

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

School District: Anser Charter School	#492	Name: Anser Public Charter School
Superintendent	Name: Michelle Dunstan	Phone: 208.426.9840 x205
	E-mail: mdunstan@ansercharterschool.org	
Literacy Plan Contact	Name: Michelle Dunstan	Phone: 208.426.9840 x205
	E-mail: mdunstan@ansercharterschool.org	

Program Summary (2016-2017)

- Based on the 2016 passage of House Bill 526 and 451, Anser made some changes to the way we deliver Literacy Intervention to the students. The changes did not necessarily affect the number of students who received intervention, but it did impact the number of minutes per week they had supplemental support and what that support “looked like”. The changes also helped us determine which programs we use for intervention and helped us be more purposeful in creating flexible groups.
- During the 2016-2017 year, our intervention schedule was developed to support the requirements to deliver 60 hours of intervention to students scoring a “1” on the IRI and 30 hours of intervention to students scoring a “2” on the IRI. When reviewing our schedule, we noticed that we had exceeded the requirements – which was a welcome observation. We expect to follow a similar schedule for the 2017-2018 school year because it was very successful.
- After the 2016-2017 Fall IRIs were completed, we did note that some students – especially in 1st Grade – who were not “proficient” on the IRI were, in actuality, very strong readers. The IRI assesses Letter Sound Fluency at the beginning of 1st grade, but several students were reading far beyond the end of the year CBM benchmark even though they appeared to be struggling based on the measure the IRI uses for Fall benchmarking. Considering the IRI is a screening assessment, we made the determination to not provide additional intervention to those students who already had demonstrated proficiency beyond the end-of-the-year CBM benchmark. Although these decisions were supported by the Spring IRI data, this year we will make a more formal plan to communicate to parents our decision-making process.
- Along those same lines, we are planning to formalize much of the communication process with our parent community. We certainly communicated about the interventions the students were receiving, but much of that was done informally through phone conversations and via email. For the 2017-2018 year, we will create a more formal Literacy Intervention Plan (for each student) that will be shared with our parents.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Performance Metric	Benchmark	Actual (2017-2018) Data
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Kindergarten Spring IRI	22 (based on class size of 37)	22 (out of 36 actual students)
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Kindergarten Spring IRI	60%	61.1%
Improvement in # of students who scored "proficient" on the Kindergarten Spring IRI	4	-12
Improvement in % of students who scored "proficient" on the Kindergarten Spring IRI	5pp	-22.7pp
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 1 Spring IRI	24 (based on class size of 36)	19 (out of 35 actual students)
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 1 Spring IRI	65%	54.3%
Improvement in # of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 1 Spring IRI	5	3
Improvement in % of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 1 Spring IRI	8pp	9.7pp
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 2 Spring IRI	26 (based on class size of 37)	26 (out of 36 actual students)
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 2 Spring IRI	70%	72.2%
Improvement in # of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 2 Spring IRI	4	4
Improvement in % of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 2 Spring IRI	8pp	12.7pp
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 3 Spring IRI	31 (based on class size of 35)	31 (out of 35 actual students)
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 3 Spring IRI	88%	88.6%
Improvement in # of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 3 Spring IRI	5	3
Improvement in % of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 3 Spring IRI	8pp	13pp
Improvement in % growth of <i>non-proficient</i> kindergarteners on Kdg Spring LSF IRI when compared to LSF score on Fall IRI.	175pp *edit 'pp' to % growth	(110 --->256) 132.7% growth
Improvement in % growth of <i>non-proficient</i> 1st Grade students on Grade 1 Spring CBM IRI when compared to CBM score on Fall IRI.	625pp *edit 'pp' to % growth	(75 --> 484) 545.3 % growth

- Our final reflection was to look at the data in order to determine if our interventions were successful - based on the benchmarks we set (using both the state's Performance Metric and our own LEA).
- We noted that the 2nd and 3rd grade benchmark goals were reached with the exception of the number (#) of 3rd grade students who scored "proficient" on the Spring IRI compared with the number (#) of students who scored "proficient" on the Fall IRI. Upon reflection we remembered that we based the benchmark goal on prior years' data; but the actual number of students not scoring "proficient" on the Fall IRI was a very low number relative to other years. In fact, there were zero (0) students who even scored a "1" on the Fall IRI. So we feel confident that the interventions were successful because the percentage (%) of students met the goal. Additionally the students showed growth beyond the expected – (the growth was actually 13 percentage points instead of the expected 8 percentage points.)

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

- When we reflected on our Kindergarten and 1st Grade data, we saw that not all of the benchmarks were met. By the end of the year, the Kindergarteners as a group met the benchmark that was set with 61.1% scoring “proficient”. However, there was a marked decrease both in the number (#) of students and the class’s improvement based on percentage points (pp) on the Spring IRI when compared to the Fall IRI. This seems concerning at first glance; however the **measure** is different from the Fall to the Spring. The expectations change dramatically for the students during their Kindergarten year, which is to be expected. But to assure ourselves that our Kindergarten students are indeed progressing in their literacy skills, we set our own benchmark. Our benchmark takes a look at the students who were not “proficient” on their Spring IRI (LSF). We compared those students’ Letter Sound Fluency with the baseline score from their Fall LSF score. In other words, we compared growth using the same measure. We set a goal of 175% percent change, and in actuality the students’ percent change was 132.7% change.

(There was a calculation error on our 2016-2017 plan. We inadvertently only used the scores of the students scoring a ‘1’ on the IRI, rather than all of the ‘non-proficient’ students. The correction is made in this 2017-2018 Program Summary in the above table.)

- We counted the total of the “non-proficient” students’ correct Letter Sounds in the Fall (110 total correct sounds) with the same students’ correct Letter Sounds in the Spring (256 total correct sounds). We used the following formula to determine the percent change between the numbers. $\frac{256-110}{110}(100) = 132.7\%$ change.

Our 1st Graders had a similar pattern when we looked more closely at the students who were not “proficient” in Letter Sound Fluency compared to the students who were not “proficient” in their CBM on the Spring IRI. The percentage (%) benchmark was not met, nor was the growth in actual numbers, although the growth in percentage points (pp) benchmark was made. Again, the IRI measure from the beginning of the year (LSF on Fall IRI) to the end of the year (CBM on Spring IRI) was not the same; and so we set our own benchmark to compare percent of growth from the Fall IRI to the Spring IRI using the CBM scores. Using the percent change formula, the 1st graders who were “not proficient” on the Spring IRI showed a 545.3% change when comparing the Fall CBM to the Spring CBM - which did not meet the expected percent change of 625% growth. ***(There was a calculation error on our 2016-2017 plan. We inadvertently only used the scores of the students scoring a ‘1’ on the IRI, rather than all of the ‘non-proficient’ students. The correction is made in this 2017-2018 Program Summary in the above table.)***

- Anser Public Charter School has dug deeply into our own data trends for years and have seen similar patterns that we saw this year. Our literacy programming seems to have long-term benefits for the students. Every year, the cohorts of students continue to show improvement over time. By third grade, our students have made gains in the percentage of their class showing “proficiency” on the IRI (compared to when they were in Kindergarten) instead of showing a decrease. We will always strive to improve instruction and to find successful ways to support our students, but we do feel proud of the achievements of our children.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Program Summary (2017-2018) - REQUIRED

+++++

- *Interventions used at each grade level or group of grades*

Kindergarten – Anser Kindergarten teachers differentiate literacy activities for their students during center time. The students are placed in flexible groups based on the different skill levels that are found in the class. Additional intervention is offered during center time by the Literacy Specialist so that more direct and supplemental instruction can be given to those students who need it. This structure allows the students needing intervention to receive support in a familiar environment, and it also allows the Literacy Specialist to get to know all of the new Kindergarten students.

Activities in the Kindergarten classroom align with the Idaho Core State Standards and include, (but are not limited to): phonemic awareness, concepts of print, letter recognition (upper and lower case), identifying letter sounds.

Intervention Programs used in Kindergarten: Anser uses a variety of programs to match with each student's instructional needs. In Kindergarten, the goal is for students to be able to identify letter names (upper- and lowercase) and the sound associated with each letter. To that end, Anser classroom teachers, the Literacy Specialist and paraprofessionals use materials developed at the Florida Center for Reading Research (a multidisciplinary research center at Florida State University).

First Grade – First grade teachers at Anser also differentiate literacy activities to target the needs of the wide range of skills found at this grade level. They are also placed in flexible literacy groups that change several times throughout the year. First graders have centers during their Literacy Block, with the classroom teachers, parent volunteers, Boise State tutors, and Anser paraprofessionals offering support. As in Kindergarten, general classroom instruction is aligned to the Idaho Core State Standards. Student received instruction in comprehension strategies (such as finding key ideas/details, noticing the author's craft and text structure, reading different texts of various complexity), but they are still learning about print concepts, sight word recognition, phonics patterns and rules, and are participating in phonological awareness activities.

Intervention Programs used in First Grade: First grade students in Intervention receive instruction outside of the Literacy Block (schedule is found later in the Plan) by the Literacy Specialist and a paraprofessional. Interventionists also use activities developed at the Florida Center for Reading Research. Later, as the students become more proficient in Letter Sound Fluency, they will be using materials developed by Core Knowledge Curriculum Series (Language Arts). Depending on their readiness, and keeping the Spring IRI CBM goal in mind, instruction will continue to support their word analysis, phonics, sound-spelling correspondences for common consonant digraphs, decoding one-syllable words and identifying sight words, and fluency.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Second and Third Grades - Anser Public Charter School has blended classrooms for 2nd/3rd Grades, so the general education and Interventions are the same for both grade levels. We have used this model for several years, so much has not changed from previous Literacy Intervention Plans.

In grades 2 and 3, the teachers use a Word Study model. Based on assessments (such as the IRI, STAR Reading Assessment, and CORE Phonics), the teachers form homogeneous groups of students from all three homerooms for a chunk of time to teach the basic skills of reading - such as phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary and fluency. After this Literacy time, the students return to their regular classrooms, thus forming heterogeneous groups where classroom teachers give instruction of comprehension strategies.

Data drives these original groupings, as well as any movement of students from one group to another as the year progresses. If a student shows growth or shows he/she needs additional intervention based on formative assessment, progress monitoring, the STAR Reading assessment, CORE Phonics, Words Their Way spelling inventories; then adjustments will be made as to where they are placed.

The Literacy Specialist has her own Word Study group (along with a paraprofessional and parent volunteers), which serves nine 2nd/3rd grade students who were identified as needing small-group instruction. This small Word Study group does not supplant any Interventions, but it does provide the students a more supportive environment in which to focus instruction to these striving readers.

Several years ago, Anser purchased the Open Court, or Imagine It phonics curriculum for 1st and 2nd grade. The teachers use the materials to supplement their core instruction in the general education setting. The state of Idaho is in the process of adopting new ELA/Literacy materials. When the new list becomes finalized, Anser staff will review the approved materials and make decisions based on that new information. Until then, teachers use available materials to align their instruction to the Idaho Common Core standards. Teachers give direct instruction on word analysis skills - such as phonics, sight word recognition, how to use context cues to decode and to expand vocabulary. Teachers connect this instruction with the spelling program, thus supporting students in encoding as well as decoding words.

Along with this explicit instruction, teachers provide other rich literacy experiences for their students. Read-alouds and subsequent discussions about these shared stories allow for students to "go deeper" in their understanding of a topic than they could do reading on their own. The read-aloud texts also connect with other subjects they are studying, which helps to build background knowledge and make cross-curricular connections.

Each day, students have the opportunity to practice reading independently from books of their own choosing. Some students, who are unable to sustain their reading on their own, read during this time with the Literacy Specialist and a paraprofessional; who support their independence with mini-lessons on comprehension, strategies for decoding unfamiliar words and building stamina. (These reading behaviors are also incorporated in the classrooms and are based on Gail Boushey and Joan Moser's *The Daily Five*.)

In addition, word sorts from Words Their Way that hit upon the phonics focus, and word building activities found in the book *Making Sense of Phonics* by Isabel L. Beck are integrated into the general education literacy program.

Intervention Programs used in Second and Third Grades: Second and Third grade students receive Intervention in a variety of ways. Students who scored a "2" on the Fall IRI receive their intervention

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

within the Word Study classroom in lieu of having an independent center. A paraprofessional provides intervention to the non-proficient students who are placed in their center groups based on their literacy needs. (Schedule is found later in the Plan.) Students who scored a "1" on the Fall IRI will not only be in the small group Word Study, but their interventions will take place during DEARS time and during another time directly after lunch. All of the intervention times are scheduled outside of the general education instruction and will be delivered by the Literacy Specialist and a paraprofessional.

The intervention instruction is focused on providing students with additional support in the areas of Phonemic and Phonological awareness, decoding, vocabulary development and comprehension/fluency. The materials at the beginning of the school year will be ones developed by the Florida Center for Reading Research and will primarily focus on phonemic awareness. Later, the students will continue to receive support with decoding and fluency. Once their skills have allowed them to decode accurately and fluently, the instruction will focus on comprehension strategies they will use during independent reading. (Comprehension strategies are already being taught during other literacy times with the whole class, but Intervention instruction will allow students to apply those skills independently.) The Core Knowledge Curriculum Series (Language Arts) – First/Second Grades – will be used for intervention materials (the level will depend on each groups' skills and we will adapt the lessons to "meet" the students where they are in their progress.

+++++

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Demonstration that the program approach is research-based and includes phonemic awareness, decoding intervention, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency applicable to each grade level

As noted above, Intervention programs used from K-3 will include materials developed by the Florida Center for Reading Research (www.fcrr.org). FCRR has many partners in their efforts to promote literacy, including the National Reading Panel, the Florida Reading Initiative, the National Institute for Literacy and the United States Department of Education.

Kindergarten – First Grade

Book One - Phonemic Awareness and Phonics	
Introduction & Contents	
Phonemic Awareness	
Part One	Part Two
• Phoneme Matching	• Phoneme Blending
• Phoneme Isolating	• Phoneme Segmenting
Part Three	
• Phoneme Manipulating	
Phonics	
Part One	Part Two
• Letter-Sound Correspondence	• High Frequency Words
Part Three	Part Four
• Variant Correspondences	• Syllable Patterns
Part Five	
• Morpheme Structures	
Book Two - Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension	
Introduction & Contents	
Fluency	
Part One	Part Two
• Letter-Sound Correspondence	• Words
• Word Parts	
Part Three	Part Four
• Phrases	• Connected Text
• Chunked Text	
Vocabulary	
Part One	Part Two
• Word Knowledge	• Morphemic Elements
Part Three	Part Four
• Word Meaning	• Word Analysis
Part Five	
• Words in Context	
Comprehension	
Part One	Part Two
• Narrative Text Structure	• Expository Text Structure
Part Three	Part Four
• Text Analysis	• Monitoring for Understanding

Second – Third Grade

Book One - Phonological Awareness and Phonics	
Introduction & Contents	
Phonological Awareness	
Part One	Part Three
• Rhyme	• Phoneme Matching
• Alliteration	Part Four
Part Two	• Phoneme Isolating
• Sentence Segmentation	• Phoneme Segmenting
• Syllables	Part Five
• Onset and Rime	• Phoneme Segmenting and Blending
	• Phoneme Manipulating
Phonics	
Part One	Part Five
• Letter Recognition	• High Frequency Words
Part Two	Part Six
• Letter-Sound Correspondence	• Variant Correspondences
Part Three	Part Seven
• Onset and Rime	• Syllable Patterns
Part Four	• Morpheme Structures
• Encoding and Decoding	
Book Two - Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension	
Introduction & Contents	
Fluency	
All Parts	
• Letter Recognition	• High Frequency Words
• Letter-Sound Correspondence	• Oral Reading
Vocabulary	
All Parts	
• Word Identification/Words in Context	• Words That Describe/Word Meaning
• Word Categorization/Word Knowledge	• Word Structure/Word Analysis
Comprehension	
All Parts	
• Sentence Structure and Meaning	• Story Structure
• Monitoring for Meaning	• Main Idea/Summarizing

As can be seen from the above figures, the FCRR materials include the required phonemic awareness, phonics/decoding, vocabulary, comprehension and fluency instruction.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Anser is also using the Core Knowledge Curriculum Series (Language Arts). According to reviews found at www.edreports.org, the Core Knowledge Language Arts curriculum has met expectations for materials developed for Grades K-3 (<http://www.edreports.org/ela/core-knowledge-language-arts-ckla/index.html>)

The review is extensive, but the following excerpts from the above review show specifically how the materials meet the Idaho requirement for providing instruction in phonemic awareness, decoding, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. It should be noted that the Program is a comprehensive one intended to be used for general instruction, however Anser is using the Skills Strand/Foundational Skills to meet the needs of the students needing intervention.

“Materials, questions, and tasks directly teach foundational skills to build reading acquisition by providing systematic and explicit instruction in the alphabetic principle, letter-sound relations, phonemic awareness, phonological awareness (K-1), and phonics (K-2) that demonstrate a transparent and research-based progression with opportunities for application both in and out of context.... Instructional opportunities are frequently built into the materials for students to practice and gain decoding automaticity and sight-based recognition of high frequency words. This includes reading fluency in oral reading beginning in mid-Grade 1 and through Grade 2.... Materials, questions, and tasks provide systematic and explicit instruction in and practice of word recognition and analysis skills in a research-based progression in connected text and tasks.... Texts are organized around a topic/topics to build students knowledge and vocabulary which will over time support and help grow students' ability to comprehend complex texts independently and proficiently”.

To supplement these intervention programs, Anser also uses “Explode the Code”, which is a research-based program that “builds essential foundational literacy skills for students at a variety of levels. Based on the Orton-Gillingham hallmarks of instruction, Explode The Code...” provides systemic and direct instruction of early literacy skills. https://eps.schoolspecialty.com/EPS/media/Site-Resources/Downloads/research-papers/series/etc_research.pdf?ext=.pdf

+++++

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Schedule for 30 and 60 Hours of Intervention

In Kindergarten, the Literacy Specialist spends 120 minutes a week in each classroom - working with students who need intervention during their center time. (The center time for the non-intervention students is an independent time, so the time spent on intervention is outside of the general instruction). Based on our calendar, there are 50 hours of intervention time allotted to the kindergarten. Only one student earned a "1", and after interventions are underway we will progress monitor that student and provide additional intervention during the afternoon if necessary.

The Intervention schedules for 1st – 3rd grade are below. For each grade level, the hours of intervention are recorded for both the students who scored a "1" and a "2" on the Fall IRI and the person providing the interventions.

1st Graders	Literacy Specialist	Paraprofessional	Total Intervention Hours
"1" on Fall IRI "Group #1"	30 min x 5 days/wk "pull-out"		30 min x 128 days = 3840 minutes/60 = 64 intervention hours
"1" on Fall IRI "Group #2"	30 min x 4 days/wk "pull-out"		30 min x 113 days = 3390 minutes/60 = 56.6 intervention hours <small>(due to flexible grouping, students will be adjusted between the two groups to make up the 3.4 hours this time slot is 'short' from the 60 hour requirement)</small>
"2" on Fall IRI		2 separate groups 30 min x 3 days/wk "pull-out"	30 min x 73 days = 2190 minutes/60 = 36.5 intervention hours

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

2 nd / 3 rd Graders	Literacy Specialist	Para	Total Intervention Hours
"1" on Fall IRI (2 nd Grade)	30 min x 3 days/wk "pull-out"	20 min x 2 days/wk "pull-out"	30 min x 82 days = 2460 min/60 = 41 hours 20 min x 59 days = 1180 min/60 = 19.7 hours 19.7 + 41 = 60.7 hours
"2" on Fall IRI (2 nd Grade and 3 rd Grade)		20 min x 4 days/wk "push-in" to Word Study	20 min x 100 days = 2000 min/60 = 33.3 hours
"1" on Fall IRI (3 rd Grade)	20 min x 3 days/wk "pull-out"	30 min x 2 days/wk "pull-out"	30 min x 61 days = 1830 min/60 = 30.5 hours 20 min x 84 days = 1680 min/60 = 28 hours 30.5 + 28 = 58.5 hours (The extra 1.5 hours will be made up during the school year by extending the 20 minutes by 10 minutes on 9 total days. 10 min x 9 days = 90 min/60 = 1.5 hours)

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

+++++

- *Information aligned to the projected literacy budget for the current school year, adequate to demonstrate that proposed budget costs are appropriate literacy expenditures*

A portion of the salary and benefits of the Reading Specialist (\$12,900 of \$69,782) is allocated from this Literacy Intervention funds but the majority of this salary is allocated to the general fund. The Reading Specialist takes the lead on the Literacy Intervention Program at Anser.

The expense for IRI proctoring of \$500 is to administer IRI testing in Fall, Winter, and Spring for Kindergarten, 1st grade, 2nd grade, and 3rd grade.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

+++++

- *Metrics to be chosen by the LEA to determine effectiveness of the Literacy Plan*
 - *Include current performance on these metrics if they are available*
 - *If current information is not available for a metric then the plan must include a note indicating the information is not available and when it will be available.*

As mentioned in the 2016-2017 Program Summary, we set a benchmark metric for specifically the Kindergarten and First Grade students who did not score “proficient” on the Spring IRI. Although the expectation is that the students will strive to become proficient by the Spring, there are some students who may not be developmentally ready to hit the end of the year marks, or students who may be struggling for other reasons (such as maybe having a learning disability). To make sure that those students do in fact grow throughout the year, we set a benchmark of growth when comparing the end-of-the-year measure – LSF in Kindergarten, and CBM in 1st Grade – with the same measure when assessed on the Fall IRI.

To that end, we will include these metrics chose by the LEA to determine effectiveness of the Literacy Plan. We adjusted last year’s benchmarks based on the students’ performance and the calculation error referenced earlier in this plan:

Improvement in % change of <i>non-proficient</i> kindergarteners on Kdg Spring LSF IRI when compared to LSF score on Fall IRI.	150% change	
Improvement in % change of <i>non-proficient</i> 1st Grade students on Grade 1 Spring CBM IRI when compared to CBM score on Fall IRI.	600% change	

We also are including metrics related to our students’ performance on the ISAT Spring 2017:

% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 3 ISAT	49%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 4 ISAT	66%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 5 ISAT	86%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 6 ISAT	70%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 7 ISAT	69%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 8 ISAT	68%

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Comprehensive Literacy Plan Alignment - REQUIRED (see Instructions)

+++++

In this section you should outline how your LEA's Literacy Intervention Plan and practices align to the Idaho Comprehensive Literacy Plan.

Collaborative Leadership

Anser Public Charter School works hard to provide teachers time to be collaborative leaders in our school. Grade level teams spend one afternoon each week together to develop curriculum, which integrates literacy throughout social studies, science and even mathematics. A Literacy Specialist position was created in 2015 to further support teachers and students with intervention support. Our school strives to communicate these efforts to our parent community.

Anser's Administrative department has consistently been supportive of the community of learners (both students and educators) by providing relevant staff development opportunities; being liaisons between parents, school board and staff for the purposes of promoting best practices in literacy (among other things); all for the purpose of cultivating common values in the area of literacy that are shared with parents, the community, the state agencies, the staff and other schools.

Developing Professional Educators

Anser staff have been provided with many sharing opportunities to collaborate with one another and with other educators within the EL Education network. Many of Anser's teachers have earned Master's Degrees in Reading and/or have participated in the Boise State Writing Project. The affiliation of Anser with the EL Education network ensures that teachers and staff are continually receiving professional development whether someone is a new teacher or has been in the classroom for years.

Effective Instruction and Interventions

As noted elsewhere in this document, Anser's Literacy Intervention Program uses research-based materials and strategies to instruct students in the area of Literacy.

Assessment and Data

Anser uses a variety of assessments – from screening the whole school (using the IRI, STAR and AIMSweb probes) to using a diagnostic assessment (such as CORE Phonics and Words Their Way spelling inventories) to determine what skills need to be either taught or reinforced, to progress monitoring students in order to make decisions as to the effectiveness of the intervention, to summative assessments (including ISAT) which informs us about the progress of individual students, as well as each grade level as a whole.

We have a standards based report card, and the teachers use assessments to report to parents regarding their child's academic growth.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM

(2017-2018)

Parent Involvement - REQUIRED

When a student is identified as needing additional intervention (based on the IRI), parents are given an opportunity to give input about their child's intervention plan. Parents are contacted by the child's teacher and are given information about the intervention and how it will be scheduled into their day. This school year, we will develop a more formal notification to parents; which will include not only their child's interventions, the schedule and the instructor(s), but also will lay out communication regarding the child's progress and the conditions under which a child may not need additional intervention support.

Celebrations are also a part of the communication as the children show growth. If the growth is not enough to "close" the achievement gap, a meeting is arranged with parents, the teacher, the Literacy Specialist - and as needed, the Education Director and/or the Student Support Specialist. During the meeting, a more formal plan may be put into place, which could include additional interventions and possible future testing if the interventions are not felt to be sufficient.

Anser's Literacy Intervention Program is communicated to the Anser Board and Family Council in the annual Board Report we must submit to the Boise School District, Anser's charter authorizer. It is also featured on our website, which is accessible by any member of our community.

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

REQUIRED Performance Metrics (must be included in LEA Continuous Improvement Plan)	SY 2015-16 (Yr 1)	SY 2016-17 (Yr 2)	Improvement / Change (Yr 2 – Yr 1)	Benchmarks (LEA Chosen Spring 2018 Performance Targets)
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Kindergarten Spring IRI	21 / 38 students	22 / 36 students	+1 student	25 / 36 students
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Kindergarten Spring IRI	55.3%	61.1%	+5.8 pp	69.4%
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 1 Spring IRI	24 / 38 students	19 / 35 students	-5 students	24 / 36 students
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 1 Spring IRI	63.1%	54.2%	-8.9 pp	66.7%
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 2 Spring IRI	28 / 36 students	26 / 36 students	-2 students	29 / 35 students
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 2 Spring IRI	77.8%	72.2%	-5.6 pp	82.3%
# of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 3 Spring IRI	33 / 39 students	31 / 35 students	-2 students	32 / 37 students
% of students who scored "proficient" on the Grade 3 Spring IRI	84.6%	88.6%	+4 pp	86.4%
OPTIONAL Performance Metrics	SY 2015-16 (Yr 1)	SY 2016-17 (Yr 2)	Improvement / Change (Yr 2 – Yr 1)	Benchmarks (LEA Chosen Spring 2018 Performance Targets)
Improvement in % change of <i>non-proficient</i> kindergarteners on Kdg Spring LSF IRI when compared to LSF score on Fall IRI.	Metric developed in 16-17 Data not available	132.7% growth	% of change data available in Spring 2018	150% growth
Improvement in % change of <i>non-proficient</i> 1st Grade students on Grade 1 Spring CBM IRI when compared to CBM score on Fall IRI.	Metric developed in 16-17 Data not available	545.3% growth	% of change data available in Spring 2018	600% growth
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 3 ISAT	59% out of 39 students	49% out of 35 students	-10pp	59%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 4 ISAT	78% out of 36 students	66% out of 38 students	-12pp	73%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 5 ISAT	76% out of 42 students	86% out of 37 students	10pp	87%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 6 ISAT	60% out of 52 students	70% out of 50 students	10pp	72%

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 7 ISAT	68% out of 50 students	68% out of 51 students	1pp	71%
% of students who scored proficient or advanced on the ELA section of the Grade 8 ISAT	78% out of 50 students	68% out of 50 students	-10pp	78%

Performance Metrics Notes

Note: Anser experienced a high volume of internet outages during the period of testing for 3rd -6th grade. The students testing during this time had their testing interrupted and had to restart multiple times. Anser had to request a testing extension from the State due to the issue. After replacing our modem, firewall, content filter and changing the port we used, the problem persisted. Our service provider, Cableone, could not identify the problem, so paid for an outside consultant to investigate. Every remedy suggested by the consultant was implemented but did not work to resolve the issue. Cableone replaced the entire cable line coming in to Anser, which resolved the problem, in June. We believe that the internet challenges impacted the scores for these students. As a result, we are also providing their STAR scores for what we feel is a more accurate depiction of their abilities.

Comparing ISAT data versus STAR data for SY 2016-2017	STAR 16-17	ISAT 16-17	
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 6 on the 6th grade STAR Spring READING assessment.	82.3% out of 51 students	70% out of 50 students	STAR results are 12.3pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 6 on the 6th grade STAR Spring MATH assessment.	76.5% out of 51 students	46% out of 50 students	STAR results are 30.5pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 5 on the 5th grade STAR Spring READING assessment.	86.5% out of 37 students	86% out of 37 students	STAR results are .5pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 5 on the 5th grade STAR Spring MATH assessment.	83.8% out of 37 students	68% out of 37 students	STAR results are 15.8pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 4 on the 4th grade STAR Spring READING assessment.	81.6% out of 38 students	66% out of 38 students	STAR results are 15.6pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 4 on the 4th grade STAR Spring MATH assessment.	69.4% out of 36 students	63% out of 38 students	STAR results are 6.4pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 3 on the 3rd grade STAR Spring READING assessment.	71.4% out of 35 students	49% out of 35 students	STAR results are 22.4pp difference than ISAT results
# and % of students scoring 50%ile - 75%ile and above in grade 3 on the 3rd grade STAR Spring MATH assessment.	54.3% out of 35 students	66% out of 35 students	STAR results are - 11.7pp difference than ISAT results

LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAM (2017-2018)

Budget Instructions: Provide the projected literacy plan budget on **Template 2**. Please note that the budget template includes more than one tab.

Please proceed to the Literacy Intervention Program Budget and Expenditures Template 2

Other Notes / Comments

LITERACY INTERVENTION PLAN - PROPOSED BUDGET
2017-2018

District Name and Number:		Anser Public Charter School (492)				
Estimated Total Literacy Funding for 2017-2018 :		\$12,900.00				
PERSONNEL COSTS						
Position / Item	Details	FTE	Cost Per FTE	Total Cost	Proposed Budget Amount from Literacy Funds	Amount from Other Funds
EXAMPLE: Literacy Paraprofessionals	4 Paraprofessionals, 15 hrs per week x \$12 per hour	1.5	24,960.00	37,440.00	37,440.00	0.00
Reading Specialist	1 Reading Specialist, 40 hours per week	1.0	57,428.00	57,428.00	12,900.00	44,528.00
IRI Testing	Testing Proctors			500.00		500.00
Benefits	PERSI, Health Insurance	1.0	12,354.00	12,354.00		12,354.00
Personnel Subtotal				70,282.00	12,900.00	57,382.00
PROGRAMS / CURRICULA COSTS						
Item	Details	# Items	Cost Per Item	Total Cost	Proposed Budget Amount from Literacy Funds	Amount from Other Funds
EXAMPLE: iStation Reading Curriculum	Licenses for all students who need interventions	29	56.00	1,624.00	1,200.00	424.00
				0.00		0.00
				0.00		0.00
				0.00		0.00
Programs / Curricula Subtotal				0.00	0.00	0.00
TRANSPORTATION COSTS (NOTE: Literacy Funds may not be used in excess of \$100 per student for transportation)						
Item	Details	# Students	Cost Per Student	Total Cost	Proposed Budget Amount from Literacy Funds	Amount from Other Funds
EXAMPLE: Bussing	Roundtrip for eligible students for summer school	29	330.00	9,570.00	2,900.00	6,670.00
				0.00		0.00
				0.00		0.00
Transportation Subtotal				0.00	0.00	0.00
OTHER COSTS						
Item	Details	# Items	Cost Per Item	Total Cost	Proposed Budget Amount from Literacy Funds	Amount from Other Funds
EXAMPLE: Tablet computers	1 per eligible student for using iStation	29	600.00	17,400.00	14,400.00	3,000.00
				0.00		0.00
				0.00		0.00
Other Costs Subtotal				0.00	0.00	0.00
TOTAL COSTS & BUDGET				\$70,282.00	\$12,900.00	\$57,382.00