of four year olds attaining one year growth as measured by Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency by 10% annually over baseline year. Target 1a: 10% annual increase in # of 4 yrs. olds meeting standard for one year growth on Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency.	Not Achieved	Tables 6, 7, & 8. Not met, a focus of the extension year 2016-17.	Z Score will develop a data collection plan and schedule to collect NYS ELA and Aimsweb data
<u>Objective 1c:</u> A minimum of 20 highly at-risk 1 <sup>st</sup> through 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade students residing in a Priority School neighborhood will participate in 50 hours of a library	Achieved	See Evaluation Table 9.	

based summer literacy learning program.			
<b>Goal 2: Increase Access to Quality Book Supporting Literacy Development</b>			
Objective 2a: Over the of the 24 month grant period a minimum 1,000 children ages 3-5 will receive free books as a part of school library distribution. A total of 3,400 books purchased and disseminated by the end of the grant.	Achieved	See Appendix C, Table 18 Evaluation Consortium Report 2,624 books purchased up until Sept 2016. In the Fall of 2016 3,000 additional books were purchased and dissemination for a total of 5,624 purchased.	
<b>Goal 3: To Expand Home, School and Community Capacity to Teach Literacy Skills</b>			
Objective 3A: A minimum of 180 K-3 Teachers, special education teachers and school librarians from SCSD elementary schools will engage in 18 hours of PD with University of Pittsburgh Institutes for Learning and local experts to support Literacy across content areas..	Achieved	Table 1 Evaluation Report Appendix B:	
Objective 3c: A minimum of 250 parent/guardians will participate in 4 hours of family literacy activities as part of school library book distribution.	Not Achieved, A focus for 2016-17 extension	See Table 20 Evaluation Report Appendix B	The project has recently hired a coordinator to reach out into the community and coordinator programming to achieve this objective before the end of the grant period. Program will keep data and provide it to the evaluator
Objective 3d: A minimum of <u>125</u> legally exempt (FFN) child care providers will engage in 4 hours of play & learn literacy training in partnership with school librarians.	Achieved.	See Appendix D.	

## Summary

In October 2014, the Schenectady City School District (SCSD) was awarded a two-year literacy grant entitled *Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL)*<sup>3</sup> by the U. S. Department of Education to increase literacy skills of PreK through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in the district by increasing access to books in the home, classrooms, and school libraries. The Evaluation Consortium at SUNY Albany severed in years 1 and 2 as the project's required external evaluator. In August 2016 the district requested a one-year no cost extension and a letter from the district by Lori McKenna, district director of planning and accountability, reported program outcomes that would be addressed during the one-year extension. Also in the Fall of 2016 a new evaluator, Z Score Inc., was hired to provide evaluation services during the project's extension. This report uses document analysis to compare evaluation findings from the previous evaluation reports to goals and objectives delineated in the August 16<sup>th</sup> letter requesting the no cost extension. Findings from this document analysis revealed that many of the goals and objectives were accomplished in years 1 and 2 of the project; however, areas still need of being addressed:

- 1) analysis of NYS ELA and Aimesweb data with 10% gains annually over baseline,
- 2) 250 parent/guardians participating in four-hour family literacy workshops/trainings, and

The external evaluator will work with the district to establish a data collection plan to address these three objectives by the end of the extension period.

---

<sup>3</sup> Grant Award Number: S215G140072

Appendix B:  
Request for No Cost Extension Letter: August 16, 2016

# Schenectady City School District

108 Education Drive  
Schenectady, NY 12303-1238



## BOARD OF EDUCATION

Catherine A. Lewis, President John Foley, Vice President

• Dharam Hitlall • Tanya Hull • Cheryl Nechamen • Ann M. Reilly • Mark Snyder

August 16, 2016

Re: S215G14072-15

Daphne Kaplan  
Innovative Approaches to Literacy Program Office  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue SW, Room 3E332  
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Ms. Kaplan:

The Schenectady City School District (SCSD) is requesting a 12-month no-cost extension for the Elementary & Secondary Counseling Grant serving students in Schenectady High School (SHS). The no cost extension would use \$225,000 in previously awarded, but unobligated funds to extend the Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant Program through September 30, 2017. In requesting the no-cost extension, the SCSD agrees to complete all activities and encumber all expenses prior to September 30, 2017. Additionally, the SCSD agrees to drawdown all expenses and submit the final IAL performance report and IAL evaluation report by December 30, 2017.

There were unanticipated delays in recruiting an IAL Program Coordinator, which resulted in the program getting a late start. As such, we were not able to reach all grant targets in Year One, thus we have fallen short of meeting certain overall program objectives. The no-cost extension will allow the SCSD to meet the following goals and objectives of the Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant:

### **Goal 1: To increase Literacy Skills**

**Objective 1b:** # of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students achieving proficiency on NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessments will increase by 10% annually over baseline year;

**Objective 1c:** A minimum of 20 highly at-risk 1<sup>st</sup> through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students residing in a Priority School neighborhood will participate in 50 hours of a library-based summer literacy learning program.

- Provide 18 hours of high-quality professional development teachers serving Grades K-3; and
- Provide 50-Hour Dream Big Read Program in Summer, 2017.

OFFICE OF  
THE SUPER

Laurence T  
Superint

Patricia Pa  
Assistant  
the Super

Planning &  
Accounta

Lori McKe  
District D

108 Educat  
Schenectad  
Phone: (518  
Fax: (518) 8

CENTR  
Tele: 518

**Goal 2: Increase Access to Quality Books Supporting Literacy Development**

**Objective 2a:** *Over the course of the 24-month grant period, a minimum of 1,000 children ages 3-5 will receive free books as a part of school library book distribution; annually;*

- Provide book distribution along with family literacy series for parents/guardians.

**Goal 3: To Expand Home, School and Community Capacity to Teach Literacy Skills**

**Objective 3a:** *A minimum of 180 K-3 teachers, special education teachers, and school librarians from SCSD elementary schools will engage in 18 hours of PD with University of Pittsburgh Institute for Learning and local experts to support literacy across content areas;*

**Objective 3c:** *A minimum of 250 parents/guardians will participate in 4 hours of family literacy activities as part of school library book distribution;*

**Objective 3d:** *A minimum of 125 legally exempt (FFN) child care providers will engage in 4 hours of play & learn literacy training in partnership with school librarians.*

- Provide 18 hours of high-quality professional development teachers of students in Grades K-3;
- Provide 4-hour family literacy series to parents/guardians as part of book distributions in multiple locations across the district;
- Provide 4-hour play & learn series to legally exempt (FFN) child care providers in multiple locations across the district.

As you may know I will be leaving the Schenectady City School District on August 17, 2017 to serve as Assistant Superintendent for Instruction in the City of Albany School District. I recommend that Kerri Messler, District ELA Coordinator replace me as IAL Project Director. As requested, I have attached a copy of Ms. Messler's resume.

Thank you for your consideration of this no-cost extension request and request to change the Project Director to Ms. Kerri Messler. If you have any questions, please contact Kerri Messler at [messlerk@schenectady.k12.ny.us](mailto:messlerk@schenectady.k12.ny.us), or Suzanne DeWald at [dewalds@schenectady.k12.ny.us](mailto:dewalds@schenectady.k12.ny.us).

Sincerely,



Lori A. McKenna  
Director of Planning and Accountability/  
IAL Program Director

Appendix c:  
Memorandum Report March 2016

## MEMORANDUM

---

---

**TO:** Lori McKenna  
**FROM:** The Evaluation Consortium, University at Albany/SUNY  
**CC:** Suzanne Dewald  
**DATE:** March 2016  
**RE:** Schenectady City School District Innovative Approaches to Literacy; Summary of Evaluation Activities to Date

---

In October 2014, the Schenectady City School District (SCSD) was awarded a two-year literacy grant entitled *Innovative Approaches to Literacy* (IAL) by the U. S. Department of Education to increase literacy skills of PreK through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in the district by increasing access to books in the home, classrooms, and school libraries. In addition, the grant seeks to expand the capacity of educators to teach literacy in the schools. One of the unique aspects of the grant is to provide training and materials to parents and caregivers to teach literacy to the children in their homes.

To address literacy across the district, the IAL has supported professional learning opportunities for teachers of students in PreK through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. The focus of the activities during the first year of the grant, 2014-2015, was to provide all K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade teachers in the district with literacy training. The four-session programs for each grade modeled the incorporation of research-based literacy practices into classroom pedagogy. These practices are in their second year of implementation. In addition, the summer program DREAM BIG READ offered intensive literacy instruction for almost two dozen struggling readers in grades 1-3 during the summer of 2015.

For Year 2, strategies to support literacy across the district have included purchasing books to expand access to age appropriate books in elementary classrooms and school libraries in the district. In order to meet grant goals, the SCSD, in collaboration with its district partners and local family organizations, developed workshops for local parents or caregivers and children in their care. The purpose of these workshops was to increase literacy exposure and reading practices to district children who are not yet enrolled in Kindergarten and also to children in early elementary grades. Trained literacy professionals presented lessons to the adults so that they could infuse literacy activities into daily routines, using environmental print, literacy through play, read-alouds, and technology. The learning workshops took place throughout the fall and spring, and will continue into the summer.

To meet the need for outside evaluation, Schenectady City School District contracted with the Evaluation Consortium at the University at Albany, SUNY. Data sources include lesson plans for literacy training for family and caregivers; documentation of family and caregiver participation in learning sessions; observation of literacy learning activities; and, documentation of books

purchased for distribution to schools, libraries, and district families. The purpose of this memo is to report on the status of the IAL grant through March, 2016.

**Increasing access to books and reading material for district children.**

An integral component of the Innovative Approaches to Literacy grant is to increase access to quality books and reading material for district children from PreK – 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. One method of increasing access has been by purchasing books and distributing them to classrooms, libraries, and families in the district. Over 24 months of the grant, objectives of the project are to purchase and provide free books to a minimum of 1,000 district children ages 3-5 through school library distribution; and, purchase and provide over 3,400 books to district classrooms and libraries to support literacy across the content areas for students in PreK – 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.

*Finding: Over 2600 books have been purchased for distribution to district schools and students.*

**Table 1**  
**Books Purchased for District Schools and Libraries**

Date	Purpose	Quantity
November 2014	Grade level Classroom Books for PD	780
December 2014	Grade level Classroom Books for PD	469
January 2016	Books for 11 District elementary schools	1375
	<b>Total books purchased</b>	2624

- To date, books have been distributed to 11 elementary school libraries in the district.
- District children and families have received  $\geq 4$  books at each learning session held for families and caregivers.

Book purchases are continuing through the spring and into summer. The project goals for the grant are 1,000 books to be given away to children ages 3-5 at the workshops, and 3,400 books to be purchased for elementary school libraries across the district for grades PreK – 3.

**Expanding home, school, and community capacity to teach literacy skills.**

In order to expand home, and community capacity to teach literacy skills, the District partnered with the Capital District Child Care Council (CDCCC) and the Schenectady County Public Library (SCPL) to provide opportunities for district families and informal care givers (also known as Family, Friends and Neighbors or FFN) to participate in learning sessions. Developed by district literacy specialists, the progression of four sessions, each focusing on a different literacy practice, provided training in activities meant to be used in the home or childcare setting, to develop early literacy skills. Each session was designed to be an hour long and allowed time for instruction, questions, and application of literacy skills with the children.

The first session—Literacy Through Play—provided parents and caregivers literacy activities or strategies that they could incorporate with children at home; using items found in and activities that happen at home. During the second session—Literacy: Environmental Print—parents and

caregivers were introduced to methods of building early literacy skills by using print found in their environment (i.e., cereal boxes, store signs). The third session—Literacy Through Read Aloud—focused on reading to the children, literacy experts modeled read-alouds, and suggested methods of making reading aloud routine. Finally, in the fourth session—Literacy Through Technology—families were introduced to Kindles and e-readers available for families to borrow from district libraries and the apps and books included with the technology. During all observations, parents and caregivers were observed participating in the training, and then were observed applying the lessons with their children.

Throughout the fall and spring, sessions (N=10) were held in district libraries and schools; observations of individual lessons (N=8) were conducted. There were 40 hours of instruction provided. At these sessions, parents and caregivers participated in learning sessions, and then were given opportunities to work with their children with the assistance of the literacy specialists. At the conclusion of each session, children were given up to five books to keep.

*Finding: To date, ten four-hour literacy training sessions have provided focused literacy training to district parents/guardians and their children.*

**Table 2**  
**Community Literacy Sessions for Parents and Children**

<b>Date of Session</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Adults*</b> (# attending 1 or more hours during each session)	<b>Children*</b> (# attending 1 or more hours during each session)
October 2015	Fulton	10	11
October/November 2015	Yates	9	10
November 2015	Fulton	5	7
December 2015	Keane	2	2
January 2016	Elmer	16	21
January 2016	Van Corlaer	7	10
January/February 2016	Lincoln	11	20
February 2016	Mount Pleasant	2	3
March 2016	Pleasant Valley	20	23
March 2016	Elmer	9	10
<b>Total sessions/hours and attendance</b>	10/40	91	117

*\*Numbers represent unique individuals.*

- *Fulton*: During the each of the four hours held in October 2015, between six and eight adults attended, with between seven and eight children. Five children and at least one parent or guardian attended all four of the hours; one child and at least one parent or guardian attended three of the four hours; two children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours, and one child attended a single hour with a parent or guardian.
- *Yates*: A set of four hour long workshops was held in October and November 2015. Between one and six adults attended each hour with between one and nine children. One

child and a parent or guardian attended three hours; five children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours; and, seven children and at least one parent attended one hour.

- *Fulton*: A third set of workshops was held in November 2015. Between one and four adults attended each hour, with between one and six children. One child and a parent or guardian attended four hours, one child and at least one parent or guardian attended three hours; one child and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours and, four children and at least one parent attended one hour.
- *Keane*: A fourth set of workshops was held in December 2015. Four sessions were held within a two week period, with two parents or guardians attending with one child each. Both children attended each of the four hours with one parent or guardian.
- *Elmer*: In January, 2016, four workshops were held at Elmer Elementary School. Between seven and nine adults attended each hour with between ten and thirteen children. Four children and a parent or guardian attended four hours; four children and at least one parent or guardian attended three hours; three children and at least one parent attended two hours; and, ten children attended one hour with at least one parent or guardian.
- *Van Corlaer*: In January, 2016, two two-hour workshops were held. Sessions 1 & 2 were combined for the first meeting, and 3 & 4 combined for the second meeting. Between four and seven adults attended each workshop with between seven and ten children. Six children and a parent or guardian attended all four hours; three children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours.
- *Lincoln*: During the each of the four hours held in January and February 2016, between six and seven adults attended, with between twelve and eighteen children. Four children and at least one parent or guardian attended all four of the hours; sixteen children and at least one parent or guardian attended three of the four hours; four children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours, and four children attended a single hour with a parent or guardian.
- *Mont Pleasant*: In March, two two-hour workshops were held at the Mont Pleasant Library. Sessions 1 & 2 were combined for the first meeting, and 3 & 4 combined for the second meeting. Two adults attended each workshop with three children. All three children and their parent or guardian attended all four hours.
- *Pleasant Valley*: In March, two sessions were held that were two hours long. Sessions 1 & 2 were combined for the first meeting, and 3 & 4 combined for the second meeting. There were a minimum of four hours that families could attend. Between twelve and twenty-nine adults attended each session with between twelve and twenty-three children. Eleven children attended both sections with at least one parent or guardian; and, twelve children attended two hours with at least one parent or guardian.

- *Elmer*: In March, 2016, four workshops were held. Between three and seven adults attended each hour with between three and eight children. One child and a parent or guardian attended four sessions; three children and at least one parent or guardian attended three sessions; two children and at least one parent attended two hours; and, two children attended one hour with at least one parent or guardian.

Families were enthusiastic during the training, and many families attended three or more sessions with their children. Attendance has ranged from a minimum of two families to up to twenty-three families per session. Several families brought more than two children, some as many as five. In some cases, two adults attended with the children. It was observed that poor weather conditions in the winter months may have contributed to the low attendance. The District continues to advertise and provide literacy training to families and caregivers.

*Finding: Literacy instruction has been made available to informal caregivers (FFN) in the district and children in their care.*

**Table 3**  
**Early Reader Workshops For FFN Caregivers**

Date of Session	Location	Adults	Children
January 2016	YMCA	2	4
March 2016	Bigelow	1	2
March 2016	Head Start	5	7
<b>Total sessions/hours and attendance</b>	3/9	8	13

- Between one and five adults have attended one of the three workshops with four and seven children.

As with the school-based trainings, poor weather conditions winter months may have contributed to the low attendance. The District is working with the CCCDC and Head Start to schedule further sessions, and will continue to advertise and provide literacy training to families and caregivers until the goal is met.

As part of the goal to expand community access to literacy resources, a minimum of 18 web-based literacy resources for parents/guardians and exempt FFN child care providers will be developed. To achieve this goal, the District has created a web presence including a Face Book page: "SCSD Early Readers" that is a forum for teachers, parents and community members and provides literacy information to families and caregivers of early readers in Schenectady age 0-9. In addition, parents and caregivers can access literacy information on the District website, Family Engagement Building Reading Skills.

**Future directions**

Moving forward, the district will continue to provide literacy training to family and caregivers, and their children. Plans are being made to provide training until the proposed number of families and caregivers have received training in literacy strategies.

A second DREAM BIG READ session will be held for struggling readers during the summer of 2016. During the 2015 summer, 21 students were able to attend. Teaching positions will be posted during the spring in order to staff for the 2016 session. Struggling readers from grades 1 – 3 will again be selected for participation in the enrichment program.

Plans are being finalized for a Summer Institute for up to 160 district teachers to be held in August, 2016. Advertised to district teachers early in the spring, registration was held through March. The five day workshop will feature focused training for each grade level (K-3), and each grade level will be led by an expert in the content for that grade. This institute will build on the professional development that teachers participated in during the first year of the grant.

In addition to reporting on learning activities that will take place during the spring and summer of 2016, the next report will provide a summative evaluation of the project. The analysis will present analysis of student progress compared to baseline measures and the achievement of project objectives including the final distribution of books and district literacy activities.

## **Summary**

In summary, findings indicate that the Innovative Approaches to Literacy project continues to increase availability of age appropriate reading material to district students in PreK – 3rd grade. The goals of increasing books in the elementary libraries and in classrooms are being met by providing books purchased by funds through the grant. Families and caregivers are learning literacy instruction and strategies that can be used at home to increase exposure to print and increase reading skills of their children. In addition, children attending the sessions are provided with books to add to their home libraries. By providing focused literacy training, and increased access to books, children will come to school better prepared to read.

Appendix d:  
Summative Report 2014-16, Summative Report

**Schenectady City School District  
Innovative Approaches to Literacy Program**

*Summative Report*  
**2014 - 2016**

*Principal Investigator:*

Victoria C. Coyle, Ph.D.

*Assisted by:*

Kathie Gullie, Ph.D., Emily M. Rodabaugh, Ericka L. Pier, Brandon P. Sinisi, Maria I. Khan, Mohammad Mansoor Khan

*The Evaluation Consortium*

**University at Albany/State University of New York  
Dutch Quadrangle B-7  
1400 Washington Avenue  
Albany, New York 12222  
(518) 442-5027**

**Schenectady City School District  
Innovative Approaches to Literacy Program  
Year Two Report 2015-2016**

**Victoria C. Coyle, Ph.D.  
The Evaluation Consortium, University at Albany/SUNY**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In October 2014, the Schenectady City School District (SCSD) was awarded a two-year literacy grant entitled *Innovative Approaches to Literacy* by the U. S. Department of Education<sup>4</sup>. This project was designed to increase literacy skills in district children from birth through third grade, increase children's access to quality books, and, expand home, school, and community capacity to teach literacy. The following is a summative report of the program through Year Two.

Through the grant the district sought to expand the ability of teachers, family, and caregivers to teach and practice literacy skills with children in grades Pre-K through Grade 3. In order to increase literacy skills of district students, and increase literacy skills for students preparing to enter kindergarten, the district used a variety of professional development models for teachers, and literacy training sessions for families and caregivers with their children. Across the two years, students in grades K through 3 who struggled with reading participated a district developed summer reading program designed to increase literacy and prevent a summer slip in reading skills.

The following is a summary of the key findings for the Schenectady Innovative Approaches to Literacy grant:

- Professional development was provided to teachers by the University of Pittsburgh, Institute for Learning, to district K-3 teachers, special education teachers and librarians.
- All teachers in the targeted grades have received literacy training. Students have experienced two years of literacy instruction from teachers who have received the research-based training. Positive trends in assessment scores can be seen among students of teachers who have participated in the project. Students who attended the Dream Big READ summer programs showed increased skills from beginning to the end of the summer school sessions.
- Access to quality books was made possible through the project and books were purchased and distributed to the district's libraries and classrooms. Book giveaways for pre-K children in the district took place through family literacy activities provided to community families through Child Care Council of the Capital Region.
- In the community, trained district librarians provided literacy training, literacy materials, and learning activities to parents/caregivers and legally exempt caregivers in the Friends and Family Network (FFN).

The purpose of this report is to document the activities and outcomes of the IAL grant activities and summarize results through September, 2016. Communication has been open and ongoing between the evaluator and grant staff throughout the project. By the end of the second year of the grant, teachers participating in the project had been exposed to increased opportunities for research-based professional development around literacy best practices and have been observed implementing those practices in their classrooms. In addition, family, friends, and informal caregivers of district children had opportunities to attend instructional activities with their children to enhance literacy skills and literacy interactions. Finally, as part of the project, access to books within the schools, libraries, and homes increased.

---

<sup>4</sup> Grant Number: S215G140072

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Evaluation Methodology</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Objective One:</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>To Document Professional Development Supporting Increase in Literacy Skills</b>	
<b>Objective Two:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>To Document Student Outcomes Related to Literacy Skills</b>	
<b>Objective Three:</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>To Document Increase Access to Quality Books and School Supplies Supporting Literacy Development</b>	
<b>Objective Four:</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>To Document Expansion of Home, School, and Community Capacity to Teach Literacy Skills</b>	
<b>Summary</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>43</b>

## INTRODUCTION

In October 2014, the Schenectady City School District (SCSD) was awarded a two-year literacy grant entitled *Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL)* by the U.S. Department of Education<sup>5</sup>. The district has a diverse student population, with over 80% qualifying for free and reduced meals, 4% with limited English proficiency, and 18% requiring special education services. In 2013, 35% of students entering Kindergarten were unable to identify a single letter sound, and students' reading proficiency was low across most grades. The purpose of the grant was to develop innovative instructional approaches to address the low literacy rates in the district. There were three goals: 1) Increase literacy skills; 2) Increase access to quality books supporting literacy development; and, 3) Expand home, school, and community capacity to teach literacy. One unique aspect of the grant was the community outreach, intended to provide training and materials to district parents and caregivers so that they could incorporate literacy practices into the everyday care of district children in their homes. Elements of the project were designed to increase literacy of students prior to entering kindergarten; throughout the district, many young children are cared for by family, friends or neighbors (FFN) in legally exempt child care settings. In an effort to connect schools, home, and community to improve literacy skills of children from birth to grade 3, SCSD partnered with libraries and community service organizations to deliver learning opportunities for parents, child care providers, and children to participate in literacy training designed to increase skills of future students. Additionally, the project sought to increase literacy skills of Pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in the district by increasing access to books in district homes, classrooms, and school libraries.

During Year 1, the district implemented synergistic grants across the grades to increase student literacy. In this first year, the IAL grant supported a yearlong approach to literacy instruction in early grades that included instruction in research-based literacy practices and supporting materials that teachers implemented in their classrooms. Through the grant, teachers in each grade (K-3) participated in grade specific professional development provided by the University of Pittsburgh Institute for Learning (IFL).

The focus of the activities during Year 2 of the grant, 2015-2016, was to continue to provide all K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade teachers in the district with additional literacy training and expand the amount of quality reading materials in classrooms and libraries. During the second year, strategies to support literacy across the district included purchasing and distributing books through various venues to expand access to age appropriate books in district homes, elementary classrooms and school libraries in the district. Also in this second year, the SCSD, in collaboration with its district partners and local family organizations, developed literacy workshops for local parents or caregivers and children in their care. The purpose of these workshops was to increase literacy experiences for district families and children by teaching reading practices to district families of children who had not yet enrolled in Kindergarten. During organized community offerings, district-trained literacy professionals used environmental print, literacy through play, read-alouds, and technology to present lessons to the adults so that they could infuse literacy activities into daily routines.

As part of the efforts to increase literacy in struggling readers already in school, the summer program Dream Big READ offered intensive literacy instruction for over 30 struggling readers in grades K-3 during each of the summer sessions in 2015 (N=18) and 2016 (N=15). Teachers were offered learning opportunities to extend their literacy knowledge during the summer. During the second year, the district developed a Summer Institute designed to provide teachers with additional grade-specific resources and professional development to support literacy practices in their classrooms.

As a means of documenting the activities and outcomes of the Schenectady City School District IAL

---

<sup>5</sup> Grant Number: S215G140072

project, the Evaluation Consortium at the University at Albany/SUNY was contracted to serve as the external evaluator for this project. Presented below is an overview of the evaluation objectives that were addressed during the project:

- To document the professional development supporting increase in literacy skills in grades preK-3;
- To document student outcomes related to literacy skills;
- To document increased access to quality books and school supplies supporting literacy development; and,
- To document expansion of home, school, and community capacity to teach literacy skills.

Data sources include lesson plans for literacy training for teachers, and for family and caregivers; documentation of family and caregiver participation in learning sessions; observation of Dream Big READ summer school literacy learning activities; interviews with stakeholders; events and materials involved in the teachers' Summer Institute; and, documentation of books purchased for distribution to schools, libraries, and district families.

## EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A multi-phase, mixed methodology design, including the collection of data from multiple stakeholder groups across the program, was utilized to support the evaluation objectives. Quantitative and qualitative methods were employed to meet the needs of project decision makers over the course of the two years of the grant. The following is a summary of the data sources, collection methods, and targeted stakeholders from whom the information was gathered during the two years of the grant initiative.

### Evaluation Instruments

Multiple instruments were designed and developed to collect data from workshop participants:

- Observations Protocol: Observations were conducted by members of the evaluation team. These observations included observation of IFL professional development (N=7); classroom observations and learning walks of teachers implementing literacy lessons during the 2014-15 and 2015-16 school years (N=10), and Dream Big READ summer school sessions (N=26).
- Semi-structured interviews: During the summer school observations, evaluation team members conducted semi-structured interviews with teachers (N=3) and an administrator (N=1).
- Attendance Records: Records were collected from teacher attendance of PD sessions; student attendance in Dream Big READ; and, family and caregiver attendance of literacy training sessions.
- Summer Institute Survey: This instrument was developed to gather information from participants and was related to the documentation of activities and outputs of the Summer Institute. The instrument was completed as a formative representation of the summer PD and was administered at prior to (N=78) and at the conclusion of the Summer Institute (N=94).
- Specific Knowledge Assessments: Teachers attending the Summer Institute participated in a pre-/post-institute surveys to assess their knowledge of stages in a mini-lesson (N=67 pre- and N=94 post-); the use of Shared Writing (N=63 pre- and N=94 post-); Guided Reading; and, steps of a Research Decide Teach conference.
- Purchase orders and grant records: Purchase orders and receipts of books (for PD, classrooms, libraries, and giveaways), e-readers, and materials used to support literacy training.

As part of the evaluation process, The Evaluation Consortium, at the University at Albany/SUNY, collaborated with the district and provided the results of data collection and analysis of the above documentation of activities and outcomes to assist in formative and summative evaluation. Formative evaluation, from the outset of the project, was on-going and used to provide project director(s) and staff with information necessary to make programmatic changes, ensuring that quality control of programming was maintained throughout delivery. Specific areas of focus included documenting the planning and development of the program, initial implementation, depth and breadth of activities and interventions taking place, inclusiveness of stakeholder involvement, and stakeholder perceptions as to the strengths and barriers of the program.

## Objective One: To Document Professional Development Supporting Increase in Literacy Skills

The purpose of this objective is to document the delivery of professional development, participation in, and perceptions of professional development offered to SCSD teachers. Data were gathered from attendance records, observations of professional development sessions, and interviews from key stakeholders.

### I. Professional Development Participation

Beginning in 2014, teachers participated in thematic, research-based professional development designed to provide them with grade-specific experience and lessons to increase the literacy skills of their elementary students. According to grant goal objectives, classroom teachers, special education teachers, and school librarians from SCSD elementary schools were required to engage in 18 hours of professional development with the University of Pittsburgh Institute for Learning (IFL) and local experts to support literacy across grades and content areas. Additionally, a pre-K teachers engaged in professional development annually with local experts to support literacy across the content areas.

*Finding: District teachers in grades K-3 participated in over 2600 hours of professional development during the first year of the project. The themed professional development was targeted to teachers at each grade. The professional development was cumulative, with succeeding sessions building on the first.*

**Table 1**  
**Teacher Professional Development**

Grade	Number of Teachers Attended PD				Number of PD Hours Offered by Grade Level	Total Number of PD Hours Achieved by Grade Level
	11/14	01/15	03/15	04/15		
Kindergarten	36	36			12.75	459
First Grade	46	44	24		20.25	770
Second Grade	40	40	24		20.25	702
Third Grade	45	41	21		20.25	712
<b>Total</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>69</b>		<b>73.50</b>	<b>2643</b>

- Teachers in grades 1, 2 and 3 participated in more than the minimum 18 hours
- Kindergarten teachers participated in over 12 hours, across 2 sessions.

### II. Professional Development Outcomes of 2016 Summer Institute

In order to extend the depth of literacy education across the district, district literacy experts developed a summer program for teachers from kindergarten through third grade. Held in August 2016, teachers participated in a five-day Summer Literacy Institute entitled “The Key to Equity and Excellence.” The focus of the Summer Institute was to provide attending teachers with the tools, strategies, content knowledge, and skills to effectively implement a systematic approach to literacy instruction. Over the weeklong institute, educators attended keynote sessions and speaker presentations; various grade-specific writing and reading workshops; and, were given opportunities to foster relationships with their colleagues in order to form professional networks across the district. Appendix A provides an overview of the schedule and introduced literacy experts engaged in the program. Goals of the sessions included: forming relationships with colleagues, planning for effective instruction in areas of reading and writing, creating comprehensive

assessment systems, and compiling a toolbox of resources and materials, Appendix B presents the goals of the Summer Institute.

*Finding: All professional development sessions achieved the goals related to facilitating relationships as well as provided methods and strategies for effective reading instruction. Half of the sessions met the goals for providing teachers with sufficient training in effective writing instruction and literacy assessment. Overall, the perceptions of the observers were consistent with the feedback provided by the participants.*

**Table 2**  
**Observers’ Perceptions of Goal Attainment during Professional Development Sessions**

<b>Goal</b>	<b>% Achieved*</b>	<b>Methods of Achievement</b>
<b>Teachers will be able to form relationships with colleagues</b>	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Shared positive and negative experiences of reading</li> <li>- Shared experiences of effective and ineffective instructional strategies</li> <li>- Spoke about the importance of meeting colleagues to ask questions and share ideas</li> <li>- Discussed comprehension strategies for students</li> <li>- Dialogue about utilizing the strengths of colleagues in areas of relative weakness</li> </ul>
<b>Teachers will be able to articulate and plan for effective instruction in phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension</b>	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Modeled read-alouds and think-alouds</li> <li>- Provided examples for guiding accountable talk and reading workshop</li> <li>- Demonstrated discussions for expanding student thinking in regard to text they have read</li> <li>- Explained the importance of instructing students on phonics and using word study</li> </ul>
<b>Teachers will be able to create a starter toolbox that contains resources, materials, strategies, and ideas for literacy instruction</b>	100%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spoke of the importance of connecting reading to other units through “turn and talk” discussions</li> <li>- Provided ideas for instruction, assessment, and activities</li> <li>- Discussed classroom management techniques</li> <li>- Shared Word Wall and Book Baggies as strategies for teaching</li> </ul>
<b>Teachers will be able to articulate and plan for effective instruction in writing (i.e., narrative, informational/expository, opinion)</b>	50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Engaged in interactive writing by composing text with the group</li> <li>- Discussed using mentor texts to develop the writing styles of students</li> <li>- Provided examples for serving as a model for writing (e.g., writing a to-do list, writing a letter)</li> <li>- Explained the impact of sharing writing with others for feedback</li> </ul>
<b>Teachers will be able to create a comprehensive assessment system</b>	50%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discovering reading level and motivation for reading of each student early in the year</li> <li>- Using CBMs to determine reading fluency</li> </ul>

*\*n=4 sessions*

- All observed (N=4) sessions included content and activities that provided teachers with opportunities to form relationships with their colleagues (100%). Participants discussed both effective and ineffective instructional strategies and the benefits of conferring with other teachers. One respondent commented on the importance of “*collaborating with colleagues to help each other move forward.*”

- Sessions for each grade also included strategies for producing effective instruction in literacy concepts (100%). When queried about teaching behaviors that are expected to change as a result of the professional development, respondents cited a variety of methods for enhancing instruction (e.g., daily read-alouds, precise language, mini-lessons, strength-based learning, and goal-setting).
- Participants had opportunities to learn about instructional tools (e.g., resources and strategies) to assist student comprehension (100%). When asked about what strategies educators planned to use in their classroom, tools such as book binders, conference portfolios, leveled reading books, mentor texts, reader response notebooks, and assessment strategies were mentioned.
- Half of the observed sessions succeeded in meeting the goals linked to assessment strategies and effective instruction in writing (50%). Although participants understood that “*with explicit instruction [and] better assessments, student confidence, student engagement, and student achievement will increase,*” a small number of participants commented that they would have liked to receive more training in using “*tech[nology] to help record/gather data*” and training to “*develop an effective reading/writing conference assessment binder.*”
- Observations were conducted for each grade on the first day of the professional development. Goals that were not witnessed during the observation may have been met at a different time during the Summer Institute.

Before and after their participation in the Summer Institute, teachers were given a pre- and post-assessment to determine their knowledge of the stages in a mini-lesson and the use of Shared Writing. Responses were compared for all teachers, and analysis was conducted for matched responses for the teachers that participated in both the pre- and post-test. Examples of pre- and post-participation assessment questions can be found in Appendix C.

*Finding: Overall, teachers' scores on the stages in a mini-lesson statistically significantly improved following their participation in the Summer Institute.*

**Table 3a**  
**Baseline and Post Responses for Stages in a Mini-Lesson**

Grade Level	Response	N	Pre		N	Post		Independent t-test
			Mean*	S.D		Mean*	S.D	
All Grades	Correct Answer	67	29.85	46.11	94	71.28	45.49	.000**
	Objective	67	34.33	47.84	94	71.28	45.49	
Kindergarten	Correct Answer	14	28.57	46.88	23	60.87	49.90	.059
	Objective	14	28.57	46.88	23	60.87	49.90	
Grade 1	Correct Answer	12	16.67	38.93	19	84.21	37.46	.000**
	Objective	12	25.00	45.23	19	84.21	37.46	
Grade 2	Correct Answer	13	38.46	50.64	26	84.62	36.80	.009**
	Objective	13	46.15	51.89	26	84.62	36.80	
Grade 3	Correct Answer	12	16.67	38.93	24	58.33	50.36	.011**
	Objective	12	25.00	45.23	24	58.33	50.36	

\*Mean scores represent percent correct

\*\* $p < .05$  [2-tailed]

- An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare all participants' scores regarding their knowledge of the stages in a mini-lesson before and after participating in the Summer Institute. Results indicated that there were statistically significant improvements in the scores across all grade levels as indicated by the average number of correct responses in the pre-scores (N=67,  $M = 29.85$ ,  $SD = 46.11$ ) and post scores (N=94,  $M = 71.28$ ,  $SD = 45.49$ ).
- Statistically significant improvements were observed for Grade 1, Grade 2 and Grade 3 teachers' responses. Although, there was improvement in teachers' scores at the Kindergarten level, the difference was not statistically significant. These results suggest that participation in the Summer Institute had a positive effect on teachers' overall knowledge of stages in a mini-lesson.

**Table 3b**  
**Matched Baseline and Post Responses for Stages in a Mini-Lesson**

Grade Level	Response	N	Pre		Post		Dependent t-test
			Mean*	S.D	Mean*	S.D	
All Grades	Correct Answer	56	8.93	28.75	75.00	43.69	.000**
	Objective	56	35.71	43.35	75.00	43.69	
Kindergarten	Correct Answer	15	20.00	41.40	60.00	50.71	.028**
	Objective	15	33.33	48.80	60.00	50.71	
Grade 1	Correct Answer	11	0	0	90.91	30.15	.000**
	Objective	11	36.36	50.45	90.91	30.15	
Grade 2	Correct Answer	15	6.67	25.82	100	0	.000**
	Objective	15	53.33	51.64	100	0	
Grade 3	Correct Answer	14	7.14	26.73	50.00	51.89	.008**
	Objective	14	21.43	42.58	50.00	51.89	

\*Mean scores represent percent correct; \*\* $p < .05$  [2-tailed]

- Analysis of a smaller number (N=56) of matched pre- and post-surveys for all grade levels indicated a statistically significant improvement. These results demonstrate that on average, there was an increase in scores across all grade levels as portrayed by the average number of correct responses in the pre-survey ( $M = 8.9$ ,  $SD = 28.75$ ) and post-survey ( $M = 75$ ,  $SD = 43.69$ ).

*Finding: Overall, teachers' scores on the use of Shared Writing statistically significantly improved following their participation in the Summer Institute.*

**Table 3c**  
**Baseline and Post Responses for Shared Writing**

Grade Level	Response	N	Pre		N	Post		Independent t-test
			Mean*	S.D		Mean*	S.D	
All Grades	Correct Answer	63	58.73	49.63	94	88.30	32.32	.000**
	When writers need support and modeling	63	90.48	29.59	94	88.30	32.32	
Kindergarten	Correct Answer	13	69.23	48.04	23	91.30	28.81	.149
	When writers need support and modeling	13	84.62	37.55	23	91.30	28.81	
Grade 1	Correct Answer	12	33.33	49.24	19	89.47	31.53	.003**
	When writers need support and modeling	12	75.00	45.23	19	89.47	31.53	
Grade 2	Correct Answer	10	60.00	51.64	26	96.15	19.61	.057
	When writers need support and modeling	10	100	0	26	96.15	19.61	
Grade 3	Correct Answer	13	61.54	50.64	24	79.17	41.49	.261
	When writers need support and modeling	13	92.31	27.74	24	79.17	41.49	

\*Mean scores represent percent correct

\*\* $p < .05$  [2-tailed]

- An independent samples t-test was used to compare participants' scores before and after participating in the Summer Institute regarding their knowledge of the implementation of Shared Writing. Results indicated that there was a statistically significant improvement in the scores across all grade levels as indicated by the average number of correct responses in the pre-scores (N=63,  $M = 58.73$ ,  $SD = 49.63$ ) and post-scores (N=94,  $M = 88.30$ ,  $SD = 32.32$ ).
- Statistically significant improvement in correct responses was observed for Grade 1 teachers. There was improvement in teachers' correct responses in Kindergarten, Grade 2, and Grade 3, however, the difference did not meet statistical significant. Overall, these results suggest that participation in the Summer Institute had a positive effect on teachers' knowledge of when to use Shared Writing in their instruction.

**Table 3d**  
**Matched Baseline and Post Responses for Shared Writing**

Grade Level	Response	N	Pre		Post		Dependent t-test
			Mean*	S.D	Mean*	S.D	
All Grades	Correct Answer	53	56.60	50.04	90.57	29.51	.000**
	When writers need support and modeling	53	90.57	29.51	90.57	29.51	
Kindergarten	Correct Answer	15	73.33	45.77	93.33	25.82	.189
	When writers need support and modeling	15	86.67	35.19	93.33	25.82	
Grade 1	Correct Answer	11	27.27	46.71	90.91	30.15	.002**
	When writers need support and modeling	11	81.82	40.45	90.91	30.15	
Grade 2	Correct Answer	11	63.64	50.45	100	0	.038**
	When writers need support and modeling	11	100	0	100	0	
Grade 3	Correct Answer	15	60.00	50.71	80.00	41.40	.189
	When writers need support and modeling	15	93.33	25.82	80.00	41.40	

\*Mean scores represent percent correct

\*\* $p < .05$  [2-tailed]

- Analysis of matched pre- and post- surveys for all grade levels (N=53) demonstrate that there was an increase in correct responses across all grade levels as revealed by the responses in the pre-survey ( $M = 56.60, SD = 50.04$ ) and post-survey ( $M = 90.57, SD = 29.51$ ). A statistically significant improvement in correct responses was found specifically for teachers in Grade 1 and Grade 2 after the pre- and post- surveys were matched for participants.

Prior to attending the Summer Institute, teachers (N=67) took a pre-assessment regarding their knowledge of the structures in Guided Reading based on the Fountas and Pinnell model and teachers participated in a pre-assessment (N=57) in which they shared their knowledge regarding the steps of a Research Decide Teach conference. At the conclusion of the professional development, a total of 94 teachers were assessed using a post-assessment. Matched pre- and post-assessment responses were used to compare teachers' improvement.

*Finding: Overall, teachers showed improvement in their knowledge of the correct structures in Guided Reading based on the Fountas and Pinnell model following their participation in the Summer Institute.*

**Table 3e**  
**Matched Baseline and Post Responses for Structures in Guided Reading**

Grade Level	Responses to All Structures Based on F & P Model	N	Pre		Post		% Increase
			Mean*	S.D	Mean*	S.D	
All Grades	Word Work	56	85.71	35.31	91.07	28.77	+5.36
	Reading the Text	56	85.71	35.31	94.64	22.72	+8.93
	Book Introduction	56	91.07	28.77	94.64	22.72	+3.57
	Discussing and Revisiting the Text	56	80.36	40.09	89.29	31.21	+8.93
	Teaching for Processing Strategies	56	69.64	46.40	85.71	35.31	+16.07
	Extension for Understanding	56	60.71	49.28	83.93	37.06	+23.22
Kindergarten	Word Work	16	68.75	47.87	87.50	34.16	+18.75
	Reading the Text	16	68.75	47.87	93.75	25.00	+25.00
	Book Introduction	16	81.25	40.31	93.75	25.00	+12.5
	Discussing and Revisiting the Text	16	75.00	44.72	93.75	25.00	+18.75
	Teaching for Processing Strategies	16	62.50	50.00	81.25	40.31	+18.75
	Extension for Understanding	16	56.25	51.24	93.75	25.00	+37.50
Grade 1	Word Work	10	90.00	31.62	100	0	+10.00
	Reading the Text	10	90.00	31.62	100	0	+10.00
	Book Introduction	10	90.00	31.62	90.00	31.62	0
	Discussing and Revisiting the Text	10	90.00	31.62	80.00	42.16	-10.00
	Teaching for Processing Strategies	10	70.00	48.31	90.00	31.62	+20.00
	Extension for Understanding	10	70.00	48.31	100	0	+30.00
Grade 2	Word Work	13	100	0	92.31	27.74	-7.69
	Reading the Text	13	92.31	27.74	92.31	27.74	0
	Book Introduction	13	100	0	100	0	0
	Discussing and Revisiting the Text	13	61.54	50.64	100	0	+38.46
	Teaching for Processing Strategies	13	69.23	48.04	84.62	37.55	+15.39
	Extension for Understanding	13	38.46	50.64	76.92	43.85	+38.46
Grade 3	Word Work	15	86.67	35.19	86.67	35.19	0
	Reading the Text	15	93.33	25.82	93.33	25.82	0
	Book Introduction	15	93.33	25.82	93.33	25.82	0
	Discussing and Revisiting the Text	15	93.33	25.82	80.00	41.40	-13.33
	Teaching for Processing Strategies	15	73.33	45.77	86.67	35.19	+13.34
	Extension for Understanding	15	73.33	45.77	66.67	48.80	-6.66

\*Mean scores represent percent correct

- Percent increase in the inclusion of correct responses was used to compare matched participants' scores before and after participating in the Summer Institute regarding teachers' knowledge of Guided Reading structures based on the Fountas and Pinnell model. Specific grade level improvements were also calculated.

- The structures “Teaching for Processing Strategies” (+16.07%) and “Extension for Understanding” (+23.22%) had the largest improvement in average inclusion in the response to the item. These results suggest that participation in the Summer Institute had a positive effect on teachers’ knowledge of the structures involved in Guided Reading.
- Analysis of grade level, matched results show that Kindergarten teachers made the greatest improvement in the inclusion of the “Extension for Understanding” (+37.50%), Grade 1 teachers’ greatest improvement was in “Extension for Understanding” (+30%), Grade 2 in “Discussing and Revisiting the Text” (+38.46%) and “Extension for Understanding” (+38.46%), and Grade 3 in “Teaching for Processing Strategies” (+13.34%). These results reveal that teachers in each of the grade levels improved in their inclusion of the specific structures related to Guided Reading according to the Fountas and Pinnell model.

*Finding: Overall, increase in teacher knowledge was noted following participation in the Summer Institute as evidenced by teachers’ inclusion of the correct steps of a Research Decide Teach conference.*

**Table 3f**  
**Matched Baseline and Post Responses for All Steps to a**  
***Research Decide Teach Conference***

Grade Level	Response	N	Pre		Post		% Increase
			Mean*	S.D	Mean*	S.D	
All Grades	Note Take	49	46.94	50.42	42.86	50.00	-4.08
	Research	49	69.39	46.57	93.88	24.22	+24.49
	Decide	49	57.14	50.00	85.71	35.35	+28.57
	Compliment	49	34.69	48.09	73.47	44.61	+38.78
	Teach	49	59.18	49.66	85.71	35.35	+26.53
	Link	49	34.69	48.09	51.02	50.51	+16.33
Kindergarten	Note Take	15	33.33	48.80	26.67	45.77	-6.66
	Research	15	60.00	50.71	93.33	25.82	+33.33
	Decide	15	60.00	50.71	86.67	35.19	+26.67
	Compliment	15	33.33	48.80	80.00	41.40	+46.67
	Teach	15	60.00	50.71	80.00	41.40	+20.00
	Link	15	40.00	50.71	80.00	41.40	+40.00
Grade 1	Note Take	10	40.00	51.64	70.00	48.31	+30.00
	Research	10	60.00	51.64	90.00	31.62	+30.00
	Decide	10	50.00	52.71	100	0	+50.00
	Compliment	10	20.00	42.16	70.00	48.31	+50.00
	Teach	10	60.00	51.64	90.00	31.62	+30.00
	Link	10	20.00	42.16	40.00	51.64	+20.00
Grade 2	Note Take	9	66.67	50.00	55.56	52.71	-11.11
	Research	9	66.67	50.00	100	0	+33.33
	Decide	9	33.33	50.00	88.89	33.33	+55.56
	Compliment	9	22.22	44.10	88.89	33.33	+66.67
	Teach	9	44.44	52.71	88.89	33.33	+44.45
	Link	9	22.22	44.10	22.22	44.10	0
Grade 3	Note Take	14	57.14	51.36	35.71	49.73	-21.43
	Research	14	85.71	36.31	92.86	26.73	+7.15
	Decide	14	71.43	46.88	78.57	42.58	+7.14

	Compliment	14	57.14	51.36	64.29	49.73	+7.15
	Teach	14	64.29	49.73	85.71	36.31	+21.42
	Link	14	50.00	51.89	42.86	51.36	-7.14

\*Mean scores represent percent correct

- Analysis of matched pre- and post-assessments for all grade levels in addition to specific grade levels was conducted. There was an improvement from pre- to post-assessment in teachers' inclusion of correct responses regarding the steps to a Research Decide Teach conference for all teachers in addition to each of the grade levels.
- Overall, when all grades were considered as a whole, the greatest improvement in response inclusion was found for the "Compliment" step (+38.78%) followed by "Decide" (+28.57%). These results, in addition to the other positive results, suggest that participation in the Summer Institute had a positive effect on teachers' overall knowledge of the steps of a Research Decide Teach Conference.
- Kindergarten teachers showed the most improvement in their inclusion of "Compliment" (+46.67%), Grade 1 teachers in "Decide" (+50.00%) and "Compliment" (+50.00%), Grade 2 in "Compliment" (+66.67%), and Grade 3 in "Teach" (+21.42). These results reveal that teachers in each of the grade levels improved in their inclusion of the steps included in a Research Decide Teach conference.

*Finding: When comparing pre-participation responses to post-participation responses, representative teachers' responses indicated that they thought that participating in the Summer Institute would positively impact student outcomes including attendance, confidence, well-being, learning, and achievement results.*

**Table 4**  
**Impact of Teacher Participation in Summer Institute on Student Outcomes**

	Pre-Survey (n=78)	Post-Survey (n=94)
<b>Student Attendance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Little impact [on student attendance]- attendance issues are usually out of the students' control regardless of engagement and motivation"</li> <li>- "Building engagement for all into lesson will increase [their] interactions, competence and thus attendance"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "This workshop has shown the power of giving student choice. When students are [given] choices, they enjoy reading and writing more and therefore will have better attendance"</li> <li>- "It is hoped with a deeper engagement in activities; students will be more motivated to come to school and will pass this desire on to parents who will consider this in their decision as to whether or not to keep a child home on a particular day."</li> <li>- "I don't feel it will impact student attendance"</li> </ul>
<b>Student Confidence</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Student learning impacts both student confidence and well-being"</li> <li>- "Strategies that will meet many student needs will instill confidence because they will be doing work on their level"</li> <li>- "Stronger readers will cause an increase in confidence"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "I have found that students are often hesitant to participate because they aren't risk takers and think they can't do it... Throughout the week, it has been stressed the importance of zeroing in on one main teaching point per mini lesson or conference etc... Hopefully, focusing on these will booster self-confidence and thereby more confident, readers, writers, and learners"</li> <li>- "The methods I have learned will definitely have a positive impact on student confidence. For example, in writing, always begin with a compliment and the</li> </ul>

		<i>student will be so much more receptive to suggestions. Also, being very clear with your teaching points and goals for the students' aid in developing confident learners."</i>
<b>Student Well-Being</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"When students feel confident, their well-being improves"</i></li> <li>- <i>"A strong community of learners creates a safe environment for risk taking"</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"They will all feel as though our classroom is their home. They will feel welcome and valued. They will all feel important"</i></li> <li>- <i>"Students will become more independent in their thinking, become leaders, collaborate, explicitly tell what they need, and feel confident in reading and writing. They will experience more success"</i></li> </ul>
<b>Student Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"Stronger literacy skills will change learning with all content areas"</i></li> <li>- <i>"Increase in student learning should always come with increase in teachers' use of best practices"</i></li> <li>- <i>"Engagement will increase, love of learning will increase, independence and leadership will be evident"</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"I feel that once [students] feel more comfortable with [reading and writing], it will have a positive influence on their overall learning in the classroom with these areas, as well as others"</i></li> <li>- <i>"I will push students to... use modeling whenever possible through mentor texts. I am really excited to do more shared reading as a way to teach targeted goals to the whole class and hopefully see them transfer those skills to their work"</i></li> </ul>
<b>Student Achievement Results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"Learning to use assessment and using more targeted instruction will raise achievement"</i></li> <li>- <i>"Student achievement will increase because students will be more engaged with the new teaching strategies"</i></li> <li>- <i>"Test scores will go up, students will be confident when being assessed, fluency will grow"</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>"Students will gain important skills and this will transfer to higher AIMSWEB scores and also results"</i></li> <li>- <i>"I am hopeful that implementing these methods will increase student achievement and promote more growth"</i></li> <li>- <i>"Because I have a clearer understating of the workshop model, and have learned so many valuable things from the instructor and my colleagues, I feel better equipped to guide and move my students to where they need to be"</i></li> </ul>

- Pre-and post-surveys indicated a mixed response in regards to teachers' perceptions regarding the impact of the Summer Institute on student attendance. Many teachers acknowledged on the pre-survey that they had observed a relationship between student attendance and student choice, engagement, and decision-making. In the post-survey, teachers noted that they felt the Summer Institute had given them strategies to make their classrooms engaging and motivating for students to come to school. They did indicate that even with the more engaging strategies, there are aspects of student attendance that may not be directly influenced by the teachers' participation in the Summer Institute.
- Overall, the participants in the Summer Institute responded that students were confident when they were strong readers, had a specific focus, and were given positive and clear feedback. In the pre-survey, it was commonly noted that by becoming better readers, students gain confidence in the classroom. Teacher participants mentioned that the methods that they had learned in the workshop would help them focus on teaching strategies that would aid in developing confident learners. In the post-survey, teachers discussed student accountability, encouraging risk-taking, and meeting classroom expectations related to students' increased confidence through the strategies that teachers acquired from the Summer Institute.
- Teachers indicated that student well-being is critical to student learning. In the pre-survey, teacher participants acknowledged positive relationships between student confidence, well-being, and community learning. In the post-survey, participants again commented on the significance of

student well-being. Participants reported that the strategies acquired during the workshop would help teachers meet student needs more efficiently and build student self-esteem.

- Respondents reported that student learning could be enhanced by improving teaching skills presented at the Summer Institute. Teachers reported that classroom strategies positively influenced student learning when teachers pushed students to meet their highest potential. In the pre-survey, teachers indicated that student learning would increase with their usage of improved teaching approaches. Respondents suggested that increased literacy skills would have positive effects on other content areas, engagement, independence, and leadership. Post-survey results indicated that teachers felt confident in implementing teaching strategies that would improve overall student learning. Some teachers also indicated that they had gained important instructional tools that would help them monitor student performance and differentiate instruction according to student needs.
- Participants had indicated a positive relationship between teaching strategies, student learning and student achievement results. Pre-survey responses indicated that teachers believed that student achievement would increase when teachers used targeted instructional techniques and the students were confident in their learning. In the post-survey, teachers indicated that the workshop enabled them to implement evidence-based methods that would increase student achievement and improve test scores.

*Finding: Educators indicated that the sessions provided relevant information that could be tied to real practice in the classroom. The presenters were viewed as knowledgeable and most respondents agreed that the format and delivery of the content was organized and facilitated learning.*

**Table 5**  
**Participant Perceptions of the 2016 Summer Institute**

<b>The Professional Development Content</b>	<b>% Agree*</b>
The content was of interest to me.	85
The professional development enhanced my skills in the topic area.	84
My understanding of reading instruction increased as a result of participation.	82
The content presented was useful and relevant for my work.	81
The content presented met the expectations that I had set for it.	80
<b>Satisfaction Level</b>	
I would recommend this professional development to a colleague.	85
I am satisfied with the quality of this professional development.	84
I expect to use the information gained from this session.	84
I expect this professional development to benefit my students.	82
<b>The Format and Setting</b>	
The communication and interaction with the presenters was sufficient for learning.	81
The format provided opportunities for participants to interact and collaborate.	80
The format of the professional development was comfortable and conducive to learning.	76
The professional development was suited to my learning needs.	76
<b>The Delivery of Information</b>	
The presenters were knowledgeable about the topic.	88
The presenters were well prepared for the session.	87
The presenters were effective at delivering the material.	86
The material was presented in a logical and organized way.	86

The presenters were receptive to participant comments and questions.	80
<b>Networking</b>	
I was able to work with colleagues that I have not worked with before.	79
There was an ample amount of time to work together during the sessions.	63
I was able to develop a support group with teachers outside of my school.	60
My colleagues and I have established a timeline to offer each other feedback.	45

\*Percentages include responses of "strongly agree" and "agree" on a 6 point Likert-type scale; n=94

- The majority of participants agreed that the overall content of the Summer Institute was interesting (85%), useful (81%), and enriched their skills related to literacy instruction (84%). Educators reported that the sessions were “*organized, professional, and purposeful,*” and the presenters were “*knowledgeable, engaging, supportive, and interesting.*”
- Respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the quality and applicability of the sessions (84%); however, a theme emerged among a small number of participant comments referencing the presenters’ lack of awareness of the attendees’ diverse range of prior knowledge about literacy instruction. One reading specialist commented that “*there should have been differentiation for those who have been immersed in this work for years,*” while another teacher stated that the presenters “*[thought] we all had that same prior knowledge, but we didn’t.*”
- The majority of educators agreed that the format and setting of the professional development was comfortable and conducive to learning (76%). One participant commented that “*it is much more meaningful when you are able to be comfortable (air conditioning, adult chairs) and work together on things that drive instruction.*”
- Overall, educators agreed that the presenters were well prepared (87%), were knowledgeable about literacy instruction (88%), and presented the information in an organized way (86%). Educators expressed that they would have appreciated more time to apply information, specifically they suggested “*more time to collaborate with peers*” and increased opportunities for “*more in-depth practice (not discussion) in literacy centers.*”
- Approximately one-third of the participants indicated that the professional development did not lead to forming relationships with teachers from other buildings (40%) and over half reported that they had not established a timeline with their colleagues to offer feedback to one another (55%). When asked for constructive feedback about the sessions, one attendee commented that he or she “*would love time to collaborate with my colleagues.*” Another teacher stated, “*As a follow-up experience, I would personally benefit from having time to collaborate with other first grade teachers as to what worked and did not work in their individual classrooms.*”

Professional development opportunities were provided through the grant, and were well attended. Sessions in the both the IFL professional development and the Summer Institute incorporated research-based learning presented by national experts. All learning sessions, held during the school year and during the Summer Institute, were targeted to district teachers in K-3<sup>rd</sup> grade, and were well received. Analysis of content-knowledge showed gains from pre-workshop to post-workshop. As incentive to participate in the Summer Institute, and as a means to provide teachers with high-quality texts to use in their classrooms, each teacher was provided with \$50 to purchase PD materials related to the Summer Institute.

**Objective Two: To Document Student Outcomes Related to Literacy Skills**

The purpose of this objective is to document an increase in literacy skills in pre-kindergarten through third grade students after the teachers had participated in professional development literacy training throughout year two. Longitudinal data was provided by SCSD to measure this goal.

It should be noted that during Year 1 of the grant, teachers attended professional development sessions that were designed to build on information and activities presented in the first session. Teachers applied the techniques incrementally in their classrooms throughout that first year. During Year 2 of the project, teachers were able to apply literacy practices from the beginning of the year; their students were able to experience full implementation of the literacy practices.

The performance measure for the project, as stated in the grant, was “the number of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students achieving proficiency on NYS ELA Common Core Learning Standards will increase by 10% annually over baseline year.” Originally, the evaluation plan was to make direct comparisons between baseline and subsequent years’ results. Unexpected changes in the state testing program prevent direct comparison; after the first year of the project (2015), the New York State Education Department changed the exam (including, but not limited to a new test vendor). Although no direct comparisons can be made, the content of the different tests are comparable and similarly rigorous; qualitative comparisons are presented to provide an overall view of student achievement.

**I. School Year Activities**

*Finding: In the Schenectady City School District, children’s literacy skills as measured by NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessments have increased from the baseline year.*

**Table 6**  
**Number of District Students Achieving Literacy Goals\***

Measure	Spring 2014 Baseline Results N = 750	Spring 2015 Results After Year One N = 730	Spring 2016 Results After Year Two N = 714	% Increase
Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency				
NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessments (Grade 3)	19%	18%	20%	1

*\*Percentages indicate percent of all students considered proficient in ELA by the New York State School Report Card*

- The number of four-year olds attaining one-year growth as measured by the Aimsweb Letter and Sound Fluency has increased by XX% one year after the baseline year.
- The number of third grade students achieving proficiency on NYS ELA Common Core Learning Assessment has increased by 1% two years after the baseline year.

*Finding: Across the district, the percentage of students achieving proficiency increased in Year 2 of the project.*

**Table 7**

**Number of 3<sup>rd</sup> Graders Achieving Literacy Goals in SCSD\***

	2013-14 Baseline			2014-15 Year 1				2015-16 Year 2			
	N	# proficient	% proficient	N	Actual # proficient (Goal # proficient)	% proficient	% Change in number of students over baseline **	N	Actual # proficient (Goal # proficient)	% proficient	% Change in number of students over 2014- 15***
SCSD all 3 <sup>rd</sup> grade students	750	142	19%	730	129 (156)	18%	-9%	714	145 (142)	20%	+12%
<b>Gender</b>											
Female	369	81	22%	333	67 (89)	20%	-17%	355	85 (74)	24%	+27%
Male	381	61	16%	397	62 (67)	16%	+2%	359	60 (67)	17%	-3%
<b>Ethnicity</b>											
African American	261	39	15%	246	28 (43)	11%	-28%	216	29 (31)	13%	+4%
Hispanic/ Latino	156	20	13%	143	20 (22)	14%	0%	152	21 (22)	14%	+5%
White	206	51	25%	182	39 (56)	21%	-4%	170	49 (43)	29%	+26%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>											
English Language Learner	24	3	13%	28	0 (3)	0%	--	28	0	0%	--
Economically disadvantaged	652	107	16%	591	89 (118)	15%	-17%	600	102 (98)	17%	+15%

\*Percentages indicate percent of students considered proficient in ELA by the New York State School Report Card, Level 3 or 4.

\*\* Goal was 10% increase over 2014.

\*\*\*Goal was 10% increase over 2015.

- Student achievement shows positive trends, the percentage change in the number of students across the district in 2016 (+12%) exceeded 10%.
- The percent change in the number of female students who were proficient in 2016 increased 27% over 2015 (N=85 in 2016; N=62 in 2015). The percentage change was smaller, and negative for males -3% (N=60 in 2016; N=62 in 2015).
- Across ethnicities, positive percentage changes were observed in African American students (+4%); Hispanic/Latino students (+5%); and, White students (+26%).
- Across the district, economically disadvantaged students also displayed positive percentage changes, +15% from 2015 to 2016.

*Finding: Individual schools show positive trends over the three testing periods (2014 baseline to end of Year 2, 2016).*

**Table 8**  
**Percent Proficient by School, Gender, Ethnicity, and LEP/Poverty**

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016
<b>Elmer Avenue</b>						
All students	70	13%	31	13%	54	26%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	32	9%	16	19%	27	33%
Male	38	16%	15	7%	27	19%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	32	16%	10	0%	16	19%
Hispanic/Latino	12	8%	5	0%	9	1%
White	14	21%	7	29%	13	31%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--*	--	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	63	13%	--	--	45	24%
<b>Franklin D Roosevelt</b>						
All students	28	4%	21	5%	36	6%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	7	0%	11	9%	19	0%
Male	21	5%	10	0%	17	2%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	--	--	--	--	12	8%
Hispanic/Latino	--	--	--	--	--	--
White	08	13%	07	0%	--	--
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Hamilton</b>						
All students	76	11%	74	20%	74	22%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	36	11%	35	23%	34	29%
Male	40	10%	39	18%	40	15%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	30	0%	31	13%	25	16%
Hispanic/Latino	16	6%	09	22%	17	18%
White	--	--	18	28%	14	21%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	66	20%	68	22%
<b>Lincoln</b>						
All students	30	23%	56	14%	49	18%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	16	25%	23	13%	25	20%
Male	14	21%	33	15%	24	17%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	12	25%	24	21%	15	7%
Hispanic/Latino	10	30%	11	0%	18	17%
White	--	--	08	13%	--	--
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	--	--	7	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	56	14%	--	--

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016
<b>Pleasant Valley</b>						
All students	65	11%	69	17%	78	17%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	30	7%	25	24%	36	22%
Male	35	14%	44	14%	42	12%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	18	11%	25	8%	30	10%
Hispanic/Latino	--	--	17	17%	15	13%
White	15	20%	--	--	--	--
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	15	33%	5	0%
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	54	13%	73	16%
<b>Van Corlear</b>						
All students	66	17%	76	8%	71	24%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	35	17%	36	8%	37	32%
Male	31	16%	40	8%	34	15%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	17	18%	21	0%	18	1%
Hispanic/Latino	--	--	18	6%	12	17%
White	32	22%	29	14%	24	38%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	53	13%	61	8%	61	21%
<b>Keane</b>						
All students	45	4%	47	11%	56	4%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	21	5%	23	17%	32	0%
Male	24	4%	24	4%	24	8%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	22	5%	14	14%	20	0%
Hispanic/Latino	7	14%	9	11%	13	0%
White	--	--	12	0%	--	--
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	45	4%	47	11%	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	41	12%	51	4%
<b>Woodlawn</b>						
All students	65	25%	60	32%	58	29%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	35	20%	30	27%	23	26%
Male	30	30%	30	37%	35	31%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	17	6%	15	27%	19	16%
Hispanic/Latino	14	21%	13	15%	11	27%
White	23	39%	19	37%	21	38%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	0	0%	0	0%	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	50	18%	46	22%	46	22%

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016
<b>Yates</b>						
All students	39	10%	47	11%	35	14%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	11	18%	17	18%	17	18%
Male	28	7%	30	7%	18	11%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	12	8%	18	6%	12	17%
Hispanic/Latino	14	14%	16	13%	13	23%
White	--	--	8	0%	5	0%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	0	0%	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	--	--	--	--
<b>Central Park</b>						
All students	61	23%	79	25%	39	36%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	34	32%	36	28%	25	36%
Male	27	11%	43	23%	14	36%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	24	17%	21	10%	9	33%
Hispanic/Latino	--	--	18	22%	--	--
White	17	24%	20	50%	9	56%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	50	18%	58	19%	30	27%
<b>Paige</b>						
All students	47	38%	36	22%	58	24%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	28	50%	18	22%	27	26%
Male	19	21%	18	22%	31	23%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	8	63%	12	17%	9	22%
Hispanic/Latino	6	17%	--	--	--	--
White	27	37%	15	33%	31	32%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	7	14%	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	34	35%	23	17%	36	8%
<b>Dr Martin Luther King</b>						
All students	80	40%	80	23%	47	26%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	52	40%	39	23%	26	31%
Male	28	39%	41	22%	21	19%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	34	29%	37	16%	17	24%
Hispanic/Latino	17	47%	--	--	8	13%
White	--	--	15	7%	--	--
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	--	--	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	--	--	72	18%	40	23%

SCHOOL	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2014	N (number tested)	% proficient In 2015	N (number tested)	% proficient in 2016
<b>Zoller</b>						
All students	68	19%	49	16%	52	19%
<b>Gender</b>						
Female	28	21%	24	21%	26	31%
Male	40	18%	25	12%	26	8%
<b>Ethnicity</b>						
African American	18	22%	9	0	9	22%
Hispanic/Latino	16	0	10	30%	14	7%
White	25	24%	19	16%	18	28%
<b>LEP/Poverty</b>						
LEP	0	0%	--	--	--	--
Free/reduced lunch	54	13%	30	17%	38	13%

*\*note: "--," no information available; "0," no students were tested; "0%," percent of students achieving proficiency was zero.*

- Nine of 13 schools showed increasing percentages of the number of students reaching proficiency Levels of 3 or 4 over three years.
- Central Park had the highest percent proficient, 38% of students tested in 2016, at the end of Year 2.
- In all but three schools, females had higher number of percent proficient. Higher percentage of males tested scored at proficiency level 3 or 4 at Keane, Woodlawn, and FDR.

## II. Dream Big READ Summer Program

In order to provide extended instruction to struggling students, SCSD created library-based summer literacy learning programs, the Dream Big READ Summer Program, for struggling readers in Pre-K to third grade. The program was created to increase students' literacy skills, give students opportunities to practice literacy skills over the summer to prevent loss of learning, and provide quality books. Observations of the summer sessions (N=26) showed that lessons and activities focused on phonics learning, sight word attainment, and guided reading.

*Finding: Overall, a total of 31 students have attended the program over two summers (2014 and 2015); students averaged over 45 hours of participation.*

**Table 9**  
**Dream Big READ Summer Program**

Year	Student Attendance	Average number of hours attended during the summer session
2015	18	53
2016	15*	45

*\* Two students participated in both years.*

*Finding: Overall, student data regarding Letter Naming Fluency indicated that the Pre-Kindergarten student's scores improved and Kindergarten student's scores can be considered proficient according to Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets.*

**Table 10**  
**Student Letter Naming Fluency Results\***

Grade	n	Data 1	n	Data 2	n	Data 3	% Increase**	% Proficient***
Pre-K	1	1	1	1	1	5	+4	0
Kindergarten	1	56	0	-	1	46	-10	100

\*Indicates average number of letters named correctly

\*\*Indicates increase in average number of letters named correctly from Data 1 to Data 3

\*\*\*Indicates percent of students listed as having proficiency level of “average” or “above average” according to Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets according to grade level and time of year

- Data was collected at intervals during the Dream Big READ Summer School program to measure students’ improvement in letter naming fluency. Letter naming fluency assessments were given to students in Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten. Students’ proficiency levels according to the Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets were also evaluated.
- One student in Pre-Kindergarten participated in the Letter Naming Fluency assessments. The student’s average number of correctly named letters improved (+4), however the student did not reach proficiency for grade level and time of year.
- One Kindergarten student was assessed on Letter Naming Fluency. The student did not show improvement from the first data collection to the third data collection (-10), however the student was listed as proficient according to the Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets.

*Finding: Overall, student data regarding Letter Sound Fluency indicated that although one student showed improvement, neither student was considered proficient according to the Aimsweb Benchmark Reading Targets.*

**Table 11**  
**Student Letter Sound Fluency Results\***

Grade	n	Data 1	n	Data 2	n	Data 3	% Increase**	% Proficient***
Pre-K	1	1	1	0	1	0	-1	0
Kindergarten	1	13	0	-	1	16	+3	0

\*Indicates average of letter sounds recited correctly

\*\*Indicates increase in average of letter sounds recited correctly from Data 1 to Data 3

\*\*\*Indicates percent of students listed as having proficiency level of “average” or “above average” according to Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets according to grade level and time of year

- One Pre-Kindergarten and one Kindergarten student were assessed on Letter Sound Fluency. Their proficiency according to the Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets was also evaluated.
- The pre-Kindergarten student did not show an increase in average letter sound fluency and could not be considered proficient.
- The Kindergarten student showed improvement in letter sound fluency (+3), however the student could not be considered proficient.

*Finding: Overall, student data regarding Oral Reading Fluency indicated that all students exhibited an*

increase in average number of words read correctly and varying levels of proficiency according to Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets.

**Table 12**  
**Student Oral Reading Fluency Results\***

Grade		n	Data 1	n	Data 2	n	Data 3	% Increase**	% Proficient***
Kindergarten	Trial 1	0	-	1	25	1	28	+3****	0
	Trial 2	0	-	1	14	1	24	+10****	0
Grade 1	Trial 1	2	17	2	24.50	2	30	+13	50
	Trial 2	2	26	2	27.50	2	32.50	+6.50	50
Grade 2	Trial 1	4	30.75	4	51.25	4	60	+29.25	75
	Trial 2	4	41.50	4	49.50	4	57.25	+15.75	50
Grade 3	Trial 1	5	58.60	5	75.00	5	71.60	+13	33.30
	Trial 2	5	52	5	66.20	5	65.20	+13.20	33.30

\*Indicates average number of words read correctly

\*\*Indicates increase in average number of words read correctly from Data 1 to Data 3

\*\*\*Indicates percent of students listed as having proficiency level of "average" or "above average" according to Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets according to grade level and time of year

\*\*\*\*Indicates increase in average number of words read correctly from Data 2 to Data 3

- Students in Kindergarten through Grade 3 were administered an assessment that measured Oral Reading Fluency. Final scores were then evaluated for proficiency using the Aimsweb Reading Benchmark Targets. Students were measured during two trials.
- Students in each grade showed improvement from the first or second data collection to the third data collection. Proficiency was also measured for each grade. The Kindergarten student improved in the first trial (+3) and the second trial (+10); however, the scores were not considered proficient. Grade 1 students showed improvement in the first trial (+13) and the second trial (+6.50). Half of the students were considered proficient. Students in Grade 2 also showed improvement in both the first (+29.25) and second trial (+15.75). The students were considered slightly more proficient in the first trial (75%) than in the second trial (50%). Grade 3 students improved in the first trial (+13) and the second trial (+13.20) and one third of students were considered proficient.

*Finding: Overall, student data regarding District Sight Word Assessments show an increase in percent of sight words or letters read correctly for each of the grade levels.*

**Table 13**  
**District Sight Word Assessment Results\***

Grade		n	Program Start	n	Program Middle	n	Program End	% Increase**
Pre-K		1	23	1	27	1	31	+8
Kindergarten	Level 1	2	94	1	88	1	100	+6
	Level 2	2	60	1	32	1	100	+40
Grade 1	Level 1	3	60	2	54	3	67	+7
	Level 2	3	51	2	54	3	63	+12
Grade 2	Level 1	4	73	3	85	5	87	+14
	Level 2	4	50	3	73	5	74	+24
	Level 3	2	86	2	88	3	96	+10
	Level 4	2	60	2	62	3	65	+5
Grade 3	Level 1	7	75	5	75	6	87	+12
	Level 2	6	74	4	83	5	93	+9
	Level 3	5	79	3	76	4	98	+19
	Level 4	2	81	1	84	3	92	+11

\*Indicates average percent of sight words or letter named correctly

\*\*Indicates increase in percent of sight words or letters correctly named from program start to program end.

- Students in pre-Kindergarten through Grade 3 were given a district sight word assessment at the start, middle, and end of the program. Each of the grade levels showed an improvement in the percent of sight words or letters correctly named from the start of the program to the end.
- The Pre-Kindergarten student’s naming of letters increased after participating in the Summer School (+8%). Kindergarten students showed the most improvement in Level 2 (+40%). Grade 1 also improved the largest amount in Level 2 (+12%). Grade 2 exhibited the most improvement in Level 1 (+14%) and Level 2 (+24%), and students in Grade 3 showed the greatest increase in Level 1 (+12%) and Level 3 (+19%).

*Finding: Overall, student results for the Words Their Way Primary Spelling Inventory Assessment indicated an increase in average points scored for each grade level.*

**Table 14**  
**Words Their Way Primary Spelling Inventory Assessment Results\***

Grade	n	Week 1	n	Week 2	n	Week 3	n	Week 4	% Increase**
Kindergarten	1	16	1	15	1	18	2	19	+3
Grade 1	2	15	2	16.50	2	20.50	2	23.50	+8.50
Grade 2	4	26	4	27.75	4	26.50	4	28	+2
Grade 3	5	30.20	4	34.50	5	28.80	5	31.40	+1.20

\*Indicates average points correct on the Words Their Way Primary Spelling Inventory

\*\*Indicates percent increase in average points correct on the Words Their Way Primary Spelling Inventory from Week 1 to Week 4.

- Students in Kindergarten through Grade 3 were assessed using the Words Their Way Primary Spelling Inventory. Measures were taken once a week for four weeks.

- Each grade level showed an increase in average points correct. Grade 1 improved the most (+8.50%), followed by Kindergarten (+3%), Grade 2 (+2%), and Grade 3 (+1.20%).

*Finding: Overall, the observed lessons exhibited a range of competencies and skills, with all lessons including activities requiring students to demonstrate basic skills at the knowledge level.*

**Table 15**  
**Observers’ Perceptions of Competencies and Skills Exhibited**  
**during Lesson Implementation**

<b>Level of competency and skills</b>	<b>% Exhibited*</b>
Level 1: Knowledge (Identifying, describing, defining, recalling information)	100
Level 3: Application (Using information and concepts in new contexts and for solving problems)	78
Level 2: Comprehension (Summarizing, interpreting, and differentiating among facts and concepts)	65
Level 4: Analysis (Recognizing patterns, organizing information into components, analyzing data)	52
Level 5: Synthesis (Generalizing from facts, predicting and drawing conclusions, creating products)	48
Level 6: Evaluation (Making decisions, comparing principles, recognizing subjectivity, judging value)	26

\*n=23

- Level 1 skills were observed in all lessons (100%). Knowledge skills include identifying, describing, defining, and recalling information. For example, in one of the lessons, according to an observer, an objective was to “*read sight words with silent e.*” This lesson objective required students to incorporate knowledge skills such as identifying words with silent e, defining what a silent e means, and describing its purpose.
- A majority of observations (78%) demonstrated Level 3 competencies that required students to apply information to solve problems or in new contexts. Level 2 competencies were observed across multiple observations; students demonstrated the ability to summarize, interpret and differentiate among facts and concepts at the comprehension level (65%).
- Approximately half of the observations (52%) showed evidence of Level 4 competencies including display of analytical skills requiring pattern recognition, organizing information into components, and analyzing data. A similar amount of the observations (48%) students were observed synthesizing information, generalizing from facts, predicting, and drawing conclusions at Level 5. The students were provided with opportunities to practice concepts individually and in groups; for example, students were asked to practice spelling words using boards with magnetic tiles, use their fingers to separate sounds, and put their hands under their chin to count syllables.
- Approximately one-quarter (26%) of the observations noted the incorporation of Level 6 evaluative skills. This highest level of competency was least emphasized in the classrooms. and include decision making, comparing principles, and recognizing subjectivity.

*Finding: Observations of the summer 2016 Dream Big READ Summer School program revealed teachers*

using class time effectively, students received praise, and time was built in for practice of literacy concepts.

**Table 16**  
**Observations of the Climate of the Classrooms**

Aspect of the Classroom Climate	% Agree* (n=23)	Classroom Observation
<b>Students receive praise</b>	96	- Praise included specific activity done by the student and their name - Stickers, prize tickets
<b>Teacher used class time effectively</b>	91	- Students engaged during entire duration of lessons - Quick and easy transitions - Began lesson immediately - Redirects students when off-task - Assessed students
<b>Students provided with opportunities to practice the concepts</b>	91	- Group practice (choral reading, group work, games) - Differentiation (iPad games/levels, work with teacher while peers work independently, move at own pace during individual practice, different activities based on literacy level) - Use of technology (iPads, laptops) - Individual practice (writing, spelling, independent reading, comprehension)
<b>Teacher on-task</b>	87	- Working with and assisting students - Attentive
<b>Content clearly communicated</b>	78	- Clear voice, directions - Modeling activity (tapping out sounds) - Verbally provided overview of lesson to the students - Stated expectations and explicit instructions - Repeating information, instructions
<b>Teacher patient when students have trouble learning</b>	78	- One-on-one prompting - Asking additional questions - Repeating directions - Differentiation (move to different task when having difficulty) - Hand over hand (pointing to words) - Offered new strategies
<b>Students in the class on-task</b>	78	- Focused on teacher and tasks - Quietly working - Redirect students that are off-task - Facing teacher
<b>Classroom is orderly</b>	74	- Materials ready - Quiet classroom

\*Percentages include observations where evaluator responded "strongly agree" and "agree" on a five point Likert-type scale.

- Almost all (96%) of the classroom observations showed evidence of students receiving praise from their teachers. Praise included statements such as "That's a good point," "I see a lot of good spelling," "Good job, [student name]!" and "You are working so hard today and I am so proud of you."
- Teachers were frequently observed using class time effectively (91%). This was indicated by students' active engagement, teacher time management, effective transitioning between lessons and activities, redirection of off-task behavior, assessment, and instruction. Through effective literacy instruction, students were given multiple opportunities to practice reading and writing concepts

(91%). Teachers incorporated individual and group work, technology, and differentiation techniques into their lessons to include as many opportunities for practice as possible.

*Finding: When interviewed about the Dream Big READ Summer School Program, key stakeholders exhibited positive attitudes regarding student participation. Responses indicated satisfaction with this year's program, and positive student outcomes regarding literacy development. Participants noted that a variety of program changes from 2015 to 2016 and the provision of tools and resources have impacted the program in a positive way.*

- During interviews for the Dream Big READ Summer School Program, an administrator commented on the academic priorities and goals offered through this project which include *“To do as much as possible to prevent the 'summer slide.’”* Teachers of the summer program also indicated that goals of this project were: *“To help, because students need sight word reinforcement,”* and *“To give parents helpful information about how to help [their children].”*
- Offering a variety of literacy activities for students to participate in were a main focus of the Dream Big READ Summer Program. When asked to comment on the ways that the Dream Big READ programs of 2015 and 2016 differ from the previous summer school programs offered to similar students, an administrator noted: *“[Our] students get a little bit of everything during the day as they see multiple teachers and participate in a variety of stations.”* Additionally, it was reported that students who participate in this program are in much smaller groups than other programs, meaning they are able to receive individualized support from their teachers. Teachers from this program noted the addition of two additional pieces: *“There is now taekwondo and a technology piece which provides our students with variety throughout the day.”*
- An administrator commented that this program has helped to improve students' literacy learning outcomes by: *“Reducing the class size to 3 or 4 students; incorporating individualized instruction; and including a variety of activities.”* When queried about specific support, tools, and resources made available through the program, an administrator noted that *“the [public] library location encouraged community involvement.”*
- Data driven instruction has begun to play an important role in the program. For example, an administrator included the importance of teachers *“utilizing Aimsweb data”* in helping to improve students' literacy outcomes. In addition, teachers stated that a positive change that has been introduced is that *“the program is more data driven now.”*
- Following student participation in this program, key stakeholders reported that they have seen *“growth on all of the students,”* in regards to literacy outcomes. When queried about the most important thing teachers believe students have learned or gained through this program, participants reported: *“marking words, learning syllable types, and phonics rules,” “trying to become independent and not rely on the teacher,”* and *“using a variety of strategies.”*
- Finally, when asked about what stakeholders would like to see included or changed in the future, respondents commented: *“[We] want to have more kids! We would like to get as many kids as possible to participate,” “more journals, supplies, and technology”* and *“shorter sessions... 30 minutes for students as opposed to 40 minutes.”*

**Objective Three: To Document Increase Access to Quality Books and School Supplies Supporting Literacy Development**

The purpose of this objective is to document an increase in the number of quality books that are available to children and families in SCSD. This increase in available books was achieved through the purchase of print books that were distributed to classrooms, school and local libraries and district families. E-readers and digital books were purchased to be loaned out to families through school library and public libraries.

An integral component of the Innovative Approaches to Literacy grant has been to increase access to quality books and reading material for district children from pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. From the beginning of the project, a key method of increasing access has been by distributing books purchased through the grant to classrooms, libraries, and families in the district. Over 24 months of the grant, objectives of the project have been to purchase and provide free books to a minimum of 1,000 district children ages 3-5 through school library distribution; and, purchase and provide over 3,400 books to district libraries to support literacy across the content areas for students in Pre-K through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade.

*Finding: Children whose family and caregivers participated in the literacy learning program received free books. Kindles/Nooks were purchased by the district and made accessible to these families. Multiple vendors were used to purchase over 4,500 materials for SCSD students.*

**Table 17**  
**Quantity of Items Purchased**

<b>Vendor</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Quantity</b>
Amsterdam Printing	School Supplies Provided to Students (Stylus Pens, Folders, Backpacks, Lanyards)	2700
Staples Business Adv	School Supplies	687
R.E.A.D America	Books	249
Lakeshore Learning	School Supplies Provided to Students (Backpacks, Clay)	11
Amazon	Kindle Fire 7" Tablets and Accessories (Case, Micro-USB Cables)	1020

- Supplies included e-readers (Kindle), protective equipment, and accessories. Digital titles and educational apps have also been purchased for use with the e-readers.
- Age appropriate supplies were purchased for use and giveaway in family and caregiver training sessions.

*Finding: Over 2600 books have been purchased for distribution to district schools and students.*

**Table 18**  
**Books Purchased for District Schools and Libraries**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Quantity</b>
November 2014	Grade level Classroom Books for PD	780
December 2014	Grade level Classroom Books for PD	469
January 2016	Books for 11 District elementary schools	1375
<b>Total books purchased</b>		2624

- Professional development supplies included appropriate classroom sets of materials/books to support literacy instruction provided by IFL.
- To date, books have been distributed to 11 elementary school libraries in the district.
- District children and families have received  $\geq 4$  books at each learning session held for families and caregivers.

#### **Objective Four: To Document Expansion of Home, School, and Community Capacity to Teach Literacy Skills**

In order to expand capacity of district families to teach literacy skills in the home, families and informal caregivers took part in a total of four hours of literacy training. The district partnered with community organizations that could provide access to local families and had the capacity to act as hosts for the sessions. The Capital District Child Care Council (CDCCC) and the Schenectady County Public Library (SCPL) partnered with the district to increase opportunities for district families and informal care givers (also known as Family, Friends and Neighbors (FFN)) to participate in literacy learning sessions. Developed by district literacy specialists, the progression of four sessions, each focused on a different literacy practice, provided literacy instruction to local families, offered training in activities meant to be used in the home or childcare setting to develop early literacy skills in district children. Each session was designed to be an hour long and allowed time for instruction, questions, and application of literacy skills with the children. The purpose of this objective is to document families and FFN caregivers attending play and learn literacy training activities in order to help their children increase their literacy skills.

The first session—Literacy Through Play—provided parents and caregivers literacy activities or strategies that they could implement with children at home; using items found in and activities that happen at home. During the second session—Literacy: Environmental Print—parents and caregivers were introduced to methods of building early literacy skills by using print found in their environment (i.e., cereal boxes, store signs). The third session—Literacy Through Read Aloud—focused on reading to the children, literacy experts modeled read-alouds, and suggested methods of making reading aloud part of a routine. Finally, in the fourth session—Literacy Through Technology—families were introduced to Kindles and e-readers that were made available for families to borrow from district libraries. Lesson plans for the pre-K through grade 1 sessions are illustrated in Appendix D; plans for grades 2 and 3 are illustrated in Appendix E. As part of the grant, apps and e-books were purchased to be included with the technology. During all observations, parents and caregivers were observed participating in the training, and then were observed applying the lessons with their children.

Throughout the fall and spring, ten, four hour long sessions were held in district libraries and schools; there were 40 hours of instruction provided. Observations of individual lessons (N=9) were conducted. At these sessions, parents and caregivers participated in learning sessions, and then were given opportunities to work with their children with the assistance of the literacy specialists. At the conclusion of each session, children were given up to five books to keep.

*Finding: Through spring of 2016, ten four-hour literacy training sessions have provided focused literacy training to district parents/guardians and their children.*

**Table 20**  
**Community Literacy Sessions for Parents and Children**

<b>Date of Session</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Adults*</b> (# attending 1 or more hours during each session)	<b>Children*</b> (# attending 1 or more hours during each session)
October 2015	Fulton	10	11
October/November 2015	Yates	9	10
November 2015	Fulton	5	7
December 2015	Keane	2	2
January 2016	Elmer	16	21
January 2016	Van Corlaer	7	10
January/February 2016	Lincoln	11	20
February 2016	Mount Pleasant	2	3
March 2016	Pleasant Valley	20	23
March 2016	Elmer	9	10
<b>Total sessions/ hours and attendance</b>	10/40	91	117

*\*Numbers represent unique individuals.*

- *Fulton:* During the each of the four hours held in October 2015, between six and eight adults attended, with between seven and eight children. Five children and at least one parent or guardian attended all four of the hours; one child and at least one parent or guardian attended three of the four hours; two children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours, and one child attended a single hour with a parent or guardian.
- *Yates:* A set of four hour long workshops was held in October and November 2015. Between one and six adults attended each hour with between one and nine children. One child and a parent or guardian attended three hours; five children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours; and, seven children and at least one parent attended one hour.
- *Fulton:* A third set of workshops was held in November 2015. Between one and four adults attended each hour, with between one and six children. One child and a parent or guardian attended four hours, one child and at least one parent or guardian attended three hours; one child and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours and, four children and at least one parent attended one hour.
- *Keane:* A fourth set of workshops was held in December 2015. Four sessions were held within a two-week period, with two parents or guardians attending with one child each. Both children attended each of the four hours with one parent or guardian.
- *Elmer:* In January, 2016, four workshops were held at Elmer Elementary School. Between seven and nine adults attended each hour with between ten and thirteen children. Four children and a parent or guardian attended four hours; four children and at least one parent or guardian attended three hours; three children and at least one parent attended two hours; and, ten children attended one hour with at least one parent or guardian.

- *Van Corlaer*: In January, 2016, two two-hour workshops were held. Sessions 1 & 2 were combined for the first meeting, and 3 & 4 combined for the second meeting. Between four and seven adults attended each workshop with between seven and ten children. Six children and a parent or guardian attended all four hours; three children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours.
- *Lincoln*: During the each of the four hours held in January and February 2016, between six and seven adults attended, with between twelve and eighteen children. Four children and at least one parent or guardian attended all four of the hours; sixteen children and at least one parent or guardian attended three of the four hours; four children and at least one parent or guardian attended two hours, and four children attended a single hour with a parent or guardian.
- *Mont Pleasant*: In March, two two-hour workshops were held at the Mont Pleasant Library. Sessions 1 & 2 were combined for the first meeting, and 3 & 4 combined for the second meeting. Two adults attended each workshop with three children. All three children and their parent or guardian attended all four hours.
- *Pleasant Valley*: In March, two sessions were held that were two hours long. Sessions 1 & 2 were combined for the first meeting, and 3 & 4 combined for the second meeting. There were a minimum of four hours that families could attend. Between twelve and twenty-nine adults attended each session with between twelve and twenty-three children. Eleven children attended both sections with at least one parent or guardian; and, twelve children attended two hours with at least one parent or guardian.
- *Elmer*: In March, 2016, four workshops were held. Between three and seven adults attended each hour with between three and eight children. One child and a parent or guardian attended four sessions; three children and at least one parent or guardian attended three sessions; two children and at least one parent attended two hours; and, two children attended one hour with at least one parent or guardian.

Families were observed to be enthusiastic during the training, and many families attended three or more sessions with their children. Attendance has ranged from a minimum of two families to up to twenty-three families per session. Several families brought more than two children, some as many as five. In some cases, two adults attended with the children. It was observed that poor weather conditions in the winter months may have contributed to the low attendance. The district continues to advertise and provide literacy training to families and caregivers.

*Finding: Literacy instruction has been made available to informal caregivers (FFN) in the district and children in their care.*

**Table 21**  
**Early Reader Workshops for FFN Caregivers**

<b>Date of Session</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Adults</b>	<b>Children</b>
January 2016	YMCA	2	4
March 2016	Bigelow	1	2
March 2016	Head Start	5	7
<b>Total sessions/hours and attendance</b>	3/9	8	13

- Between one and five adults have attended one of the three workshops with four and seven children.
- Sessions were held in conjunction with community agencies throughout the district. Cooperating agencies include Head Start, YWCA, district area public libraries, and schools. In addition, the district is providing turnkey training in the community so that providers will be able to provide family literacy training in the home.

As with the school-based trainings, poor weather conditions winter months may have contributed to the low attendance. The district has worked with the CCCDC and Head Start to schedule further sessions, and will continue to advertise and provide literacy training to families and caregivers until the goal is met. Sessions were planned to continue in the Fall of 2016.

As part of the literacy training, technology was introduced to the families. Adults and children were instructed on the use of the e-readers, after which they were allowed to check out e-readers and titles, Appendix F provides a sample use agreement used by the district. Feedback provided by the users has been taken into account when adding titles or modifying uses. The district continues to add books and educational applications. The district is also investigating additional resources and digital content that can be used by technology that families and students have access to in their homes.

The district has utilized social media to reach teachers, parents, caregivers, and students in order to expand community access to literacy resources. To achieve this goal, the district has created a web presence including a Facebook page: "SCSD Early Readers" that is a forum for teachers, parents and community members and provides literacy information to families and caregivers of early readers in Schenectady age 0-9. In addition, parents and caregivers can access literacy information on the District website, Family Engagement Building Reading Skills. The district uses a twitter account to broaden the reach of the literacy program, @scsdkey2lit.

## SUMMARY

The Schenectady City School District successfully met grant goals of providing high quality professional development that supported literacy instruction for students in grades pre-K-3. Project teachers participated in grade specific professional development designed to increase student literacy skills across the district. Overall, participants were very satisfied with the information, materials, and instruction of the professional development and reported sessions were of high quality and designed specific to the purpose of the project. During the first year, research-based professional development was provided by University of Pittsburgh Institute for Learning content experts. The professional development included grade-specific literacy content and classroom materials supporting the lessons delivered over multiple sessions. Culminating activities included learning walks with IFL staff and administrators. Professional development during the second year included a week-long Summer Institute for teachers in grades K-3. National experts provided small group development at each grade level, and teachers were given opportunities to build and strengthen relationships with their colleagues throughout the district. The Summer Institute was well attended, and teacher feedback about the professional development was positive. Teachers asked for additional opportunities for collaboration, lessons, and materials. As an extension of the project, follow-up coaching will be provided to teachers who participated in the Summer Institute. This ongoing, focused professional development should continue to strengthen the knowledge base that has been developed through the IAL grant, and support teachers' literacy instruction in the classrooms across the district.

Student outcomes related to literacy skills have been evidenced through results of NYSED standardized tests of ELA. Although direct comparisons could not be made between results of testing across different years due to changes in the state testing program within the time period of the project, student results show positive trends. The percent of third graders reaching proficiency (Levels 3 or 4) in a majority of the district's schools increased over the two years of the project. Improvements were also seen in student achievement as a result of their participation in the Dream Big READ summer program; teachers reported positive gains in literacy knowledge as measured by classroom measures. Observers noted students' use of higher level knowledge during the lessons. During interviews, Dream Big READ staff spoke of the benefits of the program; intensive instruction for struggling readers, time to focus on higher cognitive skills, the use of data to drive instruction, and small class size. Staff reported that the program benefitted these students and hoped that in the future, more parents would enroll students over the summer.

Throughout the district, in classrooms, school libraries, and district homes, the grant has increased the number of quality reading material to students and their families. In the schools, materials and books were purchased for each grade to support the curriculum of the IFL program. Over 3400 books have been purchased for the school libraries, and classrooms. The effort to provide literacy experiences to students not yet enrolled in district schools has been one unique aspect of the program; the focus on literacy practices in the homes of families and caregivers in the district may increase the likelihood that students come to school with positive reading experience. In order to ensure that families had access to quality reading materials, and could practice the literacy activities they learned through the community literacy activities, books were given to the children as they left the literacy sessions. For some families, these may be the first books the children have received. Families also received instruction on using e-readers and technology as literacy tools. After training, families could borrow the technology to use at home. The instruction also modeled how technology the family already owned could be used to increase literacy skills.

The project successfully expanded the capacity of families in the district to teach and practice literacy skills. The district partnered with local organizations that had knowledge of local families and the capacity to host learning sessions. Curriculum developed for the sessions employed materials that families would find around the home, and community to increase awareness of environmental print. Activities for building early skills included activities that incorporated cereal boxes, or store signs; teachers modeling reading aloud followed by parents or caregivers reading to their children; methods of creating literacy routines with the children. During each session, families and caregivers were observed engaged in literacy training with district literacy experts, and then practicing their new skills with the children. Literacy instructors provided guidance and answered questions that parents might have while they read to the children. The culmination of each session children received books to keep and read at home.

The goals of the Innovative Approaches to Literacy project were diverse. By the end of the second year, the project had provided research-based professional development for district personnel serving students in grades pre-K through 3. Students have received high-quality literacy instruction, and in some cases, struggling readers have had opportunity to have more personalized instruction during the summer sessions. The district was able to increase literacy materials and books to schools and families in the district, and also increased literacy practices in the homes by providing specific training to families and caregivers of district children. The training and books that have been provided through the grant have contributed positively to the literacy goals of the district. n

# APPENDICES

## Appendix A

### Summer Institute 2016: Schedule and speakers

#### Schedule at a Glance: K-3 Literacy Institute

#### Monday, August 1, 2016

7:45-8:30	8:30-9:30	9:40-10:40	10:40-11:00	11:00-12:00	12:00-12:15	12:15-1:30
Continental Breakfast Registration Pre-Assessment	Keynote with Eric Lepis	Session #1 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208	Break* (snacks provided)	Session #2 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208	Break* (snacks provided)	Session #3 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208
<b>Elston Hall</b>	<b>Carl B. Taylor Auditorium</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202	<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202	<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202

#### Tuesday, August 2, 2016 – Thursday, August 4, 2016

7:45-8:30	8:30-10:30	10:30-10:45	10:45-11:45	11:45-12:00	12:00-1:30
Continental Breakfast Registration	Session #1 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208	Break* (snacks provided)	Session #2 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208	Break* (snacks provided)	Session #3 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208
<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202	<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202	<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202

#### Friday, August 5, 2016

7:45-8:30	8:30-10:15	10:15-10:30	10:40-11:20	11:30-12:30
Continental Breakfast Registration	Session #1 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208	Break* (snacks provided)	Session #2 <b>Stockade Building</b> Kindergarten – Rm 208	Keynote Closing with Eric Lepis
<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202	<b>Elston Hall</b>	Grade 1 – Rm 206 Grade 2 – Rm 204 Grade 3 – Rm 202	<b>Carl B. Taylor Auditorium</b>

\*Presenters will adjust break times based on individual groups.

### Table of Contents

Schedule at a Glance.....Inside Front Cover

Section Assignments.....Page 1

Policy for Attendance Certificates.....Page 1

Book Sale: Where Is It, When Is It?.....Page 1

Daily Schedules

- ★ Grade K.....Page 3, 4
- ★ Grade 1.....Page 5, 6
- ★ Grade 2.....Page 7, 8
- ★ Grade 3.....Page 9

About our Presenters.....Page 11

Floor Plan of Stockade Building.....Page 13, 14

Wi-Fi at SUNY SCCC.....Page 15

Campus Map.....Back Cover

## Section Assignments

Your section assignment should reflect the grade level you currently teach or are going to teach. Your section will remain the same throughout the Institute. To find the locations of your section, please see Schedule at a Glance (inside front cover).

## Policy for Attendance Certificates

On the last day of the institute, you will be given a certificate in accordance with your attendance. Name badges will be collected daily in the last session. Please be sure to sign-in and pick up your name badge at the Registration Desk each morning in Elston Hall. Upon completion of the Institute, the Office of Planning and Accountability will credit PD hours in StaffTrac.

## Book Sale: Where Is It, When Is It

There will be a book sale on **Wednesday, August 3<sup>rd</sup>** and **Thursday, August 4<sup>th</sup>** in Elston Hall Activities Forum (across from the cafeteria). Each teacher will receive **\$50** worth of Literacy Loot at Registration on Wednesday morning. Literacy Loot will be redeemable on Wednesday and/or Thursday - \$25 for Baum & Beaulieu Associates and \$25 for Heinemann Publishing.

**Books will be available for purchase during registration and breaks.**

Wednesday	Thursday
7:45-8:30	7:45-8:30
10:30-10:45	10:30-10:45
11:45-12:00	11:45-12:00



-1-

### Schenectady Summer Literacy Institute Agenda

**Grade K**

**Presenter: Eric Lepis**

**Monday, August 1, 2016**

7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration, Pre-Assessment  
 8:30-9:30 Keynote with Erik Lepis  
 9:40-10:40 **Components of Balanced Literacy Defined**  
 10:40-11:00 Session Break (snacks provided)  
 11:00-12:00 **Setting up for Success**  
 - Classroom Environments that Support Workshop Teaching  
 - Management Systems  
 12:00-12:15 Session Break (snacks provided)  
 12:15-1:30 **Increasing Comprehension in a Whole Group Setting**  
 - Interactive Read Aloud

**Tuesday, August 2, 2016**

7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
 8:30-10:30 **Making the Reading Process Visible To All Students**  
 Shared Reading  
**Structure of the Reading Workshop**  
 - Mini Lessons  
 - Transition to Independent Reading  
 - Mid Workshop Teaching Points  
 - Shares  
 10:30-10:45 Session Break (snacks provided)  
 10:45-11:45 **Crafting Teaching Points**  
 11:45-12:00 Session Break (snacks provided)  
 12:00-1:30 **Writing Mini Lessons**

**Wednesday, August 3, 2016**

7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
 8:30-10:30 **I AM Reading – Supporting Meaning Making Prior to Conventional Reading**  
 Emergent Story Book Work  
 10:30-10:45 Session Break (snacks provided)  
 10:45-11:45 **Assessment and Recordkeeping**  
 - Administering and Analyzing Running Records  
 - Using Data to Inform Small Group Instruction  
 - Effective Recordkeeping  
 11:45-12:00 Session Break (snacks provided)  
 12:00-1:30 **Small group work in the Readers’ Workshop (continued)**

-3-

**Thursday, August 4, 2016**

7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
 8:30-10:30 **CCSS and Writing Instruction (Expectations, Text Types vs. Genre)**  
**Structure of the Writer’s Workshop**  
**Non-Negotiable Conditions for Writing Instruction**  
 -Resources to Support Young Writers

10:30-10:45 -Common Pitfalls to Avoid  
Session Break (snacks provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Writing Process**  
**Suggested Teaching Points across the Writing Process**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snacks provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Mining Mentor Texts for Multiple Teaching Points**  
**Creating Demonstration Texts**

**Friday, August 5, 2016**

7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:15 **Assessment to Drive Instruction**  
- Record Keeping  
- Examining Student Work to Identify Teaching Points  
**Conferring**  
-Types of Conferences and purpose of each  
10:15-10:30 Session Break (snacks provided)  
10:40-11:20 **Reflection and Lingering Questions**  
**Goal setting**  
11:30-12:30 Closing Remarks – Erik Lepis

-4-

**Schenectady Summer Literacy Institute Agenda**

**Grade 1**  
**Presenter: Tonia Percy**

### Monday, August 1, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration, Pre-Assessment  
8:30-9:30 Keynote with Erik Lepis  
9:40-10:40 **Components of Balanced Literacy Defined**  
10:40-11:00 Session Break (snacks provided)  
11:00-12:00 **Setting up for Success**  
- Classroom Environments that Support Workshop Teaching  
- Management Systems  
12:00-12:15 Session Break (snacks provided)  
12:15-1:30 **Increasing Comprehension in a Whole Group Setting**  
- Interactive Read Aloud

### Tuesday, August 2, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **Structure of the Reading Workshop**  
- Mini Lessons  
- Transition to Independent Reading  
- Mid Workshop Teaching Points  
- Shares  
**Supporting student growth and accountability**  
- Anchor charts  
- Book Marks  
- Reading logs  
10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Crafting Teaching Points**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Increasing Comprehension through Writing About Reading**

### Wednesday, August 3, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **Assessment and Recordkeeping**  
- Administering and Analyzing Running Records  
- Using Data to Inform Small Group Instruction  
- Effective Recordkeeping  
**Small group work in the Readers' Workshop**  
- Guided Reading  
- Strategy Groups  
- Selecting and Introducing Texts to Support Readers of all levels  
- Scaffolding through effective prompting  
- Common Traps to Avoid

-5-

- 10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Small group work in the Readers' Workshop (continued)**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Creating and Managing Purposeful Literacy Centers**

**Thursday, August 4, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration
- 8:30-10:30 **CCSS and Writing Instruction** (Expectations, Text Types vs. Genre)  
**Structure of the Writer's Workshop**  
**Non-Negotiable Conditions for Writing Instruction**  
-Resources to Support Young Writers  
-Common Pitfalls to Avoid
- 10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)
- 10:45-11:45 **Writing Process**  
**Suggested Teaching Points across the Writing Process**
- 11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)
- 12:00-1:30 **Mining Mentor Texts for Multiple Teaching Points**  
**Creating Demonstration Texts**

**Friday, August 5, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration
- 8:30-10:15 **Assessment to Drive Instruction**  
- Record Keeping  
- Examining Student Work to Identify Teaching Points  
**Conferring in the Writer's Workshop**  
-Types of Conferences and purpose of each
- 10:15-10:30 Session Break (snack provided)
- 10:40-11:20 **Reflection and Lingering Questions**  
**Goal setting**
- 11:30-12:30 Closing Remarks – Erik Lepis

-6-

**Schenectady Summer Literacy Institute Agenda**

**Grade 2**

**Presenter: Kirsten Widmer**

### Monday, August 1, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration, Pre-Assessment  
8:30-9:30 Keynote with Erik Lepis  
9:40-10:40 **Gradual Release of Responsibility and Components of Balanced Literacy, Classroom**  
10:40-11:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
11:00-12:00 **Gradual Release of Responsibility and Components of Balanced Literacy, Classroom Environment, Management Systems**  
12:00-12:15 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:15-1:30 **Reading Strategies and Read Aloud with Accountable Talk**

### Tuesday, August 2, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **Structure of the Reading Workshop**  
- Mini Lessons  
- Independent Reading and Conferencing  
- Share  
- Mid Workshop Teaching Points  
**Supporting student growth and accountability**  
- Anchor charts  
- Check-lists, bookmarks, and other helpful tools  
10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Crafting Teaching Points**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Crafting Teaching Points**

### Wednesday, August 3, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **Assessing Readers**  
- Running Records  
- Engagement Inventories  
- Reading Logs  
**Guided Reading**  
- Planning and Follow Up  
- Coaching Within  
- Record Keeping  
10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Strategy Groups and Setting Goals**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Planning and Coaching Readers**

-7-

### Thursday, August 4, 2016

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **Writing Workshop**  
-Writing Text Types and Genres  
- Writing Workshop Structures

- Writing Process
- Mentor Texts
- Demonstration writing to Support Instruction
- 10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)
- 10:45-11:45 **Crafting Teaching Points, Large Group Instruction, Small Group Instruction**
- 11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)
- 12:00-1:30 **Conferring**

**Friday, August 5, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration
- 8:30-10:15 **Assessment to Drive Instruction**
  - Record Keeping
  - Examining Student Work to Identify Teaching Points
- 10:15-10:30 Session Break (snack provided)
- 10:40-11:20 **Types of Conferences and Reflecting and Goal Setting for our own Growth as teachers**
- 11:30-12:30 Closing Remarks – Erik Lepis

**Schenectady Summer Literacy Institute Agenda**

**Grade 3**

**Presenter: Jane Bean-Folkes**

### **Monday, August 1, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration, Pre-Assessment  
8:30-9:30 Keynote with Erik Lepis  
9:40-10:40 **Bottom Lines of Workshop Teaching**  
10:40-11:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
11:00-12:00 **Teaching Reading (Part I)**  
12:00-12:15 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:15-1:30 **Teaching Reading (Part II)**

### **Tuesday, August 2, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **The Reading Workshop**  
10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Crafting Teaching Points**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Crafting Teaching Points**

### **Wednesday, August 3, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **Informal Assessments and Instruction**  
10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Instructional Practices – Small Groups**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Strategy Lessons**

### **Thursday, August 4, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:30 **The Writing Process**  
10:30-10:45 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:45-11:45 **Instructional Practices for Teaching Writing**  
11:45-12:00 Session Break (snack provided)  
12:00-1:30 **Instructional Practices for Teaching Writing**

### **Friday, August 5, 2016**

- 7:45-8:30 Continental Breakfast, Registration  
8:30-10:15 **Assessment, Feedback and Student Growth**  
10:15-10:30 Session Break (snack provided)  
10:40-11:20 **Creating Reading and Writing Toolkits**  
11:30-12:30 Closing Remarks – Erik Lepis

-9-

## **About our Presenters**

**Eric Lepis** worked for Teachers College Reading and Writing Project as a staff developer. He worked in

schools nationally, providing balanced literacy support and training, helping teachers implement reading and writing workshops in their classrooms. Mr. Lepis served as curriculum writer for units of study for the teaching of reading and writing, grades K-2, and as a presenter at summer institutes and workshops. Through his national consulting work, Mr. Lepis works closely with buildings and districts to help administrators lead school-wide change and raise student achievement through the teaching of reading and writing. Mr. Lepis is co-author of *Reading Fundamentals* published by Schoolwide. (Key Note & Kindergarten Presenter)

**Tonia Percy** has over 10 years of experience in early childhood education. As a teacher at Manhattan New School she collaborated with teachers, coaches, administrators, service providers and families to provide engaging, rigorous, standards-based instruction. Her classroom served as a lab site for teachers and researchers from across the U.S., Canada, Germany and Sweden. In 2012, she was recognized with a Blackboard Award for Excellence in Education. She holds a Master's Degree from Teachers College with post-graduate coursework in Special Education, Gifted Education and Writing Instruction. She has facilitated teacher study groups on a variety of topics and has served as a mentor and guest lecturer to pre-service teachers from Teachers College, NYS, Adelphi University, Fordham University and Touro College. (Grade One Presenter)

**Kristen Widmer** is an educational consultant working in elementary, middle and high schools. With over twelve years of experience working with teachers and administrators as an independent consultant, and a staff developer for the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project under the directorship of Lucy Calkins, and teacher leader, Kirsten brings enthusiasm for learning, passion for reading and writing, and practical approaches to workshops and classrooms.

Ms. Widmer holds workshops on a variety of topics ranging from launching and maintaining strong reading and writing workshops, conferring and assessing readers and writers, reading and writing in the content area, teaching the structure of the text to support reading comprehension, small group instruction in reading and writing, planning and authoring units of study. She has worked with superintendents, administrators and teachers to develop and implement reading and writing curriculum designed to engage all levels of learners in grades K-8. She has authored curriculum and corresponding units of study for school districts in Michigan and NJ. She is co-author of *Workshops That Work! 30 Days of Mini-Lessons*, which provides strategies for upper elementary and middle school teachers launching reading and writing workshops in their classrooms, and has presented at NCTE on writing to learn strategies in the content area and democracy in teaching. (Grade Two Presenter)

**Dr. Jean Bean-Folkes** received her M.Ed. and Ed.D. from Teachers College, Columbia University in Curriculum and Teaching with a concentration in Reading and Language Arts. Dr. Bean-Folkes advises doctoral students and teaches undergraduate and graduate courses including: Teaching Literacy, Phonics & Spelling Instruction, Language Development, Teaching Literacy in the Content Area, Reading Research Seminar, Word Study: Phonics, Spelling and Vocabulary Instruction and Selected Topics in Reading. Dr. Bean-Folkes works in K-12 classroom with students, teachers and administrators from diverse backgrounds, in high-poverty areas in NYC, NJ and across the U.S. Dr. Bean-Folkes is actively involved in The National Council of Teachers of English and the American Educational Research Association. She was a former staff developer at the Teachers College Reading and Writing Project.

(Grade Three Presenter)

-11-

## **Appendix B**

### **Goals: 2016 Summer Institute**

#### **Summer Literacy Institute: The Key to Equity and Excellence Goals**

Provide all teachers with the tools, strategies, content knowledge, and skills to effectively implement a systematic approach to literacy instruction.

1. Teachers will form relationships with colleagues in order to develop on-going support groups (cohort), to ensure that their literacy block will be successful and that they can receive collegial feedback.
2. Teachers will be able to articulate and plan for effective instruction in the content and pedagogy for direct, explicit, systematic instruction in phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.
3. Teachers will be able to articulate and plan for effective instruction in the content and pedagogy for direct, explicit, and systematic instruction in writing (i.e., narrative, informational/expository, and opinion).
4. Teachers will be able to create a comprehensive assessment system that reflects their understanding of how to use a variety of assessment types (screeners, State Tests, diagnostics, CBMs, formative and summative) to plan a literacy block that is differentiated, scaffolded and targeted for all learners.
5. Teachers will create a starter toolbox that contains resources, materials, strategies, ideas for their literacy block.

## Appendix C

### Pre- and post-assessment questions: 2016 Summer Institute

1. Which of the following is NOT a stage in a mini-lesson?
  - Active Engagement
  - Link
  - Teach
  - Objective
  
2. What are the structures in Guided Reading based on the Fountas and Pinnell model? (Check all that apply)
  - Word Work
  - Reading the Text
  - Book Introduction
  - Accountable Talk
  - Discussing and Revisiting the Text
  - Running Records
  - Teaching for Processing Strategies
  - Extension for Understanding
  - Independent Reading
  
3. What are the steps to a Research Decide Teach Conference? (Check all that apply)
  - Note take
  - Research
  - Word Work
  - Strategy Instruction
  - Decide
  - Compliment
  - Teach
  - Connection
  - Link
  
4. When should Shared Writing be used?
  - During the publishing process
  - After the publishing process had been completed
  - When writers need support and modeling
  - During peer conferencing

## Appendix D

### Lesson Plans, Pre-K through Grade 1, Family Literacy Training

These lessons are intended for students and families in Pre-Kindergarten, Kindergarten and First grades

#### **SESSION 1**

##### Environmental Print

Ideas to Share:

Conversation Bag: What's in the bag, describe it, talk about

Environmental Print Bingo

Books

Cereals Boxes/Cracker box puzzles

Junk Mail treasure hunt (letters, words, etc.), shape search, counting

Calendar

Labeling

I SPY (bus, grocery store)

Make and Take File Folder games

environmental print memory game

Dialogue to Parents:

Thank you for coming today. Last week we talked about Literacy through play. We discussed a variety of ways you could introduce literacy strategies as you interacted with your child. Would anyone like to share what they noticed this week as their child was playing at home?

Today's workshop is about using Environmental print to help your child build early literacy skills. Environmental print is everything your child sees in their environment from street signs, store signs, cereal boxes, candy wrappers and more. "I'm sure you've had the experience of going down the street and passing a McDonald's. Your child will often see the sign and recognize it and say, "McDonald's!" This is the beginning of your child recognizing words, letters and even sounds.

Today we have set up 3 (4?) different stations using environmental print. The first is Environmental Print Bingo. This is your typical bingo game using logos your child is familiar with. The second being a puzzle station. This is the easiest, least expensive way to create puzzles from everyday items you may have at home and a pair of scissors. The last is a junk mail treasure hunt.

## **Introduce and Explain each station**

Take home:

- I Can Read bags
- Parking Lot Game (Beth)
- Books

Bring Students into play at each station, rotating every 10 minutes or less.

To Do:

Whole Group Game: Environmental Print Bingo

- Several Bingo Cards
- Call Cards
- Smarties to be used as markers
- Prizes (Books)

Station 1: Box Puzzles

- Several different types of food boxes cut up
- Ziplock bags to store them in

Station 2: I Spy, Junk Mail Treasure Hunt

- Several different flyers, junk mail, CTDA bus schedules
- Index cards with beginning sight words
- Blank cards for students and families to write their first letter

Station 3: Parking Lot Game

- Laminated Copies of Parking Lot

Optional Station 4: Logo Concentration/Memory

- Index cards with a variety of familiar logos or signs on them
- Ziplock bags to store games in

Wrap up and have students complete exit ticket. Students will choose books before leaving.

## **SESSION 2**

### Literacy through play

Lesson Format

1. 15 minutes Snack with CDCCC
2. 10 minutes Theory of play with parents only, Kids with care workers. Explain centers and brainstorm activities with parents leading.
3. 30 minutes Two to three centers rotations WITH children (older siblings stay with child care workers) working with parents
4. 15 minutes Share out wrap up with parents and children

#### Supplies

##### **Grocery Store**

Crayons/Markers

Paper (scrap)

Scissors

Store Circulars (Hannaford, Shop Rite)

Laminated Poster Board for "shelves" (Kim)

Calculator

##### **Restaurant**

Place Mats

Pads of paper (Jenn and Kim)

Friendly's Menu (Kim)

##### **Playing School (Optional)**

White Board

Markers

ABC charts

Books

Gift Bag books (Jenn)

##### **Imagination Station**

**Play-Doh (Sara)**

**Legos (Sara some)**

Baggies to take home parts of activity

1. 15 minutes Snack with CDCCC
2. 10 minutes Theory of play with parents only, Kids with care workers. Explain centers and brainstorm activities with parents leading.

Describe Grant and and four sessions.

Thank you for joining us today. This is part one of a four part series working to develop early literacy skills in order to help our students/your children to be more successful. Today we are discussing Literacy Through Play. Part two, next week, is Literacy through Environmental Print, part three, is Literacy Through Shared Reading and finally part four is Literacy Through

Technology. If you take part in all four sessions you will be able to check out the kindles from the schools to take home and use.

We hope that through these workshops that you will be able to add to all the wonderful things that you do at home.

Why is Literacy through Play important?

We have come together to talk about the different ways that play helps develop early literacy skills. Through play kids learn to develop listening, speaking, categorizing, beginning sounds, conversation helps lead to student become readers. Today we have four centers, 1. The Grocery Store, 2. Restaurant, 3. Playing School, 4. Imagination Station.

We are going to rotate through the stations and then spend fifteen minutes chatting about how things went. (Keep this minimal and focused on the play so that the end conversation can be a reflection about the academics)

3. 15 minutes for each station so families have time to rotate through all four. Hands-on-centers rotations WITH children working with parents (older siblings stay with child care workers or choose to stay ).

### **Station #1 Grocery Store**

### **Station #2 Restaurant**

### **Station #3 Playing School**

### **Station #4 Imagination Station--Play-Doh--Legos**

4. 15 minutes Share out wrap up with parents and children

Why is Literacy through Play important

Overview at the end/Reflection

- What did you notice?
- What language was used?
- What was challenging?
- What worked?
- Why is play important?
- How does play promote literacy?
- How do you bring in the materials....transfer to home.

Exit Ticket/Post It/Survey to provide feedback.

What did you like best? What are able to take into your home? What else would you like more information on?

To Do

Card with centers description for families to be independent

Exit Ticket for parents and kids to fill out prior to share out

Circulars

Take home restaurant menus

Letter from Grant for donations request

Large Baggies

### **SESSION 3**

Literacy through read aloud



#### Lesson Format

1. 10 minutes Snack with CDCCCC
  - a. tables should be lined with a variety of books. Parents read with children while they are having snack.
2. 15 minutes Break into two groups. One person works with the kids on three ways to read a book, read the words, read the picture, re-tell the story. One person works with adults and shows the videos links below. Use the read aloud 15 minutes sheet to go over what it looks like.
  - . Make reading aloud a part of your daily routine- after meals, before bedtime
  - a. but I don't have a book with me...what do I do. oral storytelling, make up characters, oral history, talk about the small stuff, build connections
  - b. be explicit about purposes for read aloud- learn words, learn stories, build relationships, learning how books work.
3. 10 minutes instructors will work with small groups model three ways to read a book. Children return to parents and practice the skills that were just learned
4. 15 minutes make a puppets, with paper bags, popsicle sticks and spoons.
5. Wrap up - what did you notice today, what surprised you,

<https://www.naeyc.org/files/yc/file/200303/ReadingAloud.pdf>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sZSIUVrCJRo>  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nZp\\_OfWWhmc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nZp_OfWWhmc)  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KrMvD3GOX0>  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FjJD1UDwVKg>

What did you notice?

- What language was used?
- What was challenging?
- What worked?
- Why is play important?
- How does play promote literacy?
- How do you bring in the materials....transfer to home.

## **SESSION 4**

### Literacy through Technology

Supplies:

Tablet

Apps

The following are EBooks and Apps that are applicable for children ages 3-9. Device managers will assist with this workshop by showing families how to use the Kindle, navigate and care for the kindles, as well as answer any questions the families may have regarding the kindles. They are used for 2 weeks and they are allowed to renew the Kindle if another family is not waiting to borrow it.

Apps for Kindle

- Sight words puppy dash: vocabulary and dolch words: Reading and spelling game (APP)
- Study pad first grade splash math practice for the entire school year (APP)
- Preschool all in one learning- bubble school Adventure A to Z: basic skills games for kids (APP)
- Kids A to Z (APP)
- BrianPop Jr. Movie of the week (APP)
- Phonics island: ABCs first phonics and letter sounds (APP)
- Read me Stories: Learn to Read
- Medieval Math Battle (APP)
- Math Slicer Free (APP)
- PINKFONG Tracing world (APP)
- Sight words 2 with word bingo
- Animals first grade math games for kids
- Hooked on Phonics
- Toddler sing and play 2
- Preschool and kindergarten 2: extra lessons
- Sight word flashcards for kids
- Kids reading by sight words
- A to Z- Mrs. Owl's learning tree
- Starfall Free

Ebooks for Kindle

- Tongue Twisters for kids (book)
- Children book: Willy the Whale (book)
- Books for kids: Spike the Dinosaur (book)
- Children's book: Bruce the Moose (book)
- Books for kids: Fluffy the kitten (book)
- Children's book: the day the "A" went away (book)
- Lily Lemon Blossom Welcome to Lily's room (book)
- My very hungry caterpillar

There is a Kindle Loan agreement that families need to sign, along with a copy of their photo id (see attached). There are also directions for the Kindles and an evaluation to go along with the Kindles (see attached).

## **IAL Early Readers Program Kindle Questionnaire**

Greetings! I am asking that you complete this survey to help gather data and evidence on the use and appropriateness of the Kindles associated with the Innovative Approach to Literacy Grant. Please take a couple minutes to provide feedback on how you feel they are working in your classrooms. Please feel free to add any additional suggestions that would help in the future application of the Kindles on the back. **When you are done you can either give the questionnaire to your Device Manager or email it to Neil Estrada.** Thank you!

School: \_\_\_\_\_ : Grade \_\_\_\_\_

1. What apps do your students prefer to work with on the Kindle? What did they enjoy about the apps?

2. What eBooks do your students enjoy working with on the Kindle? What about the eBook do they enjoy the most?

3. Do you feel your students benefited from using the Kindles? Why or why not?

4. What was the average length of time your students spent on the Kindle? Please circle the time that best answers the question

**0-10 minutes a day      10-20 minutes a day      more than 20 minutes a day      none**

5. Overall, what is your impression of the Kindle experience? (please check one)

**Excellent** (loved it all!)

**Good** (it was good, but could have been better)

**Satisfactory** (we used it but it wasn't what I expected)

**Poor** (could have done without the device)

Why do you think so? (You can use the back of the sheet for additional comments)

## Appendix E

### Lesson Plans, Grade 2 and 3, Family Literacy Training

#### Workshop #1: Playing Around with Literacy

Objective: Through the use of games and play, children will reinforce literacy skills.

Materials Needed:

- Scrabble tiles or Printed Tiles on Cardstock
- Scrabble Worksheet or paper
- Pencils/Dry Erase Markers
- Dry Erase Boards
- Spinners with Words with paper clip
- Index Cards with Words
- Printed Board Games
- Small figures/markers for game

Station 1: Scrabble

Directions: Using student's spelling words or any words of your choice, use the tiles to spell each word. Using the point values on each tile, add up the sum of each word.

Example: F U N  $4+1+2=7$

Station 2: Memory/Concentration

Directions: Write student spelling words on index cards 2 times. One word on each card. Shuffle cards and place face down in an array. Taking turns, turn over 2 different cards. If they match, keep the pair. If they do not match, turn back over in its original place. Continue until there are no cards left.

This game can be used with contractions, opposites, compound words, long & short vowels.

### Station 3: Spin It, Say It, Spell It

Directions: Using a paper plate, divide the plate into 6 sections (number of choice). Write a word in each section. Words may be spelling words, vocabulary words, science words, or any other words of your choice.

Spin the spinner, read the word aloud, spell the word without looking. Depending on student ability, students may write the words on dry erase boards, sentences using the word or any other choice.

## **Workshop #2: Create with Literacy**

Objective: Through the act of creativity, students will practice and reinforce a variety of literacy skills.

### **Materials Needed:**

- Cardstock or heavy paper
- Copied bookmark templates
- Crayons, markers, colored pencils
- Scissors
- Glue
- Mixing bowl
- Spoon or spatula
- Recipe of choice Bubbles, Playdough, Slime
- Ingredients for recipe
- Blank paper
- Assembled Gift bag books

### **Station 1: Bookmarks**

Using the various materials provided at the station create a bookmark.

### **Station 2: Making Bubbles**

Following the recipe card students will create the item on the card.

Depending on the grade level/ability, students can create their own recipe card. Encourage children to use words transition words such as first, then, next, after

that.

### Station 3: Make Your Own Book

Directions: Students will create a story of their choice. Parents should encourage and use terms such as Beginning, Middle, and End. Stories should include problem, setting solution and characters.

### **Workshop #3: Strategies for Reading**

Objective: Parents will gain a better understanding of effective ways to read with their child. They will learn correct terms, questions to ask before, during and after reading to improve comprehension skills.

#### Materials:

- Multiple copies of Reader's Theater at various levels
- Books to model for read aloud
- 5 Finger Rule handout for choosing "Just Right" books
- Reading Strategies Bookmark
- Parent Handout

#### Modeling for Parents:

Teachers will read to students and parents will watch. This modeling allows for parents to see what types of questions and the conversations they should be having with their child while reading.

#### Station 1: Reader's Theatre

Directions: Children and parents will choose a play of their interest. They will read together. Encourage fluency, expression and meaning.

#### Station 2: Partner Reading

Directions: Parents and children will each have a copy of the same book. They will take turns reading. Parents should try asking questions throughout the text.

#### Station 3: Bookmarks

Directions: Students will read books with their parents. Using the bookmark to assist with unfamiliar works they will use some of the strategies on the bookmark.

## **Workshop #4: Kindles!!!**

### Literacy through Technology

Objective: Parents will learn proper procedure how to check out and use the Kindles safely and properly.

The Device Manager will meet with the group to explain how to borrow the Kindles, use it properly and go over apps that are already installed on the device.

The following are EBooks and Apps that are applicable for children ages 3-9. Device managers will assist with this workshop by showing families how to use the Kindle, navigate and care for the kindles, as well as answer any questions the families may have regarding the kindles. They are used for 2 weeks and they are allowed to renew the Kindle if another family is not waiting to borrow it.

#### Apps for Kindle

- Sight words puppy dash: vocabulary and dolch words: Reading and spelling game (APP)
- Study pad first grade splash math practice for the entire school year (APP)
- Preschool all in one learning- bubble school Adventure A to Z: basic skills games for kids (APP)
- Kids A to Z (APP)
- BrianPop Jr. Movie of the week (APP)
- Phonics island: ABCs first phonics and letter sounds (APP)
- Read me Stories: Learn to Read
- Medieval Math Battle (APP)
- Math Slicer Free (APP)
- PINKFONG Tracing world (APP)
- Sight words 2 with word bingo

- Animals first grade math games for kids
- Hooked on Phonics
- Toddler sing and play 2
- Preschool and kindergarten 2: extra lessons
- Sight word flashcards for kids
- Kids reading by sight words
- A to Z- Mrs. Owl's learning tree
- Starfall Free

#### Ebooks for Kindle

- Tongue Twisters for kids (book)
- Children book: Willy the Whale (book)
- Books for kids: Spike the Dinosaur (book)
- Children's book: Bruce the Moose (book)
- Books for kids: Fluffy the kitten (book)
- Children's book: the day the "A" went away (book)
- Lily Lemon Blossom Welcome to Lily's room (book)
- My very hungry caterpillar

There is a Kindle Loan agreement that families need to sign, along with a copy of their photo id (see attached). There are also directions for the Kindles and an evaluation to go along with the Kindles (see attached).

## IAL Early Readers Program Kindle Questionnaire

Greetings! I am asking that you complete this survey to help gather data and evidence on the use and appropriateness of the Kindles associated with the Innovative Approach to Literacy Grant. Please take a couple minutes to provide feedback on how you feel they are working in your classrooms. Please feel free to add any additional suggestions that would help in the future application of the Kindles on the back. **When you are done you can either give the questionnaire to your Device Manager or email it to Neil Estrada.** Thank you!

School:

---

\_\_\_ : Grade \_\_\_\_\_

6. What apps do your students prefer to work with on the Kindle? What did they enjoy about the apps?

7. What eBooks do your students enjoy working with on the Kindle? What about the eBook do they enjoy the most?

8. Do you feel your students benefited from using the Kindles? Why or why not?

9. What was the average length of time your students spent on the Kindle?  
Please circle the time that best answers the question

**0-10 minutes a day**                      **10-20 minutes a day**                      **more than 20 minutes a day**  
**day**                      **none**

10. Overall, what is your impression of the Kindle experience? (please check one)

\_\_\_ **Excellent** (loved it all!)

\_\_\_ **Good** (it was good, but could have been better)

\_\_\_ **Satisfactory** (we used it but it wasn't what I expected)

\_\_\_ **Poor** (could have done without the device)

Why do you think so? (You can use the back of the sheet for additional comments)

**Appendix F**  
**Technology Agreement**

Schenectady City School District

**KINDLE LOAN AGREEMENT**

1. I understand that the checkout period for a Kindle is 2 weeks and I must return it to the school I borrowed it from to renew it after the 2 weeks \_\_\_\_ (initial)
  
2. I will return the Kindle in person to the school device manager that I borrowed it from \_\_ (initial)
  
3. I understand that I may not use the Kindle to browse the internet or download/side load any additional materials to it. I am to use only library materials that have been downloaded to the Kindle by the device manager. \_\_\_\_ (initial)
  
4. The Kindle and accompanying accessories are my responsibility. I will care for the Kindle and will return it in the same shape that it was in when I borrowed it. \_\_\_\_ (initial)
  
5. I will return the kindle in the green case and with the accompanying cords. \_\_\_\_ (initial)
  
6. I will not delete existing content or un-register the kindle \_\_\_\_ (initial)

Failure to return the Kindle on time will block you from borrowing a Kindle in the future.

Printed name \_\_\_\_\_

ID# \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Kindle # \_\_\_\_\_

Staff initials \_\_\_\_\_

Case \_\_\_ cord \_\_\_ adapter \_\_\_

Appendix D:  
FNN Providers

Agency Name: **Capital District Child Care Council**

County: **Schenectady City School District**

Quarter

Date: **Oct-15 to May 2016**

Date	Provider Name	# children	zip	# books	Educator Name
10/15/15	1 provider	1	12307	3	Carol
10/8/15	1 provider	2	12306	6	Carol
10/23/15	1 provider	2	12308	6	Carol
11/17/15	1 provider	3	12303	9	Carol
11/14/15	1 provider	2	12304	6	training
11/14/15	1 provider	2	12303	6	training
11/14/15	1 provider	1	12304	3	training
11/14/15	1 provider	2	12303	6	training
11/14/15	1 provider	1	12304	3	training
1/21/16	1 provider	1	12306	3	Carol
1/23/16	1 provider	2	12302	6	training
1/23/16	1 provider	3	12308	9	training
1/25/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Carol
2/9/16	1 provider	2	12306	6	Carol
2/18/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Carol
2/24/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Carol
3/11/16	1 provider	4	12306	12	Carol
3/17/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Heather
3/17/16	1 provider	3	12307	9	Darlene

3/19/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	training
3/19/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	training
3/19/16	1 provider	1	12307	3	training
3/19/16	1 provider	1	12308	3	training
3/19/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	training
3/21/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Mary
3/21/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Mary
3/21/16	1 provider	3	12303	9	Mary
3/22/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Darlene
3/23/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Heather
3/23/16	1 provider	3	12306	9	Heather
3/23/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Heather
3/30/16	1 provider	3	12303	9	Heather
3/30/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Darlene
3/30/16	1 provider	1	12304	3	Darlene
3/30/16	1 provider	4	12303	12	Darlene
3/30/16	1 provider	1	12303	1	Heather
4/4/16	1 provider	1	12304	3	Darlene
4/12/16	1 provider	1	12307	3	Heather
4/12/16	1 provider	1	12302	3	Heather
4/14/16	1 provider	1	12308	3	Darlene
4/14/16	1 provider	3	12304	9	Darlene
4/14/16	1 provider	1	12304	3	Amneris
4/19/16	1 provider	1	12304	3	Patti
4/19/16	1 provider	3	12306	9	Patti
4/19/16	1 provider	3	12304	3	Patti
4/19/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Patti
4/19/16	1 provider	2	12306	6	Patti
4/18/16	1 provider	1	12308	3	Mary
4/18/16	1 provider	3	12307	9	Mary
4/18/16	1 provider	2	12303	6	Mary
4/18/16	1 provider	3	12307	9	Mary
4/19/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Mary
4/20/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Carol
4/20/2016	1 provider	2	12304	6	Heather
4/21/16	1 provider	2	12307	6	Mary
4/21/16	1 provider	2	12307	6	Mary
4/21/16	1 provider	4	12304	12	Carol
4/21/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Amneris
4/22/16	1 provider	3	12308	9	Darlene
4/27/16	1 provider	10	12308	30	Mary
4/27/16	1 provider	3	12308	9	Mary
4/28/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Amneris
4/28/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Darlene
4/28/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Heather

4/29/16	1 provider	2	12307	6		Darlene
4/29/16	1 provider	3	12303	9		Darlene
4/29/16	1 provider	1	12307	3		Darlene
4/29/16	1 provider	1	12306	3		Darlene
4/16/16	1 provider	1	12303	3		training
4/16/16	1 provider	2	12308	6		training
4/16/16	1 provider	3	12307	9		training
4/16/16	1 provider	1	12304	3		training
4/13/16	1 provider	2	12303	6		Mary
4/29/16	1 provider	4	12305	12		Carol
5/3/16	1 provider	2	12303	6		Amneris
5/3/16	1 provider	1	12309	3		Amneris
5/5/16	1 provider	2	12307	6		Patti
5/5/16	1 provider	1	12306	3		Patti
5/5/16	1 provider	2	12304	6		Patti
5/5/16	1 provider	2	12303	6		Patti
5/5/16	1 provider	3	12306	9		Patti
5/5/16	1 provider	2	12304	6		Patti
5/5/16	1 provider	2	12304	6		Heather
5/6/16	1 provider	3	12308	9		Darlene
5/9/16	1 provider	3	12303	9		Amneris
5/12/16	1 provider	6	12304	18		Carol
5/12/16	1 provider	2	12307		6	Carol
5/17/16	1 provider	3	12303	9		Amneris
5/17/16	1 provider	2	12306	6		Carol
5/17/16	1 provider	1	12304	3		Amneris
5/18/16	1 provider	2	12306	6		Amneris
5/18/16	1 provider	2	12307	6		Amneris
5/18/16	1 provider	1	12307	3		Carol
May-16	1 provider	2	12308	6		Amneris
5/24/16	1 provider	3	12305	9		Patti
5/24/16	1 provider	3	12308	9		Patti
5/24/16	1 provider	3	12308		9	Patti
5/25/16	1 provider	7	12308	21		Carol
6/2/16	1 provider	1	12304	3		Carol
6/11/16	1 provider	1	12308	3		training
6/11/16	1 provider	1	12307	3		training
6/11/16	1 provider	2	12308	6		training
6/11/16	1 provider	2	12307	6		training
6/11/16	1 provider	2	12303	6		training
6/11/16	1 provider	2	12308	6		training
4/16/16	1 provider	3	12307	9		training
4/16/16	1 provider	1	12303	1		training
6/9/16	1 provider	3	12304	9		Amneris
6/9/16	1 provider	2	12304	6		Carol
6/17/16	1 provider	3	12303	9		Amneris
6/22/16	1 provider	1	12307	3		Carol
6/22/16	1 provider	3	12307	9		Carol
6/27/16	1 provider	2	12303	6		Carol

6/27/16	1 provider	2	12307	6	Carol
7/14/16	1 provider	8	12303	40	Heather
7/14/16	1 provider	2	12303	6	Heather
7/14/16	1 provider	2	12303	6	Darlene
7/14/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Heather
7/14/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Darlene
7/12/16	1 provider	1	12303	3	Heather
7/21/16	1 provider	2	12306	6	Heather
7/28/16	1 provider	3	12308	9	Darlene
8/9/16	1 provider	1	12306	6	Mary
8/11/16	1 provider	2	12308	6	Mary
8/11/16	1 provider	5	12308	15	Mary
8/12/16	1 provider	2	12307	6	Mary
8/9/16	1 provider	1	12306	3	Patti
8/31/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Lorell
8/31/16	1 provider	2	12304	6	Lorell
9/1/16	1 provider	3	12307	9	Darlene
9/1/16	1 provider	2	12303	6	Darlene
9/1/16	1 provider	4	12303	12	Heather

total providers 132