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What do Frederick Douglass, Thurgood Marshall, Nancy Pelosi, Johns Hopkins, and Francis Scott Key have in common? They all called Maryland home, which is what Maryland is – a home. It may be small in geographical size, but Maryland has always had big plans, from its influence in the nation’s founding, to its defense during the War of 1812, to its creation of the national anthem, and to its continuous drive to propel all Maryland citizens to be their best. Just as Francis Scott Key watched as the resilient soldiers of Fort McHenry defended the country against British attack, today Maryland fights to ensure all its children from birth through grade 12 succeed in school and in life, with attention to the needs of the state’s most disadvantaged children, including children living in poverty, English learners, and children with disabilities. That goal is best realized through advancing pre-literacy skills; reading and writing skills; and the use of technology and technology applications including technology literacy, computer literacy, and informational literacy.
“Once you learn to read, you will be forever free.”

Frederick Douglass, Marylander

Core Beliefs
Maryland has long recognized that for students to be college and career ready, they must have strong literacy skills. Literacy, including the ability to comprehend language and then later text, starts at birth when parents or guardians talk with and read to their children not simply for bonding, but also to help build foundational literacy skills, acquire new vocabulary, and reach developmental milestones. Maryland believes that students need systematic engagement with a variety of texts beginning at birth and continuing throughout their educational journey to high school and college and career. A comprehensive literacy program, including family and community partnerships, provides equitable opportunities for all children and youth, especially those living in poverty, English learners, and those with disabilities.

Vision
The Maryland State Department of Education envisions a world class system supporting the preparation of all students for college, career, and community success to live independent, fulfilling, and productive lives in the 21st century.

Mission
The Maryland State Department of Education provides leadership, support, and meaningful engagement with parents, families, and communities, integration of evolving technologies, and accountability for effective systems of public education, library services, and rehabilitation services with a focus on excellence, equity, and efficiency.

Definition of Literacy
“Literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, compute, and communicate using visual, audible, and digital materials across disciplines and in any context. The ability to read, write, and communicate connects people to one another and empowers them to achieve things they never thought possible. Communication and connection are the basis of who we are and how we live together and interact with the world.” (Why Literacy?)

In order to help children develop a strong early literacy foundation and build on those skills, Maryland expanded its approach to literacy by integrating multiple content areas in its definition of literacy. “Disciplinary Literacy is the use of discipline-specific practices to access, apply, and communicate content knowledge, and, in Maryland, it is a shared responsibility. Literacy skills are an important part of every academic discipline; however, each discipline relies on different types of texts, writing styles, and language to convey ideas and learning. For students to be fully prepared for the challenges and expectations of college and career, it is critical that they develop literacy skills in all content areas.” (MDK12) In June 2010, the Maryland State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts K-12 and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects 6-12. These standards represent a shift in approaches to reading to clearly identify and include reading and writing standards in the content areas of Science/Technical Subjects and History/Social Studies as companions to the English Language Arts Standards. The Standards specify the literacy skills and understandings required for college and career readiness in each discipline.
Maryland’s Literacy Initiatives

Maryland’s expectations of what children should know and be able to do in language and literacy are defined by three documents: *Healthy Beginnings: Supporting Development and Learning from Birth through Three Years of Age; Maryland Early Learning Standards;* and *Maryland College and Career Ready Standards PreK-12 (MCCRS).*

*Healthy Beginnings* was developed by the Maryland State Department of Education and articulates the early learning standards for children birth through three-years-old. The document is intended for use by families with, or early childhood practitioners caring for, infants or very young children. It provides information on expectations for pre-literacy and language skills, as well as activities that caregivers can do to begin building those skills at home. *Maryland Early Learning Standards* cover the domains of language and literacy, mathematics, social studies, science, health, physical education, fine arts and social foundations for children from birth through age eight and includes the prekindergarten to grade 2 portion of the *Maryland College and Career Ready Standards (MCCRS).* The MCCRS were developed by the Maryland Department of Education to align to the K-12 Common Core standards that were adopted in 2010. Prior to the creation of a formal literacy plan, Maryland strategically supported and advanced literacy in the state’s 24 local educational agencies (LEAs). In 2004, the state was part of the U.S. Department of Education’s *Reading First* initiative to support kindergarten through grade 3 literacy and reading proficiency by third grade. Schools were included in the grant based on high poverty and low reading scores on standardized tests.

*Reading First* served 43 schools, including 5 non-public schools in Baltimore City and Allegany, Garrett, Prince George’s, Montgomery, Baltimore, Dorchester, and Somerset counties. *Reading First* funds provided local school systems with evidence-based reading programs, professional development, reading coaches, and intervention teachers for schools with students most at risk for school failure. Often, reading instruction was part of the evaluation of all teachers across all content areas. In addition, a cross-divisional state team created a *Response to Intervention (RTI) Framework* to provide guidance to all 24 LSS in the state.

During the initiative (2004–2010), proficiency rates on program outcome measures increased in all LSS and in all three grades levels targeted by *Reading First.* (Table 1)

In 2010, Maryland received a U.S. Department of Education Race to the Top Grant. Under this grant, Maryland continued its focus on literacy and expanded the continuum through grade 12. The Maryland College and Career Ready Curriculum Frameworks and Clarification Statements were developed by Maryland educators. These documents detail for educators the skills necessary for students to demonstrate proficiency in each grade level standard in Reading Literature, Reading Informational Text, Writing, Language, and Speaking and Listening. The MCCRS ELA/Literacy standards are available at [ELA Frameworks](https://www.elaframeworks.org).

Embedded in MCCRS, teachers in all subject areas are expected to build discipline-specific literacy into daily instruction. The disciplinary literacy standards are intended to support students’ mastery of existing content standards in history, social studies, science, or technical subject classrooms by providing real-life applications for critical reading and comprehension skills.

### Table 1:
Overall Pass Rates in Reading First Schools in Maryland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan: Making Equity a Priority

Given Maryland’s long history of supporting literacy at all levels, beginning in June 2017, the Maryland Literacy Team compiled demographic and trend academic data to evaluate whether existing state-level activities were meeting needs of all children. This led to the Literacy Team’s plan to engage in timely and meaningful consultation with a broad range of stakeholders and examine relevant data to determine the needs of students, schools, and/or educators, to find out what local school systems (LSS) and community-based programs have in place, and determine what is needed to ensure equity in literacy is achieved for all of Maryland’s children.

In making this guarantee a reality, two surveys were created in June 2017 and distributed to all local education agencies and community-based programs with the goal of gathering feedback regarding literacy needs as the first step in establishing a formal Comprehensive Literacy Plan. The Literacy Team used data from the Comprehensive Literacy Plan Needs Assessment to develop Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan. The surveys generated data from nearly 850 respondents across Maryland, including child care providers, parents, teachers, administrators, directors, coordinators, resource teachers, content coordinators, and grade level experts. Generally, results showed a strong sense of knowledge and application of the MCCRS and Early Learning Standards (Birth to age 8) across settings, with most responses falling in the “agree” and “strongly agree” categories. Areas of need from both the K-12 survey and the Birth to Five survey included the need to include parents, community programs, and other partners within the LSS in professional learning for literacy; and time to plan for or attend literacy meetings and collaborative planning. Finally, when 137 narrative responses were disaggregated to find patterns and trends, the need for additional training and resources became apparent.

The Maryland Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP), Maryland Keys to Comprehensive Literacy version 2.0 has been reviewed by stakeholders, has been adjusted based on reflections from the field, and is again offering evidence-based strategies and programs for Maryland children, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members.

Once again Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan is based upon stakeholder feedback, demographic and academic data sets, and latest evidence-based findings. (See surveys in Appendix B.)

Rationale and Theory of Action

Keys to Comprehensive Literacy

As a result of Maryland’s literacy work as outlined in the CLP, the State has identified another vital component to the development of a student’s success in literacy. Based on identified needs, the CLP outlined the following five keys as essential to increased literacy achievement for all students; however, Maryland recognized the need to include Family and Community Partnerships as an additional key as parents and the larger community are pivotal in ensuring student success in school and in life. “Students must have access to a range of supports and opportunities to enhance their learning and development, offered collaboratively through their school and community” (IEL Forward, Kingston and Stroback).

The keys are divided into subsections. In most Keys, the division is arranged from Birth to Age Five, Kindergarten to Grade Five, Grade Six to Grade Eight, Grade Nine to Grade Twelve. The divisions demonstrate Maryland’s commitment to literacy development that begins with birth and continues through high school, college, and career.

KEY 1 Instructional Leadership

The leadership on every level (state, local school systems, schools and early childhood programs) must recognize and tap into the needs, strengths, and concerns of the community; the cultural makeup of its citizens; and the equity issues which impact the state, school, and local educational agency. These driving forces of the Comprehensive Literacy Plan are reflected in the leadership, the instruction, and the training that is provided. Components of Instructional Leadership include identifying and encouraging teacher leaders; establishing leadership ladders; providing opportunities for regular literacy meetings, data dialogues, joint planning; and monitoring and assessing progress.
KEY 2 Strategic Professional Learning
Clear, systematic, needs-based professional learning is vital to impact student growth. Maryland’s CLP embraces the whole child, from birth to Grade 12. This occurs through strong partnerships with families and guardians, early childhood educators, PreK-12 teachers, higher education faculty and staff members, birth to 5 organizations, and other community stakeholders, as part of a high-quality and sustained system of professional development for educators. Together state and local teams will establish and disseminate needs-based professional learning in a variety of mediums to local educational agencies, K-12 Educators, Birth to 5 programs, and local communities. The team will also establish a system for addressing the needs of individual students through data dialogue, peer coaching, and mentoring.

KEY 3 Continuity of Standards and Evidence-based Instruction:
With the adoption of the MCCRS and the Early Learning Standards, educators have developed an understanding of the progression of standards from birth through 12th grade and across content areas. Working with local school systems, community-based programs, local Early Childhood Advisory Councils, public libraries, and institutions of higher education, Maryland will expand its vision of literacy to include the continuum of birth to grade 12 to engage all groups and to increase alignment. True equity of instruction cannot be achieved until all students receive instruction aligned to standards and delivered with fidelity.

KEY 4 Comprehensive System of Assessments:
Assessments provide information on various forms of instruction, student knowledge, and achievement. A comprehensive system of assessments includes state, local, school, and teacher assessment data. This data is analyzed in collaborative teams using data-dialogue, peer coaching, and mentoring to guide and refine evidence-based instruction. A comprehensive assessment system allows for strategic data-informed decision making to meet the needs of the individual student.

KEY 5 Tiered Instruction and Interventions:
Maryland has adopted regulation for the inclusion of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in all classrooms. This approach provides choice and individualization for students which, in turn, allows teachers to provide tiered instruction. In addition, Maryland developed a structured Response to Intervention Framework in 2008 that was adopted statewide. The state’s tiered system of support will continue to be refined and include all children and will provide enrichment and intervention models to achieve comprehensive literacy for all.

KEY 6 Family and Community Partnerships:
Active parent and community involvement are key components of the success of high functioning elementary and secondary schools. Across diverse economic backgrounds, family and community participation in elementary and secondary schools is associated with greater student success. Educators help families and communities add to their repertoire of strategies for promoting literacy. In order to have the most positive impact on literacy achievement for all students, it is imperative that schools, families, and communities collaborate. Partnerships help schools prepare students for college and careers by offering additional opportunities, supports, and enrichment for young people.

Theory of Action
MSDE will continue to support LSS in identifying positive evidence-based literacy instruction. All six Keys become part of an LSS Comprehensive Literacy Plan and are implemented with fidelity within each school. The program is monitored and adjusted by an instructional leadership team comprised of administrators, teacher leaders, parents, students and community members to meet the diverse needs of children. Structures are in place to sustain the literacy program for all children birth to grade 12, with a focus on disadvantaged groups. Once all educators are trained to enable students to succeed, Maryland’s children will improve in reading and writing.
Continuous Improvement Process

Measuring the effectiveness and impact of initiatives and innovations has become a common and ongoing activity by the state. If the impact is positive, an LSS can continue the program with the goal of ensuring replicability and sustainability; yet, if the innovation is not determined successful, then LSS must make improvements or seek assistance from the State, as necessary.

Ensuring educators and educational leaders participate in ongoing training in collecting and using formative and summative data is paramount to ensuring a standardized approach to data collection. This continuous improvement process (see Figure 3) is iterative and cyclical to identify how baseline data has changed over time. With baseline data collection of ELA/L reading scores and other supporting academic data at the initial stage, the State and participating LSS can verify growth or achievement over time by collecting the same type of data at the mid-year and end-of-year. This process, when implemented with fidelity, can lead to continuous improvement. Sharing this among LSS and schools will lead to a sustainable and successful Comprehensive Literacy Plan.
Measures of Progress

**Performance Outcome**

- The percentage of participating four-year-old children who achieve significant gains in oral language skills
- The percentage of participating fifth-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English Language Arts/Literacy assessments
- The percentage of participating eighth-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English Language Arts/Literacy assessments
- The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on State English Language Arts/Literacy assessments

**Performance Measure**

- LSS will determine an evidence-based assessment to gather data to report on four-year-old oral language growth. MSDE currently provides the Early Learning Assessment as an optional performance measure. LSS can choose to use the Early Learning Assessment or another evidence-based assessment.
- MSDE will use the Maryland Comprehensive Assessment Program’s (MCAP) English Language Arts/Literacy assessment as the performance measure to determine the percentage of participating fifth-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on a statewide assessment in English Language Arts/Literacy.
- MSDE will use the MCAP as the performance measure to determine the percentage of participating eighth-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on a statewide assessment in English Language Arts/Literacy.
- MSDE will use the MCAP as the performance measure to determine the percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on a statewide assessment in English Language Arts/Literacy.

---

Collect baseline data to include: Needs Assessment, State ELA/Literacy scores, research on evidence-based interventions/practices (CSM), Professional Development, tools/resources to measure growth/achievement among disadvantaged student groups.

Collect LEA Literacy Plans to determine goals. CLPs should include how ongoing support will be provided to educators/instructional leaders.

Collect LEA program and process data. Check for impact on teaching and student learning. Is there growth or change in student performance? How will this be measured and communicated over time and to whom?

---

**Figure 3:**

SEA data collection plan for continuous improvement
Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan Provides Equity for All

Rigorous Standards and Increasing Diversity

The Maryland College and Career Ready Standards require an increase in the rigor and deep analysis that has driven instructional shifts in English Language Arts/Literacy. Consequently, Maryland replaced its assessment system with the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) with its benchmark administration occurring during SY 2013-14. Maryland used PARCC to determine students’ knowledge in reading and writing in grades three through eight, and in grade ten. Kindergarten students are assessed annually using the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) in four domains: literacy, mathematics, social foundations, and physical well-being and motor development, generating a composite score indicating readiness for kindergarten.

PARCC and KRA Assessment results have indicated achievement gaps in performance of subgroups of disadvantaged students compared to the performance of all students.

As Maryland prepared to meet more rigorous academic goals through the introduction of increasingly challenging and complex standards, texts and assessments, the State was recognizing the realities of Maryland’s changing demographics, including ethnicity, language, and percent of students living in poverty. Shifts in racial and ethnic composition indicate Maryland is a diverse state with minorities accounting for 48.5% of the state’s population in 2016. By making equity a priority, Maryland is committed to advancing literacy skills for all children from birth through grade 12. Thus, the State will assist districts in aligning or modifying comprehensive literacy plans with the State plan, with a focus on improving outcomes for disadvantaged children using data, including a needs-based assessment.

Beginning in the 2019-2020 school year, Maryland shifted to ELA/L MCAP administration in lieu of the PARCC assessment and will use this data in the same way that the PARCC data had been used.

Strategies to Address the Needs of Disadvantaged Students

State level professional development will include the identification and implementation of evidence-based instructional interventions/programs, data analysis for instructional modifications, and infusion of culturally relevant instructional materials. The LSS instructional program must include frequent, repeated, developmentally-appropriate practices such as:

- instructional strategies in reading and writing across content areas;
- intentional instruction in foundational literacy skills, including print concepts, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, vocabulary, and fluency;
- explicit instruction in authentic and purposeful writing;
- high-interest, diverse, high-quality print and non-print materials;
- differentiated instructional approaches, including individual and small group instruction and discourse;
- opportunities for using and developing vocabulary;
- valid and reliable assessments systems, including screening, diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment tools;
- strategies to enhance children’s motivation to read and write and children’s engagement in self-directed learning;
- principles of universal design for learning;
- professional development around strategies and practices for increased literacy achievement;
- alignment to Maryland College and Career Ready Standards.

Evidence-Based Practices

The term “evidence-based practices” is used frequently in Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan. These practices are different from research-based practices in a vital way: research-based means there are theories behind the strategies or practices, but the research is simply in theory and not supported through proof. Evidence-based practices are proven effective and have the support to back them up. According to Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the definition of “evidence-based” activities, strategies, and interventions is as follows:

An “evidence-based” activity, strategy, or intervention:

- demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on [one of three levels of evidence, or]
- demonstrates a rationale based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes.
### Level 1: Strong Evidence
At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (i.e. randomized) links the activity to the outcome.

### Level 2: Moderate Evidence
At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study (i.e. matched) links the activity to the outcome.

### Level 3: Promising Evidence
At least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias links the activity to the outcome.

### Level 4: Under Evaluation
There is a rationale based on other high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that the activity, strategy, or intervention is likely to improve other relevant outcomes; and there are ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

US Ed’s definition of “evidence-based” includes three levels of evidence specific to the activity.

US Ed’s definition of “evidence-based” activities not yet supported by specific evidence.

---

All practices used to support students must meet Level 1, 2, 3, or Level 4 with ongoing efforts to examine the effects on student outcomes.

---

**Works Cited**
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Purpose
The intent of this key is to develop instructional leaders who are knowledgeable about evidence-based literacy practices and can analyze the strengths and needs of the school and its community. Instructional leaders articulate clear goals, encourage innovation, support professional development and collaboration, and monitor teaching and learning. Leaders will implement a system for effective school wide literacy instruction that will narrow achievement gaps.
Birth to Grade Twelve
Instructional leaders should be provided with the knowledge and resources to build effective collaborative literacy initiatives beginning at birth and continuing through grade twelve.

Birth to Age Five System of Early Care and Education
Support for leaders can include the following:

• the blending of multiple funding sources such as Preschool Development Grants, Child Care Development Funds, and Title I, IIA, and Title III funds to support literacy;
• the identification of community-based child care providers’ professional development needs to create a plan for feeder system capacity building;
• the identification of community child care and Head Start program staff to participate in joint professional learning opportunities with public school prekindergarten and kindergarten teachers;
• the creation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) that include prekindergarten teachers, EL teachers, special educators, and literacy staff to foster collaborative learning, analyze prekindergarten data and kindergarten readiness data to determine progress of individual students and school / system wide programs, and to make evidenced-based decisions to provide support and/ or intervention to students with literacy achievement gaps;
• collaboration with and resources from a variety of organizations to support dual language learners (English learners who range in age from birth through five years old and who are learning two or more languages), and their families and guardians;
• methods to work with public libraries and community resources to build literacy;
• models of world language immersion programs to support the literacy development of ELs and native English speakers (Thomas & Collier, 2012);
• collaboration with local Early Childhood Advisory Councils (ECAC) and local educational agency and school leaders in the implementation of the local ECAC’s literacy and family engagement campaigns; and
• collaboration with the public libraries’ family engagement efforts to bring parents into literacy rich environments.

Kindergarten to Grade Five
Support for leaders can include the following:

• implementation of effective analysis of literacy screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring, and outcomes data for each student to differentiate instruction and provide any needed supports for learning;
• development of a School Progress/School Improvement Plan which includes literacy goals based on data analysis for the coming school year and input from the students, families, and community partners that are representative of targeted student groups- English Learners, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged Students;
• development and implementation of a coaching model to support teachers’ use of evidenced-based instructional strategies and supports;
• methods to work with public libraries and community resources to build literacy;
• creation of Professional Learning Communities to support professional development of staff in the use of evidenced-based instructional strategies and supports;
• identification of evidence-based high-quality literacy curriculum to be implemented with fidelity, and ongoing progress monitoring;
• collaboration and resources that promote the language development of English Learners (ELs) and support the students’ home languages;
• models of world language immersion programs to support the literacy development of ELs and native English speakers;
• effective School Progress/School Improvement Plans which are designed to reflect the needs of the school population; and
• ways to address the equity and access issues that exist for students, families, and stakeholders.

Grade Six to Grade Eight
Effective leadership in upper grades targets literacy as a school priority and communicates a vision for embedding literacy across disciplines—a vision where, every day in every classroom, adolescents are reading, writing, and talking about print and nonprint materials. To achieve this vision, principals build learning communities and structure opportunities for school wide collaborative learning.
Areas to consider include:

- provide and protect time for teacher teams to meet regularly to study the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards, analyze student data and work products, plan instruction, reflect on instructional practices, and determine instructional modifications;
- engage the entire school in a cohesive literacy plan for helping all readers to improve their literacy skills;
- create opportunities for teachers to collaborate across disciplines;
- create methods to work with public libraries and community resources around literacy initiatives;
- provide teachers with job-embedded professional learning opportunities specific to their professional goals and responsibilities; and
- include reading/literacy specialists or literacy coaches as integral members of the learning community.

Support for leaders can include the following:

- effective Student Services Teaming (SST) to ensure standardized data collection, and implementation/documentation of recommended evidence-based practices, with progress monitoring;
- strategic planning for instructional leadership teams within a school to meet monthly;
- ways to use the School Progress/School Improvement Plan in instructional decision making;
- regular data sharing with school administrators and with local educational agency level representatives regarding literacy;
- strategies for growth, as developed in grade-level teams;
- supports for team leaders who meet with resource teachers from curriculum offices to meet the needs of all students;
- best practices for formal and informal observations;
- feedback that is grounded in the goals of the School Progress/School Improvement Plan;
- professional learning within the school and within a local educational agency that is based on the goals outlined in the School Progress/School Improvement Plan;
- resources that enhance language development and access to grade-level content for ELs;
- models of world language immersion programs to support the literacy development of ELs and native English speakers;
- fostering relationships with students, parents, and community members; and
- methods to work with public libraries and community resources around literacy initiatives.

**Grade Nine to Grade Twelve**

Adolescents deserve a culture of literacy in their schools and a systematic and comprehensive programmatic approach to increasing literacy achievement. School leaders play an important role in supporting efforts across disciplines to integrate appropriate adolescent literacy instruction. Effective leadership is essential for creating a safe school climate that supports students’ literacy development, and provides an encouraging and culturally relevant climate.

Areas to consider include the following:

- engage the entire school in a cohesive literacy action plan for helping struggling readers close their literacy achievement gap;
- engage and challenge all readers to use and adapt literacy skills and strategies to meet their needs in different contexts;
- create opportunities for teachers to collaborate across disciplines;
- provide teachers with job-embedded professional learning opportunities specific to their professional goals and responsibilities; and
- include reading/literacy specialists or literacy coaches as integral members of the learning community.

Support for leaders can include the following:

- the formation of teams consisting of school administrators, content leaders and specialists, special education leaders, EL leaders, and school counselors;
- designs for a strategic plan to improve literacy based on the goals of the School Progress/School Improvement Plan;
- informal and formal observation tools to provide teachers with regular feedback and support;
- resources that enhance language development and access to grade-level content for EL.
- methods for developing literacy skills in English as well as other languages;
- models of world language immersion programs to support the literacy development of EL and native English speakers;
- methods for fostering relationships with students, parents, and community members; and
- methods for working with public libraries and community resources around literacy initiatives.
Established Programs/Initiatives
The State Superintendent of Schools has established the Office of Leadership Development and School Improvement to provide targeted support to Maryland’s lowest-performing schools and to foster the growth of effective leaders. The office provides in-school professional learning experiences to future and current school leaders that focus on the skills and knowledge required to be successful in the principalship. This shared leadership structure within the school building aims to lessen the burdens of principal displacement and re-assignment. The flagship programs in the Office of Leadership Development and School Improvement are the Aspiring Leaders Institute and the Governor’s Promising Principals Academy. Both programs provide intensive yearlong training with job-embedded professional learning experiences that are designed to support local school systems in strengthening the leadership pipeline.

School teams, led by principals, attended the 2017 Summer Symposiums for Pre-K to Grade 2 along with community-based childcare provider representatives. Participants learned about recent brain research to enhance their knowledge of developmentally appropriate Essential Instructional Practices (EIP). The monthly Principals’ Newsletter is disseminated to leaders across the state to share professional learning opportunities offered both virtually and face-to-face.

Goals to Support Instructional Leadership
The leadership on every level (state, local school systems, schools and early childhood programs) must recognize and tap into the needs, strengths, and concerns of the community; the cultural makeup of its citizens; and the equity issues which impact the state, school, and local educational agency. These driving forces of the Comprehensive Literacy Plan are reflected in the leadership, the instruction, and the training that is provided. Components of Instructional Leadership include identifying and encouraging teacher leaders; establishing leadership ladders; providing opportunities for regular literacy meetings, data dialogues, joint planning; and monitoring and assessing progress. The Maryland State Department of Education has established the following goals to support the Comprehensive Literacy Plan:

- Develop instructional leaders who are knowledgeable about evidence-based literacy practices;
- Support LSS in analyzing the strengths and needs of the school and its community;
- Support LSS and the members of the System of Early Care and Education in developing strategies for monitoring teaching and learning;
- Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide supports from these collaboratives to LSS; and
- Support instructional leaders in promoting culturally responsive teaching.

Enhancements/Improvements for LSS to Consider
The State encourages LSS to form literacy teams at the school level and meet as a vertical team by feeder school to establish some continuity in literacy goals and strategies. An EL teacher would be assigned to the same cluster of feeder schools to best support the needs of that specific population and to build relationships with providers part of the system of early childhood education and teachers from PreK-12. Childcare providers and Head Start teachers could also be invited to participate at the elementary level. Elementary school leadership participating in local Early Childhood Advisory Council meetings and literacy initiatives can help build coherence from Birth-Grade 5. This would provide community members and parents with a forum to have a more open dialogue with all stakeholders regarding students’ needs. Additionally, collaboration between feeder schools on the elementary, middle, and high school levels, including general and special education, should be a required intervention as part of the School Progress/School Improvement Plan, facilitated by the individual school and local educational agency leaders. Through learning walks and collaborative data analysis, teachers will be more equipped to design instruction that is tailored to the specific needs of students and ease the student transition instructionally from child care programs to elementary, middle, and high schools.
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Purpose

Clear, systematic, needs-based professional learning is vital to impact teacher and student growth, and occurs through strong partnerships with families and guardians, early childhood providers and general and special educators, PreK-12 teachers, higher education faculty and staff members, birth to 5 organizations, and other community stakeholders, as part of a high-quality and sustained system of professional learning. Together, state and local teams will establish and facilitate needs-based professional learning in a variety of mediums to local educational agencies, PreK-12 educators, birth to 5 programs, child care teachers and directors, and local community groups that support families. Teams will also establish a system for addressing the needs of individual students through data dialogue, peer coaching, progress monitoring and mentoring.
Maryland Birth to Grade 12
Programs/Initiatives

Child Care Credentialing
To promote high quality literacy and language acquisition for early learners, MSDE supports professional development in the early childhood community by training the state-approved Child Care trainer pool on current literacy research and best practices in order for them to train early childhood educators and staff effectively. Professional development includes information on evidence-based, culturally relevant literacy practices, implementing state-approved curriculum, implementing evidence-based interventions, and supporting families in developing the child’s literacy skills.

Statewide Professional Learning Focused on Early Learning
Statewide professional learning opportunities will focus on supporting all school and community staff including, principals, assistant principals, child care and Head Start Directors, and teachers of early learners by providing professional development on essential practices related to research, skills, and strategies to increase student achievement and close achievement gaps as early as possible. Professional learning topics will include:
• research on the brain development of young children;
• developmentally appropriate instruction;
• impact of PreK-2 instruction on future learning;
• needs assessments;
• personalization;
• data analysis;
• peer coaching; and
• mentoring.

Professional Learning Program for Maryland Educators
The program acknowledges the dedication of Maryland educators to advance best practices aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards. This program allows Maryland educators to document and manage their own professional learning by choosing activities based upon their professional needs aligned to the needs of their students. The program also enables Maryland educators to earn Maryland State Continuing Professional Development (CPD) credit for those activities.

Professional Learning Online Courses
Maryland offers online courses for Maryland educators at every level through the eConnect portal Maryland Blackboard Professional Learning Courses.

Maryland Teacher Leadership Summit
The Maryland Teacher Leadership Summit is designed to promote and develop teacher-led initiatives across the state. Modeled after the successful National Teach to Lead Summit, the Maryland event:
• spotlights and supports a group of teacher-led initiatives across Maryland;
• provides teacher-led teams with hands-on training to refine program models, identify supports, and communicate initiatives to key stakeholders; and
• promotes teacher leadership among key local systems-level stakeholders, including superintendents, principals and national and local partners who advise and support teacher-led teams to refine innovative proposals.

Maryland Go Open
Maryland will share free openly licensed digital resources with all stakeholders. This effort will:
• identify current and relevant quality resources that support UDL practices;
• verify accessibility of resources;
• reduce redundancy of efforts;
• provide engaging and interactive resources;
• support personalized teaching and learning; and
• provide anytime, anywhere access.

As a #GoOpen state, Maryland will:
• adopt/implement a statewide technology strategy that includes the use of openly licensed resources;
• develop and maintain a statewide repository;
• publish OER resources to the Learning Registry;
• participate in a community of practice; and
• create a webpage to share the commitment to and progress for #GoOpen.
Maryland Collaborative Model for Peer Coaching

The Maryland Collaborative Model for Peer Coaching (MdCMPC) is an effort designed to spread a culture of professional growth by empowering teachers to use their expertise without leaving the classroom. A statewide, teacher-developed peer coaching model has been created that can be customized for local educational agencies and schools for improving 21st century teaching practices, supporting deeper learning, and fostering collaboration.

EdCamp

Colleagues join together to collaborate and create innovative professional learning. EdCamp is comprised of sessions that are determined by participants on the day of the event. Everyone is both a learner and a leader. Anyone can be a presenter or facilitator. Participants are encouraged to join and lead sessions that meet their unique needs as educators.

Formative Assessment for Maryland Educators (FAME)

FAME is a yearlong collaborative professional development process that consists of five self-study modules, application activities, communities of practice, leadership support, and support from the MSDE formative assessment specialists. The goals of FAME are to encourage and support teacher reflection and dialogue around the topic of formative assessment, help teachers revise and refine their current practices within their own classrooms and schools, and create lasting change in schools and LSS.

Curricular Support Materials Collaborative

The Maryland District Curricular Support Materials Collaborative (CSM) aims to foster peer-to-peer networking and sharing of information about curricular resources across local educational agencies. By using an online tool, Maryland content supervisors can quickly and easily identify vetted materials.

Classroom Focused Improvement Process

The Maryland Classroom Focused Improvement Process is a statewide protocol for school-based collaborative teams to conduct strategic data analysis and data dialogue to guide instruction using a six-step process for increasing student achievement. The process is planned and carried out by teachers meeting in grade level, content, or vertical teams as a part of their regular lesson planning cycle.

Initiatives and Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Professional Learning Initiatives</th>
<th>Statewide Educator Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Credentialing</td>
<td>10,751 Individuals Trained (Jan.–Mar. 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Pre-K – Grade Two Educator Symposia</td>
<td>964 Educators (Summer 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard Professional Development Online Courses</td>
<td>238 Educators (Spring 2016 - Spring 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Teacher Leadership Summit</td>
<td>52 Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Go Open</td>
<td>Educators statewide (February 2016-ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Collaborative Model for Peer Coaching</td>
<td>98 Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdCamp</td>
<td>325 Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative Assessment for Maryland Educators (FAME)</td>
<td>1955 Educators (Fall 2017-Spring 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Support Materials Collaborative</td>
<td>2017-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Focused Improvement Process</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goals for Strategic Professional Learning

Maryland’s CLP embraces the whole child, from birth to Grade 12. A high-quality and sustained system of professional learning occurs through strong partnerships with families and guardians, early childhood educators, PreK-12 teachers, higher education faculty and staff members, libraries, birth to 5 organizations, and other community stakeholders. Together state and local teams will establish and disseminate needs-based professional learning in a variety of mediums to local educational agencies, K-12 Educators, Birth to 5 programs, and local communities.

The Maryland State Department of Education has established the following goals to support the Comprehensive Literacy Plan:

- Create a high-quality and sustained system of professional learning;
- Build preservice and in-service teacher capacity;
- Support job-embedded, peer-to-peer professional learning; and
- Develop a statewide understanding of culturally responsive teaching practices.

Enhancements/Improvements for LSS to Consider

Support from English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) programs, special education offices, and Title I should be given to individual schools as needed and as requested by the school administrators. More frequent learning walks by these offices and other support specialists, as well as strategic planning time to meet with teams of teachers would promote regular professional development and timely feedback that is specifically tailored to the literacy needs of that specific school or grade level. These specialists could also coordinate with LSS and community-based programs to professional learning for childcare, Head Start, parents, and community members, utilizing parent advocates, interpreters, and support personnel.
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Purpose
Working with local school systems, community-based programs, local Early Childhood Advisory Councils, public libraries, and institutions of higher education, Maryland will expand its vision of literacy to include the continuum of birth to Grade 12 to engage all groups and to increase alignment.
Birth to Grade Twelve

Birth to Age Five System of Early Care and Education

Young children need to be engaged in language and literacy interactions throughout the day. These activities should be occurring through everyday experiences such as communicating with friends and family, traveling in the car or through the neighborhood, and through daily household activities. They also need to be read to and have opportunities to discuss the text and the vocabulary, opportunities to explore pretend reading, and engage in open-ended questions and talk. As children move into prekindergarten, classroom activities should build phonemic awareness, print concepts, initial alphabet knowledge, and language comprehension, including vocabulary knowledge, background knowledge, and knowledge of text and sentence structures. All these activities should occur through natural opportunities including play-based or center-based learning.

To promote continuity of standards-based instruction, MSDE will continue to:

• strengthen partnerships among system of early care and education and local educational agencies;
• identify and promote alignment of curriculum with Maryland College and Career Ready Standards and Early Learning Standards across content areas;
• increase collaboration with the Offices of Special Education and ESOL Programs; and
• provide appropriate accommodations and curriculum resource suggestions to meet the literacy needs of all students.

Kindergarten to Grade Five

Literacy knowledge and skills developed in kindergarten through third grade predict later literacy achievement. Classroom instruction can have an enormous impact on the development of literacy knowledge and skills. The instruction in these early grades, especially K-2nd grade should reflect developmentally appropriate instruction that allows for play-based, center-based, and or project-based learning. Kindergarten should build on those same areas that began in prekindergarten, including moving from initial alphabet knowledge to full alphabet knowledge and from phonological awareness to phonemic awareness. Beginning around 1st grade, children should also begin building fluency in context and automatic word recognition. Students in grade two begin understanding general and specific purposes for reading. In grades three to five, students also need to build knowledge of the strategies for reading. To promote continuity of standards-based instruction, MSDE will continue to:

• identify and promote alignment of curriculum with Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards and Early Learning Standards across contents;
• increase collaboration with the Offices of Special Education and ESOL Programs; and
• provide appropriate accommodations and curriculum resource suggestions to meet the literacy needs of all students.

Grade Six to Grade Eight

Adolescents need many opportunities to work with print and nonprint materials to make meaning and build relationships in their academic and social worlds. The Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS) provide a shared interdisciplinary approach to ensure middle school students meet the end-of-year-expectations that will enable them to be college and career ready. To support adolescent literacy development successfully, we must provide access to engaging and motivating content and instruction to support their continued development.

Areas to consider include the following:

• provide opportunities for adolescents to work with print and nonprint materials;
• offer web-based learning experiences;
• provide appropriate professional development for middle school educators;
• implement assessment methods that allow students to demonstrate strengths as well as needs; and
• differentiate instruction to include culturally responsive pedagogy as our classrooms become increasingly diverse learning environments.

In order to promote alignment of standards-based instruction, MSDE will continue to:

• identify and promote alignment of curriculum with Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy across contents;
• increase collaboration with the Offices of Special Education and ESOL Programs
• provide appropriate curriculum resource suggestions to meet the literacy needs of adolescent students; and
• collaborate with institutions of higher education that prepare teachers to include literacy standards with those that guide content preparation in their courses.
KEY 3

Grade Nine to Grade Twelve
Adolescents have many interests and opportunities that involve some form of literacy experiences, including the use of traditional print materials, the Internet, social media, instant messaging, texting, video games, and reading and writing in the workplace. The academic literacy demands required in school need to connect with the literacy practices in adolescent’s lives. The Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS) provide a shared interdisciplinary approach to ensure high school students meet the end-of-year expectations that will enable them to be college and career ready.

Content area teachers play a key role in building the disciplinary knowledge and strategy use that will help students learn from complex discipline specific print and nonprint materials.

Areas to consider include the following:
• encourage collaboration between teachers with expertise in literacy and all content areas inclusive of the academic disciplines, the performing arts, and the technical subject areas;
• include the use of traditional and non-traditional print materials, including the Internet, social media, instant messaging, texting, and video games, all of which can be used as tools for understanding academic content as well as forming social relationships; and
• differentiate instruction to include culturally responsive pedagogy as our classrooms become increasingly diverse learning environments.

In order to promote alignment of standards-based instruction, MSDE will continue to:
• promote alignment of curriculum with Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for English Language Arts/Literacy across contents;
• increase collaboration with the Offices of Special Education and ESOL Programs;
• provide appropriate curriculum resource suggestions to meet the literacy needs of adolescent students; and
• collaborate with institutions of higher education that prepare teachers to include literacy standards with those that guide content preparation in their courses.
Established Programs/Initiatives
The Maryland College and Career Ready Standards Curriculum Frameworks were developed by Maryland educators to unpack the Common Core State Standards and identify the essential skills and knowledge that a student would need to master the grade specific standards. The Frameworks are intended to guide the development of standards-aligned curriculum and to foster a continuum of developmentally appropriate instruction. Along with the MCCRS Clarifications documents, these teacher-developed resources help build common understandings and valuable insights into what a student must know and be able to do to demonstrate proficiency with the standards. With the MCCR Standards, teachers in all subject areas build discipline-specific literacy into daily instruction. Maryland’s disciplinary literacy framework identifies essential skills for accessing, analyzing, and evaluating content-rich informational texts and presenting evidence-based conclusions in argumentative and explanatory writing, emphasizing research. The disciplinary literacy standards are not meant to replace existing content standards in the history, social studies, science, or technical subject classrooms, but rather to support them. Library Media Specialists continue to build strong partnerships with local libraries to provide students with reading and research opportunities that support the growth of all learners. Elementary schools with Judy Centers are using text and email to promote active family engagement with literacy skill development. Programs like Raising a Reader have been implemented in elementary schools in Pre-K classrooms using previous Race to the Top funds.

Goals for Continuity of Standards-based Instruction
Working with local school systems, community-based programs, local Early Childhood Advisory Councils, public libraries, and institutions of higher education, Maryland will expand its vision of literacy to include the continuum of birth to Grade twelve education to engage all groups and to increase alignment. True equity of instruction cannot be achieved until all students receive instruction aligned to the standards and delivered with fidelity. The Maryland State Department of Education has established the following goals to support the Comprehensive Literacy Plan:

• Expand the vision of literacy to engage all groups to include the continuum of birth to grade five and the alignment from grade six through grade twelve;
• Form a Curriculum Support Materials (CSM) Collaborative to review and catalog instructional materials in use;
• Support districts in implementing the Early Learning Standards and Maryland Content Standards;
• Increase knowledge of effective, evidence-based literacy instruction for all students; and
• Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide instructional supports from these collaboratives to LSS.

Enhancements/Improvements for LSS to Consider
Additional time needs to be allotted for vertical team co-planning so that teachers from the pre-school, elementary, middle, and high school levels can collaborate and share evidence-based practices as students transition from one school to the next. Additional time also must be allotted for teachers to plan across content areas and to collaborate with other schools with similar populations to share best practices. Literacy teams need to be clearly established within the school and these teams need to collaborate with others on the local school system and state level to review curriculum, share best practices, and ensure alignment and rigor to the standards and ensure a deeper understanding of what the standards intend to achieve. LSS could consider adding secondary reading coaches in each middle and high school to support teachers’ understanding of the standards and the alignment of reading instruction from grade level to grade level and to address the needs of diverse learners. Elementary level teams should also provide opportunities to include childcare and Head Start members and should partner with their local Early Childhood Advisory Councils to participate in local literacy campaigns and promote outreach efforts to engage parents. Models of schools and programs successfully using evidence-based online literacy apps and resources should be shared with LSS, childcare, and Head Start programs.
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Purpose
A comprehensive system of assessments includes state, local, school, and teacher assessment data. A comprehensive system of assessment allows for strategic data-informed decision making to meet the needs of the individual student and should include the appropriate balance of screening tools, diagnostic tools when needed, progress monitoring of students receiving interventions, and tools to measure outcomes.
A comprehensive system of assessment also includes a formative assessment process. The Chief Council of State School Officers (CCSSO) defines the formative assessment process as follows: “Formative assessment is a planned, ongoing process used by all students and teachers during learning and teaching to elicit and use evidence of student learning to improve student understanding of intended disciplinary learning outcomes and support students to become more self-directed learners.” Further guidance from CCSSO recommends that effective use of the formative assessment process requires students and teachers to integrate and embed the following practices in a collaborative and respectful classroom environment:

• clarifying learning goals within a broader progression of learning;
• eliciting and analyzing evidence of student thinking;
• engaging in self-assessment and peer feedback;
• providing actionable feedback; and
• using evidence and feedback to move learning forward by adjusting learning strategies, goals or next instructional steps.

Maryland began mandating testing in the late 1980s. The data gathered from those initial assessments guided the improvement of instruction for students across the state. As students mastered the standards that had been established, educators realized that the standards needed to be raised, and as a result, Maryland began developing a system of assessments that reflected increased academic standards. See the chart below for the history of Maryland assessments.

Current Birth to Grade 12 Assessments

Early Learning Assessment
The Early Learning Assessment is a formative assessment tool available to all child care, Head Start, and LEAs for use with children from 36-72 months.

Kindergarten Readiness Assessment
The new Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards raised the bar for all school-age students, including kindergarteners. As a result, in 2014 Maryland developed Ready for Kindergarten (R4K), Maryland’s Comprehensive Early Childhood Assessment System under the Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge Grant in partnership with MSDE, the Johns Hopkins University Center for Technology in Education, the Ohio Department of Education, the Connecticut State Department of Education, and WestEd based on Maryland’s Prekindergarten standards. The R4K system helps identify the supports children need to be successful in school. R4K data is used to inform teachers, families, schools, programs, and the state so together we can meet the needs of every child. R4K has two components:

• Early Learning Assessment (ELA) (36 to 72 months) measuring the learning progress of young children in seven domains of learning – social foundations, language/literacy, mathematics, physical well-being and motor development, science, social studies, and the fine arts.

• Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) measuring school readiness in four domains – social foundations; language/literacy, mathematics, and physical well-being and motor development.

Previous Maryland Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Birth to Age Five</th>
<th>K-Grade Five</th>
<th>Grade Six-Grade Eight</th>
<th>Grade Nine-Grade Twelve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR)</td>
<td>Last administered to 2013-2014 kindergartners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Administered in grades three through five</td>
<td>Administered in grades six through eight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland Functional Testing Program (MFTP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland High School Assessments (HSA) English and math</td>
<td>In 2013, the algebra and English assessments were replaced with PARCC exams to align with MCCRS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>Last administered to grades three through five in spring 2019</td>
<td>Last administered in Grades 6-8 in spring 2019</td>
<td>Last administered in high school in spring 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The KRA is the required state assessment measuring kindergarten readiness and given during the first 6 weeks of school. Every jurisdiction must assess, at minimum, a representative sample of entering kindergarteners. Twelve jurisdictions chose to conduct a census administration in the 2017-2018 school year, assessing all entering kindergarteners. In the 2019-2020 school year, 18 of the 24 LSS in Maryland chose to provide census scoring to all kindergarten students, four more than last year, assessing 65% of all entering kindergarteners. This is an increase from 2018-2019, when only 39% of entering kindergarteners were assessed.

The KRA provides information regarding school readiness levels, making it possible to determine if entering students have the knowledge, skills, and abilities required to succeed in kindergarten. The KRA can:

- provide student level data by giving teachers rich information about each assessed child’s knowledge, skills, abilities, and learning needs;
- inform families through the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment Individual Student Report (ISR) which is provided to the family of every assessed child;
- instruct community leaders and policy makers by gathering important information about how well-prepared their children are for kindergarten; and
- advise school leaders and early childhood programs by offering schools and programs information about the learning needs of assessed children.

The KRA also identifies the individual needs of children, enabling teachers to make informed instructional decisions and produces reports for children with disabilities that align with Maryland’s online Individualized Education Plan (IEP) system.

The implementation of the KRA and the PARCC assessments has provided the opportunity to study student achievement from kindergarten to grade 3. The results of a correlation study conducted by REL Mathematica to compare Kindergartners KRA performance on the 2014 KRA with their performance on the 2017-2018 PARCC. The results indicate KRA has predictive validity. As indicated, over half of the students identified as Emerging students in Reading were still at a PARCC level 1 in grade 3 and fewer than 10% reached a level 4 or 5. Statewide, one in five Kindergartners are at an Emerging level each year (20%). This study has buoyed

### Meets or Exceeds Expectations 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Level</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Special Education Students</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the drive to determine what kind of instruction, support, and intervention is happening, the effectiveness of the work, and ways to improve the academic trajectory for Emerging students.

**Percentage of students at each grade 3 Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) reading performance level, by Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) readiness level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARCC Performance Level</th>
<th>Percentage of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=Did Not Meet Expectations</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=Partially Met Expectations</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3=Approaching Expectations</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4=Met Expectations</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5=Exceeded Expectations</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARCC/MCAP ELA/L**

The PARCC tests, which resulted from the PARCC Consortium created through a multistate collaborative effort, were considered end-of-course exams. For students in grades three through eleven, PARCC assessments were given toward the end of the school year. For the English test, students read passages from real texts (fiction and nonfiction) and sometimes watched videos or listened to audios. Students wrote, using what they had learned from the passages and multimedia to support their arguments. For students in high school, PARCC assessments were typically given to students after they completed most of Algebra 1, geometry, or Algebra 2 in math and their 10th or 11th grade English course. The PARCC tests in English Language Arts/Literacy measured writing at every grade because it is key to showing readiness for the next level of academic work or college and career readiness.

In 2019, Maryland decided to develop an independent assessment, which reflected Maryland students and was written by Maryland educators. Joining forces with Educational Testing Services (ETS), ELA teachers across the state began participating in all phases of MCAP ELA/L development: passage review, item writing, content review, and range-finding. The assessment is slated to be a multi-stage adaptive test, which means that the assessment will move students to a grade appropriate text based on their reading skills as determined by a router unit. The assessment is aligned to the MCCRS and will provide data on student mastery of the those standards. Due to the fact that the standards which drive instruction did not change, the transition to a new assessment did not require extensive training or messaging to stakeholders; however, information on any changes to the testing experience were shared with superintendents, local accountability coordinators, ELA supervisors, administrators, and teachers. All constituents have been updated on the similarities and differences in item types, have been provided functionality practice tests, and have had input on the development of blueprints and rubrics. The first administration will provide the equating data to verify the seamless shift from PARCC to ELA/L MCAP.

**Maryland Integrated Science Assessment**

Maryland has replaced the Maryland School Assessment with the Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (MISA), which is administered every spring to students in fifth and eighth grade. The test was first administered in the 2016-17 school year.

**Maryland High School Assessments**

The Maryland High School Assessment Program dates back to 1989, when the Governor’s Commission on School Performance reported on the issues of high-quality assessment. The Government and Biology HSAs are intended to meet the testing requirements for Maryland high school graduation as well as the high school testing requirements for federal law.

**ACCESS for ELLs 2.0**

ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 is an English language proficiency assessment administered to English Learners (ELs) identified in kindergarten through 12th grade. It is given annually to monitor students’ progress in acquiring academic English and assesses ELs’ skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

**MSAA**

Maryland’s Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) is designed to assess skills in English Language Arts and Mathematics for students with significant cognitive...
disabilities in grades three through eight and grade eleven. This represents a very small number of students. The MSAA is based on alternate achievement standards which have been derived from and are aligned to the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards (MCCRS). The overall goal of the MSAA is to make sure that all students achieve increasingly higher academic outcomes and leave high school ready for post-school options.

Alt-Maryland Integrated Science Assessment
The Alternate Maryland Integrated Science Assessment (Alt-MISA), also known as Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM), is designed for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities for whom the general education science assessment (MISA) is not appropriate, even with accommodations. The Alt-MISA is based on alternate achievement standards which have been derived from and are aligned with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).

Established Programs/Initiatives
MSDE reviews and recommends publisher-developed curriculum that aligns with the Maryland Early Learning Standards for programs for infants and toddlers (birth to age three) and comprehensive curriculum (ages three, four, and five).

The Guidelines for Healthy Child Development and Care for Young Children (Birth - Three Years of Age) was compiled in 2004 by a workgroup composed of early childhood professionals, to be compatible with the Maryland Model for School Readiness (MMSR) and the Maryland State Curriculum, making the guidelines an important part of a Birth-Grade twelve learning continuum. In 2009, the Maryland State Department of Education Division of Early Childhood Development began a revision of these guidelines and changed the name to Healthy Beginnings: Supporting Development and Learning from Birth through Three Years of Age. The revision process was intended to ensure that the information continued to meet the goals of being family-friendly, accurate, and developmentally appropriate. National experts were used to review the materials for accuracy and appropriateness with developmental milestones. Both a searchable online version and a mobile accessible version are available for parents and caregivers. The documents can be viewed at Supporting Development and Learning from Birth through Three Years of Age and Welcome to Healthy Beginnings!

In 2018, a curriculum for four-year-olds aligned to the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards and developed with the University of Maryland in partnership with Apple was made available at no cost to all childcare, Head Start, and public prekindergarten programs. In subsequent years, curriculum for three-year-olds, infants, and toddlers will also be made available.

Goals to Support Comprehensive System of Assessments
• Determine and report to stakeholders readiness for and progress toward college and career readiness for all Maryland students;
• Provide workshops, webinars, and resources regarding interpretation of various assessment data;
• Support district level assessment initiatives; and
• Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide assessment supports from these collaboratives to LSS.

Enhancements/Improvements for LSS to Consider
Creative scheduling must be put into place to ensure that there is common planning time among grade level teams to analyze data and share best practices. These common planning meetings should also include EL teachers and special educators, as well as a school administrator, as needed. Resource teachers from the local educational agency level should be regularly invited to common planning meetings to provide additional support. A balanced plan for assessment needs to be created/adjusted at the local educational agency level that includes screening, diagnostic tools, progress monitoring, and outcomes tools to assess standards for each grade level throughout the entire school year. The progress monitoring program should provide data that can be analyzed from the beginning of the school year. Schools need to use the individual and school data on these assessments to plan for improvement based on an aligned statewide data analysis planning model. These assessments should be shared in the needs assessment and as part of the School Progress Plan. Local educational agency level offices will continue to monitor the assessments and their alignment to the standards. The Early Childhood, ESOL program, and Special Education offices will also receive data reports and provide support as needed.
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KEY 5 Tiered Instruction and Interventions

Purpose
Maryland has adopted regulation for the inclusion of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in all classrooms. This approach provides choice for students, which, in turn, allows teachers to differentiate lessons and activities, and differentiation is a key to tiered instruction.
In addition, Maryland developed a structured Response to Intervention (RTI) Framework in 2008 that was adopted statewide. The state’s tiered system of support will continue to be refined, will include all children, and will provide enrichment and intervention models to achieve comprehensive literacy for all. Instruction must be supported by strong evidence-based research and must include frequent, repeated, developmentally appropriate practices such as:

- instructional strategies in developing skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing across content areas;
- targeted instructional approaches and strategies to increase the language development and access to grade-level content for EL;
- intentional instruction in foundational literacy skills, including phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition, print concepts, vocabulary, and fluency;
- explicit instruction in authentic and purposeful writing and opportunities for discourse;
- high-interest, diverse, high-quality print materials;
- differentiated instructional approaches, including individual and small group instruction;
- opportunities for using and developing vocabulary;
- valid and reliable system of assessments including screening, diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment tools;
- strategies to enhance children’s motivation to read and write and children’s engagement in self-directed learning;
- principles of Universal Design for Learning;
- professional development around evidence-based strategies and practices for increased literacy achievement;
- alignment to Maryland Content Standards and the Early Learning Standards; and
- collaboration with the local ECAC Birth-Grade 2 literacy campaigns, including strong partnerships with the public libraries, and participation in family engagement literacy strategies used by the ECAC.

Birth to Grade 12

Birth to Age Five System of Early Care and Education

Early differences in language development, which contribute to reading development, begin in infancy and grow larger over time. Thus, emphasis on supporting language development in children in early childhood is critical. Rich language experiences are needed to support the development of vocabulary, comprehension, and syntactic construction. While the requirement to administer developmental screening to all children enrolled in licensed child care programs is currently on hold, some early childhood programs and pediatricians provide developmental screening to young children and use these data to seek additional interventions if needed. Intervention in the earliest years includes families as their child’s first teacher.

Maryland’s Early Childhood Engagement Framework outlines goals and strategies to support family engagement initiatives implemented by early care and education providers including building family capacity to support their children’s school readiness. Partnerships with organizations that support the provision of high quality early care and education including MD Childcare Resource Network, Maryland State Child Care Association, MD EXCELS, Maryland State Family Child Care Association and the ECACs serve as a link to early education and care providers that may be leveraged to build capacity for data analysis, instructional planning and family engagement in literacy initiatives.

The language and literacy data for children available through developmental screenings and other assessment tools such as the Early Learning Assessment and the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment will guide providers in their instructional planning and in seeking additional interventions if needed. Maryland has a list of recommended screening tools that could be used in early learning programs.
Kindergarten to Grade Five
As students enter kindergarten, all local educational agencies utilize the KRA to determine student readiness. The data from this assessment drives instruction for early learners. Students in many cases are first identified in kindergarten as students in need of receiving free or reduced meals (FARM), EL, or students with special needs. This demographic information, as well as the students' academic and emotional readiness for school, is used to plan instruction that will meet each child’s needs. The aggregated data allows schools, the local educational agency, and the state to make decisions regarding equity in instruction.

Grade Six to Grade Twelve
LEAs use mandated testing information to drive and differentiate instruction and to provide remediation or enrichment instruction as necessary. Additionally, teacher reports, team meetings, and conferences with counselors, parents, and students provide additional information regarding ways to meet the needs of all students. This data will be viewed with research supporting learning of disadvantaged students, ELs, and students with special needs to improve equity.

Established Programs/Initiatives
The State encourages teachers to continue to work collaboratively to utilize responsive teaching methods grounded in student data to support growth. Targeted, small group instruction has been infused into classrooms as a best practice to provide personalized and customized instruction to meet the needs of all students. Para educators, resource teachers, EL teachers, and special educators work together with general education teachers to develop and implement engaging and rigorous instruction grounded in the standards. Technology has been readily infused into instruction to provide customized options to support students who need additional support as well as students who could benefit from further extension of learning experiences to enhance growth.

Goals to support Tiered Instruction and Intervention
Maryland has adopted regulation for the inclusion of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in all classrooms. This approach provides choice and individualization for students which, in turn, allows teachers to provide tiered instruction. In addition, Maryland developed a structured Response to Intervention Framework in 2008 that was adopted statewide. The Maryland State Department of Education has established the following goals to support the Comprehensive Literacy Plan:

- Provide professional learning for LSS staff, on Multi-Tiered System of Support to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities;
- Provide resources for implementing multi-tiered systems of support;
- Provide technical support; and
- Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide supports from these collaboratives to LSS.

Enhancements/Improvements for LSS to Consider
Teachers need additional professional learning in understanding available literacy data and how to use it for identifying student needs for early intervention. All teachers need additional professional learning in utilizing reading and writing strategies that will support the specific needs of their diverse learners. This also includes professional learning on culturally responsive teaching that is grounded in best practices for literacy. Multi-tiered systems of support include interventions as well as enrichments and are for students at all levels of proficiency and at every level of development. Collaboration is needed as students transition from one grade level to the next, and from one school to the next. In transition meetings, teachers need to share student-specific best practices with the next grade level teachers. Additional support is needed in high school for students reading below grade level. Many high schools do not have reading specialists assigned to the high school. The state will investigate how literacy issues and screening are being addressed in districts across the state. Evidence-based programs to support students reading below grade level at the high school level may address some of these concerns; however, considerations for sustainability for literacy support should be investigated.
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KEY 6 Family and Community Partnerships

Purpose
The intent of this key is to develop strong family and community partnerships. Active parent and community involvement are key components of the success of high functioning elementary and secondary schools. Across diverse economic backgrounds, family and community participation in elementary and secondary schools is associated with greater student success. Educators can help families and communities add to their repertoire of strategies for promoting literacy. In order to have the most positive impact on literacy achievement for all students, it is imperative that schools, families, and communities collaborate. Partnerships help schools prepare students for college and careers by offering additional opportunities, supports, and enrichment for young people.
Birth to Grade 12
Established Programs/Initiatives

Birth to Age Five System of Early Care and Education
Maryland’s Early Childhood Family Engagement Framework is designed to be a guide for programs and providers to increase the availability and quality of family engagement for all families with young children in Maryland.

According to the Framework, family engagement initiatives should:

- Promote family well-being
- Promote positive parent-child relationships
- Support families as lifelong educators of their children
- Support the educational aspirations of parents and families
- Support families through the care and education transitions of early childhood
- Connect families to their peers and to the community
- Support the development of families as leaders and child advocates

Evidence-Based Family Engagement Programs
Family engagement strategies should be securely embedded in the values and operation of early learning programs. It often helps to have specific programs that target family engagement with a focus on comprehensive family support, early literacy or home visiting. Within Maryland there are several evidence-based family and community programs designed to promote literacy for all students.

- Judy Centers. Judy Centers provide a central location for early childhood education and family support services for families with children birth through kindergarten. Currently, there are 25 Judy Centers located at or near Title I schools, serving about 12,000 children birth through kindergarten each year. Judy Centers represent a much-desired model of community engagement in early learning. They effectively link early childhood with public schools and an array of community-based agencies, organizations, and businesses.

- Family Support Centers. Operated by Maryland Family Network, a state-coordinating entity, the network of family support centers combines parent-child activities, adult education and job readiness, to support low-income families with young children. The Family Support Centers incorporate Early Head Start and Community Hubs to help families navigate access to services while working toward their own life goals.

- Head Start. Maryland has nineteen Head Start grantees that provide comprehensive early childhood education and health services. Head Start programs follow the program standards that are required by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

- Abriendo Puertas/Opening Doors. Abriendo Puertas was developed for and by Latino parents to build parent capacity and confidence to be strong and powerful advocates in the lives of their children, and to ensure their children are ready to learn. The program offers ten sessions of parenting, leadership, and advocacy training for parents of children ages birth to five. It is an interactive, multimedia curriculum that draws on real-life experiences and cultural strengths of Latino families, and makes the teachings personal and relevant.

- Maryland Public Libraries. Libraries throughout Maryland have story time or prekindergarten classes taught by librarians who are knowledgeable about the Maryland College and Career-Ready Standards and STEM. Story time provides children with a group experience where they can participate in early literacy skill building, while interacting not only with adults outside the family, but with peers as well.

- Raising a Reader. Raising a Reader is a national early literacy and family engagement program that works with direct service agencies (serving children 0-8) so that they can help families develop, practice, and maintain the habit of sharing books with their children. Each week, children bring home a bag of high-quality books that are developmentally and culturally appropriate. Parents participate in workshops that provide ideas for sharing the books and promoting oral language with their child. Over the course of a typical rotation, parents share more than 100 books with their children.

- Ready at Five. Ready at Five is part of the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education. This non-profit provides downloadable parent tips that guide families in supporting early learning and school readiness. In addition, Ready at Five hosts Learning Parties for parents and their children, during which parents learn strategies for using everyday experiences to promote learning. In 2018, Learning Parties Learning Parties took place across the state and reached 181 parents and 235 children. Surveys indicated that 92% of parents felt that they were
more confident in their ability to advocate for their child and were able to resolve conflicts in more effective ways.

- **Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY).** HIPPY is an evidence based peer home visiting program that targets families with preschool age children. During the thirty-week program, home visitors stress the importance of the parental role in children’s learning and provide families with tools – activity packets with books, manipulatives, crayons, scissors –materials they can use to support learning in the home. Parents are encouraged to read to their children every day and to support the development of school readiness skills.

- **Parent Teacher Home Visiting Project.** Building upon the lessons learned from home visiting in early childhood, the Parent Teacher Home Visiting Project is focused on building relationships between teachers and parents to support students’ learning from elementary grades through high school. The program trains teachers to conduct meaningful home visits, provides support during and after the visiting process, and tracks outcomes of the visits to evaluate the program.

**Kindergarten to Grade Five**

In Maryland, family engagement can extend beyond a relationship between families to encompass a broader connection to the community. Like family engagement, community engagement is a partnership. The early childhood program, elementary school, and the larger community work together supporting one another and sharing responsibility for meeting the comprehensive needs of all children. Some early childhood and elementary programs are located within community organizations, such as a Judy Center or a county agency. When these programs work closely with the community, everyone benefits.

- Children gain access to community-sponsored opportunities.
- Families benefit from access to services that contribute to family well-being.
- Early childhood programs and elementary schools benefit from both tangible resources such as donations, and intangible resources such as business advice.
- Communities benefit by having quality programs that ensure the next generation of community members are reaching their full potential.

**Grade Six to Grade Twelve**

Student Service Learning is a Maryland high school graduation requirement. From grade six to grade twelve, students participate in a variety of volunteer opportunities, which allow students and communities to join forces for the greater good. Students across the state have partnered with organizations such as Habitat for Humanity, the Baltimore Aquarium, the Maryland Zoo, and public libraries. The partnerships build unique relationships and provide an opportunity for support for agencies and for students and families.

**Goals to support Family and Community Partnerships**

Active parent and community involvement are key components of the success of high functioning elementary and secondary schools across diverse economic backgrounds. Family and community participation in elementary and secondary schools is associated with greater student success. Educators help families and communities add to their repertoire of strategies for promoting literacy. In order to have the most positive impact on literacy achievement for all students, it is imperative that schools, families, and communities collaborate. Partnerships help schools prepare students for college and careers by offering additional opportunities, supports, and enrichment for young people. The Maryland State Department of Education has established the following goals to support the Comprehensive Literacy Plan:

- Support districts and schools in developing strong family partnerships;
- Support districts and schools in developing strong community partnerships;
- Support LSS and the system of Early Care and Education in developing strategies for monitoring teaching and learning; and
- Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide supports from these collaboratives to districts, childcare providers, and community partners.
Enhancements/Improvements for LSS to Consider

The Essential Instructional Practices, from the Handbook for Effective Literacy Instruction are supported by research and represent ways to empower educators to support families to:

- Prompt children during reading and writing and demonstrate ways to incorporate literacy-promoting strategies into everyday activities, such as cooking, communicating with friends and family and traveling in the bus or car;
- Promote children’s independent reading;
- Support children in doing their homework and in academic learning over the summer months;
- Speak with children in their home/most comfortable language, whether or not that language is English;
- Provide literacy-supporting resources such as:
  - Books from the classroom that children can borrow or keep
  - Children’s magazines
  - Information about judicious, adult-supported use of educational television and applications that can, with guidance, support literacy development
  - Announcements about local events
  - Passes to local museums

When the school and community form a collaborative partnership, they can effectively and collaboratively provide a wider range of services than either could on their own. When first establishing a school-community partnership, it will be important to use the data from the needs assessment to assess the fit of potential community partners, and choose those that fit the needs and desires of students. The school and community partner should continually assess their relationship and impact on student success. The Coalition for Community Schools offers a Results Framework, which offers specific indicators around student learning and wellbeing that are essential for student success, and that schools and community partners could track and serve as goals for school-community partnerships.

Short Term Results Include:
- Children are ready to enter school;
- Students attend school consistently; and
- Students are actively involved in learning and in their community

Long Term Results Include:
- Students succeed academically.
- Students are healthy-physically, socially, and emotionally; and
- Communities are desirable places to live.

As we engage in productive family and community partnerships, it is important to take time to celebrate successes, share challenges, and consider ways to improve. Creating effective school-community partnerships takes time, commitment, willingness and trust to share both successes and challenges along the way. Whether seeking to begin a partnership or to sustain existing ones, some essential elements include professional learning for all stakeholders on the relationship between mental and physical wellness and student achievement, as well as highlighting effective school-family-community partnerships that already exist as models.
While Maryland has always had a consistent focus on literacy in leadership, professional learning, standards, assessment, and instruction, the data show that the state must continue its efforts and focus on disadvantaged populations beginning at birth. MSDE is driven to provide all keys necessary to help students be successful in a world that requires more of them than any era before, while juggling obstacles that educators and families could not have imagined ten or twenty years ago. Even more urgent is the need to provide equitable resources for all students, because all students must not simply survive in the 21st Century; they must thrive. The number of students from disadvantaged populations who are not college and career ready by the time they leave high school represents a challenge that MSDE will meet by providing the skills necessary for improved literacy development for all students, birth to grade twelve. The Maryland Comprehensive Literacy Plan outlined in this document establishes the plan for success for all students.
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Maryland’s demographic profile is rapidly changing. The overall student population is more diverse and now reflects a majority-minority, with the number of Hispanic students with disabilities more than tripling, from 4% in SFY 2000 to 14% in SFY 2016. More children are homeless, move frequently, are refugees from other countries, and/or speak other languages.

Moving Maryland Forward: Sharpen the Focus for 2020

This change is seen in the school building, but there is also documentation regarding children prior to entering school. Any child who falls into two or more of the categories of disadvantaged youths is at greater risk of failing than their English speaking counterparts.

Percentage of Kindergarteners Demonstrating Readiness by Subgroup

- Children w/o Disabilities: 45%
- Children w/ Disabilities: 19%
- English Proficient: 46%
- English Language Learners: 21%
- Children from Mid-/High-Income Households: 51%
- Children from Low-Income Households: 32%

26 PT GAP BETWEEN CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THEIR PEERS.
25 PT GAP BETWEEN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS AND THEIR ENGLISH-PROFICIENT PEERS.
19 PT GAP BETWEEN CHILDREN IN LOW-INCOME (FARMS) HOUSEHOLDS AND THEIR NON-FARMS PEERS.

Closing this gap is vital to the success of all children from the moment they enter school and as they complete and most beyond grade twelve. As students lag behind their peers, the risk of academic failure increases drastically. The number of disadvantaged students who are tested and reach proficiency levels on standardized tests drops significantly.

Elementary School Data for Disadvantaged Youth

Elementary School Data for Disadvantaged Youth 2019

Student Group Populations Current Year Data (2019)

Data last Updated 6/27/2019
Appendix A: Maryland 2016 data

All data can be accessed at Maryland Report Card.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>504 and Special Education Services</th>
<th>Below Poverty/FaRMS</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth – 5 years</td>
<td>4.05% * 2.3%*</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*According to the data from the 2015 Maryland Census Report, the Maryland Infants and Toddlers Program was serving 4.05% children with disabilities. Of this

Assessment Scores Pass Rates for Disadvantaged Youth
The disaggregated data shows the proficiency level for disadvantaged populations.

Meets or Exceeds Expectations 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Level</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Special Education Students</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten (KRA Literacy Domain)</td>
<td>40% (demonstrating readiness)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meets or Exceeds Expectations 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Level</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Special Education Students</th>
<th>English Learners</th>
<th>Economically Disadvantaged Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten (KRA Literacy Domain)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 (PARCC ELA/L)</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland’s Keys to Comprehensive Literacy
ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Test Scores for EL Students 2017

The percent from the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 English language proficiency test includes ELs by grade level who scored a 5.0 or higher on ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 in 2016. In 2017, the test was realigned to new standards, which impacted the results for students taking the test in spring 2017. Considering that there are over 203 languages spoken in Maryland, the population of English learners is very diverse. Although these students may be proficient in another language or languages, the English Learners are working to develop their proficiency in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of EL Students</th>
<th>Number of EL Students Scoring Proficient</th>
<th>Percent of EL Students Attaining Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>9,917</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>9,467</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>8,078</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>2,968</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>5,838</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3,417</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65,459</td>
<td>12,153</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 Test Scores for EL Students 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of EL Students</th>
<th>Number of EL Students Scoring Proficient</th>
<th>Percent of EL Students Attaining Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>10,369</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,152</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,696</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,134</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,385</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,943</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, WIDA conducted standard setting, which may have affected scores in 2019.

Anticipated Changes in Maryland’s Population

According to the federal 2010 census, Maryland’s population was 5,773,552. Between 2000 and 2010, Maryland’s population gained 477,066 persons, an increase of 9%. In 2000, Maryland ranked 19th in the nation in population. With 529.1 persons per square land mile in 1999, it ranked 6th in population density among states (including the District of Columbia). From 1990 to 2000, Maryland population grew by 10.8%, a gain of 515,733 persons. Projected numbers for increases in population are available in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Total Number of EL Students</th>
<th>Number of EL Students Scoring Proficient</th>
<th>Percent of EL Students Attaining Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>10,369</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,152</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,696</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,134</td>
<td>3,107</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,383</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,385</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,943</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,294</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2016, WIDA conducted standard setting, which may have affected scores in 2019.

Table 2: Maryland Projected Population Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1990 census</th>
<th>2000 census</th>
<th>2010 census</th>
<th>2020 projected*</th>
<th>2030 projected*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4,780,753</td>
<td>5,296,486</td>
<td>5,773,552</td>
<td>6,339,290</td>
<td>6,684,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As suggested in Table 2, Maryland’s population will continue to increase. While Maryland has a seemingly smaller number of disadvantaged youth as compared to other geographically larger states, the state’s density is 6th overall. This increase has been evidenced by local educational agencies who are encountering an increasing number of students with disabilities, students with English as a second language, and students at a lower socioeconomic level. Maryland is homing in on the needs of its changing populations to address the needs of these disadvantaged groups.

Gifted and Talented

Maryland does not currently collect data on gifted and talented students; however, the Maryland ESSA plan states, “The State intends to take steps to add ‘gifted and talented students’ as an additional student group by the end of school year 2017-2018.”
Appendix B: Needs-Based Survey and Results 2020
The first step in the development of Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan was a needs assessment. In revising the CLP, the questions were revised and sent to stakeholders across the state, and their responses informed the direction of the revised CLP. In 2017, the Birth to Grade 12 continuum required two surveys with similar questions but geared to the specific needs of various groups; this method was followed in 2020 as well. In the second Needs Assessment, over 4,000 constituents responded to the questions and their feedback is the foundation of the revision to the Maryland Comprehensive Literacy Plan.

Kindergarten to Grade 12 Literacy Needs Assessment Responses

QUESTION 1
Administrators identify community, cultural, and equity concerns related to literacy and share solutions with stakeholders.

QUESTION 2
The local school system provides professional learning to address the needs of disadvantaged populations, including students from low income households, students with disabilities, and English learners.

QUESTION 3
The local school system engages parents, community-based providers, higher education representatives, and other related stakeholders in literacy initiatives.

QUESTION 4
Literacy instruction is developmentally appropriate and strongly aligned to Maryland College and Career Ready Standards.

QUESTION 5
The local school system’s assessment system includes valid and reliable screening, diagnostic, formative, and summative components.

QUESTION 6
Assessments are used for data-informed decision-making in order to identify a child’s learning needs, inform instruction, monitor a child’s progress, and determine the effects of instruction.
QUESTION 7
The local school system uses RTI and/or multi-tiered systems of support to determine appropriate interventions and practices needed to support a variety of student populations and needs. This includes students from low income households, students

- Strongly Agree: 36.6%
- Agree: 53.7%
- Disagree: 8.5%
- Strongly Disagree: 10.3%

QUESTION 8
The interventions that the local school system uses are evidence-based and provide appropriate accommodations and supports that maintain high achievement expectations for all students.

- Strongly Agree: 36.6%
- Agree: 51.8%
- Disagree: 14.2%
- Strongly Disagree: 10.3%

QUESTION 9
Teachers design lessons with Universal Design for Learning (UDL) to provide flexibility in the way information is presented; the way students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills; and the way students are engaged.

- Strongly Agree: 33.8%
- Agree: 54.2%
- Disagree: 10.7%
- Strongly Disagree: 14.2%

QUESTION 10
The local school system has an equity plan to close the achievement/opportunity gap for disadvantaged populations, including students from low income households, students with disabilities, and English learners.

- Strongly Agree: 27.9%
- Agree: 56.1%
- Disagree: 14.2%
- Strongly Disagree: 9.7%

QUESTION 11
Does your school system collaborate with institutions of higher education around pre-service training for literacy teachers?

- Yes: 45%
- No: 48.2%
- Unsure: 6.7%
Early Childhood Literacy Needs Assessment Responses

QUESTION 1
Program Directors identify community, cultural, and equity concerns related to literacy and share solutions with stakeholders.

QUESTION 2
Our program is provided with high quality professional learning to address the needs of disadvantaged populations, including students from low income households, students with disabilities, and English learners.

QUESTION 3
The local school system engages parents, community-based providers, higher education representatives, and other related stakeholders in literacy initiatives.

QUESTION 4
Our program’s literacy instruction is developmentally appropriate and strongly aligned to Maryland Early Learning Standards.

QUESTION 5
Our program’s assessment system includes valid and reliable screening, diagnostic, formative, and summative components.

QUESTION 6
Assessments are used for data-informed decision-making in order to identify a child’s learning needs, inform instruction, monitor a child’s progress, and determine the effects of instruction.
QUESTION 7
Our program uses the Response to Intervention Model and/or multi-tiered systems of support to determine appropriate interventions and practices needed to support a variety of student populations and needs. This includes students from low income households, students with disabilities, and English learners.

QUESTION 8
The interventions/supports that we use are evidence-based and provide appropriate accommodations and supports that maintain high achievement expectations for all students.

QUESTION 9
Teachers design differentiated lessons to provide flexibility in the way information is presented; the way students respond or demonstrate knowledge and skills; and the way students are engaged.

QUESTION 10
Our program has an equity plan to close the achievement/opportunity gap for disadvantaged populations, including students from low income households, students with disabilities, and English learners.

QUESTION 11
Does your program provide training for staff on developmentally appropriate, research based early literacy practices?
Needs-Based Survey and Results 2017

The first step in the development of Maryland’s Comprehensive Literacy Plan was a needs assessment. The questions were created and sent to stakeholders across the state and their responses informed the direction of the CLP. The Birth to Grade 12 continuum required two surveys with similar questions but geared to the specific needs of various groups. Over 500 constituents responded to the questions and their feedback is the foundation of the CLP.

Birth - 5 Comprehensive Literacy Plan Needs

QUESTION 1
Program Directors and providers identify their community, cultural, and equity concerns related to literacy and share solutions with all of the program’s or provider’s staff, parents, and community partners, such as local libraries or Early Childhood Advisory Council partners.

QUESTION 2
Program Directors provide professional learning opportunities for their staff through a variety of ways, such as workshops, conferences, online modules, or book study, and encourage aspiring staff leaders to participate. Providers participate in professional learning in a variety of ways.

QUESTION 3
Program Directors provide time for regular literacy staff meetings and collaborative staff planning together. Providers participate in collaborative literacy planning opportunities.

QUESTION 4
Program Directors participate with their staff in professional learning initiatives for literacy. Providers participate in professional learning initiatives for literacy.
**QUESTION 5**
Program Directors provide ongoing professional learning for literacy that is based on research that shows it is effective. Providers participate in professional learning for literacy that is based on research that shows it is effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 501 Skipped: -1*

**QUESTION 6**
My program includes staff, parents, and other partners in professional learning initiatives for literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 501 Skipped: -1*

**QUESTION 7**
Professional learning for literacy initiatives incorporates a variety of formats such as workshops, conferences, online modules, or book study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 501 Skipped: -1*

**QUESTION 8**
Literacy instruction is developmentally appropriate and uses state recommended curriculum which is strongly aligned to the Early Learning Standards for Birth-3 and/or the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards for Prekindergarten and kindergarten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 501 Skipped: -1*

**QUESTION 9**
Program instruction meets the rigor of the Early Learning Standards and/or the Maryland College and Career Ready Standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 501 Skipped: -1*

**QUESTION 10**
My program's assessment system includes valid and reliable screening, diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment tools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 501 Skipped: -1*

**Maryland’s Keys to Comprehensive Literacy**
Appendix C: Evidence-based Resources

**Sources of Evidence**

“Warehouses” with multiple sources on various topics, evaluated against the ESSA definition:
- Evidence for ESSA (Hopkins)
- What Works Clearinghouse (IES)
- Evidence-Based Intervention Network (University of Missouri)
- National Center on Intensive Intervention (AIR)

Multiple sources on single topics, sometimes evaluated against the ESSA definition:
- Sources synthesized by groups like Class Size Matters, Attendance Works, etc.
- Literature reviews

Single sources, not pre-reviewed against ESSA definition:
- Academic and professional journals (these are reviewed, just not against the ESSA definition)
- Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
- Vendors
- Google

**What to ask after finding a piece of evidence?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the original source trustworthy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the evidence data and statistics, or research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the source clearly describe the activity, the desired outcome, and the conditions under which it was tested?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the result of the activity? (Did the activity achieve the outcome?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What “Level” of evidence is it? (How strong is the link between the activity and the outcome?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the “effect size” of the activity? (To what degree did the outcome occur, a little or a lot?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other factors might have contributed to the activity working (or not working)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can (and should) the activity be selected for the decision at hand?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Find the Evidence
The information and links below may guide LEAs in determining the level of evidence-based research for a program or resource.

1. “Warehouses” with multiple sources on various topics, evaluated against the ESSA definition:
   - Evidence for ESSA (Hopkins)
   - What Works Clearinghouse (IES) *has email subscription
   - Evidence-Based Intervention Network (University of Missouri)
   - National Center on Intensive Intervention (AIR)
   - Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Registry (SAMHSA)

2. Multiple sources on single topics, sometimes evaluated against the ESSA definition:
   - Sources synthesized by groups like Class Size Matters, Attendance Works, etc.

3. Single sources, not pre-reviewed against ESSA definition:
   - Academic and professional journals (these are reviewed, just not against the ESSA definition)
   - Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)
   - Vendors
   - Google

Checklist: Evaluating Plans for Evidence-Based Activities
Prior to selecting an evidence-based program, respond to the following questions.

1. Does the plan identify a need (and associated objectives/outcomes)?
2. What is the proposed activity to meet the need?
3. What level of evidence does the proposed activity demonstrate? (“How strong is the link between the activity and the outcome?”)
   - Level 1-3: Existing research links the specific activity to the need.
   - Level 4: Existing research links the general activity to the need, and the plan will evaluate whether the specific activity meets the need after it is implemented.
4. What is the effect size of the proposed activity? (“How large is the impact of the activity on the outcome?”)
5. Is the activity an appropriate choice, given the level of evidence, the effect size, and other context (student population, grade levels, delivery method, cost, etc.)?
Appendix D: Glossary of Terms

Child with a disability
A child evaluated in accordance with §§300.304 300.311 as having mental retardation, a hearing impairment (including deafness), a speech or language impairment, a visual impairment (including blindness), a serious emotional disturbance (referred to in this part as “emotional disturbance”), an orthopedic impairment, autism, traumatic brain injury, another health impairment, a specific learning disability, deaf-blindness, or multiple disabilities, and who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services.

Comprehensive literacy instruction
Instruction that—(a) Includes developmentally appropriate, contextually explicit, and systematic instruction, and frequent practice, in reading and writing across content areas; (b) Includes age-appropriate, explicit, systematic, and intentional instruction in phonological awareness, phonic decoding, vocabulary, language structure, reading fluency, and reading comprehension; (c) Includes age-appropriate, explicit instruction in writing, including opportunities for children to write with clear purposes, with critical reasoning appropriate to the topic and purpose, and with specific instruction and feedback from instructional staff; (d) Makes available and uses diverse, high-quality print materials that reflect the reading and development levels, and interests, of children; (e) Uses differentiated instructional approaches, including individual and small group instruction and discussion; (f) Provides opportunities for children use language with peers and adults in order to develop language skills, including developing vocabulary; (g) Includes frequent practice of reading and writing strategies; (h) Uses age-appropriate, valid, and reliable screening assessments, diagnostic assessments, formative assessment processes, and summative assessments to identify a child’s learning needs, to inform instruction, and to monitor the child’s progress and the effects of instruction; (i) Uses strategies to enhance children’s motivation to read and write and children’s engagement in self-directed learning; (j) Incorporates the principles of universal design for learning; (k) Depends on teachers’ collaboration in planning, instruction, and assessing a child’s progress and on continuous professional learning; and (l) Links literacy instruction to the State’s challenging academic standards, including standards relating to the ability to navigate, understand, and write about complex subject matters in print and digital formats.

Dual Language Learner
English learners who range in age from birth through five years old and who are learning two or more languages. The title of DLL acknowledges that very young children are still actively developing their home language(s) along with English.

English learner
An individual—(a) Who is aged 3 through 21; (b) Who is enrolled or preparing to enroll in an elementary school or secondary school; (c)(i) Who was not born in the United States or whose native language is a language other than English; (ii)(I) Who is a Native American or Alaska Native, or a native resident of the outlying areas; and (II) Who comes from an environment where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual’s level of English language proficiency; or (iii) Who is migratory, whose native language is a language other than English, and who comes from an environment where a language other than English is dominant; and (d) Whose difficulties in speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language may be sufficient to deny the individual— (i) The ability to meet the academic standards; (ii) The ability to successfully achieve in classrooms where the language of instruction is English; or (iii) The opportunity to participate fully in society.

Professional development
Activities that—(a) Are an integral part of school and LEA strategies for providing educators (including teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, paraprofessionals, and, as applicable, early childhood educators) with the knowledge and skills necessary to enable students to succeed in a well-rounded education and to meet the State’s challenging academic standards; (b) Are sustained (not stand-alone, one-day, or short term workshops), intensive, collaborative, job-embedded, data-driven, and classroom-focused; and (c) May include activities that—(1) Improve and increase teachers’—(i) Knowledge of the academic subjects the teachers teach; (ii) Understanding of how students learn; or (iii) Ability to analyze student work and achievement from multiple sources, including how to adjust instructional strategies, assessments, and materials based on such analysis; (2) Are an integral part of broad schoolwide and districtwide educational improvement plans; (3) Allow personalized plans for each educator to address the educator’s specific needs identified in observation
or other feedback; (4) Improve classroom management skills; (5) Support the recruitment, hiring, and training of effective teachers, including teachers who became certified through State and local alternative routes to certification; (6) Advance teacher understanding of— (i) Effective instructional strategies that are evidence-based; or (ii) Strategies for improving student academic achievement or substantially increasing the knowledge and teaching skills of teachers; (7) Are aligned with, and directly related to, academic goals of the school or LEA; (8) Are developed with extensive participation of teachers, principals, other school leaders, parents, representatives of Indian Tribes (as applicable), and administrators of schools to be served under this program; (9) Are designed to give teachers of English learners, and other teachers and instructional staff, the knowledge and skills to provide instruction and appropriate language and academic support services to those children, including the appropriate use of curricula and assessments; (10) To the extent appropriate, provide training for teachers, principals, and other school and community-based early childhood program leaders in the use of technology (including education about the harms of copyright piracy), so that technology and technology applications are effectively used in the classroom to improve teaching and learning in the curricula and academic subjects in which the teachers teach; (11) As a whole, are regularly evaluated for their impact on teacher effectiveness and student academic achievement, with the findings of the evaluations used to improve the quality of professional development; (12) Are designed to give teachers of children with disabilities or children with developmental delays, and other teachers and instructional staff, the knowledge and skills to provide instruction and academic support services to those children, including positive behavioral interventions and supports, multi-tier system of supports, and use of accommodations; (13) Provide instruction in the use of data and assessments to inform classroom practice; (14) Provide instruction in ways that teachers, principals, other school leaders, specialized instructional support personnel, and school administrators may work more effectively with parents and families; (15) Involve the forming of partnerships with institutions of higher education, including, as applicable, Tribal Colleges and Universities as defined in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)), to establish school-based teacher, principal, and other school leader training programs that provide prospective teachers, novice teachers, principals, and other school leaders with an opportunity to work under the guidance of experienced teachers, principals, other school leaders, and faculty of such institutions; (16) Create programs to enable paraprofessionals (assisting teachers employed by an LEA receiving assistance under part A of title I) to obtain the education necessary for those paraprofessionals to become certified and licensed teachers; (17) Provide follow-up training to teachers who have participated in activities described in this paragraph (c) that are designed to ensure that the knowledge and skills learned by the teachers are implemented in the classroom; or (18) Where practicable, provide for school staff and other early childhood education program providers to address jointly the transition to elementary school, including issues related to school readiness.

System of Early Care and Education in Maryland (SECE in MD):
Maryland’s early care and education system encompasses an array of programs with distinct purposes and designs. The system is complex with federally, state and privately funded programs subject to oversight by multiple authorizing and licensing agencies. The range of program options available to families of young children ages birth to 5 years includes:

- Public Pre-Kindergarten
- Community-based Pre-Kindergarten
- Head Start
- Early Head Start
- Licensed Childcare Centers
- Judy Centers
- Family Childcare
- Parochial Preschool
- Montessori
- Informal/Relative Care

World Language Immersion Program
A model of instruction in which academic content and literacy skills are taught through the use of both English and a partner language, usually beginning in kindergarten.
## Appendix E Timelines and Goals 2017-2020

### Instructional Leadership Goals

#### KEY 1

The leadership on every level (state, local school systems, schools and early childhood programs) must recognize and tap into the needs, strengths, and concerns of the community; the cultural makeup of its citizens; and the equity issues which impact the state, school, and local educational agency. These driving forces of the Comprehensive Literacy Plan are reflected in the leadership, the instruction, and the training that is provided. Components of Instructional Leadership include identifying and encouraging teacher leaders; establishing leadership ladders; providing opportunities for regular literacy meetings, data dialogues, joint planning; and monitoring and assessing progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSDE Goals for Instructional Leadership</th>
<th>Birth to Age 5 System of Early Care and Education</th>
<th>K - Grade 5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Key Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To develop instructional leaders who are knowledgeable about evidence-based literacy practices</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer 2017 – Summer 2018</td>
<td>Content Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EIP Webinars</td>
<td>EIP Webinars</td>
<td>EIP Webinars</td>
<td>EIP Webinars</td>
<td>Winter 2017 – Spring 2018</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support LEAs in analyzing the strengths and needs of the school and its community</td>
<td>Data Workshops</td>
<td>Data Workshops</td>
<td>Data Workshops</td>
<td>Data Workshops</td>
<td>Fall 2017</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implement Central Office Communities of Practice in LEAs</td>
<td>Implement Central Office Communities of Practice in LEAs</td>
<td>Implement Central Office Communities of Practice in LEAs</td>
<td>Implement Central Office Communities of Practice in LEAs</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
<td>Assessment Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support LEAs and the members of the System of Early Care and Education in developing strategies for monitoring teaching and learning</td>
<td>Summer workshops</td>
<td>Summer workshops</td>
<td>Summer workshops</td>
<td>Summer workshops</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide supports from these collaboratives to LEAs</td>
<td>CCSSO School Leadership Development and Support Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO School Leadership Development and Support Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO School Leadership Development and Support Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO School Leadership Development and Support Workgroup</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>MSDE Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSO Engaging Teacher Leaders to Inform Policy and Improve Instruction Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO Engaging Teacher Leaders to Inform Policy and Improve Instruction Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO Engaging Teacher Leaders to Inform Policy and Improve Instruction Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO Engaging Teacher Leaders to Inform Policy and Improve Instruction Workgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Forward</td>
<td>Learning Forward</td>
<td>Learning Forward</td>
<td>Learning Forward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support instructional leaders in promoting culturally responsive teaching</td>
<td>CCSSO CRT workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO CRT workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO CRT workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO CRT workgroup</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
<td>MSDE staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maryland’s CLP embraces the whole child, from birth to Grade 12. A high-quality and sustained system of professional learning occurs through strong partnerships with families and guardians, early childhood educators, Prek-12 teachers, higher education faculty and staff members, libraries, birth to 5 organizations, and other community stakeholders. Together state and local teams will establish and disseminate needs-based professional learning in a variety of mediums to local educational agencies, K-12 Educators, Birth to 5 programs, and local communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSDE Goals for Strategic Professional Learning</th>
<th>Birth to Age 5 System of Early Care and Education</th>
<th>K - Grade 5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Key Contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To create a high-quality and sustained system of professional learning</td>
<td>Plan and implement needs based professional learning</td>
<td>Plan and implement needs based professional learning</td>
<td>Plan and implement needs based professional learning</td>
<td>Plan and implement needs based professional learning</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize partner organizations such as Ready At Five to provide early literacy professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team, DECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Pre-K-2 Symposums, conferences, and workshops on developmentally appropriate, evidence-based instructional practices</td>
<td>Sponsor Symposums, conferences, and workshops on developmentally appropriate, evidence-based instructional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2018, 2019, 2020</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team, Content Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To build preservice and in-service teacher capacity</td>
<td>Streamline the approval process for Language and Literacy professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>DECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of childcare providers who are credentialed through MSDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>DECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of providers seeking Child Development Associate (CDA) credential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>DECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support job-embedded, peer-to-peer professional learning</td>
<td>Partner with Maryland Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to revise elementary teacher certification course frameworks</td>
<td>Partner with Maryland Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to revise secondary teacher certification course frameworks</td>
<td>Partner with Maryland Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to revise secondary teacher certification course frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-2018</td>
<td>ELA staff, Certification Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate Peer Coaching Collaboratives</td>
<td>Facilitate Peer Coaching Collaboratives</td>
<td>Facilitate Peer Coaching Collaboratives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop a statewide understanding of culturally responsive teaching practices</td>
<td>Workshops, Guest Speaker(s)</td>
<td>Workshops, Guest Speaker(s)</td>
<td>Workshops, Guest Speaker(s)</td>
<td>Workshops, Guest Speaker(s)</td>
<td>2019-2022</td>
<td>Professional Learning Team, MSDE Lead Equity Specialist, CCSSO partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KEY 3

Working with local school systems, community-based programs, local Early Childhood Advisory Councils, public libraries, and institutions of higher education, Maryland will expand its vision of literacy to include the continuum of birth to Grade 12 education to engage all groups and to increase alignment. True equity of instruction cannot be achieved until all students receive instruction aligned to the standards and delivered with fidelity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSDE Goals for Continuity of Standards-based Instruction</th>
<th>Birth- Age 5 System of Early Care and Education</th>
<th>K- Grade 5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To expand the vision of literacy to engage all groups to include the continuum of birth to grade five and the alignment from grade six through grade 12</td>
<td>Support the system of early care and education and LEAs to align programs to Maryland content standards and Early Learning Standards</td>
<td>Support LEAs to align curriculum to Early Learning Standards and Maryland content standards</td>
<td>Support LEAs to align curriculum to Maryland content standards</td>
<td>Support LEAs to align curriculum to Maryland content standards</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Content Offices of Early Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form a Curriculum Support Materials (CSM) Collaborative to review and catalog instructional materials in use</td>
<td>Provide information regarding best practices in use</td>
<td>Provide information regarding best practices in use</td>
<td>Provide information regarding best practices in use</td>
<td>Provide information regarding best practices in use</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support districts in implementing the Early Learning Standards and Maryland Content Standards</td>
<td>Continue collaboration with UMD to develop an evidence-based Infants, Toddlers, 3s, and 4s online curricula</td>
<td>Develop and provide integrated curriculum frameworks and resources that are aligned with Maryland Content Standards, including but not limited to, MCCRS (ELA, Math, History, and STEM), the Next Gen Science Standards, the C3 Standards, and the Early Learning Standards</td>
<td>Develop and provide integrated curriculum frameworks and resources that are aligned with Maryland Content Standards, including but not limited to, MCCRS (ELA, Math, History, and STEM), the Next Gen Science Standards, the C3 Standards, and the Early Learning Standards</td>
<td>Develop and provide integrated curriculum frameworks and resources that are aligned with Maryland Content Standards, including but not limited to, MCCRS (ELA, Math, History, and STEM), the Next Gen Science Standards, the C3 Standards, and the Early Learning Standards</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>DECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase knowledge of effective, evidence-based literacy instruction for all students</td>
<td>Provide support to system of early care and education in using online and print resources</td>
<td>Provide professional learning on aligning instruction to standards</td>
<td>Provide professional learning on aligning instruction to standards</td>
<td>Provide professional learning on aligning instruction to standards</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>DECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide instructional supports from these collaboratives to LEAs</td>
<td>CCSSO Birth to Age 8 Networked Improvement Community</td>
<td>CCSSO KEA Action Network</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>MSDE Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSO Early Learning SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO English Language Arts SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Language Arts SCASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support culturally responsive teaching in all classrooms</td>
<td>Workshops on CRT frameworks</td>
<td>Workshops on CRT frameworks</td>
<td>Workshops on CRT frameworks</td>
<td>Workshops on CRT frameworks</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
<td>MSDE staff CCSSO partners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comprehensive system of assessments includes state, local, school, and teacher assessment data. A comprehensive system of assessment allows for strategic data-informed decision making to meet the needs of the individual student.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSDE Goals for Comprehensive System of Assessments</th>
<th>Birth- Age 5 System of Early Care and Education</th>
<th>K- Grade 5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine and report to stakeholders readiness for and progress toward college and career readiness for all Maryland students</td>
<td>Use valid and reliable assessments to determine readiness for and progress toward literacy development</td>
<td>Use valid and reliable assessments, including KRA and PARCC, and other content standards approved assessments</td>
<td>Use valid and reliable assessments, including PARCC and content standards approved assessments</td>
<td>Use valid and reliable assessments, including PARCC and other Department approved college and career readiness assessments</td>
<td>Summer 2018-2020</td>
<td>Assessment and Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide workshops, webinars, and resources regarding interpretation of various assessment data</td>
<td>Regional Data Workshops</td>
<td>Regional Data Workshops</td>
<td>Regional Data Workshops</td>
<td>Fall 2017 – Spring 2018</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Professional Learning and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide training on developmentally appropriate assessment tools and practices</td>
<td>Provide training on developmentally appropriate assessment tools and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide resources to align assessments to student needs</td>
<td>Provide resources to align assessments to student needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DECQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support district level assessment initiatives</td>
<td>Promote awareness of, and access to, professional development around the use of the ELA</td>
<td>Solicit and facilitate Peer Collaborative teams</td>
<td>Solicit and facilitate Peer Collaborative teams</td>
<td>Solicit and facilitate Peer Collaborative teams</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Train and support Formative Assessment (FAME) cohorts</td>
<td>Train and support Formative Assessment (FAME) cohorts</td>
<td>Train and support Formative Assessment (FAME) cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide assessment supports from these collaboratives to LEAs</td>
<td>CCSSO Birth to Age 8 Networked Improvement Community</td>
<td>CCSSO KEA Action Network</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>MSDE Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSO Early Learning SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO English Language Arts SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Language Arts SCASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maryland’s Keys to Comprehensive Literacy
## Maryland's UDL initiatives

Maryland has adopted regulation for the inclusion of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) in all classrooms. This approach provides choice and individualization for students, which, in turn, allows teachers to provide tiered instruction. In addition, Maryland developed a structured Response to Intervention Framework in 2008 that was adopted statewide.

### MSDE Goals to support Tiered Instruction and Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth-Age 5 System of Early Care and Education</th>
<th>K-Grade 5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide professional learning for LEA staff, on Multi-Tiered System of Support to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities</td>
<td>Provide a variety of statewide professional learning activities</td>
<td>Provide a variety of statewide professional learning activities</td>
<td>Provide a variety of statewide professional learning activities</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Special Education and Content Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide resources for implementing multi-tiered systems of support</td>
<td>Provide support to system of early care and education programs in their administration of developmental screening tools and their analysis of the data</td>
<td>Provide implementation rubric for revised MTSS framework</td>
<td>Provide implementation rubric for revised MTSS framework</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Special Education and Content Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and transform Maryland’s Response to Intervention (RTI) framework into a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)</td>
<td>Revise and transform Maryland’s Response to Intervention (RTI) framework into a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)</td>
<td>Revise and transform Maryland’s Response to Intervention (RTI) framework into a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)</td>
<td>Revise and transform Maryland’s Response to Intervention (RTI) framework into a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS)</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>Special Education and Content Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide implementation rubric for revised MTSS framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical support</td>
<td>Provide training for the monitoring and reporting required in Specialized Intervention Services Act of 2017</td>
<td>Provide training for the monitoring and reporting required in Specialized Intervention Services Act of 2017</td>
<td>Provide training for the monitoring and reporting required in Specialized Intervention Services Act of 2017</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Special Education and Content Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training and resources on progress monitoring for Multi-Tiered System of Instruction</td>
<td>Provide training and resources on progress monitoring for Multi-Tiered System of Instruction</td>
<td>Provide training and resources on progress monitoring for Multi-Tiered System of Instruction</td>
<td>Provide training and resources on progress monitoring for Multi-Tiered System of Instruction</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Special Education and Content Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide supports from these collaboratives to LEAs</td>
<td>CCSSO Birth to Age 8 Networked Improvement Community</td>
<td>CCSSO KEA Action Network</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO Early Learning SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO Supporting Students Below Grade Level Workgroup</td>
<td>CCSSO English Language Arts SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO English Language Arts SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td>CCSSO English Learner SCASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active parent and community involvement are key components of the success of high functioning elementary and secondary schools across diverse economic backgrounds, family and community participation in elementary and secondary schools is associated with greater student success. Educators help families and communities add to their repertoire of strategies for promoting literacy. In order to have the most positive impact on literacy achievement for all students, it is imperative that schools, families, and communities collaborate. Partnerships help schools prepare students for college and careers by offering additional opportunities, supports, and enrichment for young people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSDE Goals to support Family and Community Partnerships</th>
<th>Birth- Age 5 System of Early Care and Education</th>
<th>K- Grade 5</th>
<th>Grades 6-8</th>
<th>Grades 9-12</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To support districts and schools in developing strong family partnerships</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>Content Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support districts and schools in developing strong community partnerships</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>Summer Academies</td>
<td>2020-2025</td>
<td>Content Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td>Communities of Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To support LSS and the system of Early Care and Education in developing strategies for monitoring teaching and learning</td>
<td>Develop monitoring tools</td>
<td>Develop monitoring tools</td>
<td>Develop monitoring tools</td>
<td>Develop monitoring tools</td>
<td>2019-2021</td>
<td>MSDE Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Participate in multi-state collaboratives and provide supports from these collaboratives to districts, childcare providers, and community partners | CCSSO Workgroups | CCSSO Workgroups | CCSSO Workgroups | CCSSO Workgroups | 2019-2021 | MSDE Staff |
| | Learning Forward | Learning Forward | Learning Forward | Learning Forward | | Childcare Providers Community Partners |
Appendix F: Research to Support the Keys

Research/Evidence to Support Instructional Leadership (Key 1)
Research suggests that effective instructional leadership is a key ingredient in educational reform (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010). In fact, effective instructional leadership has been linked to improved student outcomes (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Thus, instructional leadership is essential for facilitating implementation of a comprehensive literacy plan. Research suggests that key players in instructional leadership include central office personnel, principals and assistant principals, and teacher leaders (Elmore, 2000; King, 2002; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2000).

Works Cited in Key 1


Research/Evidence to Support Strategic Professional Development (Key 2)
Strategic professional learning is an important component in education reform. In fact, research suggests that ongoing and intensive professional learning opportunities can have a substantial effect on student achievement (Yoon et al., 2007). Models of effective professional learning suggest that it is tied to clear standards, aligned curricula, and systemwide accountability (Garet et al., 2001). It also includes active learning opportunities, a focus on sets of discrete skills, relevant practice, and sustained duration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Desimone, 2009). Providing ongoing professional learning and instructional support (e.g., coaching) from an instructional leader is associated with improved teacher implementation of evidence-based practices (Becker, Bradshaw, Domitrovich, & Ialongo, 2013). Notably, ongoing instructional support has been highlighted as an essential component of professional learning for facilitating teachers’ translation of research to practice (Joyce & Showers, 2002). Center-based programs play a vital role in providing explicit instruction on pre-literacy skills such as phonological awareness, letter naming, and print awareness (National Early Literacy Panel, 2008). Knowledge of these skills vary substantially across teachers (Powell et al., 2008; Connor et al., 2006), thus professional development interventions have clear benefits on the quality of instruction and children’s language outcomes (Powell et al., 2010). Multiple models have proven effective, including on-going feedback (Landry et al., 2006), pre-specified curriculum (Bierman et al., 2008), or technologically mediated remote coaching (Powell et al., 2010).
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Research/Evidence to Support Instructional Leadership (Key 1)
Research suggests that effective instructional leadership is a key ingredient in educational reform (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010). In fact, effective instructional leadership has been linked to improved student outcomes (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003). Thus, instructional leadership is essential for facilitating implementation of a comprehensive literacy plan. Research suggests that key players in instructional leadership include central office personnel, principals and assistant principals, and teacher leaders (Elmore, 2000; King, 2002; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2000).
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Research/Evidence to Support Strategic Professional Development (Key 2)
Strategic professional learning is an important component in education reform. In fact, research suggests that ongoing and intensive professional learning opportunities can have a substantial effect on student achievement (Yoon et al., 2007). Models of effective professional learning suggest that it is tied to clear standards, aligned curricula, and systemwide accountability (Garet et al., 2001). It also includes active learning opportunities, a focus on sets of discrete skills, relevant practice, and sustained duration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Desimone, 2009). Providing ongoing professional learning and instructional support (e.g., coaching) from an instructional leader is associated with improved teacher implementation of evidence-based practices (Becker, Bradshaw, Domitrovich, & Ialongo, 2013). Notably, ongoing instructional support has been highlighted as an essential component of professional learning for facilitating teachers’ translation of research to practice (Joyce & Showers, 2002). Center-based programs play a vital role in providing explicit instruction on pre-literacy skills such as phonological awareness, letter naming, and print awareness (National Early Literacy Panel, 2008). Knowledge of these skills vary substantially across teachers (Powell et al., 2008; Connor et al., 2006), thus professional development interventions have clear benefits on the quality of instruction and children’s language outcomes (Powell et al., 2010). Multiple models have proven effective, including on-going feedback (Landry et al., 2006), pre-specified curriculum (Bierman et al., 2008), or technologically mediated remote coaching (Powell et al., 2010).
Works Cited in Key 2


Research/Evidence for Continuity of Standards and Evidence-based Instruction (Key 3)

Alignment from birth through secondary school is essential for providing students the coherence and support they need to develop effective literacy skills. Misalignment between early childhood and K-12 standards results in disconnected instructional practices that limit student learning (Claessens, Engel, & Curran, 2014). Connections across ages and grade levels as well as across curricula, assessment, and professional development are needed to ensure that students experience a seamless literacy education (Bogard & Takanishi, 2005). These connections, especially from early childhood to K-12 education, must cross boundaries between formal and informal education (Coffman & Kauerz, 2012), and they must foster shared goals and instructional strategies across age and grade levels (Correnti & Rowan, 2007).

Differences in early language mirror distinctions in the communicative input to children from varying SES backgrounds. Hart and Risley (1995) estimate that relative to their higher-SES counterparts, children from lower-SES backgrounds face a cumulative input gap of 30 million words by the time they reach the school-aged year. In addition to sizable effects of input quantity, more nuanced factors such as vocabulary diversity (Rowe, 2012), informativity of the extra-linguistic context (Cartmill et al., 2013), and the connectedness or fluency of the communicative interactions (Hirsh-Pasek et al., 2015) also predict vocabulary growth. Well-established associations between language outcomes and caregiver input motivate interventions that focus on increasing caregiver input among lower-SES groups. For example, storybooks are a key source of linguistic input and a strong predictor of vocabulary size (Senechal et al., 1996) since they feature unique words that are not found in child-directed speech (Montag et al., 2015). Parent-child interventions that focus on book reading generate improvements in vocabulary size that sustain over follow-up periods (Whitehurst et al., 1994; Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005). Recent interventions that look beyond vocabulary size can examine other dimensions of language that impact early reading (e.g., use of complex syntactic structures, decontextualized language). These approaches have incorporated technology that provide real-time information about how much caregivers talk to children and home audio environment (e.g., amount of background noise), e.g., 30-Million Words Initiative (thirtymillionwords.org), Providence Talks (providencetalks.org). When paired with home-based programs, these methods may be effective for delivering and assessing low-cost strategies for promoting school readiness (Susskind et al., 2013).
However, since caregiver input varies substantially across cultural and SES backgrounds (Hoff-Ginsberg, 1991), center-based programs paired with a parenting component are able to achieve larger improvements compared to those that focus on parents alone (Brooks-Gunn & Markman, 2005; Burger, 2010). Relative to control groups that do not receive services, children who enroll in early Head Start (HS) programs show improved cognition, language, attention, and health (Love et al., 2013). These effects sustain over time when children continue onto formal programs following the completion of early HS. Similarly, HS children take part in a family-based training program show greater improvements in language and cognition beyond those who were enrolled in HS alone (Neville et al., 2013).

Evidenced-based practices are those “effective educational strategies supported by evidence and research” (ESEA, 2002). The federal Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015 non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments (2016) states, “using, generating, and sharing evidence about effective strategies to support students gives stakeholders an important tool to accelerate student learning.” Therefore, supporting the use of evidence-based strategies in the classroom is essential to improving teacher literacy instruction.

Educators must take part in thoughtfully designed professional learning experiences to ensure evidence-based strategies are at the core of all literacy instruction. Although utilizing evidence based strategies provides tools to improve learning, “changing literacy instruction in an evidence-based approach is hampered by a lack of knowledge regarding exactly how to combine multiple effective practices into a comprehensive instructional program” (Greenwood, C.R., Tapia, Y., Abbott, M., Cheryl Walton, C., 2003). Evidence-based strategies, learning experiences, and interventions must be part of an ongoing cycle that includes identifying local needs, selecting the evidence-based intervention, having the capacity to implement, and examining while reflecting upon how the intervention is working. It is necessary for educators to be guided on how to make the connections from evidence-based strategies to effective instructional practices. Carefully designed supports must be in place to identify strong and moderate evidence-based interventions that also consider the needs of students, schools, and communities. When selecting evidence-based practices there are several concepts that are to be considered. According to Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments (2016), “Interventions supported by higher levels of evidence, specifically strong evidence or moderate evidence, are more likely to improve student outcomes because they have been proven to be effective” (p.4). In addition to identifying practices that are shown to be successful, “teachers also must examine the generalizability, or fit, of the evidence” (International Reading Association, 2002). Intentional time and support must be allotted for educators to explore evidence-based strategies in order to improve instruction.

Utilizing evidence-based strategies to improve student outcomes is part of a larger ongoing process of improvement to instruction. The impact of utilizing evidence-based strategies is evident. However, successful identification and implementation of these strategies does not just happen. It takes support in identifying needs, identifying evidenced-based strategies, and planning for implementation. The ongoing cycle of improvement requires dedicated time and support for local educational agencies and schools.

**Works Cited in Key 3**


Research/Evidence for Comprehensive System of Assessments

A comprehensive system of assessment is a coherent plan for monitoring student achievement across age and grade levels and includes measures for screening, progress monitoring, diagnosis, and evaluation (Fletcher & Vaughn, 2009; Walpole & McKenna, 2007). Screening assessment is used to determine whether students may need additional support in a particular area. Progress monitoring is used to determine whether students are responding to instruction. If students are identified as needing support, diagnostic assessment can be used to determine specific areas to target. Finally, outcome assessment can be used to determine (a) how much a student grew and (b) where he or she ended up in relation to their peers in a given area. Did students make gains? Did they begin to catch up with their peers or get closer to grade level? Data from these assessment systems must be used as part of a continuous cycle of instructional improvement (Hamilton, et al., 2009). A comprehensive system of assessment may include teacher, center/school, and local educational agency level evaluation plans that can be used to inform professional development and school improvement efforts (Darling-Hammond, 2012).

Formative assessment as critical component of Multi-tiered Systems of Support

Formative assessment is a critical component of effective school systems that improve students’ performance and closes the achievement gaps. Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), discussed in Key 5, rely on four basic components: (a) the provision of multiple tiers of generally effective instructional practices, with a core curriculum that meets the needs of most (e.g., 80%) students; (b) access for all students to high-quality instruction that is matched to their needs; (c) an emphasis on formative instruction data to document the match between students’ needs and their instruction; and (d) a mechanism to evaluate system effectiveness across tiers, using a problem-solving model of data-based decision making (Atkins & Cummings, 2011).

Strong measurement tools are integral in the conceptualization of MTSS and to its success or disappointment in being able to both improve academic outcomes and provide data for the identification of LD (Fletcher & Vaughn, 2009). The assessment demands of an MTSS approach bring forth an increased need for formative assessments that both meet the traditional criteria for psychometric acceptability and are predictive of high-stakes achievement outcomes. Additionally, these measures should be brief, repeatable, and instructionally relevant so that they can be used to improve instruction and, ultimately, student...
outcomes. Screening instruments have risen to prominence in education due to the need to identify students as being at-risk for poor reading and other outcomes. The practical benefits of universal screening include efficient measurement and the opportunity to prevent more serious deficits. Screening systems can help teachers make more efficient and effective instructional decisions (e.g., Stecker, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005) and reduce disproportionality in special education referrals (Marston, Muyskens, Lau, & Canter, 2003). Curriculum-based measurement (CBM) technology has evidence of utility as a formative assessment tool (Deno, 1985; Fuchs & Deno, 1992). Historically, CBMs have been used in special education to provide student-level data that measures how students are progressing in a curriculum towards specific outcomes. More recently, CBMs are being used to provide system-level data to improve the overall academic health of the school, including the progress of students in general education (Kaminski & Cummings, 2007).

**CBM as a Formative Assessment Tool**

Curriculum-based measurement was developed as a system for formative assessment; a methodology for adapting teaching to meet student needs (Deno, 1985). Because the primary purpose of formative assessment is to support student learning, it is linked to assessment practices for the purposes of improving student outcomes (Kaminski & Cummings, 2007). In addition to setting individual student goals, formative assessment also aims to provide a database on which effective instructional programs may be developed empirically over time (Fuchs, 1986).

At the individual student level, developed initially through the Data-Based Program Modification system (Deno & Mirkin, 1977), CBM has grown to become one of the most widely-studied assessment technologies. Converging evidence over the past 30 years has demonstrated CBM’s validity in the following key areas: (a) CBM displays high degrees of content validity because the content for CBM is either based on or mirrors the daily curriculum taught in the classroom (Fuchs & Deno, 1992; Hasbrouck, Woldbeck, Ihnot, & Parker, 1999; Capizzi, Barton-Arwood, 2009), (b) CBM displays high levels of decision utility (Messick, 1989) in that it can be used to make instructional modifications when needed and results in better, more responsive teaching (Deno, 1985; Fuchs & Fuchs, 2003; Fuchs, Fuchs, & Hamlett, 1989; Fuchs, Fuchs, Hamlett, Walz, & Gerth, 1993) (c) CBM has evidence of discriminant validity in that students who are grouped based on CBM data are more likely to benefit from similar instruction than students who are grouped based on other assessments (Wesson, Vierthaler, & Haubrick, 1989; Kranzler, Brownell, & Miller, 1998; Good & Jefferson, 1998).

**Formative assessment linked to student outcomes**

One way to ensure that all students are on track for being successful readers is to provide educators with assessment tools that allow them to make timely, appropriate decisions about a child’s response to instruction (Cummings, Kaminski, Good, & O’Neill, 2011). The practice of collecting formative assessment data on a wide scale can have a dramatic effect on global student achievement (Ervin, Schaughency, Goodman, McGlinchey, & Matthews, 2006). Other benefits of formative assessment include reduced referral and eligibility rates for the category of specific learning disability (SLD; VanDerHeyden, Witt, & Gilbertson, 2007; Wanzek & Vaughn, 2011), reduced disproportionality in special education placements (Marston et al., 2003; O’Connor, Bocian, Beach, Sanchez, & Flynn, 2013), and improved achievement (O’Connor et al, 2013; Sharp, Sanders, Noltemeyer, Hoffman, & Boone, 2016).

**Works Cited in Key 4**


Research/Evidence to Support Tiered Instruction and Interventions (Key 5)

Tiered approaches to instructional delivery help students at all levels of achievement and assist their access to the core curriculum, irrespective of grade level. Districts or schools may implement a tiered model in a variety of ways (Berkeley, Bender, Peaster, & Saunders, 2009) but critical features include:

- **A strong, evidence-based core reading program.** One of the most critical components of any tiered model is that it is based on a strong general education curriculum (Tier 1; Foorman et al., 2016; Gersten et al., 2009). The core program forms the basis for all other intervention efforts and affects the achievement of all students.

- **Multiple, flexible tiers of instruction.** Successful tiered models also include 2-4 flexible tiers of supplemental, not supplanted, instruction. The purpose of these tiers is to provide additional supports to students who are struggling to make adequate progress in Tier 1 alone, though some schools also include tiers of enrichment for students performing above level. These supplemental tiers must be flexible, all students will move in and out of different support levels in accordance with their needs. According to a recent Department of Education Practice Guide (Gersten et al., 2009), Tier 2 supports demonstrated strong evidence in terms of improving students’ reading achievement.
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- **Strategic integration.** Supplemental supports should be based on and deliberately linked to Tier 1 content. Too often we intervene with students who are struggling by offering many disparate interventions, expecting the students to make connections between these interventions and their Tier 1 program (Tilly, 2008). This process hasn’t been effective because it can be redundant with other programs, provide conflicting information, and lacks coordination. For tiered systems to be successful, we must work to connect all supports—including flexible tiers but also special education and ELL supports, back to Tier 1.

- **Universal screening:** Best practices in universal screening assessment includes assessing all students at least twice per year (fall, winter). The purpose of screening is two-fold, first to determine students who may benefit from additional support and second to evaluate the various school-level supports. For example, schools can examine the percentage of students whose needs are met by the core reading program. Tier 1 should meet the needs of the majority of students in the school (e.g., 60-80%). Schools can also examine the extent to which their supplemental supports are reducing risk for students. Universal screening alone has a moderate impact on student reading achievement, particularly if coupled with progress monitoring (Gersten et al., 2009).

- **Progress monitoring:** Students who have been identified as needing additional supports are unlikely to meet subsequent reading goals UNLESS we intervene to change that outcome. Thus, struggling readers should be monitored more frequently so that teachers can make decisions about their progress on a more frequent basis.

**Grades K-Five**

Tiered systems have their roots in the elementary grades and are widely regarded as models for preventing reading difficulties and disabilities (Fuchs & Fuchs, 1998; Vaughn, Linan-Thompson, & Hickman, 2003; Vellutino, Scanlon, Small, & Fanuele, 2006). Vaughn et al., (2008) note the goal of any RTI approach is to “raise the achievement levels of all students, which requires a multi-tiered approach beginning in general education settings that provides increasingly intense and differentiated interventions for students who struggle with reading and learning from text.” (p.338).

Key milestones of tiered systems in the early grades focus on foundational reading skills. Foorman and colleagues (2016) identified four key recommendations for enhancing the quality of instruction and these include (p. iii):

- Teach students’ academic language skills, including the use of inferential and narrative language, and vocabulary knowledge
- Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to letters
- Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words
- Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension

The elementary grades represent a critical period for intervention in reading. We know that reading challenges in elementary school ultimately lead to school failure and harmful long-term consequences, from reduced academic performance (Torgesen, 2000) to poor employment opportunities (Juel, 1988; McGill-Franzen, 1987; McIntosh, Horner, Chard, Boland, & Good, 2006). We also know that many students are not learning to read sufficiently well, indicated by the decline in reading proficiency over time (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2006; Lee, Grigg, & Donahue, 2007). Tiered systems have demonstrated promise in preventing such risk factors and they do a better job remediating those that do exist. Such systems also show promise for reducing disability identification, can improve students’ reading performance, and enhance their general academic functioning and future opportunities for gainful employment (Chard, Harn, Horner, & Sugai, 2008).

Successful implementation of tiered systems, however, rely on both structural components, such as data collection and decisions about placement into tiers, as well as evidence-based interventions. Although all five components listed above are important, the quality of instruction is, or at least should be, paramount. Put simply, regardless of the size of small groups, data collection, placement decisions, or other operational details associated with MTSS or other systems changes, poor-quality instruction will not likely produce proficient readers (e.g., Metis Associates, 2011) nor will it teach and reinforce appropriate, functional behaviors. At the same time, high-quality instruction could potentially preclude the need for tiered systems, per se (e.g., Carlson & Francis, 2002; Watkins, 1997).

**Grades Six to Twelve**

Many adolescents enter middle or high school after struggling with reading for years. Some students struggle with decoding multisyllabic words which they encounter frequently in secondary level text (Bhattacharya, Aplana, & Ehri, 2004). Others may be able to decode fluently, but they continue to face comprehension challenges. Their poor reading
performance can be attributed to a variety of factors such as never receiving sufficiently intensive, explicit evidence-based instruction or intervention that targets their needs and/ or having a reading disability. The consequences of poor reading ability are glaringly apparent for some students from an early age and can result in frustration and less independent reading over time. In addition, some students may need supplemental literacy support because, although they have proficiency in a language other than English, they are in the process of developing English language skills.

Ultimately, reading less leads to a rapidly widening gap between these struggling secondary readers and their typically achieving peers. When students read less, they profit less. In other words, students who do not read often acquire less vocabulary, background, and content knowledge (Gelzheiser & Meyers, 1991; Hairrell et al., 2011; O’Sullivan, Ysseldyke, Christenson, & Thurlow, 1990). Without explicit instruction and practice, we also deprive students of a ‘tool box’ of strategies that they can apply to make sense of text when their comprehension breaks down (Snow, Porche, Tabors, & Harris, 2007; Smith, Doabler, & Kame’enui, 2016). Stanovich (1986) described this phenomenon as the Matthew Effect. Put simply, we can think of it as “the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.” Unfortunately, poor reading ability can lead to grave consequences. For example, struggling readers are likely to demonstrate frustration, disengagement, and misbehavior (Lane, Carter, Pierson, & Glaeser, 2006). Thus, improving adolescent literacy achievement is critical. A tiered model for secondary education can be implemented in a variety of ways (Berkeley, Bender, Peaster, & Saunders, 2009), hence it is referred to as a model and not a program. Besides variation in implementation within elementary level settings, implementation can also vary extensively between the elementary and secondary settings (Reed, Wexler, & Vaughn, 2012). Indeed, while tiered models at the secondary level share the same essential components as conceptualized at the elementary level listed above, there are some unique challenges and logistics that make the model somewhat different for secondary level implementation. For example, we can expect less growth from students as they get older (Bloom, Hill, Black, & Lipsey, 2008). Because of this, it is possible to conduct universal screening only one time per year if resources are scarce and we can use existing data (e.g., state test data) rather than using resources to assess all students. Furthermore, while it is important to use data on an ongoing basis to monitor students’ progress and make instructional decisions, we can consider conducting formal progress monitoring less often (Reed, Wexler, Vaughn 2012). Finally, in many schools, more than 60% of the student population may qualify for supplemental, intensive intervention.

However, with scarce resources, schools can be challenged about how to intervene with all the students who qualify for intervention. This makes providing evidence-based reading instruction in the Tier 1 (i.e., English language arts, science, social studies, and math) even more critical as students with disabilities spend a majority of their day in the Tier 1 setting (Newman, 2006; U.S. Department of Education, 2011). In a practice guide on Improving Adolescent Literacy, Kamil and colleagues (2008) highlight the following evidence-based recommendations:

- Provide explicit vocabulary instruction
- Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction
- Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation
- Increase student motivation and engagement in literacy learning
- Make available intensive and individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by trained specialists.

• **Recommendations 1-4 should be integrated across the Tier 1 setting and in supplemental intervention settings.** The final recommendation stresses the need for secondary schools to determine ways to provide more intensive supplemental intervention, typically during an elective period, to students who need more help in foundational level skills (i.e., word-reading).

**Works Cited in Key 5**
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Research/Evidence to Support Family and Community Partnerships

“The way schools care about children is reflected in the way schools care about children’s families” (Esptein 2019). When a school views the parent as the entity responsible for parenting roles and the school is identified as the entity responsible for the academic education, a divide is created. This divide reflects an antiquated view that a school is a place to learn the curriculum and not a place to educate the whole child. When the considerations of social emotional learning are ignored, the child cannot fully develop into a thoughtful, active member of society. School, family and community partnerships improve, “school climate, strengthen school and classroom programs, provide family services and support, increase parents’ skill and leadership, connect families with other in the school and support in the community, help teachers understand and appreciate parents, and support teachers’ efforts” (Epstein 2019). This view has been strengthened by federal policies since the late 1980s. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) included specific mandates for family and community engagement, and currently, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) reinforces those requirements, “to develop research-based programs of parent and family engagement to increase student achievement and other indicators of success in school” (Epstein 2019). The inclusion of family and community engagement in both ESEA and ESSA reflect research that indicates successful family and community engagement activities are attainable, and these programs are the strongest predictors of educational success. With over 40 years of research to support the impact of family and community engagement on student performance, it is important to note that the results do not happen overnight. One size does not fit all when programs are being considered to engage families and community partnerships (California Department of Education, 2011; Weiss, Bouffard, Bridglall, & Gordon, 2009).

Schools need to consider their school base, their needs, and their ability to train teachers and to engage all constituents. When considering a program, it is important to consider obstacles that may be faced when developing meaningful relationships. Some things to consider are:

- Parents’ (and other family members’) previous negative experiences or interactions with schools (for example, parents did not do well in school or educators told parents only what they should do without acknowledging what they might already be doing).
- Language and cultural barriers (for example, parents or their representatives believe they should defer to educators and not play an active role in education).
- Limited professional development and training of educators in family and community engagement.
- Educators’ own cultural beliefs and attitudes.
- Lack of exposure to the practices, experiences, and beliefs that are validated by the school culture (Garcia, Frunzi, Deam Toolkit of Resources for Engaging Families and the Community as Partners in Education).

While educators understand the jargon of the profession, families and community members may not. Additionally, family and community members may not be aware of grading policies, standards, the impact of conferences, and on the value and ways schools communicate with stakeholders. Being unfamiliar with the practices, needing help navigating resources, or feeling as a student versus a partner, families and community members may feel unimportant. The key is to create a true partnership, where each member is working together toward a common goal (Gordon, 2005).

Maryland has a history of encouraging family and community engagement in state and local decisions. Recommendations for school improvement is required to be posted to allow for public comment, which, in turn, drives revisions and adoptions of various programs, documents, and changes to various aspects of the Maryland educational program. Additionally, Maryland has been active in establishing relationships with all groups in order to improve student achievement. No true statewide reform occurs without the support of the LSS and its constituents, which is why Maryland has included Family and Community Engagement as a separate key in its Comprehensive Literacy Plan 2020.

Works Cited in Key 6


Appendix F: Research to Support the Keys


“Nine elements of Effective School Community Partnerships to Address Students Mental Health, Physical Health, and Overall Wellness.” Nine Elements of Effective School Community Partnerships to Address Student Mental Health, Physical Health, and Overall Wellness, IEL, Jan. 2016, pdf.


