



COLORADO SCHOOL DISTRICT 27J
GOVERNING POLICY OF
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Board Goal: Academic 1.1

Date Adopted/Last Revised: October 1, 2015

1.4 Primary Literacy: The district will increase the percentage of primary students (k-2) reading at benchmark by 2% per year until 90% of primary readers are at benchmark as measured by DIBELS Next. At the same time, the district will decrease the percentage of students who have significant reading deficiencies by 1% each year until only 5% of primary readers have significant reading deficiencies. Once the targets of 90% benchmark and 5% significant reading deficiencies have been reached, the district shall maintain such performance levels.

I interpret k-2 readers at benchmark to mean: The percentage of students k-2 who score “at benchmark” or “above benchmark” on the end of year DIBELS Next (Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills) composite score. The composite score takes into account all Dibels assessments given during the beginning of year (BOY), middle of year (MOY), end of year (EOY) for each student at each grade level and provides the best overall estimate of the student’s reading proficiency. Included in these composite scores are first sound fluency, letter naming, phoneme segmentation, nonsense words, oral fluency, and retell. If a student scores “at benchmark” or “above benchmark”, odds are in favor of achieving later reading outcomes with continued high quality instruction. The cut scores used are criterion-referenced and nationally recognized benchmark.

I interpret k-2 significant reading deficiencies (SRD) to mean: The percentage of students k-2 who score “well below” benchmark. This rating also is based on a DIBELS Next composite score that is criterion referenced and nationally used. Cut points for risk indicate a level of skill below which the student is unlikely to achieve subsequent reading goals without receiving additional, targeted instructional supports.

I interpret a % increase or decrease to mean: The aggregate percentage of all students k-2 who have met “at benchmark” or “above benchmark”, or “well below” benchmark compared to the previous academic year.

Achievement of Goal 1.4: Primary Literacy

Table 1: 27J School Primary Literacy Rates (Students performing “At or Above Benchmark”)

	2013 %	2014 %	2015 %	2016 %	2017 %
Brantner	68	66	79	83	89
Henderson	65	68	68	76	68
North	29	39	49	48	56
Northeast	43	47	62	68	58
Pennock	59	72	79	79	64
Second Creek	73	73	83	84	80
South	41	67	66	72	71
Southeast	61	69	61	60	63
Thimmig	82	77	71	82	72
Turnberry	71	75	81	86	80
West Ridge	76	83	87	88	86
Bromley East		67	69	75	68
Foundations		88	84	82	77
Belle Creek		74	75	72	77
Landmark		87	89	85	80

Table 1 presents individual school literacy rates. The data represents the percentage of students performing “at or above benchmark”.

1-year data reports:

- 4 of the 10 the 27J managed schools improved the percentage of students scoring “at or above Benchmark” from the 2016 data.
- 1 of the 4 charter schools improved.

5-year trend data is far more positive:

- 10 of the 11 27J managed schools show a positive data trend
- 3 of the 4 Charter managed schools show a positive data trend

Some “at or above benchmark” 5-year trend celebrations

- South has improved the number of students performing at benchmark by 30 percentage points over the last 5 years.
- North has improved by 27
- Brantner has improved by 21
- Northeast has improved by 15
- West Ridge has improved by 10

Table 2: 27J School Primary Literacy Rates (Students performing “Well Below Benchmark”)

	2013 %	2014 %	2015 %	2016 %	2017 %
Brantner	15	13	6	6	5
Henderson	19	19	18	10	18
North	50	38	30	28	31
Northeast	34	32	21	18	25
Pennock	20	11	9	11	17
Second Creek	10	15	7	8	9
South	37	18	15	14	14
Southeast	21	15	24	26	17
Thimmig	9	14	18	8	16
Turnberry	11	11	8	6	10
West Ridge	8	6	5	7	7
Bromley East		20	14	14	15
Foundations		3	7	7	12
Belle Creek		9	13	13	13
Landmark		4	3	5	9

Table 2 presents the percentage of students scoring “well below benchmark”. These students are classified as having a significant reading deficiency (SRD).

Yearly progress reports:

- 7 of the 11 27J managed schools showed an increase in the numbers of SRD students from the 2016 year.
- 3 of the 4 charter schools showed an increase in the numbers of SRD students from the 2016 school year

5-year trend data reports:

- 10 of 11 27J managed schools showed a decrease in the numbers of SRD students over the past 5 years.
- There were highlights at:
 - South Elementary has reduced the number of SRD students by 23 percentage points over the course of the last 5 years
 - North Elementary has reduced by 19 percentage points
 - Brantner by 10
 - Northeast by 9
- 1 of the 4 charter schools have showed a decrease in the numbers of SRD students over the past 5 years.

Table 3: 27J Primary Literacy Rates (Students performing “Well Below Benchmark”)

	2013 Well Below Benchmark (%)	2014 Well Below Benchmark (%)	2015 Well Below Benchmark (%)	2016 Well Below Benchmark (%)	2017 Well Below Benchmark (%)
Colorado	16.3	14.3	13.8	14.8	15.7
Adams 12 Five Star	20.2	18.4	20.0	17.3	18.3
School District 27J	18.0	14.1	13.3	13.1	13.6
Adams 50 Westminster	37.1	28.6	29.5	31.1	31.3
Adams 1 Mapleton	23.1	21.6	17.6	17.9	18.4
Adams 14 Commerce City	29.6	18.1	25.2	36.7	30.6
Cherry Creek	12.1	9.9	9.5	11	14.9
Boulder	10.6	10.0	7.7	9.0	6.8
St. Vrain	18.0	13.0	8.0	10.9	12.9
Denver	25.6	17.7	17	19.3	16.5
Douglas	8.5	8.5	8.5	11	11.7

Table 3 presents 27J against various other metro area school districts in the percentage of students scoring “well-below benchmark”. This data is available at the CDE READ ACT home page linked: <http://www2.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/readact/dashboard.asp>

13.6 percent of our 27J Schools students remain labeled with a significantly reading deficiency (SRD) or scoring “well below benchmark” on DIBELS Next. Here are some bulleted reactions to this data:

- 27J Schools is out performing the state of Colorado
- 27J ranks #1 in Adams County
- 27J ranks #4 on this list of comparison districts, and is outpaced by Boulder, Douglas County and St. Vrain respectively

Table 4: 27J Schools Percentage of Students “At or Above Benchmark”

BOY – Beginning of Year

EOY – End of Year

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	
Kindergarten						
BOY	43%	44%	41%	43%	37%	
EOY	63%	70%	75%	82%	76%	
1st Grade						
BOY	42%	43%	44%	49%	54%	
EOY	60%	68%	72%	70%	73%	
2nd Grade						
BOY	60%	61%	64%	69%	69%	71%
EOY	62%	70%	72%	69%	71%	74%
District EOY						
	61.6%	69%	69.3%	73.0%	73.6%	73.3%

* **Highlighted** cells indicate implementation year of Superkids.

Table 4 presents the historical trend of students rating “at or above benchmark” over the course of a school year from BOY to EOY. We cannot control the readiness of all of our incoming kindergarten students, but outside of that initial data set, we can see strong trends of increases in primary literacy performance. Over the past 5-year trend, we can observe:

- Kindergarten EOY for students scoring “At or Above Benchmark” has grown 13 percentage points
- 1st Grade EOY has also grown 13 percentage points
- 2nd Grade EOY has grown 9 percentage points

There is also an increasing trend for students at the beginning of the year (BOY), proving increased retention over the summer.

- 1st Grade has increased 12 percentage points over 5 years
- 2nd Grade has increased 11 percentage points over 5 years

Kindergarten EOY dipped from 82% to 76% over one year, yet this maintained a 39 percentage point increase from BOY.

1st Grade EOY climbed from 70% to 73% over one year, yet this was only a 19 percentage point increase from BOY compared to a 21% increase the following year

2nd Grade EOY increased from 69% to 71%, and this did increase student learning by 2 percentage points from BOY.

Percent of primary students scoring at or above Benchmark: 73.3%, or .3% decrease from 2016

Table 5: 27J Schools Percentage of Students “Well Below Benchmark”

BOY – Beginning of Year

EOY – End of Year

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Kindergarten						
BOY	33%	34%	38%	35%	42%	
EOY	16%	12%	10%	8%	9%	
1st Grade						
BOY	40%	40%	40%	38%	31%	
EOY	23%	19%	16%	18%	16%	
2nd Grade						
BOY	26%	25%	26%	21%	23%	20%
EOY	20%	16%	15%	10%	17%	MOY 16%
District EOY						
	19.6%	15.6%	13.6%	12.0%	14.0%	

* *Highlighted cells indicate implementation year of Superkids.*

Table 5 presents the historical trend of students rating “well-below benchmark” over the course of a school year from BOY to EOY. We can observe some positive trends in our 5-year data:

- Kindergarten EOY for students scoring “well below benchmark” has declined 5 percentage points
- 1st Grade EOY has declined 7 percentage points
- 2nd Grade EOY has declined 3 percentage points

There has also been a decrease in students who are scoring “well-below benchmark” at the beginning of the year, proving increased retention over time.

- 1st Grade BOY has declined 9 percentage points
- 2nd Grade BOY has declined 6 percentage points in the past 6 years

Kindergarten EOY revealed an increase in SRD students from 8% to 9%, this decreased the number of SRD students from BOY by 33 percentage points compared to 27 in 2016.

1st Grade EOY revealed a decrease in SRD students from 18% to 16%, this decreased the number of SRD students from BOY by 15 percentage points compared to 20 in 2016.

1st Grade EOY revealed an increase in SRD students from 10% to 17%, this decreased the number of SRD students from BOY by 6 percentage points compared to 11 in 2016.

Percent of primary students scoring well below benchmark: 13.6%, or a .5% increase from 2016

We have many trends to be proud of, and we are encouraged by the early gains since we have adopted *Superkids*, trained our teachers, and offer district level coaching support. Change is hard and new learning is overwhelming to our staff. There are many other conditions that we have yet to control for, and there are more data trends that give us perspective as it relates to our results. We will continue to improve as we aren't satisfied with our results yet.

Conclusion: Non-compliance

Action Steps to Improve Primary Literacy Rates:

The Thinking Classroom

Since 2012 27J schools have pursued the Thinking Classroom as a conceptual framework for an ideal classroom. This concept includes GELL (Goal, Evidence and Learning Environment and Learning Experiences), which have added priority and focus to our work across the system including primary literacy.

We know that the most important strategy to improve student learning outcomes is to improve the teaching in our classrooms for all of our kids.

Specific to primary literacy, we have already:

- We utilized READ Act monies to fund 3 primary literacy district coaches to work with only K-2 teachers around content instruction of foundational skills.
- We have purchased *Superkids*, a comprehensive literacy program that we believe matches our curricular frames and aligns to the best practices in literacy education.
- We have created an implementation plan that slowly utilized our available resource and funding training and coaching support for all kindergarten teachers in 2015-16, all 1st grade teachers and new kindergarten teachers in 2016-17, and all second grade teachers and new K, 1st and 2nd grade teachers in 2017-18.
- Our training and support model integrated LETRS (researched based literacy teaching) with *Superkids*, and then followed up with site visits and personal coaching from our district level primary literacy coaches.
- We have also funded as many full day kindergarten classrooms as possible with ECARE dollars and tuition based kindergarten.
- We have also hired special education coaches to specifically support elementary teachers to ensure access to all of our students to high quality literacy instruction.
- We have intervention models and supports both inside and outside of the classrooms to further aid our SRD students in their literacy development.

We shall continue:

- To support teachers and schools that have yet to build capacity within their schools to produce results.
- To support teachers new to 27J with personalized coaching and training.
- To support the analysis of our common assessment data to help drive instruction and support intervention both inside and outside of the classroom.
- To review the data at a district level for program gaps, and additional curricular or instructional supports.
- To support building leaders in developing their teachers toward high quality instruction.