

PLSAS Local Literacy Plan Report Submitted to MDE in June, 2026

Component 1: READ Act Smart Goal

1.1 Restate the district or charter school's literacy goal(s) for the 2025-26 school year.

PLSAS 2025-26 Reading Goals - Implementation • Have all Phase I teachers (PreK-5, EL, Special Education) educators complete their state required ReadAct training. • Field test at least one state approved curricular resource as determined by our local literacy committee. • Choose a state approved curricular resource along with an implementation plan.

1.2 Describe what was implemented or changed to make progress towards the goal(s).

All phase I teachers completed the state required READ Act training. We had 42 teachers field test state approved curricular resources as determined by the local literacy committee. The committee chose a state approved curricular resource to begin implementation for the 2026-2027 school year.

1.3 Describe how current student performance differs from the literacy goal detailed in the READ Act.

While most of our students in our system are achieving grade level reading proficiency, we do have some students who are not at grade level and or who are not meeting special education or EL goals. We also have gaps between students of color and white students, students with economic disadvantages, and other predictive demographic characteristics. We need to be able to provide more consistent, evidence-based, data-driven reading instruction in order to better ensure all students can achieve grade level expectations in reading.

1.4 Overall SMART Goal

By Spring 2029, we will increase the percentage of students scoring in the 'meets or exceeds' category on the MCA IV reading assessment by a total of 6 percentage points—meeting yearly benchmarks of a 2 percentage point increase across the 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12 grade levels—while simultaneously increasing the percentage of K-2 students meeting or exceeding annual growth targets on Fastbridge earlyReading assessments. Measured against a baseline established in Fall 2026, we will achieve these yearly benchmarks by:

- **Elementary:** Implementing Arts & Letters, UFLI (grades K-2), and Functional Morphology (grades 3-5) with fidelity.
- **Secondary:** Implementing a cross-curricular Tier I focus on multisyllabic words and immediate Tier II foundational interventions, utilizing Capti and Fastbridge screening data to ensure equitable, root-cause-aligned support for all learners, including those with complex profiles or IEPs.

1.5 Name of District Literacy Lead

Gwen Moldan

1.6 The District Literacy Lead, Gwen Moldan, has an FTE of (between 0.00 and 1.00)

.4 FTE

1.7 Describe how the District Literacy Lead is engaging with the District and School Leadership Teams.

The District Literacy Lead engages extensively with both district and school leadership teams to support implementation of Minnesota's READ Act and the district's Local Literacy Plan. At the district level, she collaborates with the Learning Leaders Team (school and department leaders), the Teaching and Learning Leadership Team, and the Teaching & Learning Advisory Committee. She provides updates on literacy implementation, student achievement data, and READ Act progress to district leadership, the School Board, and other stakeholder groups as appropriate. The District Literacy Lead also participates in Minnesota Department of Education trainings, Regional Literacy Networks, and collaborative opportunities with other districts to stay current on guidance, best practices, and READ Act requirements.

At the school level, the District Literacy Lead works closely with principals, Building Instructional Leadership Teams (BILTs), Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and classroom teachers to support literacy instruction and implementation. She facilitates professional learning, presents at staff meetings, analyzes student data with school teams, and helps identify instructional priorities and next steps. A significant focus of her work includes supporting pilot and implementation teachers, providing coaching and job-embedded professional development, and monitoring implementation fidelity of literacy curriculum resources. Through ongoing collaboration with educators and school leaders, she builds instructional capacity, strengthens evidence-based literacy practices, and promotes consistent implementation of district literacy goals across all schools.

1.8 Does the District Literacy Lead hold at least one of the required active licenses?

Yes.

1.9 (NA)

1.10 Has the District Literacy Lead completed an MDE approved READ Act Professional Development program?

Yes. (OL&LA - Online Language and Literacy Academy)

1.11 (NA)

1.12 Submit the URL for the location of the Local Literacy Plan to be posted on the District Website

<https://www.plsas.org/about-us/departments/teaching-and-learning>

Component 2: Screening Tools K-3

2.1 Does the district or charter school serve students in any grade, K-3?

Yes

2.2 Does the district or charter school administer an MDE approved K-3 READ Act screening tool in any grades K-3?

Yes

2.3 Screening Tools Used in Grades K-3

Screening Tool: Fastbridge

Grades: K-3

Benchmark Criteria: Vendor Composites using vendor benchmarks

Additional Screeners:

2.4 Did the district or charter school conduct oral language screening in the 2025-26 school year?

No

2.5 Will the district or charter school make changes to K-3 screening in the 2026-27 school year?

Yes

2.6 Which tool will be utilized in the 2026-27 school year?

FBL Early reading and CBM Reading

2.7 Describe changes to K-3 screening that will be implemented in the 2026-27 school year.

We will be using FBL to administer the oral language (Oral Repetition subtest) screening as required.

Component 3: Screening Tools 4-12

3.1 Does the district or charter school serve students in any grade, 4-12?

Yes

3.2 Did the district or charter school administer the MDE approved grades 4-12 READ Act screening tool Capti ReadBasix in the 2025-26 school year?

Yes

3.3 What process was used to identify students in grades 4-12 not reading at grade level?

Two step screening process

3.4 Screening Tools, Grades 4-12

4-9: Fastbridge

10-12: Other data points were used this year including Fastbridge when available, MCA scores, ACT scores, and other historic data.

Screening Tool	Grades	Administration Timing	Criteria Used
Fastbridge aReading	4, 5	3 times per year	Vendor Benchmark
Fastbridge aReading	6, 7, 8	3 times per year	Vendor Benchmark
Fastbridge aReading	9	1 time per year	Vendor Benchmark
Other	10, 11, 12	1 time per year	Vendor Benchmark

Component 4: Student Screening Data Submission

4.1 How is the district or charter school submitting READ Act required K-3 student screening data to MDE?

Vendor submission

4.2 (NA)

4.3 How is the district or charter school submitting the READ Act required Capti ReadBasix student screening data to MDE?

Vendor submission

Component 5: Screening Summary Student Counts Grades K-3

5.1 Screening Summary Student Counts Grades K-3

Grade	# of students Universally Screened	# of students at or above benchmark	# of students universally screened	# of students at or above benchmark	# of students universally screened	# of students at or above benchmark
	Fall	Fall	Winter	Winter	Spring	Spring
K	495	323	509	305	511	331
1	528	263	531	306	531	306
2	548	324	558	382	564	370
3	595	435	596	433	596	424

Component 6: Dyslexia Screening Summary K-3

6.1 What criteria was used to identify students demonstrating characteristics of dyslexia?

Vendor Composites using vendor benchmarks

6.2 Dyslexia screening student counts K-3

Grade	# of students screened for characteristics of Dyslexia	# of students demonstrating characteristics of dyslexia (some risk/ high risk?)
K	495	172
1	528	265
2	548	224
3	595	160

6.3 What process was used to administer the Nonsense Words subtest to measure decoding skills for students in Grades 2 and 3?

Dropdown menu

6.4 Will the district or charter school make changes to K-3 dyslexia screening in the 2026-27 school year?

No

Component 7: Dyslexia Screening Summary 4-12

7.1 Identification of Characteristics of Dyslexia Student Counts 4-12

Grade	Total # of students in grade level	# of students administered district step 1 tool(If no step 1 tool used, enter zeros in this column)	# of students administered CAPTI ReadBasix	# of students demonstrating reading difficulties (reporting optional in 2026)	# of students demonstrating characteristics of dyslexia	# of students identified as not reading at grade level who were opted out of screening
4	617	599	162	167	91	7
5	606	594	166	176	89	2
6	663	642	158	159	100	4
7	691	660	183	178	112	5
8	706	676	194	192	111	11
9	736	657	193	169	94	26
10	708	44	212	39	87	41
11	721	50	206	29	90	44
12	650	68	101	46	57	36

Note: Total number of students and number of students administered Step 1 are numbers from the fall screening period.

Component 8: Data-Based Decision Making for Action

8.1 Describe the process and the data used to assure that evidence-based instruction and intervention is matched to student needs.

We do not have this component in place district-wide as it relates to literacy instruction. Our Foundations instructional materials are the closest we have in place currently for evidence-based instructional materials in literacy.

8.2 Describe the processes for monitoring fidelity and differentiating Tier 1 instruction.

We use PLC learning teams to strengthen horizontal alignment within school. We are limited in our

ability to bring grade level teams together across the district. That is something that we are working on improving. We are also aware of the need to bolster our vertical alignment. We began this work in the 2025-2026 school year. The foundational component of the alignment needs to be the evidence-based instructional materials, which we do not currently have in place. This year, we continued to implement fidelity processes for our math curriculum implementation in year two, and intend to replicate these processes when we have our evidence-based instructional materials in place for the area of reading.

8.3 Provide the criteria for entrance into Tier 2 (supplemental) and/or Tier 3 (intensive) targeted reading intervention. Specify any difference in processes at the elementary and secondary school levels.

TIER 2

- **Criteria 1, Evidence-Based Tier 2 Instructional Materials Are Provided to Students Who Need Supplemental Support:** For Tier 2, we use the interventions identified through Fastbridge assessments and PRESS intervention materials and strategies. In Tier 2, the interventions tend to be in small groups facilitated by either a Reading Corps member, Reading Interventionist, or a classroom teacher. These materials are evidence-based.
- **Criteria 2, Evidence-Based Tier 2 Instructional Practices Are Likely to Be Effective for Most Students:** Our Tier 2 strategies are evidence based, consistently progress monitored, and are effective for most students.
- **Criteria 3, Tier 2 Supports Are Aligned with Tier 1 and Designed to Help Students Meet Tier 1 Expectations:** In general, our Tier 2 supports are not aligned with Tier 1 because we do not have evidence-based literacy instruction in reading.
- **Criteria 4, Fidelity: High Quality Tier 2 Intervention for Those Receiving It:** Our reading interventionists and Reading Corps members consistently monitor intervention through progress monitoring.

TIER 3

- **Criteria 1, Evidence-Based Tier 3 Instructional Materials Are Provided to Students Who Need Intensive Support:** For Tier 3, we use the interventions identified through Fastbridge assessments and PRESS intervention materials and strategies. In Tier 2, the interventions are one-on-one and facilitated by either a Reading Corps member, Reading Interventionist, or a classroom teacher.
- **Criteria 2, Evidence-Based Tier 3 Instructional Practices Intensify and Individualize Supports for Students Who Require Customized Programming:** Our Tier 2 strategies are evidence based, consistently progress monitored, and are effective for most students.
- **Criteria 3, Tier 3 Interventions are Aligned to Student Specific Needs and To Making Students Successful with Grade Level Standards:** In general, our Tier 2 supports are not aligned with Tier 1 because we do not have evidence-based literacy instruction in reading.
- **Criteria 4, Fidelity: Tier 3 Interventions are Monitored to Ensure Fidelity:** Our reading interventionists and Reading Corps members consistently monitor intervention through progress monitoring. Tier 3 is also supported through the schools' Problem Solving Teams (PST).

8.4 How often is progress monitoring data collected for students receiving Tier 2 support?

Once every two weeks

8.5 How often is progress monitoring data collected for students receiving Tier 3 support?

Once every two weeks

8.6 Provide the K-12 progress monitoring protocol used to determine any necessary intensifications or modifications of Tier 2 (supplemental) and/or Tier 3 (intensive) targeted reading intervention.

Our reading interventionists and Reading Corps members consistently monitor intervention through progress monitoring. Tier 3 is also supported through the schools' Problem Solving Teams (PST).

8.7 Provide the criteria for exit from Tier 2 (supplemental) and/or Tier 3 (intensive) targeted reading intervention. Specify any difference in processes at the elementary and secondary school levels.

Upon review of the data, student scores at or above the next benchmark for 2 of the last 3 weeks of progress monitoring would serve as the criteria for exiting Tier II and III.

8.9 Describe changes to data-based decision-making processes, criteria, or progress monitoring procedures.

Building on our ongoing learning and insights from the OL&LA training, we are systematically reviewing our intervention model to make necessary improvements. As we introduce new resources aligned with evidence-based structured literacy practices for the 2026-27 school year, we will ensure that instruction and intervention remain closely matched to student needs.

Component 9: Parent Notification and Involvement

9.1 Are parents or guardians notified when children are identified as not reading at grade level?

Yes

9.2 Parent Notification Grades K-12

Grades	Frequency of Notification	Method of Notification	Other, Explain
K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	3 times per year	Other	Parent/teacher conferences twice a year and digital messaging a third time
6, 7, 8	2 times per year	Digital messaging	NA
9, 10, 11, 12	1 time per year	Mailed letter	NA

9.3 Do parent notifications from the district or charter include all required information?

Yes

9.4 How are families or the community engaged around literacy?

Parent/teacher conferences

9.5 Will the district or charter school make changes to parent notification and involvement in the 2026-27 school year?

Yes

9.6 Describe changes to parent notification and involvement that will be implemented in the 2026-27 school year.

We will work to integrate literacy updates into existing community touchpoints, focus on sharing the Families READ Toolkit for strategies to support at home, and highlight support strategies during Dyslexia Awareness Month. We will continue to share progress monitoring data during Fall and Spring conferences, and send notifications when students enter or exit interventions.

Component 10: Tier 1 (Core) Curricular Resources

10.1 Does the district or charter school serve students in any grade, K-5?

Yes

10.2 Tier 1 (Core) Literacy Instruction and Curricular Resources

Implemented Curriculum	Other Curriculum	Curricula Type	Grades	Instructional Delivery Minutes
Foundations, K-3, 2012 (non-ranked)	NA	Foundational	K, 1, 2, 3	30
Other curriculum	Units of Study for Teaching Reading	Other	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	60
Other curriculum	Words Their Way	Other	4, 5	20

10.3 Describe the process the district or charter school used or will use to select an evidence-based Tier 1 (Core) curricular resource.

The PLSAS Continuous Improvement Process is informed by the Plan-Do-Study-Act framework and Implementation Science. The components of the Continuous Improvement Process involve district and/or school level areas, including disciplines, programs, and/or services. Stakeholder groups, which may include teachers, administrators, parents, students, and/or community members, engage in this process to respond to the need for systemic change as the result of a formal study and review with just-in-time and ongoing improvements.

10.4 Describe the selection and implementation timeline (e.g., selection, training, fidelity checks, standards alignment).

Our Elementary Literacy Team followed the PLSAS Continuous Improvement Process through the 2025-26 school year. During that process the committee researched the tier 1 curricular resources on the Highly Aligned to Evidence-Based Structured Literacy Practices section on the MDE website. After presentations from each company, the committee chose to pilot Arts & Letters, UFLI Foundations, Functional Phonics, and Functional Morphology. After the committee attended training and field tested resources for a semester, they studied data and chose to adopt Arts & Letters, UFLI Foundations, and Functional Morphology. All K-5 general education, special education, intervention, and EL teachers will engage in training this summer.

During the 2026-27 school year, teachers will align their student achievement goals and building SCIP goals to effective instructional literacy practices. Teachers will look at student data, backwards map units, and study standards alignment during their weekly PLCs and continue to engage in professional

learning in the Science of Reading and structured literacy. Building principals will continue to build their competence by attending professional development on structured literacy practices and participate in guided walkthroughs aligned to the new curriculum resources.

10.5 Will the district or charter school make changes to Tier 1 (Core) curricular resources in grades K-5 in the 2026-27 school year?

Yes

10.6 Describe changes to Tier 1 (Core) curricular resources in grades K-5 that will be implemented in the 2026-27 school year.

In the 2026-27 school year, we will begin using the following resources for literacy instruction in our elementary classrooms:

- Arts & Letters (Knowledge Building Resource K-5)
- UFLI Foundations (Foundational Skills Resource K-2)
- Functional Morphology (3-5)

Component 11: Literacy Intervention Resources

11.1 Reading Interventions

Tier 2 and Tier 3 Resources	Other Resource Name	Resource Used For	Grades	Instructional Delivery Minutes
READ 180	NA	Tier 3	6, 7, 8	50
Sonday	NA	Tier 3	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	30
UFLI	NA	Tier 3	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	30
Other Resource	Functional Phonics and Morphology	Tier 3	9, 10, 11, 12	20
Path to Reading Excellence in School Sites (PRESS)	NA	Tier 2	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	20

11.2 Will the district or charter school make changes to literacy intervention resources in grades K-12 in the 2026-27 school year?

Yes

11.3 Describe changes to literacy intervention resources in grades K-12 that will be implemented in the 2026-27 school year.

In the 2026-27 school year, we will begin using the following resources in tier 2:

- UFLI Foundations (K-5)
- Lexia PowerUp (6-12)
- Rewards (6-12)

These resources will replace the current resources we have been using in Tier 2.

Component 12: Literacy Aid Funds

12.1 What amount of literacy aid funds were received in 2025-26 school year?

\$443,981.79

12.2 What amount of literacy aid funds were spent in 2025-26 school year?

\$753,549.05

READ Act Literacy Aid

12.3 What amount of READ Act Literacy Aid was received in 2024-25 school year?

\$350,553.38

12.4 As of the completion of this Local Literacy Plan how much READ Act Literacy Aid remains in the required reserved account?

\$350,403.38

12.5 If funds remain, describe the plan for spending remaining funds.

Continued time carding for phase 2 teachers, salaries and benefits

12.6 Literacy Aid Funds

Use the table below to indicate all eligible uses of literacy aid funds for which funding was applied in the 2025-26 school year.

Use of Literacy Funds	Funds Used
Contracting or employing a District Literacy Lead	Literacy Aid Funds
Professional development on evidence-based literacy screening and progress monitoring tools	Literacy Aid Funds
Approved literacy screeners (this can include materials, training, and coaching)	Literacy Aid Funds

Component 13: Professional Development Plan

13.1 Name of the approved Phase 1 professional development program:

Core OL&LA

13.2 Date of expected completion for Phase 1:

5/25/26

13.3 How were Phase 1 synchronous sessions facilitated?

Local Certified Facilitator

13.4a Is the district planning or currently engaging in an approved Phase 2 professional development

program?

Yes

13.4 Name of the approved Phase 2 professional development program:

CORE OL&LA Secondary

13.5 Date of expected completion for Phase 2:

6/2/27

13.6 How were Phase 2 synchronous sessions facilitated?

Local Certified Facilitator

13.7 Describe how the district or charter school is supporting teachers who do not complete the approved training at the vendor proficiency level of 80%.

All teachers in the phase 1 training completed OL&LA at the 80% proficiency level. Our phase 2 teachers are just beginning the training and we will continue to monitor staff progress throughout the year to ensure that all staff reach 80% proficiency.

13.8 Describe the fidelity data that is being collected to ensure that teachers in grades K-12 are able to implement systematic, sequential, explicit, and diagnostic evidence-based instruction in literacy.

During the 2025-26 school year, we field tested elementary literacy resources that were highly aligned to structured literacy practices. During the field test, our peer coaches and Curriculum Specialist observed teachers using a rubric that focused on explicit and diagnostic practices in their instruction. This information will be used to build a more comprehensive plan when implementing fully during the 2026-27 school year.

13.9 Describe how the district or charter school is implementing coaching support and feedback based on the results of the fidelity data to ensure that all teachers in grades K-12 are able to implement systematic, sequential, explicit, and diagnostic evidence-based instruction in literacy.

During this field test year, our peer coaches and Curriculum Specialist used the data from the observations to refine a rubric that will be used in all observations with elementary staff. Since our new curriculum resources are systematic and sequential, the rubric focused on explicit teaching practices and relying on data-based decision making when considering next instructional moves with students. This rubric will be used with teachers during the pre-observation and post-observation.

As our secondary staff engage in phase 2 training this upcoming school year, we will begin to evaluate our curriculum and instructional practices. During this process, we will most likely need to update resources in order to ensure they are highly aligned to evidence-based structured literacy practices. Once we have these resources in place, we will begin the process of gathering fidelity data.

13.10 Describe how the changes in instructional practices (systematic, sequential, explicit, diagnostic) have impacted K-12 student outcomes. Provide evidence of this impact.

In our elementary field test there was a shared consensus among the field test teachers: the newly piloted ELA resources are highly rigorous, successfully aligned with the Science of Reading, and are driving noticeable academic growth. Across all grade levels, teachers reported that students are engaging

with complex texts, improving their writing, and acquiring phonics and spelling skills much faster than in previous years.

Initial Fastbridge scores did not show clear measurable outcomes, but this is common in implementation science – the first year of implementation often shows a ‘dip’ in outcomes. Some pilot teachers and grade levels did see significant increases in Fastbridge scores. Because of the change from MCA-III to MCA-IV, we do not have preliminary literacy data, so we are not able to compare MCA data between pilot and non-pilot teacher at this time. We will continue to study the data we gather from students and teachers to make decisions on next steps.

13.11 How has the district implemented work around culturally responsive practices? Include a description of the plan for supporting teachers with implementing culturally responsive literacy practices.

The district has implemented professional development around culturally responsive practices through its adoption of CORE Learning's Online Language & Literacy Academy (OL&LA), an MDE-approved training program aligned to the Minnesota READ Act. This structured literacy course is intentionally designed to support culturally and linguistically diverse learners, including Multilingual Learners (MLs), English variety speakers, and students with dyslexia. OL&LA incorporates second-language acquisition research, evidence-based reading instruction, and culturally responsive pedagogy by:

- Integrating instructional strategies tailored for language-diverse classrooms.
- Addressing oral and academic language development, which is essential for multilingual and culturally diverse students.
- Teaching educators to understand and honor the linguistic and cultural backgrounds of their students through structured, inclusive literacy practices.

13.12 How did the district engage with the Regional Literacy Network?

- Attended District Literacy Lead Community of Practice
- Attended Local Certified Facilitator Community of Practice

13.13 Describe any additional literacy focused professional development opportunities the district or charter school will be providing. Provide any specific alignment to the strands of the ELA Standards (reading, writing, and exchanging ideas).

Our elementary will focus on fidelity to implementation of our new resources. There will be specific training on each of the resources beginning in the summer and continuing throughout the school year for our K-5 general education teachers, special education teachers, interventionists, and English Language teachers. Administrators will also engage in training on the resources and conduct walkthroughs with trainers from the curriculum programs along with peer coaches and district-level staff. During PLCs, teachers will look at data, study standards alignment, and backwards map units.

Our secondary English teachers will be taking the OL&LA Secondary course throughout the school year. Since we have a local facilitator, we will have the live sessions in person and build on the content from the modules. In order to build capacity with all teachers, we will focus on multisyllabic word instruction. In the beginning of the school year, we will introduce the Archer Method for decoding multisyllabic words and all staff will display word walls in their spaces. We will continue to build on this during staff meetings, PLCs, and district professional learning days. Our secondary staff is also working on a

curriculum audit where they are mapping their courses to the standards, looking for alignment and ways to improve practice.

13.14 Will the district or charter school make changes to the professional development plan in the 2026-27 school year?

No

Component 14: Professional Development Educator Count

14.1 Educator Counts Phase 1

Phase 1: Educator Role	Total Number in District	Educator who have completed training	Educator with training in progress	Required educators who need training
Pre-K classrooms teachers	24	24	0	0
K-3 classroom teachers	95	96	0	0
K-12 teachers holding English as a second language licenses	10	10	0	0
K-12 reading intervention teachers	8	8	0	0
K-12 Special Education educators responsible for foundational reading instruction	82	82	0	0
Pre-K through grade five curriculum directors	7	7	0	0
Employees who select literacy instructional materials for grades Pre-K through grade five	24	24	0	0
Fourth and fifth grade teachers	47	47	0	0
Instructional support staff, contractors, and volunteers who assist in providing reading intervention under the oversight and monitoring of a trained licensed educator	0	0	0	0

14.2 Educator Counts Phase 2

Phase 2: Educator Role	Total Number in District	Educator who have completed training	Educator with training in progress	Required educators who need training
Teachers who provide foundational reading instruction to student in grades 4-12	30	0	30	30

Teachers who provide reading instruction to students in dual language immersion programs	16	16	0	0
Teachers who provide reading instruction to students in a state-approved alternative program	2	0	2	2
Employees who select literacy instructional materials for grades 6-12	1	0	1	1
Grades 6-12 curriculum directors	0	0	0	0
Grades 6-12 instructional support staff who provide reading support	50	46	2	2

14.3 Of the total number of required instructional support staff, contractors, and volunteers from the above charts, enter the number that have completed the Paraprofessional Structured Literacy Training (PSLT, 8-hour training).

46

14.4 The PSLT was provided by:

Regional Literacy Network

Section 15: Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS)

15.1 Is the district or charter school implementing a multi-tiered system of support framework?

Yes

15.2 Is the district or charter school using the MnMTSS framework?

No

15.3 (NA)

15.4 Will the district or charter school make changes to MTSS in the 2026-27 school year?

Yes

15.5 Describe changes to MTSS that will be implemented in the 2026-27 school year.

This year we had a leadership group complete the MnMTSS COMPASS training. This group met monthly after the training to continue evaluating current MTSS systems. Our goal is to build a sustainable infrastructure that standardizes our student support systems. As a first step, we plan to create a multi year roadmap to implementation where our first year focus will be on universal screeners and diagnostic assessments, leadership commitment to MTSS, and tiered support alignment.

Section 16: Dual Language Immersion Programs

16.1 Does the district or charter school include a DLI program?

Yes

16.2 Dual Language Sites K-12

Partner language	Other partner language	Name of school site	Grades	Percent of students in partner language
Spanish	NA	La ola del lage	K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	20

16.3 Literacy Screening Tools K-12

Literacy Screening	Grades Screened	Name of Partner English Screening Tool	Partner Language Screening Tool
Both	K, 1	Fastbridge: earlyReading and CBMReading	Fastbridge; early Reading and CBM Reading
English	2, 3, 4, 5	Fastbridge: earlyReading and CBMReading	None

16.4 Complete the table below to indicate the number of students in Grades K-3 in the district or charter school's DLI program, the number screened and identified as reading at or above benchmark in Spring.

Grade	Number of students in DLI Programs	Number of students screened	Number of students reading at or above benchmark in spring
K	74	73	70
1st	75	75	34
2nd	87	85	45
3rd	77	77	60

16.5 Complete the table below to indicate the number of students in Grades 4-12 in the district or charter school's DLI program, the number screened and identified as not reading at grade level.

Grade	Number of students in DLI Programs	Number of students screened	Number identified as not reading at grade level	Number of students opted out of screening
4th	67	67	19	0
5th	59	59	12	0
6-12	NA	NA	NA	NA