



# An analysis of Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program



Institute of Education Sciences  
U.S. Department of Education



# An analysis of Utah's K–3 Reading Improvement Program

June 2007

Prepared by

**Reino Makkonen**  
WestEd


**Chun-Wei Huang**  
WestEd

**Paul Koehler**  
WestEd



Institute of Education Sciences

U.S. Department of Education



**Issues & Answers** is an ongoing series of reports from short-term Fast Response Projects conducted by the regional educational laboratories on current education issues of importance at local, state, and regional levels. Fast Response Project topics change to reflect new issues, as identified through lab outreach and requests for assistance from policymakers and educators at state and local levels and from communities, businesses, parents, families, and youth. All Issues & Answers reports meet Institute of Education Sciences standards for scientifically valid research.

June 2007

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-06-CO-0014 by Regional Educational Laboratory West administered by WestEd. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Makkonen, R., Huang, C-W, & Koehler, P. (2007). *An analysis of Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 002). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory West. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

This report is available on the regional educational laboratory web site at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

## Summary

# An analysis of Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program

### **More districts and charter schools reported implementing key elements of the state literacy framework and meeting their own goals.**

Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program provides state matching funds to help districts and charter schools achieve the state's goal of having third graders read at or above grade level. All 40 Utah school districts took part in both Year 1 (2004/05) and Year 2 (2005/06) of the program, and the number of participating charter schools increased from 10 (of 12) in Year 1 to 17 (of 20) in Year 2.

With the aim of informing Utah legislators and education officials on program activities, use of funds, and outcomes, Utah's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Patti Harrington, asked Regional Education Laboratory West at WestEd to review district and charter school participation during the first two years of the program. The Year 1 analysis was presented in early 2006.

This report presents the Year 2 analysis, which addresses the following key questions:

- How have participating school districts and charter schools carried out the provisions of the state legislation?

Program funds most commonly supported key components of the Utah K-3 Literacy Framework for Successful Instruction and Intervention, specifically tiered literacy instruction (a targeted reading intervention model), small-group literacy instruction, and focused professional development. More than two-thirds of program participants also reported funding literacy coaches or reading specialists and training for staff to administer and interpret reading assessments to monitor student progress and guide instruction. Both tiered and small-group instruction were used more widely in Year 2 than in Year 1, as were the state's Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program, new basal reading programs and leveled reading libraries, and before- and after-school literacy programs.

- What outcomes are evident after two years of program implementation?

More participating districts and charters reported meeting their self-established goals in Year 2, and statewide grade-level proficiency rates—identified through English Language Arts Criterion-Referenced Test results—increased slightly for grades 1 and 3 but remained about the same for

grade 2. However, it is difficult to assess the program's influence on these changes, as there is no control group and researchers did not observe the local efforts under way in schools.

**June 2007**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Summary</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Overview</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>How have participating school districts and charter schools carried out the provisions of the legislation?</b>	<b>2</b>
Program funds increasingly supported methods emphasized in the state’s literacy framework	2
Participants applied funds across five program components	3
Practices funded by the program generally aligned with national reading research	6
<b>What outcomes are evident so far?</b>	<b>7</b>
More participants met self-reported goals in Year 2	7
More Criterion-Referenced Test proficiency gains at grades 1 and 3	7
<b>Limitations of the study and implications for further research</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Appendix A The SB 230 legislation</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Appendix B Utah’s K–3 Reading Improvement Program: state and local funding for fiscal 2005–07</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix C Summary of WestEd’s SB 230 Year 1 Report</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix D Self-reported SB 230 program information by district or charter school</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix E Individual district and charter school data: self-reported proficiency goals and results</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>89</b>
<b>Boxes</b>	
1 Data sources and study limitations	2
2 K–3 Reading Improvement Program funding in Year 2	3
<b>Figures</b>	
1 More participants reported meeting self-reported proficiency goals in Year 2 than in Year 1	7
2 Criterion-Referenced Test proficiency rates increased more in Year 2 than in Year 1 in grades 1 and 3, but not grade 2	8
3 Overall grade-level Criterion-Referenced Test proficiency rates rose more in Year 2 than in Year 1, except at grade 2	8
<b>Tables</b>	
1 Self-reported uses of program funds show widespread support of methods from Utah’s literacy framework	3
2 Some school districts targeted a specific proficiency level on the Criterion-Referenced Test, others an annual gain	6
<b>B1 Districts</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>B2 Charter schools</b>	<b>15</b>

# More districts and charter schools reported implementing key elements of the state literacy framework and meeting their own goals.

## OVERVIEW

Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program provides state matching funds to help districts and charter schools achieve the state's goal of having third graders read at or above grade level. All 40 Utah school districts took part in both Year 1 (2004/05) and Year 2 (2005/06) of the program, and the number of participating charter schools increased from 10 (of 12) in Year 1 to 17 (of 20) in Year 2.

With the aim of informing Utah legislators and education officials on program activities, use of funds, and outcomes, Utah's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Patti Harrington, asked Regional Education Laboratory West at WestEd to review district and charter school participation during the first two years of the program. In early 2006 WestEd presented its Year 1 analysis to the Utah State Board of Education, the state Legislative Committee on Education, and the state's school districts.

This report presents the Year 2 analysis (see box 1 for data sources and study limitations), which addresses the following key questions:

- How have participating school districts and charter schools carried out the provisions of the state legislation?

Program funds most commonly supported key components of the Utah K-3 Literacy Framework for Successful Instruction and Intervention, specifically tiered literacy instruction (a targeted reading intervention model), small-group literacy instruction, and focused professional development. More than two-thirds of program participants also reported funding literacy coaches or reading specialists and training for staff to administer and interpret reading assessments to monitor student progress and guide instruction. Both tiered and small-group instruction were used more widely in Year 2 than in Year 1, as were the state's Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program, new basal reading programs and leveled reading libraries, and before- and after-school literacy programs.

- What outcomes are evident after two years of program implementation?

More participating districts and charters reported meeting their self-established goals in Year 2, and statewide grade-level proficiency rates—identified through English Language Arts Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) results—increased slightly for grades 1 and 3 but remained about the same for grade 2. However, it is difficult to assess the program's influence on these changes, as there is no control group and researchers did not observe the local efforts under way in schools. The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) should continue its efforts to ensure that participants implement research-based literacy strategies correctly and with technical fidelity.

## BOX 1

**Data sources and study limitations**

Data analysis relied on two sources of data: the year-end Annual Reading Proficiency Reports, submitted to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) in the fall of 2006 by districts and charter schools participating in Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program, and the English Language

Arts Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) data files provided by the USOE.

The proficiency reports contained self-reported data from the districts and charter schools on proficiency goals and use of funds. Schools participating in the program are required to report progress annually to the state. The CRT scores were used to obtain aggregated proficiency rates for each program participant in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

Both the self-reported data and the CRT data were reviewed to get a broad view of reading and literacy levels in participating districts and charter schools. The analysis was limited to self-reported data (see appendix D). Because the researchers made no site visits and were unable to observe local implementation of any reported practices, this report cannot address the quality of local efforts.

### HOW HAVE PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS CARRIED OUT THE PROVISIONS OF THE LEGISLATION?

To receive program monies from the state, participating districts must match the funds with an amount based on a formula.<sup>1</sup> Most districts use these program monies along with other literacy-improvement funds.<sup>2</sup> (Appendix B reports fiscal 2005-07 funding allocated to each district and charter school.)

The USOE guides implementation of the K-3 Reading Improvement Program. Prospective program participants submit their literacy plans to the USOE for approval, and the office counsels participating districts and charter schools on research-based uses of program funds and hosts literacy institutes and training.

#### Program funds increasingly supported methods emphasized in the state's literacy framework

Most program participants reported using program funds (box 2) to implement key components of the state literacy framework, such as tiered instruction, small-group instruction, and focused professional development, which were each implemented by more than 75 percent of participants (table 1). More than 70 percent also used state funds to pay for literacy coaches or reading specialists, and almost 70 percent of participants reported using funds to train staff to administer and

interpret the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) reading assessments to better monitor student progress. These were the most common practices in Year 1 as well.

Self-reports also indicated that certain program practices were used more broadly among participants in Year 2 than in Year 1. Tiered instruction and small-group instruction—key strategies promoted in the state literacy framework—rose from approximately 60 percent and 65 percent of participants in Year 1 to more than 75 percent in Year 2. Other activities more widely implemented in Year 2 included the state's Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program (up from 31 percent of participants in Year 1 to 47 percent in Year 2), new basal reading programs (19 percent in Year 1 and 28 percent in Year 2), and before- or after-school literacy programs (13 percent in Year 1 and 21 percent in Year 2).

#### Participants applied funds across five program components

The legislation for the Reading Improvement Program requires participants to report annually on five aspects of their literacy plans: assessment tools, intervention strategies, professional development, reading performance standards, and measurable goals.

*Assessment tools.* According to the Utah K-3 Literacy Framework for Successful Instruction and



BOX 2

**K–3 Reading Improvement Program funding in Year 2**

In Year 2 Utah disbursed nearly \$12.3 million to its 40 districts for the K–3 Reading Improvement Program, and all 40 districts matched the state funds, with some districts

even exceeding the required match (see table). The state also disbursed \$212,645 to 17 participating charter schools (charter schools are not required to provide matching funds), for a total of \$24.8 million. (Appendix B shows state and local funding levels by individual districts and charter schools.)

**Funding amounts in Year 2**

Source	Amount
State funds to districts	\$12,287,355
District matching funds	12,348,629
State funds to charters	212,645
Total	\$24,848,629

TABLE 1

**Self-reported uses of program funds show widespread support of methods from Utah’s literacy framework**

Activity supported by state funds	Year 1 2004/05 school year (number = 48) <sup>a</sup>		Year 2 2005/06 school year (number = 53) <sup>a</sup>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Tiered literacy instruction (Utah literacy model)	29	60	41	77
Small-group classroom literacy instruction	31	65	40	76
Professional development for K–3 teachers on Utah literacy model	33	69	40	76
Literacy coaches	34	71	38	72
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills testing	32	67	37	70
Alignment of literacy instruction with Utah Core Curriculum	30	63	35	66
Leveled classroom or take-home reading libraries	20	42	26	49
Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program	15	31	25	47
Professional learning communities or study groups focused on literacy	22	46	25	47
Summer literacy program	16	33	20	38
Utah Principals Literacy Institute	19	40	20	38
New basal reading program	9	19	15	28
Before- or after-school literacy program	6	13	11	21
Full-day kindergarten	7	15	9	17

a. The number of districts and charter schools that submitted completed Utah K–3 Literacy Initiative Checklists of Practices to the Utah State Office of Education by October 20, 2006. All 40 districts are included in both 2004/05 and 2005/06, along with 8 charter schools in Year 1 and 13 in Year 2.

Intervention, districts and schools are expected “to identify appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and monitor student progress” (Utah State Office of Education, 2005b, p. H6). With no statewide elementary reading test in place and no common assessment mandated by the program, participating districts and charter schools have used a variety of formative and summative measures to monitor and assess students’ reading progress.

*Kindergarten.* Because the statewide English Language Arts CRT begins at grade 1, most program

participants assess their kindergarten students using DIBELS, a set of standardized measures of early reading skills that are used to monitor literacy growth over a school year. Usually administered in fall, winter, and spring, DIBELS assessments allow teachers to measure a student’s progress toward developmental benchmarks and to plan the student’s instruction accordingly. The DIBELS end-of-year assessments, based on nationally normed benchmark scores, include three levels of proficiency: deficit/at risk, emergent/some risk, and established/low risk.<sup>3</sup> Twenty-five

districts and three charter schools reported using DIBELS at the kindergarten level during Year 2. Overall, nearly 70 percent of participants reported using program funds in both Year 1 and Year 2 for training staff to administer and interpret DIBELS.

**More than 70 percent of participants reported using program funds to hire additional literacy specialists, coaches, or aides to assist in supplemental instruction and tutoring**

Other kindergarten reading measures used in Year 2 include the USOE Kindergarten Assessments (pre- and post-tests), the Developmental Reading Assessment, the Texas Primary Reading Inventory, the Curriculum-Based Measurement, and the Qualitative Reading Inventory, as well as local assessments developed by individual

school districts or charter schools. Several school districts reported using multiple assessment instruments to measure kindergartners' reading progress.

*Grades 1–3.* The Utah English Language Arts CRT is administered to students in grades 1–3 in the spring to measure their knowledge and skills in reading, writing, and listening, as outlined in the state's Elementary Language Arts Core Curriculum. The CRT measures an individual student's performance against the curriculum and indicates mastery of the subject matter. Although not focused entirely on reading, the statewide English Language CRT nonetheless measures such key literacy components as concepts of print (first grade), phonemic awareness (first grade), phonics, spelling, vocabulary, and comprehension. Performance levels are tied to the "cut score" for passing, which differs at each grade level, with students scoring in Levels 3 and 4 on the CRT considered proficient on Utah's core curriculum.<sup>4</sup> Level 1 is minimal (at least one standard deviation below the cut score), Level 2 is partial (no more than one standard deviation below the cut score), Level 3 is sufficient (equal to the cut score), and Level 4 is substantial (at least one standard deviation above the cut score).

Because the core curriculum "clearly defines what all students should know and be able to

do at the various grade levels within the critical areas of the literacy process" (Utah State Office of Education, 2005b, p. H7) and because the state's English Language Arts CRT is tightly aligned to the core curriculum, almost 90 percent of Year 2 program participants used the summative English Language Arts CRT as a part of their program assessment strategy. However, because a gain score within one school year cannot be reliably determined using the English Language Arts CRT (Utah State Office of Education, 2005a, p. 4), 16 participating districts and 6 participating charter schools combined multiple assessment measures to evaluate and monitor their students' reading progress. Additional tests administered at grades 1–3 included DIBELS, the Development Reading Assessment, the Qualitative Reading Inventory, the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and internal district- or school-developed grade-level measures.

*Intervention strategies.* Utah's K–3 literacy framework states that "early and appropriate intervention with research-based practices is critical" if all students are to become successful readers (Utah State Office of Education, 2005b, p. H2). Utah's model for targeted intervention is known as tiered instruction. Tier 1 is reading instruction delivered by the classroom teacher for two to three hours daily; tier 2 is supplemental, small-group instruction for students who are not proficient readers; and tier 3 is intensive intervention with the most at-risk readers, often provided by a reading specialist, literacy coach, or special education teacher. More than 75 percent of participants reported using the tiered instruction model as part of their literacy improvement strategy in Year 2, compared with 60 percent in Year 1.

Participating districts and charter schools used a variety of other literacy interventions. More than 70 percent reported using program funds to hire additional literacy specialists, coaches, or aides to assist in supplemental instruction and tutoring and small-group instruction and progress monitoring. Seventeen districts and five charter schools also reported using program funds to provide school-based reading interventions before school,

after school, or in the summer. Twenty districts and six charters expanded their libraries of leveled reading books, and 25 participants (about 47 percent) implemented the Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program, a substantial increase over Year 1 (31 percent). Appendix D provides additional detail about the specific reading interventions reported by program participants in Year 2.

*Professional development.* Utah’s literacy framework recommends that schools and districts “should maintain a focus on high-quality instruction by organizing and allocating resources to provide quality professional development aligned with data-driven needs” (Utah State Office of Education, 2005b, p. H5). Most Year 2 participants heeded that advice, with more than 75 percent (up from 69 percent in Year 1) dedicating program funds to support professional development based on the Utah literacy framework.

In both Year 1 and Year 2 many districts and charter schools reported using state program funds to employ literacy coaches or reading specialists, mainly to help teachers instruct students in the five core literacy skills identified by the National Reading Panel: phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Year 2 efforts also included training teachers to use literacy assessments, such as DIBELS and the Developmental Reading Assessment, in a formative way, by using the data to monitor progress, differentiate instruction, and design interventions for struggling readers.

Appendix D lists specific professional development activities reported by each Year 2 program participant. (This study did not involve any site visits or classroom observations to evaluate these local efforts.)

*Reading performance standards.* Program participants expected their K–3 students to meet primarily the eight standards (and accompanying objectives and indicators) included in the USOE Elementary Language Arts Core Curriculum, as they had in Year 1. Reflecting current literacy

research, these standards cover oral language, concepts of print, phonological and phonemic awareness, phonics and spelling, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing. (For details see the state language arts curriculum at [www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/core/core.htm](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/core/core.htm).)

*Measurable goals.* Participants’ literacy improvement plans must incorporate specific, measurable goals based on student gain scores. Because there is no statewide standard for student progress, the state leaves goal setting and assessment to participants. Therefore, performance targets vary by participant, with some districts and charter schools setting more ambitious goals than others.

Although the overall objective of the state’s K–3 Reading Improvement Program is to ensure that all Utah third graders “read at or above grade level,” this term and its measurement have not been specifically defined. Participants generally sought continuous improvement marked by increases in the overall percentages of students reading at the proficient level, as measured by various assessments. Some targeted cohort gains (following the same group of students over time), while others sought grade-level improvements (for example, 2005/06 first graders performing better than 2004/05 first graders). Many districts and charter schools sought performance gains within the 2005/06 school year and administered pre- and post-assessments to evaluate student progress.

**Although the objective of the program is to ensure that all Utah third graders “read at or above grade level,” this term and its measurement have not been specifically defined**

Program participants using DIBELS set goals for gains in the number of students achieving a benchmark score or achieving a proficiency level. For example, districts reported such benchmark-related goals as “2 percent more students at benchmark in spring 2006 than in spring 2005” and “10 percent fewer students not at benchmark.” Others sought such proficiency-level

TABLE 2

**Some school districts targeted a specific proficiency level on the Criterion-Referenced Test, others an annual gain**

Specific percentage of students proficient in 2005/06 <sup>a</sup>		Cohort or grade-level gain <sup>b</sup> (2004/05 to 2005/06)
District	Proficiency level (percent)	
Cache	90	Alpine
Carbon	77	Box Elder
Daggett	75	Davis
Grand	78	Duchesne
Jordan	70	Emery
Juab	85	Garfield
Kane	73	Granite
Millard	72	Iron
Morgan	85	Logan
Murray	80	Ogden
Nebo	75	Park City
North Sanpete	74	Provo
North Summit	80	Salt Lake
Piute	75	South Summit
Sevier	71	Tintic
South Sanpete	80	Washington <sup>c</sup>
Tooele	77	
Uintah	71	
Wasatch	72	
Washington <sup>c</sup>	80	
Wayne	77	

Note: Beaver, Rich, San Juan, and Weber did not report using the English Language Arts CRT as part of their assessment strategy.

a. Proficiency targets rounded to nearest unit. For districts that targeted a performance range or had different proficiency goals at different grade levels, only the lowest goal is listed.

b. For details, see appendix E.

c. Sought either an 80 percent proficiency rate or a 10 percent gain.

Source: 2005/06 annual reading proficiency reports submitted to the Utah State Office of Education by October 20, 2006.

improvements as “10 percent decrease in at risk” or “80 percent ‘established’ or ‘emerging.’”

With students scoring in Levels 3 and 4 on the CRT considered proficient on Utah’s Elementary Language Arts Core Curriculum, participants commonly sought consistent increases in the

proportion of students scoring in this range at each grade level. (Improvement trajectories obviously differed due to varying baseline scores among participants.) Most districts and charter schools sought to have a high proportion (usually 75–90 percent) of their students achieving a score of proficient on the CRT, while others simply targeted a yearly improvement (table 2). Appendix E provides additional information about the proficiency goals set by each Year 2 program participant.

**Practices funded by the program generally aligned with national reading research**

Review of the available evidence indicated that the literacy improvement practices funded by the program in Year 2 are generally aligned with strategies advocated by national reading research. For example, the federal Reading First program shares the K–3 Reading Improvement Program’s goal of ensuring that every child read at grade level or above by the end of third grade. Reading First champions the five essential components of reading instruction as identified by the National Reading Panel, assessment strategies for diagnosing student needs and measuring progress, and professional development that helps teachers meet the reading needs of individual students. Reading First’s research also emphasizes small-group instruction and flexible in-class grouping based on ongoing assessment (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 6).<sup>5</sup>

These are also the core tenets of Utah’s literacy framework. The USOE also offers more direct, hands-on support through site visits and regular training, which, like the state framework, have been designed to align with Reading First. State officials reported that more Utah reading teachers are now discussing student instruction and outcomes among themselves, that ongoing assessments are inspiring smarter decisions, and that classroom literacy instruction has become more focused and explicit.<sup>6</sup>

Because the analysis was limited to self-reported data, however, and the researchers made no site

visits, this report cannot address the quality of these efforts

**WHAT OUTCOMES ARE EVIDENT SO FAR?**

This section summarizes program participants’ K–3 literacy proficiency goals and results.<sup>7</sup> Performance targets varied by participant—often as a result of the differing literacy assessments used—with some districts or charters reporting more ambitious goals than others. (Appendix E presents individual participants’ self-reported proficiency goals and results.)

**More participants met self-reported goals in Year 2**

Each fall participating districts and charter schools set their literacy goals for the coming school year. Of the districts and charter schools that participated in the first two years of the program, more reported meeting their grade-level goals in Year 2 than in Year 1 (figure 1).

Additionally, many participants reported meeting their grade-level proficiency goals over both program years. Thirty-three districts and charter schools (67 percent of participants) reported meeting all their kindergarten goals in both Years 1 and 2, and 22 participants (45 percent) reported meeting all their proficiency goals in grades 1 and 2 in both program years. Twenty-six districts and charters (53 percent of participants) reported meeting all of their grade 3 goals in both years. Twelve districts and two charter schools (29 percent of participants) reported meeting all of their K–3 proficiency goals in both program years.

**More Criterion-Referenced Test proficiency gains at grades 1 and 3**


The research team used elementary students’ English Language Arts CRT scaled scores to obtain proficiency rates for each district or charter school participating in the program in 2004, 2005, and 2006 and then calculated changes in proficiency rates from 2004 to 2005 and 2005 to

2006 (figure 2). Twenty-six Utah school districts (65 percent) increased their first grade proficiency rate from 2005 to 2006, up from 17 (43 percent) between 2004 and 2005. Similarly, 24 districts (60 percent) increased their third grade proficiency rate from 2005 to 2006, whereas 20 (50 percent) had done so the previous year. At grade 2, however, only 19 districts (48 percent) increased their proficiency rate from 2005 to 2006, down from 23 (58 percent) the previous year.

**Twelve districts and two charter schools reported meeting all of their K–3 proficiency goals in both program years**

After Year 1 of the program 77.3 percent of first graders were considered proficient on the English Language Arts CRT. After Year 2 the share rose to 77.9 percent (figure 3). Slight proficiency rate increases were also found at grade 3 and for all participating K–3 students. These increases were statistically significant.<sup>8</sup> At grade 2 the overall proficiency rate decreased slightly (from 79.8 percent to 79.6 percent), but the difference was not statistically significant. Because of data limitations, English Language Arts CRT proficiency


**FIGURE 1**  
**More participants reported meeting self-reported proficiency goals in Year 2 than in Year 1**



Note: Totals are based on the 40 districts and 9 charter schools that submitted both Year 1 and Year 2 goal reports to the Utah State Office of Education.

FIGURE 2

**Criterion-Referenced Test proficiency rates increased more in Year 2 than in Year 1 in grades 1 and 3, but not grade 2**



Note: All 40 districts participated in both program years. Participating charter schools were excluded because their smaller enrollments tended to dramatically shift their proficiency rates from year to year. In part because of the relatively small number of districts in Utah, none of the year-to-year changes were statistically significant at the 5 percent level using a z-test.

rates are compared for different student cohorts at each grade level (for example, for 2004/05 and 2005/06 first graders). Thus, while it may be reasonable to assume that the characteristics of each Utah grade-level cohort are similar, the grade-level comparisons should be interpreted with caution. Isolating the Reading Improvement Program's influence on statewide English Language Arts CRT results was beyond the scope of this study.


## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

After the implementing legislation was passed in 2004, the K-3 Reading Improvement Program was immediately embraced, with all 40 of the state's school districts signing on. As a result, no control group exists for comparison, and it is impossible to contrast participants and nonparticipants. Thus, any relationship subsequently identified between the program

The English Language Arts CRT changes discussed in this report could have been influenced by any number of factors

FIGURE 3

**Overall grade-level Criterion-Referenced Test proficiency rates rose more in Year 2 than in Year 1, except at grade 2**



Note: All district students taking the English Language Arts Criterion-Referenced Test in the specified years were included in the calculations. These district (noncharter) students constitute most of the relevant population. The data compare different student cohorts at each grade level (for example, 2004/05 first graders and 2005/06 first graders) because data limitations did not permit tracking the same cohorts over time.

a. Statistically significant at the 5 percent level using a z-test.

and student achievement outcomes is correlational at best and does not imply that the program caused the results. The English Language Arts CRT changes discussed in this report could have been influenced by any number of factors.<sup>9</sup>

Through statewide training USOE officials have worked to align program implementation with research-based strategies. However, the research team for this report did not conduct site visits to observe local implementation of reported activities, as this was beyond the scope of the study. As a result, it was not possible to evaluate the quality of the literacy efforts under way in schools and classrooms. In all likelihood the quality of these local efforts varied. Utah should continue its efforts to see that districts and charter schools have the capacity to ensure that school staff implement research-based literacy strategies correctly and with technical fidelity. The state may also want to consider supporting more research on program implementation, including site visits, to evaluate the quality of

local efforts and the extent to which they meet the spirit of the law.

The stated goal of the legislation is to ensure that all Utah third graders are “reading at or above grade level,” yet the state has not specifically defined what this means. Doing so would be an important step forward, helping participants to set clearer goals and strengthening evaluation efforts. And finally, to allow for more insightful evaluation in the future, as Utah policymakers consider legislating any new program, they may also want to consider how to measure that program’s effects. Possible scenarios might include mandating a detailed evaluation procedure in the statute or specifying the allocation of program funds based on specific criteria.

---

## NOTES

1. Utah Code 53A-17a-151: “Each local school board may levy a tax rate of up to .000121 per dollar of taxable value for funding the school district’s K-3 Reading Improvement Program. The levy authorized under this section is in addition to any other levy. . . . A local school board shall establish its board-approved levy under this section by June 1 to have the levy apply to the fiscal year beginning July 1 in that same calendar year.”
2. Local literacy improvement efforts in Utah are supported by a variety of funding sources, including local taxes and levies; federal Reading First monies; Title I and special education funds; trust funds; and Parent Teacher Association, community, and business contributions.
3. DIBELS assesses initial sounds fluency, phoneme segmentation fluency, letter naming fluency, nonsense word fluency, and oral reading fluency. For more information about DIBELS, visit the DIBELS Web site, hosted by the University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning, <http://dibels.uoregon.edu/index.php>.
4. The Utah Elementary Language Arts Core Curriculum describes the research base underlying each of the state’s eight standards and includes suggestions for teacher delivery, assessment, differentiation, and home connections. It is available online at [www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/core/core.htm](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/core/core.htm).
5. In 2005/06 Reading First supported literacy training in 18 schools across Utah’s Duchesne, Granite, North Sanpete, Ogden, Salt Lake, and San Juan districts. For more information about Reading First in Utah, visit [www.schools.utah.gov/curr/readingfirst/about.htm](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/readingfirst/about.htm).
6. December 2006 interview with Lynne Greenwood, USOE elementary language arts specialist and chief program officer.
7. At the request of Utah Superintendent of Public Instruction Patti Harrington, the research team investigated the relationship between program activities and student achievement gains. To do so, the team employed a statistical method known as hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) to examine how certain school characteristics and district program activities were descriptively related to English Language Arts CRT scores (aggregated to the school level). However, the available data had two major limitations: 1) For participating districts, the data lacked school-level information about program activities; and 2) they lacked a clear set of comparison districts for examining the relationship between various program activities and school-level gains. Because of these limitations, the findings were not sufficient to warrant any inferences about such relationships. Thus, the HLM results are not included in this report.
8. Slightly different z-test calculations were used for figures 2 and 3. The z-test for figure 2 assessed the proportion differences for two dependent samples, while the z-test for figure 3 assessed the proportion differences from two independent samples. This methodology

is described in further detail in Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (1998).

9. For example, some of the literature suggests that small improvements may be due simply to the consistent application of statewide accountability policies and assessments.

Research by the University of Colorado's Robert Linn on behalf of the federally funded Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing ([www.cse.ucla.edu/](http://www.cse.ucla.edu/)) has shown that some year-to-year improvements are to be expected as teachers and principals grow more accustomed to statewide tests.



## APPENDIX A THE SB 230 LEGISLATION

Utah Code Title 53A, Chapter 17a, Section 150  
The K–3 Reading Improvement Program  
Enacted by Chapter 305, 2004 General Session (SB230)

- (1) As used in this section:
  - (a) “program” means the K–3 Reading Improvement Program; and
  - (b) “program monies” means:
    - (i) school district revenue from the levy authorized under Section 53A-17a-151;
    - (ii) school district revenue allocated to the program from other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, for the purpose of receiving state funds under this section; and
    - (iii) monies appropriated by the Legislature to the program.
- (2) The K–3 Reading Improvement Program consists of program monies and is created to achieve the state’s goal of having third graders reading at or above grade level.
- (3) Subject to future budget constraints, the Legislature may annually appropriate money to the K–3 Reading Improvement Program.
- (4) (a) Prior to using program monies, a school district or charter school shall submit a plan to the State Board of Education for reading proficiency improvement that incorporates the following components:
  - (i) assessment;
  - (ii) intervention strategies;
  - (iii) professional development;
  - (iv) reading performance standards; and
  - (v) specific measurable goals that are based upon gain scores.
- (b) The State Board of Education shall provide model plans which a school district or charter school may use, or the district or school may develop its own plan.
- (c) Plans developed by a school district or charter school shall be approved by the State Board of Education.
- (5) There is created within the K–3 Reading Improvement Program three funding programs:
  - (a) the Base Level Program;
  - (b) the Guarantee Program; and
  - (c) the Low Income Students Program.
- (6) Monies appropriated to the State Board of Education for the K–3 Reading Improvement Program shall be allocated to the three funding programs as follows:
  - (a) 8% to the Base Level Program;
  - (b) 46% to the Guarantee Program; and
  - (c) 46% to the Low Income Students Program.
- (7) (a) To participate in the Base Level Program, a school district or charter school shall submit a reading proficiency improvement plan to the State Board of Education as provided in Subsection (4) and must receive approval of the plan from the board.
  - (b) (i) Each school district qualifying for Base Level Program funds and the qualifying elementary charter schools combined shall receive a base amount.

- (ii) The base amount for the qualifying elementary charter schools combined shall be allocated among each school in an amount proportionate to:
    - (A) each existing charter school's prior year fall enrollment in grades kindergarten through grade 3; and
    - (B) each new charter school's estimated fall enrollment in grades kindergarten through grade 3.
- (8) (a) A school district that applies for program monies in excess of the Base Level Program funds shall choose to first participate in either the Guarantee Program or the Low Income Students Program.
- (b) A school district must fully participate in either the Guarantee Program or the Low Income Students Program before it may elect to either fully or partially participate in the other program.
- (c) To fully participate in the Guarantee Program, a school district shall:
- (i) levy a tax rate of .000056 under Section 53A-17a-151;
  - (ii) allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, equal to the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000056; or
  - (iii) levy a tax under Section 53A-17a-151 and allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, so that the total revenue from the combined revenue sources equals the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000056.
- (d) To fully participate in the Low Income Students Program, a school district shall:
- (i) levy a tax rate of .000065 under Section 53A-17a-151;
  - (ii) allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, equal to the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000065; or
  - (iii) levy a tax under Section 53A-17a-151 and allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, so that the total revenue from the combined revenue sources equals the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000065.
- (9) (a) A school district that fully participates in the Guarantee Program shall receive state funds in an amount that is:
- (i) equal to the difference between \$21 times the district's total WPUs and the revenue the school district is required to generate or allocate under Subsection (8)(c) to fully participate in the Guarantee Program; and
  - (ii) not less than \$0.
- (b) An elementary charter school shall receive under the Guarantee Program an amount equal to \$21 times the school's total WPUs.
- (10) The State Board of Education shall distribute Low Income Students Program funds in an amount proportionate to the number of students in each school district or charter school who qualify for free or reduced price school lunch multiplied by two.

- (11) A school district that partially participates in the Guarantee Program or Low Income Students Program shall receive program funds based on the amount of district revenue generated for or allocated to the program as a percentage of the amount of revenue that could have been generated or allocated if the district had fully participated in the program.
- (12) (a) Each school district and charter school shall use program monies for reading proficiency improvement in grades kindergarten through grade three.
- (b) Program monies may not be used to supplant funds for existing programs, but may be used to augment existing programs.
- (13) (a) Each school district and charter school shall annually submit a report to the State Board of Education accounting for the expenditure of program monies in accordance with its plan for reading proficiency improvement.
- (b) If a school district or charter school uses program monies in a manner that is inconsistent with Subsection (12), the school district or charter school is liable for reimbursing the State Board of Education for the amount of program monies improperly used, up to the amount of program monies received from the State Board of Education.
- (14) (a) The State Board of Education shall make rules to implement the program.
- (b) (i) The rules under Subsection (14)(a) shall require each school district or charter school to annually report progress in meeting goals stated in the district's or charter school's plan for student reading proficiency as measured by gain scores.
- (ii) If a school district or charter school does not meet or exceed the goals, the school district or charter school shall prepare a new plan which corrects deficiencies. The new plan must be approved by the State Board of Education before the school district or charter school receives an allocation for the next year.
- (15) If after 36 months of program operation, a school district fails to meet goals stated in the district's plan for student reading proficiency as measured by gain scores, the school district shall terminate any levy imposed under Section 53A-17a-151.

**APPENDIX B**  
**UTAH'S K-3 READING IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM:**  
**STATE AND LOCAL FUNDING FOR FISCAL 2005-07**

TABLE B1  
**Districts**

District	FY05 state	FY05 local	FY05 total	FY06 state	FY06 local	FY06 total	FY07 state	FY07 local	FY07 total
Alpine	\$1,451,657	\$1,076,437	\$2,528,094	\$1,260,285	\$1,059,148	\$2,319,433	\$1,277,695	\$1,121,916	\$2,399,611
Beaver	61,901	31,220	93,121	50,873	25,712	76,585	50,721	25,721	76,442
Box Elder	386,588	264,752	651,340	315,816	258,219	574,035	305,189	274,689	579,878
Cache	461,017	255,807	716,824	380,384	275,467	655,851	378,318	287,370	665,688
Carbon	123,269	176,848	300,117	91,110	164,618	255,728	83,527	176,127	259,654
Daggett	30,702	12,334	43,036	26,273	12,621	38,894	26,266	13,474	39,740
Davis	1,597,988	1,283,811	2,881,799	1,383,537	1,136,032	2,519,569	1,392,239	1,199,317	2,591,556
Duchesne	197,236	95,054	292,290	154,166	109,916	264,082	151,184	119,351	270,535
Emery	82,789	53,521	136,310	65,869	40,615	106,484	65,629	40,629	106,258
Garfield	79,197	43,872	123,069	63,796	38,292	102,088	63,899	39,118	103,017
Grand	69,408	70,538	139,946	53,253	64,538	117,791	50,535	67,117	117,652
Granite	2,207,231	2,067,486	4,274,717	1,782,182	2,013,815	3,795,997	1,731,000	2,100,791	3,831,791
Iron	261,331	246,749	508,080	210,136	238,119	448,255	210,071	252,749	462,820
Jordan	1,670,377	1,657,157	3,327,534	1,364,100	1,685,036	3,049,136	1,302,920	1,825,162	3,128,082
Juab	59,372	26,526	85,898	49,790	29,870	79,660	46,047	34,160	80,207
Kane	69,897	60,304	130,201	52,949	58,723	111,672	49,864	62,312	112,176
Logan	217,951	182,876	400,827	180,951	179,021	359,972	168,604	191,658	360,262
Millard	90,051	169,249	259,300	74,392	154,013	228,405	74,103	154,607	228,710
Morgan	73,662	48,836	122,498	58,028	46,017	104,045	57,655	48,112	105,767
Murray	158,011	199,821	357,832	103,645	173,128	276,773	96,365	181,748	278,113
Nebo	758,280	491,876	1,250,156	673,697	473,883	1,147,580	678,889	482,917	1,161,806
North Sanpete	128,678	57,633	186,311	102,404	64,717	167,121	101,390	67,155	168,545
North Summit	29,268	0	29,268	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	25,000
Ogden	603,176	330,725	933,901	497,479	331,830	829,309	469,927	387,828	857,755
Park	37,200	7,932	45,132	31,142	6,104	37,246	31,106	6,106	37,212
Piute	52,215	7,511	59,726	45,371	9,000	54,371	44,095	9,559	53,654
Provo	432,851	451,383	884,234	382,897	418,053	800,950	368,575	428,541	797,116
Rich	29,268	0	29,268	25,000	0	25,000	25,000	0	25,000
Salt Lake	669,727	1,355,459	2,025,186	546,370	1,289,053	1,835,423	543,319	1,463,319	2,006,638
San Juan	211,027	57,856	268,883	172,580	62,609	235,189	169,794	68,970	238,764
Sevier	211,671	97,798	309,469	166,073	121,447	287,520	162,473	128,726	291,199
South Sanpete	160,271	49,601	209,872	137,360	54,125	191,485	138,259	56,507	194,766
South Summit	40,340	77,097	117,437	34,178	72,935	107,113	34,124	72,404	106,528
Tintic	48,960	3,627	52,587	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tooele	388,594	227,787	616,381	343,050	252,352	595,402	348,142	277,919	626,061
Uintah	202,732	234,540	437,272	117,560	91,986	209,546	117,018	92,018	209,036

(continued)

TABLE B1 (CONTINUED)

**Districts**

District	FY05 state	FY05 local	FY05 total	FY06 state	FY06 local	FY06 total	FY07 state	FY07 local	FY07 total
Wasatch	78,262	48,994	127,256	67,071	41,810	108,881	25,000	0	25,000
Washington	524,136	672,698	1,196,834	425,768	704,765	1,130,533	405,743	774,043	1,179,786
Wayne	59,289	19,741	79,030	48,038	19,279	67,317	47,773	19,753	67,526
Weber	836,356	611,754	1,448,110	724,782	571,761	1,296,543	718,352	598,041	1,316,393
Total	\$14,851,936	\$12,827,210	\$27,679,146	\$12,287,355	\$12,348,629	\$24,635,984	\$12,035,810	\$13,149,934	\$25,185,744

Note: Figures provided to REL West by Utah State Office of Education in October 2006. Funding totals for fiscal 2007 are preliminary.

TABLE B2

**Charter schools**

Charter schools	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007
American Leadership	—	\$30,793	\$30,738
American Prep	15,316	12,411	12,627
Entheos	—	—	9,497
Freedom Academy	17,324	19,565	19,385
John Hancock	9,561	8,108	7,841
Lakeview	—	—	14,194
Legacy Prep	—	—	11,122
Liberty	—	—	9,859
Lincoln Academy	—	12,107	11,660
Moab Community School	2,076	5,735	2,126
Monticello	—	—	14,787
Mountainville	—	—	13,562
Navigator Pointe	—	11,499	11,141
North Davis Prep	15,591	17,304	18,083
North Star Academy	—	10,913	10,560
Ogden Prep	17,019	17,335	23,143
Pinnacle Canyon	19,475	17,142	18,212
Renaissance	—	—	13,039
Soldier Hollow	—	2,354	2,618
South Ridge	—	—	13,658
Spectrum	—	—	8,276
Summit Academy	16,184	12,718	12,287
Syracuse Arts	—	—	11,037
Thomas Edison North	10,983	9,120	9,120
Thomas Edison South	—	7,187	6,765
Timpanogos Academy	13,169	10,275	11,392
Wasatch Peak Academy	—	8,079	7,592
Washington Academy	—	—	9,579
Webster	—	—	11,035
TOTAL	\$136,698	\$212,645	\$354,935

---

**APPENDIX C**  
**SUMMARY OF WESTED'S SB 230 YEAR 1 REPORT**

In May 2005, following the first year of Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Patti Harrington asked WestEd to review its implementation. In early 2006 WestEd presented its Year 1 findings to the Utah State Board of Education, the Legislative Committee on Education, and the state's school districts. Overall, in Year 1 (SY2004/05) WestEd found that:

- Large-scale program implementation was under way.
- Self-reports indicated that research-based literacy strategies and best practices were being implemented.

- Leadership was provided by the Utah State Office of Education.
- Legislation presented both opportunities and challenges for evaluation.
- End-of-year outcomes from the first months of implementation were encouraging.
- Districts and charters should review the rigor of their goals to ensure they align with the objectives of the legislation.

The full report (WestEd, 2005) is available at [www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf).

## APPENDIX D

### SELF-REPORTED SB 230 PROGRAM INFORMATION BY DISTRICT OR CHARTER SCHOOL

The following pages detail how each program participant reported using SB 230 funding in Year 2 and also include the short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes each participant set. Each entry contains self-reported data and is based on the input/output/outcome format of the Utah State Office of Education's End-of-Year Annual Reading Proficiency Report.

#### ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT

ALPINE: Inputs/uses of program funds

*Hired 12 curriculum coaches to:*

- Help classroom teachers implement the state core standards in literacy instruction (Tier 1) and interventions (Tier 2);
- Model effective literacy instruction; and
- Coach teachers to improve their skills in delivering literacy instruction to their students.

*Increased the contract of 15 Reading Recovery teachers to provide:*

- 2 extra Reading Recovery student slots for intervention instruction in specific schools;
- Small-group instruction for K–2 students in addition to their regular classroom; and
- Reading Recovery services at two new schools.

ALPINE: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches and the teachers they coach attend professional development that defines the state core curriculum standards for each grade level.
- Literacy coaches receive training in essential literacy instructional and assessment practices.
- Coaches study the elements of coaching and integrate those with the professional teacher standards to improve the professional practices of teachers.
- Reading Recovery teachers assess students' needs for literacy instruction in small groups.
- Reading Recovery teachers provide intensive literacy instruction to identified students.
- Teachers of small groups attend four professional development meetings with a district intervention specialist.

ALPINE: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

Teachers working with curriculum coaches will design classroom literacy programs that help students become proficient in literacy standards for their grade level. Small-group teachers and Reading Recovery teachers will develop a plan for improvement for each child they serve based on the child's strengths and needs. Students involved in Reading Recovery or small-group instruction will improve their reading achievement on school benchmark assessments by three levels.

*Medium Term*

Teachers will be coached to improve their delivery of literacy instruction, assessment, and intervention strategies. Students will maintain gains compared to the "average" classmate or make progress toward closing the gap on those benchmark tests.

*Long Term*

Students will benefit from appropriate Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction, by which literacy achievement will improve. 77% of kindergartners will pass the end-of-the-year benchmark on DRA. The percentage of students in grades 1 and 2 who score 1 or 2 on UCA CRT will be reduced by 1%.

**BEAVER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT****BEAVER: Inputs/uses of program funds**

- Hired 1 full-time literacy specialist to implement the district's reading program in all elementary schools.
- 1 teacher at the Minersville Elementary, 1 teacher at Belknap Elementary, and 1 teacher at Milford Elementary were paid a stipend to help oversee the implementation of the Beaver School District's Literacy Program in their schools.
- Hired 6 part-time reading aides for district's most at-risk K-3 students.
- Provided professional development for the district reading specialist and coaches.
- Provided tutoring instruction for 6 literacy aides.
- Provided professional development for K-3 teachers using literacy aides.

**BEAVER: Activities/program outputs**

- Literacy specialist received USOE training on the essential elements necessary to implement the recommended literacy model on the district level and received training on essential practices for successful literacy coaching.
- District provided DIBELS training for reading aides and K-3 teachers.
- District provided professional development training for all new K-3 teachers on DRA assessment and all 4-6 grade teachers on QRI assessment.
- District provided time for general classroom, Title I, and special education teachers to meet with the district reading specialist to review student assessment data and develop appropriate instructional practices and interventions to support struggling readers. Meetings were scheduled monthly but were held more frequently as needed.
- District provided professional development training on scientifically based reading research (SBRR) practices using the Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum to improve reading skills, increase the number of students reading on grade level, and prevent reading failure. K-6 teachers received specific training in SBRR methods used to teach vocabulary, spelling, phonics, phonemic awareness, comprehension and fluency.
- District provided in-service training on the Three Tier Model. Teachers were instructed on how to use SBRR practices in all tiers and decide when Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions were needed.
- District paid stipends for teachers to attend training on Six Traits Writing and the writing process.
- Substitutes were provided for teachers to observe classrooms that were effectively using SBRR practices in order to better understand the process and move toward implementation in their own classrooms.
- 6 teachers and 40 volunteers were trained in the Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program.

**BEAVER: Program outcomes***Short Term*

- 925 students were assessed to determine reading strengths and needs.
- 201 students in grades K-3 received program review to improve reading proficiency.
- 147 students in grades K-3 received Tier 2 instruction and 45 students received Tier 3 instruction to improve literacy proficiency.
- 142 students in grades 4-6 received program review to improve reading proficiency. 61 students in grades 4-6 received Tier 2 instruction and 64 students received Tier 3 instruction to improve literacy proficiency.

*Medium Term*

92% of all K students met proficiency on letter-naming fluency and 91% met proficiency on phoneme segmentation as measured by DIBELS. All 1-3 grades improved the percentage of students achieving benchmark for their grade level by 25% from baseline and 5% from 2005 as measured by the DRA. All 4-6 grades will improve the percentage of students achieving benchmark for their grade level by 12% from baseline and 2% from 2005 as measured by the DRA.

*Long Term*

85% of students in kindergarten will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS. 90% of all students in grades 1-3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by the DRA.



## BOX ELDER SCHOOL DISTRICT

### BOX ELDER: Inputs/uses of program funds

- 8 literacy coaches
- Materials and supplies
- Professional development
- Summer Early Intervention Program

### BOX ELDER: Activities/program outputs

- Professional development
  - Monthly training/collaboration for coaches
  - Kindergarten training/collaboration (x4)
  - Paraprofessional training/guided reading
  - Faculty training/literacy centers (12 schools)
  - Faculty training/interventions (12 schools)
  - Principal/coaches training
  - Study groups (at school level)
  - Coaches participation in state literacy training
- Intervention program
  - Kindergarten assessment
  - PreK summer intervention program

### BOX ELDER: Program outcomes

#### *Short Term*

- Reading instruction will be differentiated for every elementary student at his/her instructional level.
- Every student will be assessed with DIBELS at least 3x during the school years.
- Targeted interventions will be used to instruct students who are identified as below benchmark on the DIBELS test.

#### *Medium Term*

K–3 DIBELS scores will show improvement in the number of students scoring at benchmark.

#### *Long Term*

- 90% of K–1 students will reach benchmark or make progress toward benchmark in Phoneme Segmentation as measured by Spring 2007 DIBELS.
- 90% of 2–3 grade students will reach benchmark or make progress toward benchmark in Oral Reading Fluency as measured by Spring 2007 DIBELS.

## CACHE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

### CACHE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Funded 7 literacy facilitators to serve across 13 elementary schools.
- Funded paraprofessionals to assist teachers with small-group instruction in K and 3rd grade classrooms.
- Purchased intervention materials for K and 3rd grade students.
- Provided explicit vocabulary instructional materials for K-3 classrooms.
- Provided professional development for teachers and instructional staff.

### CACHE: Activities/program outputs

- Assessment: Literacy facilitators directed the collection and analysis of ongoing performance data at each school.
- Intervention: Literacy facilitators helped teachers design and implement appropriate Tier 2 instruction for struggling readers.
- Professional development:
  - Literacy facilitators provided on going professional development for paraprofessionals and all other personnel who provide literacy instruction to students.
  - Literacy facilitators helped new teachers use assessment to design differentiated instruction to meet the needs of students.

### CACHE: Program outcomes

#### *Short Term*

##### Literacy Facilitators

- Received 100+ hours of professional development in the components of literacy instruction and strategies of direct instruction; administering and interpreting DIBELS diagnostic assessments; and effective coaching practices.
- Managed the collection, dissemination and analysis of DIBELS benchmark assessments administered to all students 3x during the year.
- Helped administer and analyze DIBELS progress monitoring and other ongoing assessments to guide Tier 2 instruction.
- Provided ongoing training to paraprofessionals.

##### *Students*

- 362 of 1118 K students received 30 minutes of daily intensive Tier 2 intervention.
- 289 of 1054 3rd grade students received 30-45 minutes of daily intensive Tier 2 intervention.

##### *Medium Term*

- K students demonstrating proficiency in phonemic segmentation as measured by the Spring DIBELS assessment increased from 86% in 2005 to 93% in 2006.
- 1st grade students' demonstrating proficiency in oral reading fluency as measured by the Spring DIBELS assessment increased from 84% in 2004 to 87% in 2006.
- 2nd grade students' demonstrating proficiency in oral reading fluency as measured by the Spring DIBELS assessment increased from 79% in 2005 to 80% in 2006.
- 3rd grade students demonstrating proficiency in oral reading fluency as measured by the Spring DIBELS assessment from 69% in 2005 to 73% in 2006.

##### *Long Term*

- 80% of K students will achieve proficiency as measured by DIBELS phoneme segmentation.
- 90% of 1-3 grade students will achieve proficiency as measured by the Utah CRT.
- CCSD reached their three-year goals as described above.

**CARBON SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## CARBON: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 2.5 literacy coaches for district's most at-risk elementary schools.
- Provided professional development for 3 literacy coaches and 2 previously hired coaches.
- Provided professional development support for teachers working with school literacy coaches.

## CARBON: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received USOE training on the essential practices for successful school literacy coaching.
- District provided training for coaches and grade-level teacher representatives on DIBELS assessments.
- Quarterly substitutes were provided for teachers in grades K–3 to review student assessment data with school literacy coaches. Appropriate instructional practices and interventions were planned and implemented to support the needs of struggling readers.
- Coaches were trained on observing Tier I instruction and successfully implementing needed SBRR practices using the Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum to prevent reading failure.
- Coaches were trained to observe Tier 2 instruction and successfully implement individual and/or small-group interventions to support Tier I instruction.
- Teachers met regularly to review assessment data with literacy coaches; and appropriate instruction and interventions were planned and implemented to support struggling readers.
- Intervention specialists were trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS.

## CARBON: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- Literacy coaches, intervention specialists, teachers, and paraprofessionals proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS.
- Literacy coaches, intervention specialists, and teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers and monitor their progress.
- K–3 students were given DIBELS benchmark screening assessments to identify struggling readers.
- Students not at benchmark received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency, with continued progress monitoring.

*Medium Term*

- Identified students to receive Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency.
- DIBELS assessment is used effectively to drive instruction for all students.
- District improvement in K–3 CRT Language Arts scores.

*Long Term*

- 65% of all K students will attain reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS.
- 77% of all grades 1–3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by Utah Language Arts CRT.

**DAGGETT SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## DAGGETT: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired a full-time reading specialist at Manila Elementary.
- Provided professional development for teachers.
- Provided leveled-library classroom sets of novels.
- Funded summer reading program.

## DAGGETT: Activities/program outputs

- District provided training for teachers and aides on DIBELS.
- Substitutes were provided to allow progress monitoring by teachers.
- Principal attended Principals Literacy Institute.

## DAGGETT: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- Reading specialist trained on essential coaching practices.
- 5 teachers, 1 reading specialist, and 3 aides trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS assessments.
- Reading specialist can observe classroom instruction and work cooperatively with teachers to ensure best practice techniques are used.
- In conjunction with training in SBRR at Principals Literacy Institute, principal will ensure that proper appropriate materials are purchased.
- 72 (100%) students received DIBELS and progress monitoring, as needed, to identify students not meeting proficiency.
- 21 (29%) students received Tier 2 intervention with reading specialist.

*Medium Term*

Goals for grades 1-6 were met, while grade 3 had 3 students at risk (all 3 had an IEP) and K had 2 students at risk.

*Long Term*

Results pending 2006 Utah Language Arts CRTs.

**DAVIS SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## DAVIS: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Funded 59 FTE for Tier 2 reading teachers (an increase of 2.3 FTE).
- Provided professional development:
  - For 11 reading coaches in 2005-06 (this has increased to 20 literacy coaches in training);
  - Through Scholastic Red in Tier 1 and Tier 2;
  - To support Tier 1 teachers in teaching the Federal Five (P, PA, F, V, C).
- 42 schools participated in the Integrated Learning System (ILS) for individualized student practice.
- Sponsored 3 Northern Utah Curriculum Consortium (NUCC) reading endorsement cohorts.

## DAVIS: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received professional development through Scholastic Red, coaching academies, and mentoring programs. USOE trainers came in to work with Davis literacy coaches.
- District provided staff development for all Tier 2 reading teachers in quarterly day-long training, which included: assessment; working with struggling readers, phonics and phonemic awareness; interfacing with classroom teachers; literacy nights, etc. Teachers also received instruction as needed on QRI, Soar to Success, Struggling Readers materials, etc.
- Literacy coaches received instruction on Houghton Mifflin reading materials, the coaching academy model, and working with struggling readers.
- DIBELS training was provided for interested schools (80 participants).
- Professional development was provided for all grade-level teachers:
  - 100 new teachers received training using the Houghton Mifflin basal program;
  - 45 teachers attended the handwriting workshop by Zaner Bloser;
  - 15 teachers received staff development in the class “Elements of Reading & Writing with Compr. Strategies” ;
  - 15 teachers received staff development in the class “Content Area Reading and Writing”;
  - 100 teachers received staff development in the class “Elements of Writing” with Tamara Jetton;
  - 100 teachers received staff development in the class “Elementary Literacy Conference”;
  - 65 teachers received staff development in the class “Comprehension” with Tamara Jetton;
  - 53 teachers received staff development in the class “Vocabulary & Writing to Learn” with Tamara Jetton;
  - 45 teachers received staff development in the class “Writing Training: Great Source & Lucy Caulkins”;
  - 40 teachers received staff development in the class “Step Up to Writing”;
  - 60 teachers received staff development in the class “Making the Most of Success Maker”; and
  - 10 elementary schools received “Reports Review” training for assessment in the ILS.
- 65 teachers participated in the NUCC reading endorsement program.

## DAVIS: Program outcomes

- 15 literacy coaches received over 60 hours of coaching instruction in the coaching academy (now in year 2 of 3-year plan).
- 9 literacy coaches worked in schools following district guidelines, assessing students, planning and implementing instruction, and working with classroom teachers for improved literacy instruction.
- 85 Tier 2 intervention teachers and paraprofessionals received 40+ hours of instruction working with struggling readers and using assessment to drive instruction.
- 638 teachers participated in literacy staff development equally over 8,932 hours of instruction.
- 80 teachers were proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS assessment.
- Houghton Mifflin basal reading program was aligned with the Utah State Core for each grade level.
- Approximately 4,240 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency.
- Over 600 teachers increased their knowledge to improve instruction.
- 85 Tier 2 teachers and paraprofessionals increased their knowledge and refined their practices in working with struggling readers.
- 15 literacy coaches made an impact in their schools by providing onsite professional support.

**DUCHESNE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

DUCHESNE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- SB 230 funding sustained literacy efforts in 6 schools with 4.25 reading coaches and 1 district coordinator.
- Professional development provided to teachers and coaches by USOE/Reading First/District.

DUCHESNE: Activities/program outputs

*Reading Coaches:*

- Modeled, observed, and helped teachers apply SBRR with their students;
- Managed collection of student data;
- Collaborated with teachers to analyze data, to identify children needing intervention groups, to locate resources and materials, to write individual learning plans (ILPs), and to monitor progress;
- Taught Tier 2 and Tier 3 struggling readers;
- Met with principals regularly to review fall/winter benchmark results and to ensure effective instruction for all students;
- Attended district meetings; conducted site-based in-services;
- Celebrated successes and communicated concerns; and
- Evaluated schoolwide effectiveness of tiered instruction.

DUCHESNE: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- Collaborating with Reading First and special education.
- Implementing new basal series.
- Defining and working toward differentiated/small-group instruction.
- Delivering instruction using SBRR materials.
- Using a district assessment plan and individual learning plan.
- Structuring a 3-hour Gr. 1-3 literacy block and a 2-hour literacy block for K.
- Providing ongoing training for all district teachers and paraprofessionals in the administration of the DIBELS benchmark and progress monitoring assessments.
- Acknowledging the Level I reading endorsement of 34 district teachers.
- Short Term Goal: To consistently monitor progress of all students; to look at data and identify students who may be at risk or who are failing.

*Medium Term*

Goal: To focus on increasing literacy achievement; to select and use instructional strategies based on SBRR.

*Long Term*

Goal: Teach 90% of K-3 students to read at or above grade level by third grade.

## EMERY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

### EMERY: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 2 reading teachers to be assigned to two of the district's Title I schools.
- Provided staff development opportunities for reading teachers.
- Provided opportunities for staff development for all K-3 teachers and educational assistants.
- Purchased reading assessment materials.

### EMERY: Activities/program outputs

- Provided opportunity for training for all reading and K-3 teachers in Reading First, Leveled Reading, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, and curriculum strategies related to the newly adopted reading program.
- Coordinated with Southern Utah University to provide a two-year reading endorsement and masters degree program.
- Provided funding and support for the EduTest (Lightspan) assessment tools for ongoing reading assessment.
- Provided support for focused grade-level meetings to review data and collaborate for instructional improvement.
- Provided training and time for DRA, DRP, running Records, and DIBELS.
- Adopted and implemented a new reading program at all elementary schools.
- Provided opportunity for teachers to participate in the USOE-sponsored reading summer institutes.
- Provided training in "Classroom Instruction that Works" (Diane Paynter) and Mastery Teaching.
- Provided training in Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading.

### EMERY: Program outcomes

#### *Short Term*

- 20 K-3 teachers and assistants trained in DIBELS assessments.
- 5 K-3 teachers training in Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading.
- 41 K-3 teachers trained in EduTest assessment.
- 41 K-3 teachers trained in reading interventions as provided by USOE through the summer reading institutes, Rural Schools Literacy Project, and Six Trait Writing.
- All principals have now completed the Principal's Literacy Academy.
- 41 K-3 teachers trained in all 9 instructional strategies of "Classroom Instruction the Works."
- 12 K-3 teachers involved in the reading endorsement program at Southern Utah University (SUU).
- 41 K-3 teachers involved in grade-level meetings.
- 41 K-3 teachers received follow-up curriculum training in newly adopted reading program.
- 322 students assessed 3 times using Edu-Test assessment for reading proficiency.
- 106 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve reading proficiency, including Title I and Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading.

#### *Medium Term*

Language Arts CRT scores improved in all grades. The percentage of K students meeting proficiency in both letter-naming fluency and phoneme segmentation increased.

#### *Long Term*

Goal: An overall increase in the percentage of students reading at or above grade level by the end of third grade beginning in 2004-05.

### GARFIELD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### GARFIELD: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Supported and maintained 3 literacy coach positions in the district; all 5 elementary schools received training and support from the literacy coaches.
- Maintained professional development in each of the elementary schools where the literacy coaches provided instruction.

#### GARFIELD: Activities/program outputs

- Because of the literacy coaches' staff development, training was organized and implemented in elementary schools for DIBELS testing, Step Up to Writing, Reciprocal Teaching, fluency and comprehension.
- District supported a representative from each elementary school to receive training at Rural Schools Academy.
- District provided support for monthly literacy coach meetings for district correlation purposes.

#### GARFIELD: Program outcomes

##### *Short Term*

- Because of a continued use of DIBELS (training started last year in DIBELS, this year it was used for 3 benchmark tests), district elementary schools were able to collect data and use that information in planning and staff development.
- 9 reading specialists and an additional 41 teachers earned their reading endorsement.
- 9 reading specialists and teachers in all 9 elementary schools have been trained in analyzing assessment data and data-based decision-making.
- 9 coaches can observe and coach teachers on effective research-based literacy practices in their own rooms.
- Garfield School District was able to maintain three literacy-coaching positions and continues professional literacy instruction for staff development.
- 431 at-risk students received Tier 2 instruction.
- 393 special education and ESL students received Tier 2 instruction.

##### *Medium Term*

Garfield had a growth of 37% of students reaching benchmark on the DIBELS; 83% of first graders were proficient on the CRT; 82% of second graders were proficient on the CRT; 85% of third graders were proficient on the CRT.

##### *Long Term*

Increase percentage of students scoring proficient (Levels 3 & 4) on the Language Arts CRT for grades 1-3 by 2% over the 2004 baseline data. Garfield is close but has not yet reached this goal.



**GRAND SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## GRAND: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 2 teachers to help staff a total of 5 full-day kindergarten classes.
- Provided for 3 half-time teaching assistants assigned to full-day kindergarten.
- Provided a 0.5 position, which the district matched in order to create a full-time ALS specialist position.

## GRAND: Activities/program outputs

- Training was provided for all teachers in administration, scoring and interpretation of DIBELS assessments.
- An assessment team was created to help teachers with the assessment process.
- Teachers received DIBELS data immediately following the testing sessions in order to inform instruction.
- Teaching assistants for K were trained in specific intervention procedures to use with students based on their DIBELS scores.

## GRAND: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- Teachers are proficient in administration, scoring and interpretation of DIBELS measures.
- 3 teaching assistants and one special education teacher are trained in standardized intervention strategies to use with targeted students.
- All students (as appropriate) were assessed using DIBELS at least three times over the course of the year.
- Students that were higher risk were assessed more frequently as progress dictated.

*Medium Term*

All goals set for K reading achievement were met. 28% more K students reached DIBELS PSF benchmark in 2006 than in 2005. 20% more reached DIBELS benchmark in LNF in 2006 than in 2005.

*Long Term*

70% of all 1–3 grade students will reach benchmark on DIBELS ORF by spring 2007. 78-82% will rank Sufficient or above on state CRTs by spring 2007.

## GRANITE SCHOOL DISTRICT

### GRANITE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- 6 literacy coaches trained teachers and principals.
- 1 new coach hired to work with new teachers and mentors.
- 1 special education teacher hired to provide instruction and in-class coaching.
- Provided summer program with an ELL focus.
- Provided Early Steps/Next Steps, Reading Recovery interventions.
- Provided professional development in Tier 1 and 2 interventions and offered induction to new teachers.
- Purchased leveled-reading libraries.
- Provided training on using DIBELS data to guide school-level literacy committee discussions and initiate student achievement plans.

### GRANITE: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches provided training and coaching for 12 principals and 120 teachers on delivering SBRR instruction.
- District provided induction for new teachers in SBRR strategies.
- Teachers administer DIBELS and Yearly Progress Pro literacy assessments.
- Teachers use data walls to guide decisions regarding delivery models and differentiated instruction.
- District hosted Jump Start on Reading summer program for ELL students.
- District implemented Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program.
- Partnership with Utah State University (USU) provided reading endorsement courses for reading specialists.

### GRANITE: Program outcomes

#### *Short Term*

- 61 reading specialists trained on Tier 2 interventions, including use of DIBELS and TPRI.
- Instructional support given to 1,363 at-risk readers.
- 2 teachers trained in Early/Next Steps in 15 elementary schools, serving 373 students.
- 1 lead teacher supported 41 Reading Recovery teachers serving 300 students.
- 338 students attended summer school with ELL support.
- Yearly Progress Pro percentage increases in student grade-level mastery: 1st grade = 3 to 46; 2nd grade = 36 to 63; 3rd grade = 38 to 57.
- Schoolwide CRT performance increased in 75% of schools served through literacy leadership in grades 1–2, by 50% in grade 3 schools. Gains not seen in schools not receiving training support.
- Decreased teacher attrition from 24% to 17%.

#### *Medium Term*

Based on spring 2006 CRT data, the number of students proficient in reading in grades 1–3 will increase, or in grades K–3, students will show measurable gain in reading performance as measured on grade-level appropriate DIBELS subtests from 2005 baseline data.

#### *Long Term*

- DIBELS will be used as a screening, progress monitoring, and outcome measure; TPRI will be used as a diagnostic assessment for at-risk readers.
- Based on spring 2006 CRT data, the number of students proficient in reading in grades 1–3 will increase, or in grades K–3, students will show measurable gain in reading performance as measured on grade-level appropriate DIBELS subtests from 2005 baseline data.

**IRON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## IRON: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 3 reading specialists.
- Provided professional development for the specialists, who in turn trained K–3 teachers.

## IRON: Activities/program outputs

- Reading specialists received ongoing research-based practice training from the USOE.
- District provided DIBELS training for the specialists.
- Monthly meetings were held with reading specialists, classroom teachers, special educators, and ESL teachers to identify student needs and differentiate instruction.
- The Utah State CORE Curriculum forms the basis of classroom instruction, differentiated curriculum, etc.

## IRON: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- 9 reading specialists were trained on essential coaching techniques.
- 9 reading specialists and an additional 41 teachers earned their reading endorsement.
- 9 reading specialists and teachers in all nine elementary schools have been trained in analyzing assessment data and data-based decision-making.
- 9 coaches can observe and coach teachers on effective research-based literacy practices in their own rooms.
- 80 kindergarten students; 63 first graders; 176 second graders; and 112 third graders received progress monitoring and had their program reviewed to assist with their improvement.
- 431 at-risk students received Tier 2 instruction.
- 393 special education and ESL students received Tier 2 instruction.

*Medium Term*

Iron experienced a growth of 37% of students reaching benchmark on the DIBELS; 83% of the first graders were proficient on the CRT; 82% of the second graders were proficient on the CRT; 85% of the third graders were proficient on the CRT.

*Long Term*

Increase percentage of students scoring proficient (Levels 3 & 4) on the Language Arts CRT for grades 1–3 by 2% over the 2004 baseline data. Iron is close but has not yet reached this goal.

## JORDAN SCHOOL DISTRICT

### JORDAN: Inputs/uses of program funds

- \$3,575,000 to maintain school literacy specialists in 55 elementary schools (hires made in Year 1).
- Provided 95 hours of ongoing professional development for 55 specialists in addition to individual, on-site coaching.
- Purchased paper and online formative assessment and data management services (\$308,816).
- Provided training in the use of purchased formative assessments in all 55 schools.
- Developed and piloted an end-of-year K assessment aligned with Utah K Core in 12 schools.

### JORDAN: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy facilitator activities: delivered ongoing literacy professional development to teachers; mentored teachers and supported Comprehensive Balanced Literacy implementation across all grades; trained and monitored paraprofessional assistants for Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions, managed ongoing assessment within Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, and provided individual and small group reading intervention for struggling K-3 readers.
- District literacy personnel trained facilitators during monthly full-day professional development focused on research-based teaching best practices of reading and literacy. Monthly after-school CONNECT professional development provided training in literacy integration in all content areas for 230 teachers.
- Curriculum Department elementary literacy consultant trained elementary principals in literacy and instructional leadership.
- DIBELS and Gates-McGintie test materials were purchased and training was provided for all schools.
- Jordan School District Kindergarten Committee piloted end-of-year kindergarten assessments.
- Quarterly guided reading monitoring and end-of-year summaries were implemented.

### JORDAN: Program outcomes

#### *Short Term*

- Elementary teachers in 55 schools received ongoing, onsite, literacy professional development.
- Teachers received onsite Comprehensive Balanced Literacy implementation support.
- More struggling readers received reading intervention services due to added staff (literacy facilitator) and implementation of the tiered intervention model.
- 55 literacy facilitators participated in monthly literacy training.
- All elementary teachers had access to testing materials and accompanying training and data services.
- A kindergarten post-assessment was developed and piloted in 12 schools.
- Increased literacy education knowledge and skill of 55 elementary literacy facilitators.
- Increased teacher and principal knowledge and understanding of best practices and Comprehensive Balanced Literacy strategies and skills.
- Increased motivation for implementing Comprehensive Balanced Literacy strategies and skills.
- Increased skill in implementing Comprehensive Balanced Literacy research-based best practices.
- Increased amount and quality of reading interventions (3-Tier Model).
- 80% reading proficiency – kindergarten.
- 70% reading proficiency – grades 1-3.

#### *Medium Term*

- 90% reading proficiency grades 1-3
- Schoolwide K-6 Comprehensive Balanced Literacy implementation

#### *Long Term*

- 90% reading proficiency K-6
- Districtwide K-6 Comprehensive Balanced Literacy implementation

**JUAB SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## JUAB: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 4 kindergarten teachers to provide after-school tutoring to students in need of extra, small-group help.
- Provided all elementary teachers one hour per week to look at individual student data and to team possible remediation strategies.
- Provided in-service for a group of teachers K–3 (3 from each grade level) to develop plans and strategies for language arts in their grade level.
- Provided an intensive 6-week summer school to all students K–3 not reading at grade level.

## JUAB: Activities/program outputs

- K teachers provided 203 sessions of extended day service per week for all K–3 students below grade level.
- K–3 teachers met weekly for one hour in grade-level teams to monitor the progress of their students and plan strategies to remediate those who were not at grade level.
- Three teachers from each grade level K–3 are meeting for 5 hours per day for 10 days to receive training and create plans to implement USOE Core Curriculum standards and objectives.
- All students K–3 reading below grade level will be invited to attend a comprehensive, 6-week summer school to remediate language arts deficits.

## JUAB: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- 52 K students received extended day services for the entire school year to remediate basic reading skills deficit.
- 52 students received Tier 2 reading intervention.
- All students grades K–3 were progress monitored and benchmarked using DIBELS.
- Spread sheets showing present levels and gain in reading skills and six-trait writing proficiency for every student K–3 in the district have been created and analyzed.
- A curriculum map created to be used by all teachers in the district.
- A pre- and post-assessment will be compiled showing gain of all students attending summer school.

*Long Term*

85% of all students in grades K–3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS or Utah State Language Arts CRT.

**KANE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## KANE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- 0.5 literacy facilitators hired to serve 1 elementary school.
- 4.5 paraprofessionals hired to assist teachers with small-group instruction at K-3.
- Intervention materials purchased for K-3 students.
- Teacher manuals and assessment materials purchased for K-3 classrooms.
- Extended learning time initiated by individual schools.

## KANE: Activities/program outputs

## Literacy facilitators, teachers, Title I paraprofessionals:

- Received over 100 hours each of professional development in: multi-sensory, analytical strategies for phonemic awareness, phonics, spelling, vocabulary, and fluency, comprehension, and diagnostic teaching.
- Managed the collection, dissemination, and analysis of DIBELS benchmark, District Writing Exams along with all other classroom tests to guide Tier 2 instruction and for use during Individualized Literacy diagnostic meetings for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
- Model mentor process in place to ensure proper procedure for SBRR procedures.

## KANE: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- 46 K-3 students received 30-40 minutes daily intensive Tier 2 intervention.
- 25 K-3 students received 10-15 minutes Tier 3 specific skills practice.

*Medium Term*

- 85% of kindergarten students proficient on DIBELS nonsense word fluency.
- 82% of kindergarten students proficient on DIBELS phoneme segmentation.
- 84% of grade 1 students established on DIBELS nonsense word fluency.
- 76% of grade 1 students low risk on DIBELS oral reading.
- 72% of grade 2 students low risk on DIBELS oral reading.
- 57% of grade 3 students low risk on DIBELS oral reading fluency.

*Long Term*

- 80% of kindergarten students will achieve proficiency on DIBELS phoneme segmentation.
- The long-term goal of students who meet or exceed proficiency standards on the CRT in the year 2012 will be set within a window of 80% to 90% for all students grades 1-3.

**LOGAN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## LOGAN: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired and trained 5 literacy coaches.
- Provided professional development for 70 K–3 teachers, 19 special education/ESL teachers, and 80 paraprofessionals.
- Provided 18 substitutes who covered K–3 classrooms for a half-hour each day while teachers attended grade-level literacy team meetings.
- Provided approximately 75 additional hours daily of paraprofessional assistance.
- Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading was implemented in 6 elementary schools.

## LOGAN: Activities/program outputs

- Coaches attended weekly training sessions to build their background knowledge on SBRR practices and their capacity for effectively coaching teachers.
- Coaches were trained on a variety of data collection techniques to structure classroom observations.
- Weekly substitutes were provided for teachers in grades K–3 to review student assessment data with school literacy coaches.
- Appropriate instructional practices and interventions were planned and implemented to support the needs of struggling readers.
- Coaches provided paraprofessionals with modeling and guided practice of components of the Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program and followed up as needed with individual coaching of paraprofessionals.

## LOGAN: Program outcomes

*Short Term*

- 5 coaches can adequately observe classroom instruction and work cooperatively with teachers in implementing improved instructional practices using the core curriculum to prevent reading failure.
- 5 coaches and 65 K–3 teachers are trained to analyze assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
- 80 paraprofessionals are proficient in planning and implementing Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading.
- Approximately 250 students received Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading intervention.
- Based on Fall 2005 DIBELS assessment, the following percentage of students at each grade level required and received targeted interventions in small groups: K = 31%, 1st = 21%, 2nd = 35%, 3rd = 34%.

*Medium Term*

Based on Spring 2006 DIBELS assessment, 99.2% of all K–3 students met benchmark or showed growth between Fall 2005 and Spring 2006 DIBELS assessments.

*Long Term*

90% of K–3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS.

### MILLARD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### MILLARD: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 3 literacy coaches and 3 part-time intervention specialists at 3 of 4 elementary schools.
- Provided professional development for literacy coaches and intervention specialists.
- Provided professional development support of administrators, teachers, and paraprofessionals working with school literacy coaches.
- Purchased DIBELS web-based reporting and DIBELS materials for all K-3 classrooms.

#### MILLARD: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received USOE training on the essential practices for successful school literacy coaching.
- District literacy director provided training for coaches, teachers, and paraprofessionals on the DIBELS assessment. District and school teams were organized to assess K-3 students three times during the school year (Sept, Jan, Apr).
- K-3 grade-level teams met regularly with literacy coaches and principals to receive professional support and review student assessment data. Appropriate instructional practices and interventions provided by professionals were planned and implemented to support the needs of struggling readers.
- Concerted efforts were made to include special services (SpEd, ESL, Title I) as part of grade-level collaborative teams to improve support for struggling readers.
- Coaches were trained on Tier 1 instruction. They supported successful implementation of SBRR practices using the Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum and newly acquired basal reading programs to prevent reading failure.
- Coaches were trained on the Tier 2 instructional model and successfully implemented individual and/or small-group interventions throughout the year to support Tier 1 instruction.

#### MILLARD: Program outcomes

##### *Short Term*

- 3 literacy coaches and 3 part-time intervention specialists were trained on essential coaching practices.
- 3 literacy coaches, 3 part-time intervention specialists, 32 teachers, and 16 paraprofessionals proficient in administering and interpreting the DIBELS assessment.
- Literacy coaches, intervention specialists, and all K-3 teachers were trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers. They also provide progress monitoring.
- Coaches and intervention specialists work with teachers in implementing improved instructional practices utilizing the core curriculum and the newly acquired basal reading program to prevent reading failure.
- Coaches and intervention specialists work cooperatively with classroom teachers in implementing Tier 2 instructional practices, using the core curriculum, to support Tier 1 instruction in the regular classroom.
- Coaches and intervention specialists work individually and in small groups with at-risk students using Tier 2 intervention instructional practices.
- 1,475 K-6 students received DIBELS benchmark assessments to identify struggling readers. 75% of students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency, as well as progress monitoring. All students received differentiated instruction.

##### *Medium Term*

2nd and 3rd grade Language Arts CRT scores improved districtwide. Positive growth was recorded for K students from the first to the third administration of the DIBELS test in letter-naming fluency and phoneme segmentation.

##### *Long Term*

65% of all K students will attain reading proficiency as measured by the DIBELS screener. 73% of Gr. 1-3 students will reach proficiency as measured by the Utah Elementary Language Arts CRTs.



**MORGAN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT****MORGAN: Inputs/uses of program funds**

- Hired half-time literacy coach.
- Hired 6 highly trained paraprofessionals to work in the Tier 3 intervention program.

**MORGAN: Activities/program outputs**

- Literacy coach received USOE and USU training on the essential procedures of school literacy coaching.
- District provided training for coaches and grade-level teachers on DIBELS assessments.
- Training was provided for the classroom teachers in Tier 1 and Tier 2 teaching practices.
- Training was provided for Tier 2 level intervention and small-group pull-out methods of instruction.

**MORGAN: Program outcomes***Short Term*

- Literacy coach trained on the essential coaching procedures.
- 1 coach and 36 teachers proficient in administering and interpreting the DIBELS assessment.
- 1 coach and 36 teachers trained to review and use the assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
- 7 paraprofessionals trained to work in the Tier 3 intervention program.
- 120+ students received instruction to improve reading proficiency through intervention program.
- More than 200 students received Tier 2 enhanced instruction.

*Medium Term*

- All Gr. 1–3 CRT scores stayed in the 85–95% range.
- 94% of K students met proficiency goals on phoneme segmentation using the DIBELS assessment.

*Long Term*

85–95% of all K–3 students reached their reading proficiency goals as measured by DIBELS in kindergarten and the Utah Elementary Language Arts CRTs in grades 1–3.

### MURRAY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### MURRAY: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 3.5 reading coordinators; each elementary school had 0.5 reading coordinator prior to the additional legislative funding; program allowed each elementary school to have 1 full-time reading coordinator.
- Provided professional development for reading coordinators.
- Provided para-educators who provided direct reading intervention to students who were reading below proficient.

#### MURRAY: Activities/program outputs

- Reading coordinators received professional development in the Arkansas Literacy model and the Early Steps intervention program, and each reading coordinator was provided professional development in cognitive coaching.
- The district provided training for reading coordinators and grade-level teachers on DIBELS, DRA, and QRI.
- Substitutes were provided at the beginning of the school year for all Gr. 1-3 teachers; each teacher administered an individual reading assessment to each student.
- Students not proficient in reading were identified by the individual reading assessments and an individual literacy plan was developed for the student. Appropriate instructional practices and interventions were planned and implemented to support the needs of these students.
- Substitutes were provided 2x during the school year to allow teachers to review student progress data.

#### MURRAY: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 7 reading coordinators trained on essential coaching practices, Arkansas Literacy Model, and Early Steps intervention.
- 7 reading coordinators and 80 teachers proficient in administering and interpreting the individual reading assessment appropriate to their grade level.
- 7 reading coordinators and 80 teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
- All K-3 students were administered a diagnostic reading assessment to determine proficiency.
- 320 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency.

##### *Medium Term*

Based on data from ILP meetings, the majority of students receiving reading interventions made significant gains on their reading proficiency.

##### *Long Term*

85% of all students who leave 3rd grade will be proficient readers.

## NEBO SCHOOL DISTRICT

### NEBO: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 13 literacy specialists; half-time literacy specialist provided to each of 25 schools.
- Funded professional development for teachers in all 25 schools.
- Funded a Reading Recovery (RR) teacher leader; hired 7 RR teachers to complement 5 others providing RR services; trained 1 new RR teacher.
- Provided “Continuing Contact” professional development for 6 RR teachers.
- Funded transitional 1st grade program at 5 schools; provided professional development for 5 transitional 1st grade teachers; monitored progress of students in the transitional 1st grade classes.
- Funded summer tutoring for all identified K–2 students that benchmarked at least one year below level; hired qualified elementary teachers to tutor identified students; provided professional development support for teachers hired for summer tutoring.

### NEBO: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy specialists worked with the principals and teachers to review student assessment and provide appropriate instruction in Tier 2 interventions; specialists received district training on the Three C’s (Collaborating, Consulting, Coaching) used by Nebo School District for literacy specialists and mentors.
- During collaboration team meetings (some schools once per week and other schools once per month) teachers provided assessment information. The assessment was reported as a reading level and student cards (corresponding to levels) were moved along a line of reading progression. Professional development, specific to the needs at each grade level, was provided to teachers during collaboration meetings.
- 1 teacher provided in-depth training for teachers in the Reading Recovery program.
- 1 teacher was hired to provide ongoing professional development in use of appropriate strategies that would enable identified students to read and write at grade level; based on the Utah Core Curriculum.
- 5 transitional first grade teachers provided explicit instruction and carefully monitored student progress throughout the year; progress was reported at collaboration team meetings.
- Summer Tutoring: Through an application process, Nebo identified the best elementary reading teachers that would provide differentiated tutoring for the identified students; each teacher participated in a day of professional development to learn the structure of the tutoring process for instructing, assessing, and reporting.

### NEBO: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- All students received initial literacy instruction in the regular classroom to improve literacy proficiency.
- Approximately 1,200 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency (Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading).
- 54 students received an alternate classroom placement to improve literacy proficiency (transitional 1st grade).
- 53 1st grade students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency (Reading Recovery).
- 180 K–2 grade students received summer tutoring to improve literacy proficiency.

#### *Medium Term*

- Gr. 1–3 benchmark (reading) scores improved at midyear and end of year: 85.5% of all 1st grade students, 80.6% of 2nd grade students, and 77.3% of 3rd grade students performed at or above grade level on decoding accuracy, comprehension, and fluency as measured by Nebo School District Benchmark Assessment.
- 194 1st grade students, who were non-readers without alphabetic knowledge and little phonemic awareness, all made progress in the Nebo School District Transitional 1st Grade Program or Reading Recovery Program.
- K–2 students who were a full year or more below proficiency level made significant growth after participating in the Nebo School District Transitional First Grade Program or Reading Recovery Program, as measured by the Nebo School District Benchmark Assessment.
- 1st grade students who were below expected level at 9 elementary schools, participated 30 minutes per day on Waterford Tutoring. Performance on Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Early Reading Behaviors, word reading and comprehension all showed significant improvement. Students experienced as much as 6 levels of growth.

#### *Long Term*

75% of all students in grades 1–3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by the Utah Elementary Language Arts CRTs.

### NORTH SANPETE SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### N. SANPETE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Paid half the salaries of the literacy coaches who work at 5 elementary schools.
- Paid half the salaries of 2 full-day kindergarten teachers.
- Partially funded professional development for 45 K-3 teachers and paraprofessionals.
- Purchased teaching materials, including a new basal reading program (Scott Foresman Reading Street [2007]), and books for classrooms, media centers, leveled libraries and take-home libraries.
- Paid tuition for several K-3 teachers to complete state reading endorsement.

#### N. SANPETE: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received training at monthly Reading First professional development sessions.
- Substitutes were provided one afternoon a month for grades K-3; teachers reviewed assessment data (DIBELS, TPRI, CRT, CORE, Scott Foresman, Words Their Way) with peers and literacy coaches; appropriate instructional practices and interventions were planned to support the needs of struggling readers.
- Coaches observed in classrooms and modeled exemplary Tier I and Tier 2 instruction that implemented SBRR practices.
- Teachers used a new basal reading program and an increased amount of printed material.
- Teachers who completed reading endorsement classes have increased knowledge that helps them be more effective in their classrooms.

#### N. SANPETE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 2 coaches are exceptionally well trained.
- Literacy director, 2 coaches, 2 principals, and 45 K-3 teachers are proficient in administering many types of assessments.
- Coaches work cooperatively with teachers to implement improved instructional practices that prevent reading failure in their students.
- Teachers are able to assess student progress competently and to provide appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, as well as Tier 1 instruction.
- 700 students received a program review to improve reading efficiency.
- Approximately 40 at-risk K students received a full day of instruction, which improved their chances for success.
- Students whose assessments showed less than adequate reading ability received Tier 2 or Tier 3 intervention.

##### *Medium Term*

- 94.4% of K students met benchmark standards on phonemic segmentation as measured by DIBELS.
- All Gr. 1-3 average CRT scores exceeded our goals for the year.

##### *Long Term*

Primary grade students are continuing to show progress, especially 1st and 3rd grades. North Sanpete is confident that it will reach all of its year three goals.

**NORTH SUMMIT SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## N. SUMMIT: Inputs/uses of program funds

Hired 1 literacy specialist for North Summit Elementary.

## N. SUMMIT: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy specialist guided small-group instruction; provided writing instruction; oversaw and provided Tier 2 instruction in the afternoon; administered and managed benchmark and screening of DIBELS; boosted parental involvement and awareness in district's motto "20 Minutes to Success."
- All teachers were trained in fluency instruction.

## N. SUMMIT: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Teachers were provided 30 minutes of help for small-group instruction during the literacy block for grades 1–3.
- Literacy specialist managed DIBELS benchmark and screening with fidelity; organized several reading and literacy opportunities for involvement in district motto "20 Minutes to Success."
- All grade 1-4 teachers were trained to teach fluency lessons.
- Tier 2 instruction (intervention) was given outside the 3-hour literacy block.
- Approximately 56 students received afternoon Tier 2 instruction (intervention) to improve reading proficiency.
- The majority of the staff implemented daily fluency lessons.

*Medium Term*

- The number of students meeting benchmark on DIBELS improved.
- All Gr. 1-4 Language Arts CRT scores improved.

*Long Term*

- 83% of K students were to meet benchmark using DIBELS.
- 70% of grades 1-4 students were to meet benchmark using DIBELS.
- 80% of grades 1-4 students were to meet proficiency on the Utah Elementary Language Arts CRTs.
- All goals were met by the end of the 2005–2006 school year.

**OGDEN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## OGDEN: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Paid salary of 1.5 reading coaches (district paid for the other 14).
- Upgraded every school to a current scientifically based core reading program.
- Paid for 28 hours of training for all K-3 teachers, including special education, ESL, and reading coaches.
- Printed DIBELS assessment materials; all students K-6 were given the 3 benchmark assessments.
- Purchased fluency passages for all grades and schools.
- Paid presenters and technical consultants.

## OGDEN: Activities/program outputs

- Reading coaches met weekly for training and collaboration.
- Every student now has instruction from the best available materials.
- AmeriCorps volunteers organized thousands of hours of one-on-one tutoring for students.
- All K-3 teachers received training in: classroom environment; explicit instruction; fluency; use of informational text; comprehension; effective use of the basal program, presented by a certified trainer in the Program-Specific (Harcourt Brace). Training developed through the Western Regional Reading First Technical Assistance Center.
- Classrooms are now organized better for learning, including how to use the walls and what spaces should be created and used.
- Principals received training and coaching in observation.
- Every student now has access to hundreds of informational texts, to build much-needed background knowledge and to learn to read to gain.

## OGDEN: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- New standards for instruction are now in place in classroom environment, explicit teaching, fluency, use of informational text, and comprehension. These standards will be taught and monitored from now on.
- Students receiving more direct instruction focused on more specific targeted learning outcomes (e.g., phonemic awareness, fluency, etc.)
- Reading coaches and principals have better skills in program improvement.
- Classrooms better equipped and better organized for high-quality instruction.
- Teachers' knowledge base is much greater on targeted outcomes.

*Medium Term*

- Expectations and standards are now in place for the future, including specific follow-up this coming year.
- 75% of the grades in schools (68 of 90) have more students at benchmark than they did a year ago.

*Long Term*

Sustained increases in student proficiency: 3rd grade as target grade: 2004 = 60%; 2005 = 65%; 2006 = 70%.

## PARK CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

### PARK CITY: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Trained paraprofessionals at the 4 elementary schools.
- Provided a reading specialist at 1 school (all elementary schools had at least 1 reading specialist and 2 of the 4 had 2 specialists).
- Provided Level 2 Reading Endorsement classes for the reading specialists.
- All teachers were provided with intensive Words Their Way training.
- Provided 80 Earobics slots in each school.
- Paid for Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading coordinators in every school (to supplement Title V monies).
- Supported a summer program for at-risk, non-proficient readers in grades 1–3.
- Purchased Great Source Writing Kits and leveled library materials.

### PARK CITY: Activities/program outputs

- All teachers received training on DIBELS, the development of Individual Learning Plans, and monitoring student progress.
- Substitutes were provided 3 times a year for teachers to assess student progress and collaboratively plan effective interventions.
- Earobics software was installed and Curriculum Technology Facilitators trained teachers in its use.

### PARK CITY: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- 8 teachers participated in Reading Level 1 Endorsement program.
- Each school has a trained reading specialist and two paraprofessionals.
- All teachers were trained in Words Their Way.
- Teachers were trained to use DIBELS as a level assessment and monitoring tool.
- Almost 500 students were given attention, additional services, and intensive intervention through the ILP process.
- CRT scores improved for grades 1–3.
- Teachers' skills have been improved through additional training.

#### *Long Term*

Students gaining proficiency in reading at earlier ages.

## PIUTE SCHOOL DISTRICT

### PIUTE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 2 half-time teachers to reduce class size during the reading block.
- Provided professional development for all K–3 teachers on 3-Tiered instructional model.

### PIUTE: Activities/program outputs

- All K–3 teachers trained on DIBELS, TPRI, and UTIPS.
- All K–3 teachers analyzed CRT and UTIPS test results and planned interventions for struggling readers.

### PIUTE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- 9 teachers are proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS data, CRT data, and UTIPS data.
- 9 teachers are proficient in using above data to plan and administer interventions to assist struggling readers.
- 70 students received program review to improve reading proficiency.
- 15 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve reading proficiency.

#### *Medium Term*

K–3 test scores have improved each year, on average.

#### *Long Term*

- Average Gr. 1–3 CRT scores are to stay above 70% passing.
- AYP goal is to reach AYP; so far the goal has been met.
- In 2005, 3rd grade reached 100% passing AYP standard.

**PROVO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## PROVO CITY: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Provided time-release literacy coordinators (LCs) at every school.
- Provided schools with paraprofessional hours for K-3 reading interventions.
- Provided professional development for LCs to support teachers in their use of literacy strategies in their schools.
- Provided professional development for paraprofessionals involved in literacy tutoring.
- Provided literacy materials for all of the district's elementary schools.

## PROVO CITY: Activities/program outputs

- LCs received district training related to Comprehensive Balanced Literacy and the Big 5 (phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary) in monthly professional development meetings.
- LCs provided in-service and led discussions with classroom teachers related to Comprehensive Balanced Literacy in monthly guided meetings.
- Paraprofessionals trained in the use of Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading Tutoring and Project SEEL.
- Assessments used at all schools to identify students in need of literacy tutoring.
- 7 of 13 elementary schools used Professional Learning Communities to focus grade-level collaboration on student achievement.
- Paraprofessionals at all schools provided individual and small-group literacy tutoring to at-risk students.
- Principals and LCs identified and purchased materials to be used in supporting improved classroom instruction and tutoring.
- LCs and the district reading specialist created a new LC job description and a new K-2 phonics scope and sequence.

## PROVO CITY: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- 13 elementary LCs are trained in literacy and coaching strategies.
- All schools and teachers participate in regular professional development directed to improving student literacy.
- All teachers have the opportunity to be mentored and coached in their classrooms by trained LCs.
- Over 50 paraprofessionals are trained in providing reading interventions.
- Over 800 students participated in reading interventions across the district.
- Teachers' instructional practice in Language Arts continues to improve.
- Teachers' attentiveness to their students' reading assessments is increasing.
- The majority of students participating in reading interventions made significant growth in reading ability based on individual assessments given at the school level.
- The Provo City School District K assessment is providing appropriate cut scores of proficiency and gain measurements.

*Medium Term*

- Percentage gain on the K assessment will continue to increase despite growing numbers of at-risk students as K interventions expand.
- A 2% increase in the percentage of students achieving reading proficiency on the Language Arts CRTs was anticipated in Gr. 1-3. However, while 2nd and 3rd grades did make gains, 1st grade declined. The overall CRT proficiency for primary grades remained at 78% despite growing number of at-risk students.

*Long Term*

- The gain experienced by kindergartners from the beginning to the end of the school year as measured by the district's K assessment will continue to increase year to year until an 80% gain is realized consistently.
- By 2007, 84% of grade 1-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by the state CRTs.



**RICH SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## RICH: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Provided access to Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) monitoring that helped teachers track the progress and growth of students. This also works as an assessment to determine weakness early, so the district can better support children and guide them in instruction appropriate to their needs.
- Books were purchased to supplement the Scott Foresman reading activities and to use in the Accelerated Reader program. Quizzes were purchased to measure success of reading students.
- Teacher resource books were purchased, including individual teacher resource books for elementary teachers. The district purchased many resource books for center activities, writing ideas, six-traits writing, vocabulary building, and fluency-strengthening strategies, phonics, and reading materials.

## RICH: Activities/program outputs

- Provided professional training from a well-known reading specialist.
- Teachers attended professional development workshops throughout the year to enhance their practice.
- Appropriate interventions and assessments were developed to use as baseline levels for students. The interventions were decided after the assessments were administered and scored to determine in which groups children were placed. The district's reading intervention practice was implemented because of this opportunity.
- Substitutes were provided while regular classroom teachers were in training.

## RICH: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Students were tested to determine their reading levels and improve reading proficiency.
- Students below grade level were given extra reading help to develop skills and strategies they can use to become more fluent readers.

*Medium Term*

- All Gr. 1–3 students performed higher on assessments in the spring than in the fall. First grade showed improvement of +1.2, second grade +0.9, and third grade a +0.9 on the Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading test.
- 96% of K students met proficiency on letter-naming fluency and sounds as measured by CBM.

*Long Term*

80% of all students in grades K–3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading testing, and Utah Elementary Language Arts Core Curriculum Standards.

## SALT LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

### SALT LAKE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 4.5 literacy coaches, 1 assistant to the language arts coordinator, 1 cross-age tutor/Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading trainer.
- Provided additional instructional time for K students at 25 sites.
- Provided professional development for K teachers; substitutes provided for teachers to attend 3 days.
- Provided professional development for Gr. 1 and special education teachers; substitutes provided for teachers to attend 4 days.
- Provided professional development for Gr. 2 teachers; substitutes provided for teachers to attend 4 days.
- 3 FTEs funded 6 Reading Recovery teachers (one half-time for RR Teacher Leader) at 6 sites.
- Purchased Early Steps materials, trained 10 teachers, provided substitutes for one-on-one tutoring at 2 sites.
- Purchased materials to support early literacy instruction: phonics, spelling, phonemic awareness, writing, fluency, content literacy, comprehension, and oral language.
- Purchased leveled books to support small-group instruction.

### SALT LAKE: Activities/program outputs

- 4.5 literacy coaches, 1 cross-age trainer, and assistant to the language arts coordinator coached and supported 577 teachers in 27 schools and designed and facilitated 28 professional development days for K-3 teachers.
- 1 new school implemented Early Steps.
- 27 schools implemented screening/benchmarking/DIBELS at K-3.
- 486 teachers trained in administering and using DIBELS; 12,698 students were benchmarked 3 times throughout year.
- Literacy coaches facilitated 1,621 data collection sessions and 1,154 follow-up sessions to discuss instructional implications.
- 27 schools used DRA to assess reading growth at Gr. 1-2.
- All K teachers assessed students using district's K assessment, fall and spring.
- 25 full-day kindergarten programs provided 6 hours of instruction for 579 K students; 2 extended-day K programs served 102 children.
- 69 students completed a Reading Recovery Program; 74% returned to the classroom reading at grade level.
- 2 new sites implemented cross-age tutoring.
- 5 sites implemented Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program (147 volunteers tutored 294 students).

### SALT LAKE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- Students attending full-day K in 2004-05 held achievement gains in 2005-06.
- 95% of students reading on grade level in Gr. 1 are on or above grade level in Gr. 2
- Gr. 3 cohort (continuously enrolled) increased proficiency: 66% proficient in 2003-04, 69% proficient in 2004-05, 72% proficient in 2005-06.
- 68% of students at strategic level on DIBELS were proficient on the CRT, while 92% of students reaching benchmark reached proficiency.

#### *Short Term*

- Increased oral language acquisition among K-2 students.
- Increased fluency rates and comprehension among Gr. 1-3 students.
- Increased number of classrooms implementing systematic phonics and spelling instruction.
- Increased number of schools using screening and benchmarking assessment practices.

#### *Medium Term*

- Increased % of students making or exceeding 1 year's growth when comparing CRT scores from year to year.
- Increased proficiency for targeted Tier 2 students.
- Increased % of students reading on grade level, using DRA.
- Increased % of students reaching grade-level benchmarks.

#### *Long Term*

Increased % of students scoring proficient on Utah end-of-level CRT.

**SAN JUAN SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## SAN JUAN: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 9 classroom interventionists to rotate to all K–3 classrooms providing support for Tier 2 or 3 instruction.
- Provided professional development support for interventionists and K–3 classroom teachers.

## SAN JUAN: Activities/program outputs

- Classroom teachers and interventionists received 3-day training on template and lesson plan instruction.
- K–3 teachers received a minimum of 30 minutes each day of intervention support to allow for Tier 2 small-group instruction.

## SAN JUAN: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- 42 teachers and 9 interventionists have clear, precise understanding of tiered instruction.
- 42 teachers are using the district's specific lesson plan and template direct instructions.
- 42 teachers and 9 interventionists are proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS assessments.
- All Strategic and Intensive (on DIBELS) students receive Tier 2 instruction.
- All students receive 15 minutes of direct phonological template instruction.

*Medium Term*

- 92% of all K students are low risk as assessed by DIBELS NWF.
- 71% of 1st graders at benchmark as assessed by DIBELS.
- 64% of 2nd graders at benchmark as assessed by DIBELS.

*Long Term*

- 57% of 3rd graders will be at benchmark as assessed by DIBELS.
- 80% of all students K–3 will be at benchmark as assessed by DIBELS.

## SEVIER SCHOOL DISTRICT

### SEVIER: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 3 literacy coaches for 3 Title I elementary schools.
- Provided professional development for literacy coaches, intervention specialists and principals.
- Provided Level I Reading Endorsement classes for teachers.
- Provided school-based intervention programs before and after school and during the summer.
- Purchased leveled libraries to support reading interventions.
- Improved Sevier School District's Parent Page so parents can easily access literacy skill levels of their students.

### SEVIER: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received USOE training on the essential practices for successful school literacy coaching.
- District provided training for coaches and grade-level teachers on DIBELS and TPRI assessments.
- Monthly substitutes were provided for teachers in grades K-3 to review student assessment data with principals, literacy coaches and intervention specialists; appropriate instructional practices and interventions were planned and implemented to support the needs of struggling readers.
- Schools used TPRI, DIBELS, and Open Court assessment data to provide targeted intervention to struggling readers before and after school and during the summer.
- State core curriculum was mapped; power standards identified in language arts; blueprints and district four-year literacy plan developed.
- Schools provided training to parents so parents could access the Parent Page and interpret the literacy scores for their children.

### SEVIER: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- 3 literacy coaches trained on essential coaching practices.
- 3 coaches and all K-3 teachers proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS and TPRI assessments.
- 3 coaches and all K-3 teachers trained in data-driven decision-making and using assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
- 3 coaches and 4 principals are trained to observe literacy instruction and work cooperatively with teachers to improve Purpose, Engagement, Rigor and Results (PERR).
- Students' ongoing diagnostic reading data were reviewed and Individual Learning Plans were developed.
- 163 students received from 20-105 minutes for up to 170 days per year of Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency.

#### *Medium Term*

- All K students improved results on the TPRI (January to April) progress monitoring assessments in all subtests.
- Gr. 1-3 students improved results on the TPRI (Sept. to April) progress monitoring assessments in all subtests.

#### *Long Term*

- 88% of K students reached reading proficiency as measured by the Visual Discrimination/Phonemic Awareness subtest of the state K assessment and 92% of K students reached reading proficiency as measured by the comprehension subtest.
- In 2006-07, 85% or more K students will link sounds to letter with 90% accuracy on the TPRI subtest.
- 77% of 1st grade students reached reading proficiency as measured by the Utah Language Arts CRT.
- 77% of 2nd grade students reached reading proficiency as measured by the Utah Language Arts CRT.
- Gr. 3 students will match the state's status goal in reading proficiency as measured by the Utah CRT.

### SOUTH SANPETE SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### S. SANPETE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 3 literacy coaches, one at each elementary school.
- Provided classroom materials for 3 literacy coaches.

#### S. SANPETE: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received training through CUES Regional Reading Specialist.
- Literacy coaches and classroom-level teachers held grade-level study groups.
- School faculty received Tier 2 and Tier 3 literacy training.
- School faculty received training in Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP).
- Established curriculum councils in language, math, and social studies.

#### S. SANPETE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 3 literacy coaches trained.
- Coaches and teachers are administering and interpreting the DIBELS and TPRI assessments.
- 844 students received DIBELS testing to determine reading proficiency.

##### *Long Term*

80% of all students will reach the Established or Emerging level on DIBELS.

### SOUTH SUMMIT SCHOOL DISTRICT

#### S. SUMMIT: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 1 reading specialist and funded attendance at IRA reading conference.
- Hired 2 full-time para-educators, 1 AmeriCorps volunteer, and 3 class size reduction teachers.
- Provided professional development and literacy instructional support.
- Added to and repaired existing leveled reading books.

#### S. SUMMIT: Activities/program outputs

- Reading specialist provided staff training, led small-group interventions, oversaw DIBELS assessments, offered Guided Reading training, served as Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading reading coordinator (supervised AmeriCorps volunteer), aligned literacy instruction with Utah Core.
- K–3 class size kept at 22 or less.
- All staff trained to administer DIBELS; students benchmarked 3 times per year.
- Guided Reading para-educators work with small groups on focused literacy skills.
- Fall Literacy Fair held during parent-teacher conferences.
- 110 literacy bags provided to incoming K students.

#### S. SUMMIT: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 95% of families attended family literacy night.
- 638 students received balanced literacy program.
- 100 students received Tier 2 interventions with a reading specialist.

##### *Medium Term*

All students were progress monitored 3 times per year; interventions modified as needed.

##### *Long Term*

- All K–5 students increased their oral reading fluency.
- All students identified as Intensive on DIBELS increased to the Strategic level.

**TINTIC SCHOOL DISTRICT**

TINTIC: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired reading specialist/literacy coach.
- Purchased TPRI.

TINTIC: Activities/program outputs

- Reading specialist took reading endorsement classes.
- 3 elementary teachers took reading endorsement classes.
- Training was provided for the reading specialist and all teachers on the TPRI.

TINTIC: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Reading specialist trained on research-based reading practices.
- 3 elementary teachers trained on research-based practices.
- Reading specialist, special education teacher, and 9 teachers proficient in administering and interpreting the TPRI assessments.
- Reading specialist, special education teacher, and 9 teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
- 40 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency.

*Medium Term*

- All K students improved on the Utah K assessment.
- All 1st grade students improved on the CRTs.
- All 2nd grade students improved on the ORI 3.

*Long Term*

- Reduce the number of K students that did not make proficiency by 10% as measured by the Utah K test.
- Reduce the number of Gr. 1-3 students that did not make proficiency by 10% for the language arts core tests.
- Reduce the number of Gr. 1-3 students that did not meet or exceed one year's growth in reading by 10% as measured by the QRI 3.

**TOOELE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## TOOELE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired 13 literacy specialists for 15 elementary schools.
- Purchased DIBELS material for K.
- Literacy specialists at each school provided professional development.
- Produced and duplicated Tooele School District literacy framework handbook for 350 teachers.
- Purchased Scott Foresman basal literacy program on a two-year implementation plan for 14 elementary schools.
- Time provided for staff development and district literacy team planning.

## TOOELE: Activities/program outputs

- Provided literacy leadership and research-based professional development.
- Provided DIBELS training for 45 K teachers.
- Developed literacy framework and handbook for 350 teachers.
- Provided implementation leadership for Scott Foresman basal for all grade 4–6 teachers.
- Attended local, state and national conferences and workshops.
- Coordinated budgets and collaborated on literacy goals with special education, Title I, technology and district mentors.
- Board adopted new state teacher standards after director presentation.
- 85 new teachers trained by team on literacy as part of new teacher induction program.

## TOOELE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- All K students assessed with DIBELS and grade 1–6 students assessed with DRA.
- Students receive Tier 1 instruction from classroom teacher.
- More students receive planned Tier 2 interventions.

*Medium Term*

- Gr. 4–6 teachers will use various progress monitoring tools available in SF series.
- Literacy specialist and teachers continue to improve their literacy knowledge and expertise through effective professional development, cognitive coaching and modeling.
- Collaboration and communication improve between classroom teachers and special service providers.
- More students participate in small-group instruction.
- Teachers plan for and anticipate more students will be proficient on CRT Assessment.

*Long Term*

- 80% of K students will be proficient on DIBELS
- 77% of 1st grade students will be proficient on CRT.
- 80% of 2nd grade students will be proficient on CRTs.
- 80% of 3rd grade students will be proficient on CRTs.

**UINTAH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## UINTAH: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Provided professional development for 7 literacy coaches and all elementary teachers.
- Provided 14 reading tutors for the 7 elementary schools.
- Provided pre-, mid-, and post-assessment to screen, diagnose, and monitor progress leading to proficiency.
- Provided 7 half-time teachers to provide released time for literacy coordinators at 7 schools.

## UNITAH: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches received Cell/Exll training on the essential practices for successful school literacy coaching.
- Cell/Exll professional development was provided to all K-5 teachers, helping them become more effective in providing literacy instruction.
- Under the direction of the literacy coaches, 2 reading tutors for 7 elementary schools provided Tier 2 instruction for struggling readers.
- All 7 elementary schools were trained to use NWEA as a pre-, mid-, and post-assessment to monitor progress of all students toward state and district standards.
- All 7 elementary schools provided training for coaches and elementary teachers on DIBELS assessment.

## UINTAH: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- 7 literacy coaches trained on Cell/Exll and essential coaching practices.
- 7 coaches and 140 elementary teachers proficient in Cell/Exll (literacy instruction) to improve instruction for all students.
- 7 coaches and 140 teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for all students.
- 7 literacy coaches can adequately observe classroom instruction and work with teachers in implementing improved instructional practices using the core curriculum to prevent reading failure.
- All students received a comprehensive instructional program that included teacher read-aloud and independent reading during the Self-Selected Reading Block. Comprehension instruction was included during Guided Reading. Phonics, including phonemic awareness, was taught during Working With Words. Fluency was taught during Word Wall activities and during Guided Reading. Writing instruction was included during the Writing block and across curriculum areas. Meaning vocabulary was taught during Guided Reading and during Guided Reading related to science and social studies. Meaning vocabulary was developed during Self-Selected Reading and as children listened to what the teacher read aloud.
- 400 students were targeted to improve reading proficiency.
- 350 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency.

*Medium Term*

- While not all Gr. 1-3 Language Arts CRT scores improved as a whole, all grades have achieved the yearly AYP goal of at least 71% of the students achieving passing scores.
- K students were tested using the state K post-test: 85% of K students scored 80% correct or better.

*Long Term*

All students will demonstrate 9 months' literacy growth as measured and monitored by instruments such as CRT, NWEA, IOWA, IRA, and DIBELS.



**WASATCH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## WASATCH: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired a district elementary literacy coach.
- Hired literacy coordinators and teacher assistants in each of the district's elementary schools.

## WASATCH: Activities/program outputs

- District literacy coach received USOE training on essential practices for school literacy coaching as well as training through the BYU partnership on literacy.
- Provided professional development for teachers on guided reading strategies.
- Teachers learned how to choose and introduce instructional level texts; the teachers observed, prompted, and evaluated student performance as students independently read text sections.
- Quarterly grade-level meetings were held for teachers to review student assessment data and collaborate on instructional practices and interventions to support struggling readers.
- Teachers were trained to use the DRA; data used to guide instruction.

## WASATCH: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Literacy coaches trained on essential coaching practices.
- Elementary teachers were observed and evaluated on their implementation of effective instructional strategies by the literacy coach; all administrators visited elementary classrooms to observe these practices.
- Each teacher reviewed with the literacy coach the strengths and weaknesses of their instructional program.
- District and school literacy specialists worked directly with teachers in their classrooms as coaches and mentors, modeling new strategies and techniques through demonstration lessons.
- All students who are not reading proficiently are receiving Tier 2 and 3 instruction to improve their proficiency.

*Medium Term*

K–3 Language Arts CRT scores improved although all goals were not reached.

*Long Term*

The percentage of non-proficient students as measured by the CRTs will decrease each year until the district, state, and federal goals are met.

**WASHINGTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT****WASHINGTON: Inputs/uses of program funds**

- Hired literacy coaches for every school site.
- Other funding was used to hire additional Reading Recovery teachers.
- Other funding provided professional development for all literacy/math staff developers and Reading Recovery teachers and advocates.
- Other funding provided professional development for schools becoming professional learning communities.
- Other funding provided funding for instructors for the State Level I Reading Endorsements.

**WASHINGTON: Activities/program outputs**

- All teachers continued training in comprehension instructional strategies.
- Implemented the Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program where needed.
- Trained paraprofessionals in Early Success and Soar to Success Tutoring for grades 2-5.
- Implemented cross-age tutoring where needed.
- Implemented extended-day kindergarten where needed.
- Implemented after-school programs where needed.
- Implemented summer reading programs where needed.
- Implemented summer access to the take-home library in all elementary schools.
- Improved the use of assessment data to inform instruction and provide intervention through professional learning communities.
- Supervised teachers at school level.
- Reading Recovery teachers worked with identified students in 1st grade.
- District training focused on the district's literacy model.
- Reading Recovery teachers were trained weekly for the entire year.
- New principals and literacy staff developers attended PLC conferences during the past year.
- Collaboration improved between classroom teachers and special education teachers.
- Weekly collaboration time was set aside at each school site.
- District continued to offer reading endorsement classes each year to better train our teachers.

**WASHINGTON: PROGRAM OUTCOMES***Short Term*

- All teachers were trained in comprehension strategy instruction.
- All schools implemented intervention plan K-3.
- 13 schools used cross-age tutoring.
- 8 schools had an extended-day kindergarten.
- 9 schools had an after-school program.
- 11 schools had a summer reading program.
- 28 Reading Recovery teachers were trained or had continuing contact.
- Over 100 teachers attended one or more of the Level 1 reading endorsement classes offered through the district.
- All students not proficient as measured by the CRT will be identified each year and interventions put into place.
- All students not proficient as measured by the DRA will be identified each year and interventions put into place.

*Medium Term*

- All grade 1-3 Language Arts CRT scores will improve each year.
- Mid-year testing will show that 100% of all identified at-risk readers are making progress.

*Long Term*

- At least 80% of all students in grades 1-3 will be proficient as measured by the CRT at the end of 3 years, with a 10% increase of the total students in grades 1-3 who did not previously reach reading proficiency as measured by the CRT at the end of each year.
- At least 80% of all students in grades 1-3 will be proficient as measured by the DRA at the end of 3 years, with a 10% increase of the total students in grades 1-3 who did not previously reach reading proficiency as measured by the DRA at the end of each year.

**WAYNE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## WAYNE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired full-time reading coach and paraprofessional.
- Provided professional development for staff.
- Assessment development provided (PreK, TPRI, QRI, CRT).
- Funds spent to support home interventions (home visits, summer reading, parent involvement).

## WAYNE: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy staff: conducted/attended literacy workshops with administrators and faculty; developed literacy framework with paraprofessionals; facilitated small groups, individualized instruction, monthly collaboration, and assistance with assessment.
- Assessments scored by teachers, specialists and coaches and used to guide instruction, identify at-risk students, and develop ILPs.
- Delivered small-group instruction during summer reading program.
- Held parent nights such as Quarterly Parent Popsicle Reading Activity.
- Reading coach and paraprofessional led Tier 2 and Tier 3 small-group instruction, developed ILPs, built book bags, led one-on-one tutoring (I Can Read).

## WAYNE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Teachers used assessment to drive curriculum.
- Teachers correlated areas of weakness with the Utah State Core Curriculum.
- Increased student attendance as a result of home interventions.
- Improved parent involvement in student learning.

*Medium Term*

- Decision-making based on data.
- Policies dictated by SBRR.
- Increase efficiency of instruction.
- Increase CRT scores.
- Reading at grade level.

*Long Term*

- Increase student achievement.
- Students become life-long learners.
- Student achievement increases across all classes.
- Students become responsible citizens.
- Students master Utah Core Curriculum and standards and objectives for each grade level.

**WEBER SCHOOL DISTRICT**

## WEBER: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired reading teacher/literacy coach in each of its 28 elementary schools.
- Purchased materials for Tier 2 interventions.
- Provided standards-based professional development for all reading teachers.
- District funds purchased and provided professional development on DIBELS assessment tool.

## WEBER: Activities/program outputs

- Reading teachers led small-group interventions at K-3.
- Reading teachers/coaches participated in USOE Reading First professional development sessions.
- Monthly study groups held for reading teachers/coaches.
- Reading teachers and grade-level teacher representatives trained on DIBELS.
- Reading teachers/coaches trained on USOE Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading and cross-age tutoring programs as well as Words Their Way.
- Reading teachers offered reading endorsement courses as they worked toward Advanced Reading Endorsement.
- 1,270 K students, 931 1st graders, 1,104 2nd graders, and 1,110 3rd graders received reading intervention.
- 2,499 students received Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading and cross-age tutoring.

## WEBER: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Differentiated reading instruction for every K-3 student.
- All K-3 students assessed 3 times per year using DIBELS.

*Medium Term*

Improved reading instruction in the regular education classroom.

*Long Term*

- All Gr. 1-3 Utah Language Arts CRT scores will be maintained or improve.
- Data will continue to indicate increased reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS.

## PARTICIPATING CHARTER SCHOOLS (YEAR 2)

### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Purchased the beginnings of a leveled library to support instruction.
- Provided professional development support in SBRR practices.
- Obtained grade-level-appropriate, context-based classroom libraries of narrative and informational text for small, differentiated group instruction.
- Provided explicit, intense, targeted instruction for school's most at-risk students.

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP: Activities/program outputs

- USOE provided training for grade-level teacher representatives on DIBELS assessments.
- Quarterly substitutes were provided for teachers needing observation opportunities for SBRR practices, using the Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum to prevent reading failure.

#### AMERICAN LEADERSHIP: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 12 teachers have materials to support Tier 1 Reading instruction according to SBRR practices and using the Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum.
- 12 teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers.
- All students monitored for reading proficiency.

##### *Medium Term*

Struggling students received small-group or one-on-one intervention.

##### *Long Term*

80% of students in grades K–3 were to reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS LNF and CRT (Gr. 1–3).

### AMERICAN PREPARATORY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

#### AMERICAN PREP: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired Corrective Reading Specialist to oversee students needing intense interventions.
- Trained teachers and paraprofessionals in using DIBELS benchmark assessments.
- Purchased program materials as well as the DIBELS Data System.

#### AMERICAN PREP: Activities/program outputs

- All students assessed using SRA Reading Mastery assessments; students needing interventions were identified by the Corrective Reading Specialist.
- Training provided for K–6 reading teachers and paraprofessionals in DIBELS administration and scoring.

#### AMERICAN PREP: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 26 teachers and paraprofessionals are proficient in using DIBELS progress monitoring.
- 350 students are monitored regularly and interventions are more quickly implemented.
- 46 struggling readers received specialized corrective reading interventions.

##### *Medium Term*

All 2nd and 3rd grade-level Language Arts CRT scores improved.

##### *Long Term*

15 of 46 struggling readers are no longer considered needing intensive interventions in reading instruction.

**FREEDOM ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL**

## FREEDOM: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Increased the selection of materials in K-3 curriculum libraries, extended selection of take-home readers, added titles to library.
- Invited guest speakers and trainers to present information.
- Purchased professional literacy texts for teacher discussion groups focusing on strategies and assessment development.
- Expanded listening centers and purchased big books, nonfiction readers, reading games, reading tutors, and computer tests inventory.

## FREEDOM: Activities/program outputs

- Monthly in-service trainings, workshops and grade-level meetings about reading instruction and literacy skills were provided for teachers throughout the year.
- Provided in-service opportunities to train teachers in creating lessons and curriculum maps that ensured student instruction in reading and literacy across the curriculum.
- Administrative oversight and coaching/mentoring guided teachers in effective development and curriculum delivery throughout the school year.
- Reading tutors worked effectively one-on-one and in small groups to increase phonics skills, fluency, and comprehension.
- Teachers used additional texts in guided reading groups to extend and enrich the curriculum; classroom book sets supported differentiated instruction for all learners.

## FREEDOM: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- All students received Spalding instruction with differentiated extensions and interventions as needed.
- Targeted students participated in Tier 2 with reading tutors in small-group and one-on-one settings.
- Students functioning at Tier 3 worked with special education instructors/intensive learning professionals in additional support programs.
- First grade students soared above the other grades with a 7% overall increase in proficiency.
- Students enrolled in summer program greatly improved their reading skills, including a marked increase among students with IEPs.

**JOHN HANCOCK CHARTER SCHOOL**

## JOHN HANCOCK: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired literacy coach.
- Provided DIBELS training to teachers.
- Purchased license from AIMSweb to track student progress.
- Provided focused literacy professional development (Spalding, Words Their Way, alignment with Utah Core Curriculum) for K-3 teachers.

## JOHN HANCOCK: Activities/program outputs

- Developed intensive 3 Tiered literacy program; all teachers trained on it.
- All K-8 teachers trained in use of DIBELS and administer the tests three times per year.
- Students deemed at risk of academic failure are progress monitored more often and the literacy specialist works with teachers on providing needed interventions.
- Teachers trained in Spalding I, Words Their Way, alignment with Utah Core Curriculum.

## JOHN HANCOCK: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Provided teacher literacy training.
- Provided student progress monitoring using DIBELS, teacher assessments including observations, and the state CRTs.

*Medium Term*

Students met all K-3 literacy goals in 2005 and 2006.

## MOAB COMMUNITY SCHOOL

### MOAB: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired a part-time reading coach who provided an additional tier of intervention for struggling readers.
- Funded a parent training night.
- Purchased new basal reading textbooks.

### MOAB: Activities/program outputs

- Reading coach worked one-on-one with struggling readers using Great Leaps as a structured phonics program.
- Parent night focused on teaching skills and helping the children read at home.
- Basal textbooks were purchased during the summer and are being implemented this fall.

### MOAB: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- Reading coach worked with 8 students daily to improve reading skills and phonics.
- 10 parents were trained in comprehension, decoding, and phonic synthesis skills, as well as SBRR reading practices.
- Teachers used the structured approach of the Houghton Mifflin reading program to teach the Utah Core Curriculum; textbooks also facilitate group reading and peer tutoring.
- 8 students received Tier 2 intervention daily.
- 10 parents learned new reading support skills.
- Basal reading program introduced to 290 students and program implemented across 3 grades.

#### *Medium Term*

- 100% of teachers will have additional training in SBRR literacy methods.
- 60% of students will reach proficiency by the end of the third year of implementation.

#### *Long Term*

80% of students will reach proficiency by the 3rd grade, 5 years after the beginning of the reading program.

## NAVIGATOR POINTE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

### NAVIGATOR: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Purchased Reading Mastery program.
- Hired 15 paraprofessionals to help implement program and assist with small groups.
- Literacy coaches attended ADI conference and learned to implement proven procedures to improve reading.
- Substitutes provided so mentors could provide modeling for new teachers.

### NAVIGATOR: Activities/program outputs

- Literacy coaches attended ADI conference and learned to implement proven procedures to improve reading.
- Teachers and paraprofessionals trained to improve Reading Mastery performance.
- Interventions planned and implemented to help struggling readers reach mastery level.
- Substitutes provided so mentors could provide modeling for new teachers.

### NAVIGATOR: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- 3 coaches, 6 teachers, 6 paraprofessionals, and principal trained in Reading Mastery practices.
- Reading Mastery checks have revealed student gains.

#### *Medium Term*

Comprehension skills improved, as measured by daily independent work.

#### *Long Term*

90% of K–3 students were to complete Reading Mastery within their levels, with 80% accuracy on fluency, accuracy, and comprehension tests.

### NORTH DAVIS PREPARATORY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

#### N. DAVIS: Inputs/uses of program funds

- DIBELS: 7 staff assistants tested students and entered data.
- Provided professional development: Susan Mulkey presented in-service on science-based research strategy.
- Implemented Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program.
- Implemented small-group instruction.
- Purchased leveled readers.
- Teacher assistants worked with small groups in grades K-3 during reading intervention block.
- Provided stipends to team leaders to facilitate professional learning communities.

#### N. DAVIS: Activities/program outputs

- 20 teachers were trained in SBRR strategies.
- DIBELS testing began in January.
- 3rd grade teachers supplemented the basal program with Words Their Way strategies.
- Implemented the Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading program on December 1; a 3-hour staff assistant served 39 students.
- Teacher assistants worked with small groups in grades K-3 during reading intervention block.
- Each grade-level team met Friday afternoons to assess student achievement and plan improvements.

#### N. DAVIS: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

##### *Short Term*

- 140 students' progress was monitored every 2 weeks with DIBELS.
- 40 students received Tier 2 instruction with Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading.
- Teachers modified instruction based on student data.
- 3rd grade teacher provided interventions in reading block using additional curriculum materials.

##### *Medium Term*

- K: 2005 to 2006: 88% to 74%: Fewer students in mastery.
- Gr. 1: 2005 to 2006: 84% to 69%: Fewer students in mastery.
- Gr. 2: 2005 to 2006: 80% to 71%: Fewer students in mastery.
- Gr. 3: 2005 to 2006: 89% to 90%: Slight gains.

##### Comparing year to year with the same students . . .

- K to Gr. 1: 88% to 69%: Dropped.
- Gr. 1 to Gr. 2: 84% to 71%: Dropped.
- Gr. 2 to Gr. 3: 80% to 89%: Gained.

##### *Long Term*

North Davis has only been in operation for two years; 2006-07 is year 3.



## NORTH STAR ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

### NORTH STAR: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Provided listening centers (players and headsets and jack boxes).
- Purchased leveled readers for leveled library.
- Purchase and produced grammar materials.
- Purchased 6+1 writing materials.

### NORTH STAR: Activities/program outputs

- All teachers trained on Tier 1 method of instruction (Guided Reading).
- Guided reading instructor coached and mentored individual teachers.
- Teachers trained on administering running records as well as DRA placement exams.
- A Tier 2 literacy intervention (Reading Mastery) provided for students K–3 who were reading below grade level.
- Special education is providing Tier 3 reading intervention per IEP.

### NORTH STAR: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- All teachers proficient in teaching Guided Reading.
- All teachers know how to administer DRA assessments.
- Teachers trained to place students in Tier 2 intervention.
- Students below grade level are being served in Tier 2 or Tier 3 programs.
- Approximately 90% of students scored proficient on CRT or North Star kindergarten assessment.

## OGDEN PREPARATORY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

### OGDEN: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Hired qualified teaching assistants to work with targeted groups of students, test targeted students, and record data for teachers to analyze at team meetings.
- Purchased professional development materials for teachers to use at school-based workshops.
- Purchased teaching materials used for working with targeted students.

### OGDEN: Activities/program outputs

- Teaching assistants trained to work with DIBELS testing and teaching materials.
- Data recorded from Harcourt pre- and post- unit tests were analyzed by teaching staff along with DIBELS results for skill development on a student-by-student basis.
- Weekly team meetings are used to discuss students' skill acquisition and effective teaching strategies.
- UTIPS assessments are used to determine specific skill mastery among students needing further interventions.

### OGDEN: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- 8 teachers trained in administering DIBELS.
- 8 teachers are proficient in reading data from UTIPS assessments, Harcourt spreadsheets, and DIBELS.
- Teachers trained assistants in administering DIBELS, given weekly to targeted students (results analyzed bi-weekly).
- Teaching assistants coached in effective reading instruction and small-group strategies; observed working with students and given feedback from classroom teacher or principal.
- 250 students affected by reading proficiency improvement plan.
- 20 students receiving Tier 2 interventions to improve proficiency.

#### *Medium Term*

- DIBELS testing will show an increase of 5% of students moving into Low Risk status.
- 90% of students will show mastery of skills taught and re-taught to date.

#### *Long Term*

All Gr. 1–3 Language Arts CRT scores will improve annually by more than 5%.

**PINNACLE CANYON ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL**

## PINNACLE: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Purchased Success for All Program (SFA).
- Trained 8 regular education teachers, 2 special education teachers, and 12 paraeducators on SFA.

## PINNACLE: Activities/program outputs

- Comprehensive program was purchased for each classroom; materials included puppets, instruction manuals, scripted reading instruction and daily lesson plans.
- All regular and special education teachers (and 12 paraeducators) received 7 additional days of professional development and 3 monitoring visits provided by SFA staff.
- 160 students received literacy instruction through SFA; received take-home books weekly to increase their home reading libraries; received quality instruction that met all 3 tiers of the 3 Tiered Model.

## PINNACLE: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- 7 teachers, 2 special education teachers, and 12 paraeducators trained in SFA implementation.
- K-3 students have additional reading materials in their homes.
- Students in grades K-3 assessed often to determine areas to target.
- Students given specific and additional help as needed.

*Medium Term*

- Students given books to read on their own reading level.
- 94% of students in grades K-3 reading on or above grade level.

*Long Term*

95% of all K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS in K and the Language Arts CRTs in grades 1-3.

**SOLDIER HOLLOW CHARTER SCHOOL**

## SOLDIER HOLLOW: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Teachers trained in new instructional techniques.
- Purchased new basal reading program for grades 1-6.
- Implemented Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading tutoring for grades K-3.
- Purchased leveled reading libraries.

## SOLDIER HOLLOW: Activities/program outputs

- Implemented new classroom practices such as Words Their Way.
- Using DIBELS to monitor student reading progress.
- Using basal readers as initial classroom instrument; add supplements to each program to reinforce skill development.
- Created curriculum maps.
- Using short-term skill groups to reteach lessons and reinforce difficult concepts.
- Working as a K-3 team to differentiate curriculum ideas and lessons to better meet the needs of individual students.

## SOLDIER HOLLOW: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading tutoring is a daily activity in all K-3 classrooms.
- Teachers developing word walls and other practices that reinforce techniques from inservices or workshops attended.
- Teachers are skilled in using DIBELS to assess students and chart ongoing progress throughout the year to measure areas needing further instruction or review.
- More frequent needs assessment allows for quicker refocusing on things that need to be retaught or reinforced.
- Students are more focused on word recognition through word walls and tutoring.

*Medium Term*

- Reading levels are increasing towards grade level at a better rate.
- Families are getting more involved as they volunteer for tutoring and development of the take-home library.

*Long Term*

- More reading interest among students.
- Reading proficiency levels are rising.

## SUMMIT ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

### SUMMIT: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Literacy coaches hired to assist in professional development training and implementation of literacy program.
- Provided instructors for small-group instruction to target language arts with a focus on reading proficiency and mastery.
- Provided extended phonics/reading classes after school for struggling students requiring reading assistance and intervention.
- Purchased specific, supplemental phonics and reading curriculum materials to enhance language arts instruction and target readers at all ability levels.

### SUMMIT: Activities/program outputs

- Teachers received intensive training in phonics and language arts strategies, Utah Literacy Model, and embedded curriculum assessment from master teachers, reading specialists, and literacy coaches.
- Teachers participated in professional development in Multiple Intelligences (MI) theory and developed learning strategies to help “engage” students and overcome barriers to learning. MI strategies were integrated into all areas of reading and language arts instruction.
- Small-group instruction was utilized to target students at their specific mastery levels for the purpose of specializing instruction to meet specific needs and to sequentially build skills and reading proficiency.
- Teachers regularly evaluated and reviewed student assessment data and used the UT Language Arts Core Curriculum to improve instruction.

### SUMMIT: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- Interventions through “Fun Phonics” classes for identified students yielded improvements in individual reading proficiency.
- Teachers are well-trained in small-group instruction for targeted reading and language arts proficiency at all mastery levels.
- MI strategies are integrated in all areas of the reading and language arts curriculum.
- Teachers are trained to administer, review, and use assessment data and the Utah Core to plan and implement improved reading instruction and best practices for student success.
- All K–3 students participated in small-group instruction targeting reading, literacy, and language arts proficiency.
- All students participated in CRT testing for 2005–06 school year.

#### *Medium Term*

DIBELS tests are administered by K–3 teachers on a monthly or bi-monthly basis (as designated) to assess individual student gains in reading and literacy.

#### *Long Term*

80% of all K–3 students will reach proficiency as measured by DIBELS in kindergarten and the Utah Language Arts CRTs in grades 1–3.

**THOMAS EDISON CHARTER SCHOOL NORTH CAMPUS**

T. EDISON NORTH: Inputs/uses of program funds

Partially funded the hiring of an instructional specialist, who provides ongoing staff development in literacy.

T. EDISON NORTH: Activities/program outputs

- Instructional specialist is certified trainer in the Spalding Method.
- Instructional specialist provides professional development to teachers and monitors progress through classroom observations.
- Instructional specialist demonstrates research-based reading and language arts strategies in all classrooms.

T. EDISON NORTH: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

*Short Term*

- Spalding training provided to all teachers (during summer) and most K-3 instructional aides.
- 3 in-service days focus on literacy.
- Weekly supplemental training provided during faculty meetings.
- 224 K-3 students are taught 70 Spalding phonograms daily and use phonograms to begin reading and vocabulary development.
- Students taught writing strategies through six-traits and Step Up to Writing.

*Medium Term*

By spring 2006, K-3 students achieved at least one year of growth in phonemic awareness and reading comprehension.

*Long Term*

UPASS goals have not been met and have been rewritten.

**THOMAS EDISON CHARTER SCHOOL SOUTH CAMPUS**

T. EDISON SOUTH: Inputs/uses of program funds

Paid portion of the salary of Director of Instruction.

T. EDISON SOUTH: Activities/program outputs

- Director of Instruction trained all teachers (including specialists) in instructional methods and assessment tools.
- Director of Instruction provided individual coaching and modeling.
- Most staff meetings focused on literacy details. Director of Instruction and the principal frequently monitored program delivery.
- Written feedback was provided to each teacher.

T. EDISON SOUTH: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

- All teachers trained and consistently applied the strategies taught.
- Monthly student scores gradually improved throughout the school year.
- Most end-of-year scores/goals achieved.
- Most students and parents gained confidence in their new school experience.

### TIMPANOGOS ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

TIMPANOGOS: Inputs/uses of program funds  
Hired language arts specialist for the 2005-06 school year.

TIMPANOGOS: Activities/program outputs

- Timpanogos Academy staff received extensive training on the Spalding Method.
- Certified Spalding trainer led parent trainings.

TIMPANOGOS: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- Staff trained in Spalding Language Arts and administering Spalding assessments.
- Language arts specialist observed, tutored, and gave in-service workshops for the faculty during SY2005-06.
- All students received the Spalding Method of Language Arts to improve reading proficiency, with additional tutoring for those not meeting grade levels.

#### *Medium Term*

- 96% of K students met proficiency on phonogram recognition as measured by Spalding.
- Gr. 1–3 students' Language Arts scores improved according to Spalding assessments and reached targeted proficiency levels on the CRT.

#### *Long Term*

- Students will continue to reach 90% on reading proficiency in phonemic awareness and phonograms.
- 75% of grades 1–3 will be proficient on the CRT.

### WASATCH PEAK ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

WASATCH PEAK: Inputs/uses of program funds

- Purchased basal reading books (Scott Foresman) for grades 1–3 and Start Reading books for K.
- Purchased ECRI reading teaching materials.
- Provided 3 weeks of initial professional development prior to school starting for 14 teachers and 9 instructional assistants in the ECRI methods for teaching reading.
- Provided professional development for 9 instructional assistants in ECRI tutoring methods.
- Provided professional development for 1 reading teacher mentor.

WASATCH PEAK: Activities/program outputs

- Scott Foresman basal reading books for grades 1–3 and the ECRI Start Reading books for K were used daily.
- Teachers and instructional assistants used the teaching methods of ECRI for 90 minutes daily in ability groups.
- Instructional assistants and some parent volunteers tutored Tier 2 students.
- Teachers and instructional assistants continued learning correct teaching methods for ECRI instruction.
- The reading mentor visited ECRI reading groups and mentored beginning reading teachers as needed.

WASATCH PEAK: PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### *Short Term*

- 14 teachers and 9 instructional assistants proficient in teaching ECRI reading methods.
- 9 instructional assistants proficient in tutoring Tier 2 students to prevent reading failure.
- 330 students assessed for their reading ability group placements.
- 20 students received Tier 2 and 10 students received Tier 3 targeted interventions to improve literacy proficiency.

#### *Medium Term*

- Using Wasatch Peak's baseline percentages on the IOWA and CRTs, it is anticipated grades 1–3 percentages will improve yearly.
- Using students' ECRI IRI and Mastery Test scores, Wasatch Peak anticipates advancement for students.

## APPENDIX E

### INDIVIDUAL DISTRICT AND CHARTER SCHOOL DATA: SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS AND RESULTS

The tables that follow, for each participating district and charter school, have two main parts: self-reported data and state English Language Arts Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) data.

Part 1 of each table specifies the self-reported goals, assessments, and results submitted to the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) in fall 2006 Annual Reading Proficiency Reports.

- Column 1 indicates grade level.
- Column 2 specifies the Year 2 proficiency goal that was set for each grade level. Year 1 goals are not included in these tables.<sup>1</sup>
- Column 3 lists the assessment measure used to evaluate whether the participant's Year 2 goal was met.
- Columns 4, 5, and 7 depict student performance on the specified measure in SY2003/04, SY2004/05, and SY2005/06.
- Columns 6 and 8 indicate whether the district or charter school reported meeting its specified grade-level goals in Year 1 (SY2004/05) and Year 2 (SY2005/06). Note that a *Yes* or *No* in Column 6 indicates whether the participant met its Year 1 goal, which is not listed in the table. So if the district or charter changed its proficiency goal from Year 1 to Year 2, the determination in Column 6 may not align with the goal listed in Column 2.

Part 2 of each data table (the three right columns) indicates the district's or charter school's proficiency rates (the percentages of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4) on the English Language Arts CRT administered in the spring of 2004, 2005, and 2006.<sup>2</sup> When reviewing CRT figures in this context, certain key statistical considerations should be kept in mind.

First, these results depict three different grade-level cohorts of varying sizes and compositions; they do not represent the performance of a single group of students over three years. Second, among charter schools and smaller school districts, even a single student can have a disproportionate statistical impact on the overall grade-level proficiency rate.

Assessment measures:

- *English Language Arts CRT*.
- *Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM)*.
- *Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA)*.
- *Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS)*.
- *Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI)*.
- *Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI)*.

#### Notes

1. Year 1 goals set by participating districts and charter schools are available in WestEd (2005), accessible online at [www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf).
2. Data exclude home-schooled students, those spending less than a full academic year at their school, and students in private schools. The inclusion rules for these calculations were based on "Blank," "Attempted," "Accommodated," and "UT Alternate Assessment" Participation Codes as well as a "V" (Valid) Record Status Code. These rules were established in October 2005 through phone discussions with Jerry Winkler, USOE Information Technology Manager, and were subsequently verified by Aaron Brough, USOE Data Specialist, in September 2006. Additional technical detail, including the SPSS syntax used to produce the 2006 results, is available upon request. (The 2004 and 2005 results were retrieved from WestEd, 2005.)

**Alpine School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Reduce percentage of students not passing DRA level 3 to below 25%	DRA oral reading	28% not passing	24%	Yes	20%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Decrease the percentage of students at CRT levels 1 and 2 by 1%	CRT	L1: 7% L2: 13% Tot: 20%	L1: 6% L2: 13% Tot: 19%	Yes	18%	Yes	82.3%	81.8%	83.0%
2	Reduce individual achievement gap by 1% on district value-added Gr. 2 core test as compared to Gr. 1 core test for students below CRT scaled score (155)	CRT	150	155 (3.3%)	Yes	1%	Yes	80.8%	83.7%	82.7%
3	Reduce individual achievement gap by 1% on district value-added Gr. 3 core test as compared to Gr. 2 core test for students below CRT scaled score (155)	CRT	149	153 (2.6%)	Yes	1%	Yes	80.8%	80.0%	82.4%

**Beaver County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS LNF DIBELS PSF	10% 48%	97% 92%	Yes Yes	97% 93%	Yes Yes	–	–	–
1	80% proficient	DRA	37%	72%	Yes	88%	Yes	75.6%	79.7%	87.8%
2	80% proficient	DRA	62%	93%	Yes	90%	Yes	88.1%	92.9%	90.4%
3	80% proficient	DRA	71%	91%	Yes	93%	Yes	76.7%	79.5%	87.8%

**Box Elder School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	68% at benchmark	DIBELS LNF/PSF	35%	61%	Yes	68%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Increase percentage proficient from 78% (2005) to 80% (2006)	CRT	73.9%	77.8%	Yes	78.5%	No	73.9%	77.8%	78.5%
2	Increase percentage proficient from 73% (2005) to 75% (2006)	CRT	77.9%	73.5%	No	80.2%	Yes	77.9%	73.5%	80.2%
3	Increase percentage proficient from 78% (2005) to 80% (2006)	CRT	80.0%	78.1%	No	73.9%	No	80.0%	78.1%	73.9%

**Cache County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficient	DIBELS PSF	78%	86%	Yes	93%	Yes	–	–	–
1	90% proficient	CRT	91.9%	90.8%	Yes	94.0%	Yes	91.9%	90.8%	94.0%
2	90% proficient	CRT	90.4%	93.5%	Yes	93.3%	Yes	90.4%	93.5%	93.3%
3	90% proficient	CRT	90.6%	92.0%	Yes	92.0%	Yes	90.6%	92.0%	92.0%

**Carbon School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	65% proficient	DIBELS LNF	55%	70%	Yes	66%	Yes	–	–	–
1	77% proficient on CRT; DIBELS improvement	CRT	84.4%	80.3%	No	84.6%	Yes	84.4%	80.3%	84.6%
		DIBELS PSF	60%	80%	Yes	93%	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	59%	71%	Yes	72%	Yes			
2	77% proficient on CRT; DIBELS improvement	CRT	81.9%	81.4%	No	85.0%	Yes	81.9%	81.4%	85.0%
		DIBELS ORF	40%	43%	Yes	54%	Yes			
3	77% proficient on CRT; DIBELS improvement	CRT	81.5%	80.9%	No	79.9%	Yes	81.5%	80.9%	79.9%
		DIBELS ORF	42%	45%	Yes	46%	Yes			



**Daggett School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	75% scoring Some Risk or better on DIBELS	DIBELS LNF	33%	20%	Yes	25%	Yes	–	–	–
		DIBELS PSF	At Risk	At Risk	Yes	At Risk	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	11%	0%	Yes	25%	Yes			
			At Risk	At Risk		At Risk				
			22%	20%		13%				
			At Risk	At Risk		At Risk				
1	75% proficient	CRT	87.5%	100.0%	Yes	87.5%	Yes	87.5%	100%	87.5%
2	75% proficient	CRT	100.0%	63.6%	No	90.0%	Yes	100%	63.6%	90.0%
3	75% proficient	CRT	100.0%	73.3%	Yes	81.8%	Yes	100%	73.3%	81.8%

**Davis School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Increased pre/post mean scores	USOE K assessment	76% to 90%	Yes	77% to 91%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Reading level gains for Tier 1 students	CRT	169 to 169 (median scale scores)	Yes	79.2 to 80.3	Yes	78.2%	77.9%	77.3%
	Reading level gains for Tier 2 students	QRI	1 year, 2 month gain	Yes	1.0				
2	Reading level gains for Tier 1 students	CRT	168 to 169 (median scale scores)	Yes	83.2 to 83.3	Yes	82.4%	82.3%	81.8%
		SDRT	NA	NA	Scale score gain = 26.0				
	Reading level gains for Tier 2 students	QRI	2 year, 3 month gain	Yes	1.9				
3	Reading level gains for Tier 1 students	CRT	168 to 169 (median scale scores)	Yes	82.4 to 83.0	Yes	80.7%	80.5%	80.9%
		SDRT	NA	NA	Scale score gain = 30.0				
	Reading level gains for Tier 2 students	QRI	1 year, 7 month gain	Yes	1.6				

**Duchesne County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	2% more reaching benchmark on DIBELS	DIBELS PSF	64% Low Risk 19% Some Risk 18% At Risk	81% Established 15% Emerging 4% Deficit	Yes	85.5% 12.2% 2.4%	Yes	-	-	-
1	2% higher proficiency	CRT	82.7%	79.5%	No	81.5%	Yes	82.7%	79.5%	81.5%
2	2% higher proficiency	CRT	78.0%	78.4%	No	77.3%	No	78.0%	78.4%	77.3%
3	2% higher proficiency	CRT	77.1%	77.2%	No	76.8%	No	77.1%	77.2%	76.8%

**Emery County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Lower percentage At Risk (Fall vs. Spring)	DIBELS LNF DIBELS PSF	30% to 25% At Risk 18% to 8% At Risk	Yes Yes	39% to 23% At Risk 33% to 10% At Risk	Yes Yes	-	-	-
1	Higher percentage of cohort proficiency (K to Gr. 1)	CRT	NA to 78.7	NA	NA to 81.3	NA	89.9%	78.7%	81.3%
2	Higher percentage of cohort proficiency (Gr. 1 to Gr. 2)	CRT	89.9 to 85.1	No	78.7 to 82.0	Yes	79.1%	85.1%	82.0%
3	Higher percentage of cohort proficiency (Gr. 2 to Gr. 3)	CRT	79.1 to 90.0	Yes	85.1 to 89.6	Yes	81.8%	90.0%	89.6%

**Garfield County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	All students will show progress each year	DIBELS	NA	11% Deficit 23% Emerging 67% Established	Yes	10% Deficit 17% Emerging 73% Established	Yes	-	-	-
1	All students will show progress each year	CRT	89.7%	93.0%	Yes	93.2%	Yes	89.7%	93.0%	93.2%
2	All students will show progress each year	CRT	82.1%	83.1%	Yes	93.2%	Yes	82.1%	83.1%	93.2%
3	All students will show progress each year	CRT	68.7%	72.6%	Yes	84.1%	Yes	68.7%	72.6%	84.1%

**Grand County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	70% at benchmark	Letter recognition	70%	94%	Yes	95%	Yes	-	-	-
		Letter/sounds	51%	86%	Yes	89%	Yes			
		Sound segments	51%	71%	Yes	80%	Yes			
		Elementary spelling	64%	87%	Yes	88.5%	Yes			
		HFW Reading	40%	71%	Yes	76%	Yes			
		HFW Written	62%	82%	Yes	80%	Yes			
K	60% at benchmark	DIBELS PSF	NA	50%	No	78%	Yes			
		DIBELS LNF	NA	48%	No	68%	Yes			
1	80% proficient	CRT	83.5%	87.4%	Yes	80.5%	Yes	83.5%	87.4%	80.5%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	NA	55%	No	65%	No			
		DIBELS NWF	NA	55%	No	75%	Yes			
	64% at Level I	Guided Reading	58%	60%	No	72%	Yes			
64% at Level 6	Elementary spelling	64%	82%	Yes	78%	Yes				
2	78% proficient	CRT	75.7%	79.2%	Yes	80.4%	Yes	75.7%	79.2%	80.4%
	60% at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	47%	No			
	64% at Level M	Guided Reading	58%	84%	Yes	77%	Yes			
3	78% proficient	CRT	87.8%	80.7%	Yes	79.8%	Yes	87.8%	80.7%	79.8%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	56%	No			
	66% at Level P	Guided Reading	75%	68%	Yes	64%	No			

**Granite School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Measurable performance gains	USOE Pre/Post K assessment	NA	NA	Yes	63% to 88%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Measurable performance gains	CRT	69.3%	69.5%	Yes	67.8%	No	69.3%	69.5%	67.8%
		Yearly Progress Pro	NA	3% (Fall)	–	46%	Yes			
2	Measurable performance gains	CRT	68.4%	70.8%	Yes	70.0%	No	68.4%	70.8%	70.0%
		Yearly Progress Pro	NA	36% (Fall)	–	63%	Yes			
3	Measurable performance gains	CRT	66.4%	67.6%	Yes	69.7%	Yes	66.4%	67.6%	69.7%
		Yearly Progress Pro	NA	38% (Fall)	–	57%	Yes			

**Iron County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS LNF	NA	28% gain	Yes	37% gain	Yes	–	–	–
1	3% higher proficiency than 2004 baseline	CRT	80.3%	82.4%	No	83.5%	Yes	80.3%	82.4%	83.5%
	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS	NA	23% gain	Yes	2% gain	No			
2	3% higher proficiency than 2004 baseline	CRT	82.9%	85.0%	No	82.2%	No	82.9%	85.0%	82.2%
	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS	NA	7% gain	Yes	7% gain	Yes			
3	3% higher proficiency than 2004 baseline	CRT	84.7%	87.1%	No	84.8%	No	84.7%	87.1%	84.8%
	3% gain on DIBELS	DIBELS	NA	3% gain	Yes	4% gain	Yes			

**Jordan School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficiency	USOE K assessments	NA	87%	Yes	96%	Yes	-	-	-
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+32%	Yes			
1	70% proficient	CRT	80.1%	77.5%	No	77.4%	Yes	80.1%	77.5%	77.4%
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+26%	Yes			
2	70% proficient	CRT	81.6%	80.4%	Yes	80.6%	Yes	81.6%	80.4%	80.6%
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+19%	Yes			
3	70% proficient	CRT	79.4%	77.9%	Yes	78.7%	Yes	79.4%	77.9%	78.7%
	1% more on grade level	Guided Reading	NA	NA	Yes	+13%	Yes			

**Juab School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	85% proficient	DIBELS	NA	93% on gr. level	Yes	94% on gr. level	Yes	-	-	-
1	85% proficient	CRT	88.8%	95.4%	Yes	88.2%	Yes	88.8%	95.4%	88.2%
2	85% proficient	CRT	92.9%	95.0%	Yes	92.5%	Yes	92.9%	95.0%	92.5%
3	85% proficient	CRT	89.8%	86.4%	Yes	86.9%	Yes	89.8%	86.4%	86.9%

**Kane County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	2% increase in % meeting DIBELS benchmark	DIBELS PSF	64% Low Risk	85% Established	Yes	82% Established	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS NWF	63% Low Risk	79% Low Risk	Yes	85% Low Risk	Yes			
1	73% proficient	CRT	86%	82%	Yes	84%	Yes	85.9%	82.3%	83.9%
	84% Established	DIBELS NWF	37% Low Risk	82% Established	Yes	84% Established	Yes			
	76% Low Risk	DIBELS ORF	59% Low Risk	77% Low Risk	Yes	76% Low Risk	Yes			
2	73% proficient	CRT	84%	92%	Yes	93%	Yes	84.4%	92.2%	92.6%
	72% Low Risk	DIBELS ORF	51% Low Risk	59% Low Risk	Yes	72% Low Risk	Yes			
3	73% proficient	CRT	87%	81%	No	77%	Yes	87.0%	80.5%	76.5%
	57% Low Risk	DIBELS ORF	45% Low Risk	47% Low Risk	Yes	57% Low Risk	Yes			
	National Percentile Rank	Iowa Reading Iowa Language	67% 54%	73% 55%	NA	73% 55%	NA			

**Logan City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficiency	DIBELS	LNF 51%	LNF 99% PSF 55%	Yes	PSF 99%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Lower percentage below grade level	CRT	12.0%	14.5%	No	12.7%	Yes	88.0%	85.5%	87.3%
	90% proficiency	DIBELS	NWF 67%	NWF 99% PSF 74%	Yes	PSF 99%	Yes			
2	Lower percentage below grade level	CRT	11.3%	9.5%	Yes	13.8%	No	88.7%	90.5%	86.2%
	90% proficiency	DIBELS	ORF 60%	ORF 100% ORF 65%	Yes	ORF 99%	Yes			
3	Lower percentage below grade level	CRT	14.3%	10.9%	Yes	12.8%	No	85.7%	89.1%	87.2%
	90% proficiency	DIBELS	ORF 65%	ORF 99% ORF 66%	Yes	ORF 98%	Yes			

**Millard County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	55% scoring 40+	DIBELS LNF	NA	46%	Yes	78%	Yes	–	–	–
	55% scoring 35+	DIBELS PSF	NA	45%		64%				
1	72% proficient	CRT	77.9%	79.9%	Yes	75.4%	Yes	77.9%	79.9%	75.4%
2	72% proficient	CRT	78.7%	82.3%	Yes	86.6%	Yes	78.7%	82.3%	86.6%
3	72% proficient	CRT	78.2%	74.2%	Yes	76.2%	Yes	78.2%	74.2%	76.2%

**Morgan County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	85–95% proficient	DIBELS ISF	88%	87%	No	94%	Yes	–	–	–
		DIBELS LNF	91%	83%		94%				
1	85–95% proficient	CRT	95.9%	91.7%	No	98.0%	Yes	95.9%	91.7%	98.0%
2	85–95% proficient	CRT	88.7%	88.0%	Yes	91.6%	Yes	88.7%	88.0%	91.6%
3	85–95% proficient	CRT	84.5%	87.4%	Yes	88.5%	Yes	84.5%	87.4%	88.5%

**Murray City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% decrease in Intensive students	DIBELS LNF	22% At Risk	23% At Risk	No	96 to 64 (33%)	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS PSF	19% Deficient	6% Deficient	Yes					
1	80% proficient	CRT	76.6%	76.4%	No	83.4%	Yes	76.6%	76.4%	83.4%
2	82% proficient	CRT	84.4%	83.6%	Yes	82.2%	Yes	84.4%	83.6%	82.2%
3	82% proficient	CRT	78.5%	80.7%	Yes	82.2%	Yes	78.5%	80.7%	82.2%

**Nebo School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K		District K assessment	NA	NA	NA	95	Yes	-	-	-
1	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	83.8	82.9	Yes	87.2	Yes	84.5%	83.8%	87.2%
		Benchmark	80.4	83.5	Yes	85.5	Yes			
2	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	82.3	82.2	Yes	84.5	Yes	84.0%	82.9%	84.5%
		Benchmark	83.3	80.2	Yes	80.6	Yes			
3	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	82.3	81.8	Yes	83.9	Yes	83.7%	82.9%	83.9%
		Benchmark	76.5	76.6	Yes	77.3	Yes			

**North Sanpete School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% scoring 35+ by 2007	DIBELS PSF	70% Established	90% Established	Yes	94.4% Established	Yes	-	-	-
1	74% proficient	CRT	71.5%	78.7%	Yes	88.0%	Yes	71.5%	78.7%	88.0%
2	74% proficient	CRT	75.0%	85.6%	Yes	77.9%	Yes	75.0%	85.6%	77.9%
3	74% proficient	CRT	77.5%	64.3%	No	84.4%	Yes	77.5%	64.3%	84.4%



## North Summit School District

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	83% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	82%	NA	92%	Yes	–	–	–
1	80% proficient	CRT	84.8%	75.7%	No	85.9%	Yes	84.8%	75.7%	85.9%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	68%	No	78%	Yes			
2	80% proficient	CRT	95.0%	88.9%	No	91.8%	Yes	95.0%	88.9%	91.8%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	69%	No	71%	Yes			
3	80% proficient	CRT	77.9%	84.6%	Yes	88.9%	Yes	77.9%	84.6%	88.9%
	70% at benchmark	DIBELS	NA	59%	Yes	71%	Yes			

## Ogden City School District

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ISF, PSF	54%	74%	Yes	78%	Yes	–	–	–
1	10% fewer students not proficient	CRT	61.7%	64.0%	No	68.1%	No	61.7%	64.0%	68.1%
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS PSF, NWF, ORF	43%	52%	Yes	58%	Yes			
	10% cohort growth (K to Gr. 1)	DIBELS	NA	74% (K)	NA	58% (Gr1)	No			
2	10% fewer students not proficient	CRT	65.2%	68.9%	No	70.9%	No	65.2%	68.9%	70.9%
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 1 to Gr. 2)	CRT	NA	64% (Gr1)	NA	70.9% (Gr2)	Yes			
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	37%	47%	Yes	45%	No			
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 1 to Gr. 2)	DIBELS ORF	NA	52% (Gr1)	NA	45% (Gr2)	No			
3	10% fewer students not proficient	CRT	61.6%	67.1%	No	70.5%	Yes	61.6%	67.1%	70.5%
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 2 to Gr. 3)	CRT	61.7% (Gr1)	68.9% (Gr2)	NA	70.5% (Gr3)	No			
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	34%	43%	Yes	42%	No			
	10% cohort growth (Gr. 2 to Gr. 3)	DIBELS ORF	43% (Gr1)	47% (Gr2)	NA	42% (Gr3)	No			

**Park City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Not provided	DIBELS PSF	63% Established	76% Established	Yes	NA	NA	-	-	-
1	Higher percentage proficient	CRT	76.8%	74.2%	No	82.2%	Yes	76.8%	74.2%	82.2%
2	Higher % proficient	CRT	81.9%	80.6%	No	83.1%	Yes	81.9%	80.6%	83.1%
3	Higher % proficient	CRT	82.9%	82.1%	No	85.9%	Yes	82.9%	82.1%	85.9%

**Piute School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Average of K-3 passing rates > 75%	USOE PreK assessment	76%	76%	Yes	76%	Yes	-	-	-
1		CRT	73.3%	85.7%	Yes	72.7%	Yes	73.3%	85.7%	72.7%
2		CRT	75.0%	70.0%	Yes	100%	Yes	75.0%	70.0%	100%
3		CRT	42.1%	69.2%	Yes	66.7%	Yes	42.1%	69.2%	66.7%

**Provo City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Increased yearly gain until 80% reached	District K assessment	69%	69%	No	75%	Yes	-	-	-
1	2% proficiency gain	CRT	83.7%	82.4%	No	78.3%	No	83.7%	82.4%	78.3%
	Proficiency gain	DRA	71%	65%	No	64%	No			
2	2% proficiency gain	CRT	76.0%	79.4%	Yes	81.4%	No	76.0%	79.4%	81.4%
	Proficiency gain	DRA	72%	74%	Yes	74%	No			
3	2% proficiency gain	CRT	78.5%	77.9%	No	80.8%	Yes	78.5%	77.9%	80.8%
	Proficiency gain	DRP	61%	77%	Yes	72%	No			

## Rich School District

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Classroom (skills)	25% to 95%	Yes	29% to 96%	Yes	-	-	-
		CBM LSF (letters)	13 to 41	Yes	2 to 51	Yes			
		CBM LNF (letters)	41 to 72	Yes	19 to 53	Yes			
1	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (grade level)	1.0 to 2.3	Yes	0.6 to 1.8	Yes	84.2%	86.2%	92.6%
		CBM R-CBM (words/minute)	19 to 87	Yes	6 to 82	Yes			
		CBM Maze (multiple choice)	5 to 16	Yes	1 to 14	Yes			
		CBM Spelling (letter sequence)	24 to 29	Yes	26 to 45	Yes			
2	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (grade level)	1.1 to 3.0	Yes	2.2 to 3.1	Yes	100%	88.6%	77.8%
		CBM R-CBM (words/minute)	73 to 120	Yes	71 to 120	Yes			
		CBM Maze (multiple choice)	7 to 21	Yes	4 to 20	Yes			
		CBM Spelling (letter sequence)	43 to 61	Yes	48 to 58	Yes			
3	<u>General:</u> Student growth from Fall to Spring <u>Long term:</u> 80% proficient on CBM, Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading, Utah Core tests	Student Tutoring Achievement for Reading (grade level)	3.5 to 4.5	Yes	3.0 to 3.9	Yes	96.0%	92.6%	89.7%
		CBM R-CBM (words/minute)	79 to 138	Yes	89 to 167	Yes			
		CBM Maze (multiple choice)	10 to 26	Yes	15 to 21	Yes			
		CBM Spelling (letter sequence)	65 to 81	Yes	60 to 98	Yes			

**Salt Lake City School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Increased percentage reading at grade level	District K test	54% to 77% (full day) 62% to 77% (half day)	Yes	77% to 76% (full day) 77% to 80% (half day)	Yes	–	–	–
1	Increased proficiency	CRT	67.8 to 62.9	No	62.9 to 66.8	Yes	67.8%	62.9%	66.8%
	Increased percentage reading at grade level	DRA	66 to 61	No	61 to 65	Yes			
2	Increased proficiency	CRT	66.7 to 68.6	Yes	68.6 to 66.4	No	66.7%	68.6%	66.4%
	Increased percentage reading at grade level	DRA	64 to 66	Yes	66 to 64	No			
3	Increased proficiency	CRT	66.6 to 69.2	Yes	69.2 to 71.2	Yes	66.6%	69.2%	71.2%
	Increased percentage reading at grade level	DRA	64 to 67	Yes	67 to 72	Yes			

**San Juan School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS NWF	71%	82%	Yes	92%	Yes	–	–	–
1	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS ORF	54%	56%	No	71%	Yes	62.5%	62.7%	70.3%
2	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS ORF	45%	46%	No	64%	Yes	58.5%	75.9%	69.6%
3	5% improvement over previous year	DIBELS ORF	45%	50%	Yes	57%	Yes	59.3%	60.1%	62.9%

**Sevier School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	85% with correct response	USOE PA subtest	85%	85%	Yes	88%	Yes	–	–	–
	91% with correct response	USOE Compr subtest	91%	89%	No	92%	Yes			
1	71% proficient	CRT	84.7%	83.8%	Yes	80.3%	Yes	84.7%	83.8%	80.3%
2	71% proficient	CRT	85.1%	84.7%	Yes	84.7%	Yes	85.1%	84.7%	84.7%
3	77% proficient	CRT	89.6%	87.5%	No	84.8%	Yes	89.6%	87.5%	84.8%

## South Sanpete School District

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% "sufficient" or above	DIBELS	77%	78%	No	84%	Yes	–	–	–
1	80% "sufficient" or above	CRT	90.5%	84.1%	Yes	91.1%	Yes	90.5%	84.1%	91.1%
		DIBELS	83%	83%		86.5%				
2	80% "sufficient" or above	CRT	85.6%	87.0%	No	88.9%	Yes	85.6%	87.0%	88.9%
		DIBELS	73%	73%		81%				
3	80% "sufficient" or above	CRT	86.4%	85.7%	Yes	90.1%	Yes	86.4%	85.7%	90.1%
		DIBELS	73%	81%		86%				

## South Summit School District

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	30%	8%	Yes	98%	Yes	–	–	–
		DIBELS NWF	At Risk	Deficit		ORF				
		DIBELS LNF	39%	23%						
			At Risk	At Risk						
1	3% proficiency increase	CRT	86.9%	88.4%	Yes	84.0%	No	86.9%	88.4%	84.0%
	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	11% At Risk	11% At Risk		0% At Risk	Yes			
2	3% proficiency increase	CRT	85.6%	83.8%	No	87.0%	Yes	85.6%	83.8%	87.0%
	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	27% At Risk	33% At Risk		0% At Risk	Yes			
3	3% proficiency increase	CRT	77.9%	85.3%	Yes	76.9%	No	77.9%	85.3%	76.9%
	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	24% At Risk	17% At Risk		0% At Risk	Yes			

**Tintic School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% reduction in students not proficient	USOE K assessment	36%	94%	Yes	96%	Yes	-	-	-
		Teacher CRT	NA	100%	Yes	96%	No			
1	10% reduction in students not proficient	CRT	93.3%	77.8%	No	83.3%	Yes	93.3%	77.8%	83.3%
	10% fewer not making one year's growth	QRI 3	31%	100%	Yes	85%	No			
2	10% reduction in students not proficient	CRT	100%	93.8%	Yes	80.0%	No	100%	93.8%	80.0%
	10% fewer not making one year's growth	QRI 3	60%	88%	Yes	95%	Yes			
3	10% reduction in students not proficient	CRT	88.2%	100%	Yes	89.5%	No	88.2%	100%	89.5%
	10% fewer not making one year's growth	QRI 3	91%	100%	Yes	89%	No			

**Tooele County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	NA	Training	NA	89%	Yes	-	-	-
1	77% proficient	CRT	81.3%	79.7%	No	77.5%	Yes	81.3%	79.7%	77.5%
2	80% proficient	CRT	81.1%	81.4%	Yes	85.2%	Yes	81.1%	81.4%	85.2%
3	80% proficient	CRT	82.5%	81.1%	No	83.9%	Yes	82.5%	81.1%	83.9%

**Uintah County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	No official proficiency goal set by USOE	USOE K assessment	68%	89%	Yes	85% ≥80%	Yes	-	-	-
1	71% proficient	CRT	83.3%	79.8%	Yes	80.0%	Yes	83.3%	79.8%	80.0%
2	71% proficient	CRT	81.6%	84.3%	Yes	81.8%	Yes	81.6%	84.3%	81.8%
3	71% proficient	CRT	78.4%	83.5%	Yes	83.1%	Yes	78.4%	83.5%	83.1%

**Wasatch County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	94.40% proficient	USOE K assessment	93%	95%	Yes	95%	Yes	–	–	–
1	71.62% proficient	CRT	70.2%	78.7%	Yes	78.1%	Yes	70.2%	78.7%	78.1%
2	81.64% proficient	CRT	81.0%	77.6%	No	81.5%	No	81.0%	77.6%	81.5%
3	76.85% proficient	CRT	79.0%	74.3%	Yes	75.5%	No	79.0%	74.3%	75.5%

**Washington County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	USOE K assessment	87%	96%	Yes	NA	NA	–	–	–
1	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	CRT	76.7%	75.6%	No	75.2%	No	76.7%	75.6%	75.2%
		DRA	75%	78%	Yes	75%	No			
2	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	CRT	76.7%	79.0%	Yes	77.4%	No	76.7%	79.0%	77.4%
		DRA	83%	85%	Yes	82%	Yes			
3	10% increase (or 80%) at proficiency	CRT	76.3%	74.1%	No	77.0%	No	76.3%	74.1%	77.0%
		DRA	87%	81%	Yes	85%	Yes			

**Wayne County School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% scoring $\geq$ 74%	K TPRI	69%	100%	Yes	97%	Yes	–	–	–
1	77% proficient	CRT	83.8%	82.1%	Yes	93.8%	Yes	83.8%	82.1%	93.8%
2	77% proficient	CRT	83.8%	88.2%	Yes	77.5%	Yes	83.8%	88.2%	77.5%
3	77% proficient	CRT	78.8%	82.5%	Yes	90.9%	Yes	78.8%	82.5%	90.9%

**Weber School District**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS PSF	386 to 120	Yes	281 to 89	Yes	-	-	-
1	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS PSF	386 to 7	Yes	193 to 19	Yes	79.5%	80.1%	80.1%
		DIBELS NWF	659 to 112	Yes	409 to 98	Yes			
2	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS ORF	499 to 489	Yes	493 to 372	Yes	82.5%	82.1%	81.8%
3	Fewer students At Risk	DIBELS ORF	491 to 347	Yes	524 to 336	Yes	77.4%	78.5%	78.1%

**PARTICIPATING CHARTER SCHOOLS (YEAR 2)**

**American Leadership Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS	-	-	-	NA	NA	-	-	-
1	80% proficient	CRT	-	-	-	55.7%	No	NA	NA	55.7%
		DIBELS	-	-	-	NA				
2	80% proficient	CRT	-	-	-	78.1%	No	NA	NA	78.1%
		DIBELS	-	-	-	NA				
3	80% proficient	CRT	-	-	-	80.8%	Yes	NA	NA	80.8%
		DIBELS	-	-	-	NA				

**American Preparatory Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	NA	NA	NA	81%	Yes	-	-	-
		DIBELS NWF				85%	Yes			
1	80% proficient	CRT	88.9%	79.2%	No	78.3%	No	88.9%	79.2%	78.3%
		DIBELS PSF	NA	NA	NA	97%	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF				79%	No			
		DIBELS ORF				77%	No			
2	80% proficient	CRT	80.0%	83.3%	Yes	86.5%	Yes	80.0%	83.3%	86.5%
		DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	77%	No			
3	80% proficient	CRT	87.2%	74.1%	No	94.3%	Yes	87.2%	74.1%	94.3%
		DIBELS ORF	NA	NA	NA	69%	No			



**Freedom Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Measurable gains	Spalding assessment	30%	75%	Yes	75%	Yes	–	–	–
1	Measurable gains	CRT	54.5%	76.5%	Yes	83.8%	Yes	54.5%	76.5%	83.8%
2	Measurable gains	CRT	78.3%	88.3%	Yes	81.8%	No	78.3%	88.3%	81.8%
3	Measurable gains	CRT	82.9%	81.0%	No	80.8%	No	82.9%	81.0%	80.8%

**John Hancock Charter School**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	SAT9	60% ≥50%	90%	Yes	80%	Yes	–	–	–
1	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	CRT	95.0%	100%	Yes	95.0%	Yes	95.0%	100%	95.0%
2	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	CRT	64.7%	85.0%	Yes	100%	Yes	64.7%	85.0%	100%
3	75% "sufficient" or "substantial"	CRT	65.0%	84.2%	Yes	85.0%	Yes	65.0%	84.2%	85.0%

**Moab Community School**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	–	–	–
1	All students proficient	CRT	NA	3 of 5	No	0 of 2	No	NA	60.0%	0.0%
2	All students proficient	CRT	NA	3 of 4	No	1 of 5	No	NA	75.0%	20.0%
3	All students proficient	CRT	NA	0 of 2	No	1 of 3	No	NA	0.0%	33.3%

**Navigator Pointe Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	-	-	-
1	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	NA	NA	74.0%
2	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	NA	NA	88.0%
3	Reading mastery	Internal assessments	-	-	-	Not provided	Yes	NA	NA	77.1%

**North Davis Preparatory Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Cohort growth	DIBELS	NA	NA	88 to 74 (grade level)	No	-	-	-
1	Cohort growth	CRT	NA	NA	88 to 68.8	No	NA	85.3%	68.8%
2	Cohort growth	CRT	NA	NA	85.3 to 71.1	No	NA	80.3%	71.1%
3	Cohort growth	CRT	NA	NA	80.3 to 91.0	Yes	NA	90.2%	91.0%

**North Star Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficient	School's K assessment	-	-	NA	98%	Yes	-	-	-
1	90% proficient	CRT	-	-	NA	89.8%	No	NA	NA	89.8%
2	90% proficient	CRT	-	-	NA	91.7%	Yes	NA	NA	91.7%
3	90% proficient	CRT	-	-	NA	93.9%	Yes	NA	NA	93.9%

**Ogden Preparatory Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004 to 2005	Met 2005 goal?	2005 to 2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-
1	5% improvement	CRT	NA to 52.4 (K to Gr.1)	NA	NA to 81.8 (K to Gr.1)	NA	52.4%	81.8%	73.3%
2	5% improvement	CRT	52.4 to 55.3 (Gr.1 to Gr.2)	No	81.8 to 73.9 (Gr.1 to Gr.2)	No	70.6%	55.3%	73.9%
3	5% improvement	CRT	70.6 to 83.3 (Gr.2 to Gr.3)	Yes	55.3 to 70.5 (Gr.2 to Gr.3)	Yes	73.9%	83.3%	70.5%

**Pinnacle Canyon Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Not provided	USOE K assessment	71%	89%	Yes	NA	NA	–	–	–
1	Not provided	CRT	87.2%	63.9%	No	65.6%	Yes	87.2%	63.9%	65.6%
		Iowa reading level	1.6	NA		NA				
2	Not provided	CRT	82.9%	59.5%	No	51.2%	Yes	82.9%	59.5%	51.2%
		Iowa reading level	NA	2.1		NA				
3	Not provided	CRT	75.6%	80.8%	No	56.8%	No	75.6%	80.8%	56.8%
		Iowa reading level	3.4	3.1		NA				

**Soldier Hollow School**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	75% proficient	DIBELS PSF	NA	NA	NA	NA	Yes	–	–	–
1	75% proficient	CRT	NA	NA	NA	80.0%	Yes	100%	100%	80.0%
2	75% proficient	CRT	NA	NA	NA	62.5%	No	88.9%	87.5%	62.5%
3	75% proficient	CRT	NA	NA	NA	85.7%	Yes	100%	100%	85.7%

**Summit Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	80% proficient	DIBELS	NA	NA	Yes	NA	Yes	–	–	–
1	80% proficient	CRT	NA	93.2%	Yes	91.8%	Yes	NA	93.2%	91.8%
2	80% proficient	CRT	NA	89.6%	Yes	95.7%	Yes	NA	89.6%	95.7%
3	80% proficient	CRT	NA	94.4%	Yes	91.7%	Yes	NA	94.4%	91.7%

**Thomas Edison Charter School North Campus**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	NA	2.23	Yes	81.1	Yes	-	-	-
		Phonogram testing	NA	80%	Yes	88.2%	Yes			
1	90% proficient	CRT	83.7%	81.8%	No	82.9%	No	83.7%	81.8%	82.9%
	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	1.97 GRE	3.62 GRE	Yes	3.13 GRE	Yes			
2	90% proficient	CRT	68.0%	85.5%	No	89.5%	No	68.0%	85.5%	89.5%
	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	2.84 GRE	3.25 GRE	Yes	4.47 GRE	Yes			
3	90% proficient	CRT	77.3%	79.4%	No	80.0%	No	77.3%	79.4%	80.0%
	At least 1 year's growth	Morrison McCall	3.31 GRE	3.93 GRE	Yes	5.24 GRE	Yes			

**Thomas Edison Charter School South Campus**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Phonograms 80%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	90%	Yes	–	–	–
	Spelling 1.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	1.8	Yes			
	Sentence dictation 80%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	85%	Yes			
	Poetry recitation 80%	Teacher guide	–	–	NA	100%	Yes			
1	Phonograms 80%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	82%	Yes	NA	NA	80.0%
	Spelling 2.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	3.1	Yes			
	UPASS 80%	CRT	–	–	NA	80%	Yes			
	Reading skills 80%	Reading skills tests	–	–	NA	87%	Yes			
	Language skills 80%	Language skills tests	–	–	NA	87%	Yes			
2	Phonograms 85%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	91%	Yes	NA	NA	70.0%
	Spelling 3.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	3.85	Yes			
	Reading comprehension 3.3	McCall Crabbs	–	–	NA	4.25	Yes			
	UPASS 80%	CRT	–	–	NA	70%	No			
	Reading skills 80%	Reading skills tests	–	–	NA	86%	Yes			
	Language skills 80%	Language skills tests	–	–	NA	90%	Yes			
3	Phonograms 85%	Teacher tests	–	–	NA	93%	Yes	NA	NA	65.6%
	Spelling 4.3	Morrison McCall	–	–	NA	5.0	Yes			
	Reading comprehension 4.3	McCall Crabbs	–	–	NA	4.9	Yes			
	UPASS 80%	CRT	–	–	NA	65.6%	No			
	Reading skills 80%	Reading skills tests	–	–	NA	75%	No			
	Lang skills 80%	Language skills tests	–	–	NA	79%	No			

**Timpanogos Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	90% proficient	Spalding – phonograms 1-26	10% (Sept)	98% (May)	Yes	96% (May)	Yes	–	–	–
1	75% proficient	CRT	85.4%	81.3%	No	86.0%	Yes	85.4%	81.3%	86.0%
2	75% proficient	CRT	83.1%	85.4%	No	84.0%	Yes	83.1%	85.4%	84.0%
3	75% proficient	CRT	81.6%	80.8%	No	79.6%	Yes	81.6%	80.8%	79.6%

**Wasatch Peak Academy**

Grade	2006 goal	Assessment measure	2004	2005	Met 2005 goal?	2006	Met 2006 goal?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	2006 CRT
K	Annual improvement	ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons	NA	-	-	-
1	Annual improvement	CRT	-	-	NA	71.1%	baseline	NA	NA	71.1%
		ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons				
		ECRI Mastery Tests	-	-	NA					
2	Annual improvement	CRT	-	-	NA	85.7%	baseline	NA	NA	85.7%
		ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons				
		ECRI Mastery Tests	-	-	NA					
3	Annual improvement	CRT	-	-	NA	91.7%	baseline	NA	NA	91.7%
		ECRI IRI	-	-	NA	Indiv. student comparisons				
		ECRI Mastery Tests	-	-	NA					
		Iowa	-	-	NA	80				

---

**REFERENCES**

- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (1998). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002, April). *Guidance for the Reading First program*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/guidance.pdf>.
- Utah State Office of Education. (2005a, March). Literacy assessments supporting the Utah literacy framework and the Utah elementary core curriculum. Retrieved from [http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/core/ASSESSMENTS.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/core/ASSESSMENTS.pdf).
- Utah State Office of Education. (2005b). Utah K–3 literacy framework for successful instruction and intervention. Retrieved from <http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/sars/readingta/literacyframework.pdf>.
- Utah State Office of Education. (2006). Utah charter schools directory. Retrieved November 29, 2006, from <http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/charterschools/directory.htm>.
- WestEd. (2005). *WestEd analysis of Utah's K–3 Reading Improvement Program*. Retrieved from [http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang\\_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf](http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/lang_art/elem/k3Framework/2005WestEdReview.pdf).