

California Department of Education

**Early Literacy Support Block Grant Program
Annual Progress Report Template**

The Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant program Annual Progress Report allows for participating districts and eligible schools to determine and describe the effectiveness in addressing the required components of the ELSB Grant planning process. **The Annual Report for Year 1 (Planning Year) is due to the California Department of Education on July 30, 2021.** Please complete the following information and email the completed report to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov.

Name of District and Eligible Participating School(s):

Stockton Unified School District
Hamilton
Hazleton
Pulliam
Roosevelt
Taft
Taylor
Van Buren

Report Submitted By (Name/Title): Janet Yarbrough, Director - State and Federal

Phone/Email: (209) 933-7130, ext. 2221 / jyarbrough@stocktonusd.net

Period Covered: Planning Year ending June 30, 2021

Date Submitted: September 10, 2021

1. Account for the ELSB grant program planning activities that identify both individual and collective contributions in the conducting of a Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.
 - a. Describe the process and timeline of activities conducted in the development of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment
 - b. Specify the local educational agency (LEA) ELSB lead and primary fiscal contact staff.
 - c. Include the names of participants for each participating school and participant roles (e.g., J Brahms – 1st grade teacher at Mozart Elementary; A. Vivaldi – Principal, Bach Elementary, R. Wagner – Bach Site Literacy Coach, G. Verdi – District Curriculum Coordinator etc.).

a. In January of 2021, all seven school sites formed site teams consisting of administration, instructional coaches, and TK- 3rd grade teachers. In addition, the Interim Curriculum Director and two Curriculum Specialists attended all meetings and trainings, and led the Instructional Coaches as they worked on site teams.

In partnership with the Sacramento County Office of Education, we began ELSB professional development. The PD provided familiarity with research related to early literacy success. We quickly realized we (and teachers district-wide) needed training on how students learn to read. We reflected on several questions.

Do we have the curriculum, program and/or materials to support explicit instruction in Phonemic Awareness, Letter Knowledge, Decoding and Encoding, Word Recognition? Do we have the data that shows how each of our students is progressing on this component?

We also reflected on our current assessments used at sites and district-wide. We understood that we needed to know where all students were in the process of learning to read; have good assessment tools; ensure that all kids have access to effective screening; and explicitly teach students according to their areas of need.

We questioned if our materials supported our understanding and teaching of Background Knowledge and Literacy Knowledge, Language Structure, and Verbal Reasoning. We discussed what additional support we needed in each area.

We questioned if our materials supported using read-aloud text as a tool for developing language comprehension, using decodable text as a pathway to fluent grade-level reading, and what additional support we needed in each area.

Finally, we discussed our overall strengths and weaknesses at each site and district-wide. By March, all sites began collecting data to conduct a Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment. The site teams developed their own Problem Statement, and then brainstormed possible causes. Next teams dug deeper and asked "Why?". Teams sorted causes based on what they controlled vs. what they could not control. Teams focused on actions in the classroom that might be contributing to the problem. From there, those things teams had control over were consolidated into a single fishbone diagram. Then, items were categorized.

In April, teams identified the highest leverage opportunities for improvement and began writing SMARTe goals. Once the goal was written, teams determined what was needed (Needs Assessment) to accomplish the goal. Teams considered if they needed:

- Assessment instruments
- Literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials
- Evidence-based professional development
- Support personnel

Site teams also considered how additional categories such as expanded learning programs, extended school day, culture and climate, and others might support their literacy goals. Now teams were ready to connect with stakeholders to share what they had learned and to continue building their plans.

b. Janet Yarbrough – Director State & Federal - District Contact, Carla Gonzales – Curriculum Director (Former), Kelly Townley – Program Technician (Budget)

c.

Hamilton: J.P. Wheeler - (Interim) Principal, Monica Gayle - (New) Principal, Lori Arzadon – Program Specialist, Irene Valdez – Instructional Coach, Lilia Hall – Kindergarten Teacher, Maria Perez – 1st Grade Teacher, Lorena Ochoa Torres – 2nd Grade Teacher, Sean Gamer – 3rd Grade Teacher

Hazelton: Victor Zamora – Principal, Hollis Blake – Assistant Principal, Gina Barney – Instructional Coach, Valarie Walker – Kindergarten Teacher, 2nd Grade Teacher, Maria Heu – 1st Grade Teacher, Katherine Kline-Preoo – 2nd Grade Teacher, Julissa Ramirez – 3rd Grade Teacher

Pulliam: Krystal Taylor – Principal, Bruce Roberson – NAACP Chapter Head, Rachel Perez Stafford – ELA Instructional Coach, Janice Hodges – Librarian, Shannon Loyd – Kindergarten Teacher, Mallory Mason – 1st Grade Teacher, Regan Ruffoni – 1st Grade Teacher, Barbara Erlandson – 2nd Grade Teacher, Daniel Sandoval – 3rd Grade Teacher

Roosevelt: Janice Roberts – Principal, Jennifer Ryan - Instructional Coach, Chanry Sok – Kindergarten Teacher, Karen Newton – 1st Grade Teacher, Taisha Reed – 2nd Grade Teacher, Adriana Soriano – 3rd Grade Teacher

Taft: Jana Brooks – Principal, Shirley Hansen – Instructional Coach, Patricia Blackwell – Transitional Kindergarten Teacher, Raquel Poblete – Kindergarten Teacher (Bilingual), Cynthia Thurman - 1st Grade Teacher (Bilingual), Rubi Garcia – 2nd Grade Teacher (Bilingual), Pam Vickers – K-3 Special Education Teacher

Taylor: Benjamin Yang – Principal, Rebecca Abellana-Delvo – Assistant Principal, Allison Silva – Instructional Coach, Lisa Ward – Kindergarten Teacher, Sharon Yang – 1st Grade Teacher, Padee Vue – 2nd Grade Teacher

Van Buren: Isabel Arellano – Principal, Charlene Amarante – Program Specialist, Lori Morgan – Instructional Coach, Debbie Mingua – Kindergarten Teacher, Peter Barosso – 1st Grade Teacher, Melissa Llamas - 2nd Grade Teacher

2. Validate the results of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

- a. Specify the findings from the examination of both school-level and LEA-level practices or unmet needs, including those relating to school climate, social-emotional learning, and the experience of under-performing pupils and their families, that have contributed to low pupil outcomes for pupils in grade three on the consortium summative assessment in English Language Arts.

Hamilton:

Hamilton students in 3rd grade, according to the 2019 CA Dashboard, scored 87.5 points below the standard in English-Language Arts (ELA), significantly higher as compared to the 107.3 points below the ELA Standard in 2018. Unfortunately though, the disproportion between our Student groups - African Americans (111.3 points below the standard) and Socioeconomically Disadvantaged (91.8 points below the standard) are not achieving at the same growth rate.

The Hamilton Site Team root cause analysis and needs assessment revealed the lack of explicit, academic phonics instruction for grades TK-3, the inability to track, analyze and create reports about student academic progress in letter recognition, phonological awareness, decoding and spelling, and sight word recognition, the lack of common time during the school day in order to provide foundational phonics intervention across grades TK-3, and the a summer school program that creates a partnership with parents/families that will build not only on foundational phonics intervention but also literacy skills, including concepts of print, language comprehension, building background knowledge, language structure, verbal reasoning, and literacy knowledge, in our TK-3 students.

Though many Hamilton students score below/far below grade level, the school climate focuses on a positive, growth mindset, life skills, and the social-emotional well-being of our students. Our Counseling team teaches students about calming activities to assist them when frustrated with their lack of knowledge, hosts activities to ensure a positive school culture, and are an integral part of the SAP process. The PLUS team surveys students, examines the data, and holds forums to address student survey results.

Hazelton:

The Hazelton Site Team's Problem Statement: Too few of our students are able to independently read complex, grade level texts by the end of 3rd grade. The Root Cause Analysis revealed deficiencies in the Benchmark curriculum such as systematically supporting Phonemic Awareness and Phonics and lacked materials to support fundamental skills. In addition, it was determined that more time was needed to teach foundational skills. Inconsistency in assessments given and response to data was problematic. In addition, teachers were using inconsistent strategies and not necessarily best practices. Teacher experience and expertise ranged from high to low.

The Needs Assessment showed a need for

- Systematic Instruction in phonics/phonemic awareness
- Assessment Protocols and response to data

- With professional development built in to support each area

Pulliam:

Based on iReady data from 2019-2020, we found 79% of our students were reading below grade level. The data for the 2020-2021 school year shows that 73% of our students were reading below grade level.

We brainstormed contributing factors and identified root causes that might be inhibiting the literacy of our students. Members of the team shared the concern that the phonics instruction in our district adopted curriculum was not a sufficient reading program and did not dedicate enough time to phonics instruction. In addition to the data indicated on the iReady assessments, there was strong agreement among the team that student performance in writing is not meeting the grade level standards. Teachers openly expressed their struggle with writing instruction and shared that the lesson and instruction provided in our district adopted curriculum was not explicit, nor did it support teacher instruction on the three writing types. Other contributing factors that caused low performance in foundational reading skills and writing included the strength of Tier 1 lesson instruction, assessments and responding to assessment data, and the lack of a Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional programs.

After identifying the root causes for low performance in literacy, we then began to discuss possible solutions that could improve literacy and writing outcomes for students in grades K-3. Our team decided that there is a need for a systematic method of early identification and intervention for struggling readers. Identifying the students and knowing the data is only one component of this process. We determined the most crucial component is our response to the assessment data and providing research based intervention that meets the needs of the students.

Roosevelt:

Our data showed 50% of third grade students are two or more grade levels below in reading complex grade- level text.

Two areas that became an area of concern as the team looked through the curriculum and the iReady data were phonics and vocabulary. The team discussed how these areas need to be strengthened in order to see progress in reading comprehension. While the current reading curriculum has a phonics section, more phonics practice is needed. Phonics appears daily in K-2nd grade, but only two times a week in 3rd grade. The team agreed that this was not enough exposure for the high amounts of students who have not mastered the previous grade's standards. This became more apparent as team members shared data from iReady, and foundational skills assessments (2nd-3rd fluency, K-1st letter sound recognition, K-2 High frequency words).

The team discussed the inconsistent use of the curriculum routines for foundational skills, inconsistent opportunities for English Language Development training among staff, and inconsistent progress monitoring of foundational skills at the site level, as well as a way to intervene with our most striving students.

It was decided that the SIPPS program would help meet the need for a consistent intervention program that would focus on foundational skills, specifically phonics and fluency. In order to implement SIPPS with integrity, the team will attend a workshop for teachers new to SIPPS hosted by Collaborative Classroom. The need for a full time instructional coach was discussed in order to support teachers with the implementation of SIPPS and the Benchmark tier 1

instruction by providing ongoing coaching opportunities like coplanning, co-teaching, and observation/ feedback.

The team discussed the need for a Program Specialist to help coordinate and implement intervention. The Program Specialist would work collaboratively with teachers to monitor student progress to maintain fluidity in groups as they move between Tiers I, II, and III. The Program Specialist will be responsible for facilitating in-depth data analysis with teachers to support them in creating individual student learning plans. With the focus on intervention, the Program Specialist would also organize and oversee the tutorial program by using data to identify students and their needs. The Program Specialist will also monitor and oversee the placement of the instructional assistant in K-3 for literacy support. The Program Specialist will also pull groups to provide Tier 2 intervention.

In order to have a consistent screening/diagnostic system to monitor the progress on foundational skills, the team chose to use assessments from the Assessing Reading: Multiple Measures book and SIPPS program.

For year two, the team saw the need to add a focus on language acquisition strategies, in particular those that would have a great impact on our English Learners. It was decided that training in GLAD strategies would help teachers meet this need. To assist with the implementation the instructional coach will facilitate lesson studies so teachers can have opportunities to discuss best practices with the GLAD strategies and how to incorporate them with the district curriculum. In order to track progress with our goals the team decided that there was a need to have release time to have data conferences so that trends can be identified and then a plan to act on the data can be created.

Taft:

The Taft Team's Problem Statement:

Systemic approach to establishing equitable learning environments and coordinating practices to enhance all student's social, emotional, and academic learning. Integrated SEL through our schools academic curricula and culture.

The Root Cause Analysis showed:

1. Lack of good first instruction (*teachers have not received sufficient in depth focused training on teaching foundational reading standards, and all of the components of the Scarborough's Rope in a systematic way that builds capacity.*)
2. Curriculum deficiency reading *foundational skills are not spiraled from year to year to "catch students" who miss the first instruction. Our curriculum is also not strong in phonemic and phonics instruction.*
3. Our reading instruction hasn't targeted all of the components of Scarborough's Rope.
4. *In the classroom only none of our teachers use read-alouds two-years above grade-level daily to help bridge our EL learners & Title 1 low socioeconomic learners that come to school with a lack of background knowledge, vocabulary and concepts of how language works.*
5. A weakness of our local educational agency (SUSD) is that our district does not have much in place that is systematic or uniform for monitoring student progress with the exception of iReady 3X a year and the use of adopted curriculums with varying degrees of faithful implementation. The district also has some AVID strategies like annotation.

To increase student achievement and help all of Taft's K-3 learners master reading we need the following supports

High-Quality literacy teaching

- training for teachers as to what that looks like and how to implement the strategies for literacy teaching

- Lesson studies with teachers/students
- Collaboration time to review the two components above, progress monitoring, data, etc.
 - Release time for teachers

Literacy materials and assessments (Tiers 1-3)

- Benchmark Curriculum (District Adopted)
- CORE Reading Assessments /Multiple Measures
 - Training on how to implement and use the data to inform the instruction
- SIPPS(Systematic Instruction in Phoneme Awareness, Phonics, and Sight Words)
- Heggerty Program (P.A.)
- Step up to Writing
- Read Aloud Trade Books
- CORE Professional Development Language Acquisition

Pupil supports ○ After school tutoring/summer school, yield to what the students need in grades K-3

- Daily Intervention time built into the master schedule for all K-3 students
- Systemic approach to establishing equitable learning environments and coordinating practices to enhance all student's social, emotional, and academic learning.
 - Integrated SEL through our schools academic curricula and culture.

Family and community supports:

- K-3 Parent Training with Literacy/ Bilingual translator
- Parent and community engagement - Parent Literacy and Engagement in English and Spanish
- Parent Lending Library
- Parent Literacy Program

Taylor:

Foundational skills testing/iReady diagnostic scores revealed a majority of our K–3 students are testing below proficiency in phonemic awareness and phonics according to our screening data. The Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment revealed we currently do not have a site specific assessment calendar for Foundational Skills testing K-3. We have some testing in place but lack consistency and a systemic plan for administering assessments. In addition, we realized we had an inconsistent data collection on foundational skills (letter recognition, sound recognition, phonemic awareness, fluency).

The Root Cause Analysis also indicated that our current phonics program does not meet the needs of our K-3rd students as indicated by our current assessment results. We will select and purchase the explicit phonics program SIPPs in order to improve our foundational skills in reading by offering systematic tier 2 and 3 interventions. In addition, we need to increase teacher capacity in systemic/explicit phonics instructional practices and strategies by providing training in foundational skills for all TK-3 teachers.

Van Buren:

Van Buren School's fundamental root cause analysis shows that our students' lack mastery of reading foundational skills. Van Buren's iReady historical data shows the root cause of 80% of our students in K-3 not reading at grade level is related to lack of effective

common literacy practices, a lack of a systematic progress monitoring system, and insufficient knowledge of how to work together in the PLC model to meet all student needs.

We attributed this to the following;

1. Assessment Practices

During our ELSB collaboration meeting we determined our site does not have a systematic screening, diagnostic, and monitoring processes in place to ensure students receive timely support when they are not meeting learning goals. We also do not have a systematic tier 2 intervention prior to the referral to SPED testing. We also do not have a master schedule for intervention or a set intervention program (tier 2 instruction)

2. Quality First Instruction

During our ELSB meetings (Problem Statement & Root Cause Analysis) we concluded that we lack common literacy practices evident by our I-Ready Data Teachers have not received sufficient in-depth focused training on teaching foundational reading standards, or how to effectively implement our core curriculum, especially in the area of phonological awareness and phonics instruction. We also have limited knowledge of how to implement small group instruction to support the foundational skill deficient, not all teachers have the knowledge and capacity needed to use data to drive their small instructional groups.

3. PLC practices

During our ELSB meetings (Problem Statement & Root Cause Analysis) we concluded that our teachers lack knowledge and training on how to effectively work as a PLC as it relates to data collection, data analysis, and collectively responding to the 4 essential questions.

Our Needs Assessment shows we need:

High-Quality literacy teaching

- training for teachers as to what that looks like and how to implement the strategies for literacy teaching
- Lesson studies with teachers/students
- Collaboration time to review the two components above, progress monitoring, data, etc.
 - release time for teachers
 - literacy materials and assessments (tiers 1-3)
- CORE Reading Assessments/ Multiple Measures
- SIPPS
 - training on how to implement the assessments and how to analyze the data and use that information to inform instruction
- Classroom libraries
- Read Aloud books
- CORE Sourcebooks and multiple measures for all teachers
- Pupil supports
 - Tutoring based on needs of K-3 students
 - Teacher PD on Trauma Informed Practices

3. Describe the identified strengths and weaknesses of both the eligible school(s) and the LEA regarding literacy instruction in transitional kindergarten through grade 3 (TK –3), inclusive. Identify all relevant diagnostic measures, including, but not limited to, pupil performance data, data on effective and ineffective practices, and equity and performance gaps reviewed during the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment.

District-wide

Strengths

- Our district already has a state-approved core curriculum that includes culturally responsive curriculum and instruction. We have been focused on improving and deepening our implementation of the curriculum district-wide.
- All seven sites already have After School Education and Safety grant funded programs that provide an opportunity for tutoring, homework help, and enrichment activities.
- Each sites receives mental health support services.

Weaknesses

- Our state-approved core curriculum for ELA lacks explicit Phonics instruction.
- We need a district-wide system of teaching and assessing explicit foundational skills.

Hamilton:

Strengths –

- Our teaching staff has participated in a 2 ½ day training by UnboundEd. This professional development facilitated conversations about equitable lesson planning and instruction that is without bias and prejudice.
- Our school has been focused on school culture and climate. Hamilton has two full-time counselors, a PLUS team, as well as a PBIS Committee to focus on improving school climate, pupil connectedness, attendance, reducing discipline practices, and both in- and out-of-school suspensions.

Weaknesses –

- Hamilton lacks explicit academic phonics instruction for gradesTK-3, and does not track, analyze and create reports about student academic progress in letter recognition, phonological awareness, decoding and spelling, and sight word recognition.
- The lack of common time during the school day in order to provide foundational phonics intervention across grades TK-3.

Hazelton:

Strengths –

- Hazelton has two, full time counselors who are devoted to improving school climate and improving student well-being. Both the counselors and PBIS team have implemented a variety of activities and supports to help create a positive learning environment for all students. During the past school year, Hazelton’s school counselors were nationally recognized for having a comprehensive, data-driven, model school counseling program and will be a model school for others in the district and state.

Weaknesses –

- We lack consistency and a systematic plan for administering assessments as well as how we respond to the data generated from these assessments

- We have a need for additional professional learning in foundational skills. We have a mix of brand new teachers and new to k-3 teachers in the elementary levels.

Pulliam:

Strengths –

- Our school site currently has a library that is operated by a site librarian.
- We also currently have 2 full-time counselors that service our students and provide professional development and support to teachers in this area.
- Our school site also employs a full time parent liaison. The role of the parent liaison is to inform parents about available resources within the broader community that can support with student learning.

Weaknesses –

- There is a need for a systematic method of early identification and intervention for struggling readers.
- Phonics instruction in our district adopted curriculum is not a sufficient reading program and does not dedicate enough time to phonics.
- We need to provide a research based intervention that meets the needs of the students.
- Teachers struggle with writing instruction and shared that the lesson and instruction provided in our district adopted curriculum was not explicit, nor did it support teacher instruction on the three writing types.

Roosevelt:

Strengths –

- 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms have a collection of culturally authentic literature and informational texts
- Mental health resources are provided through our school counselor and district’s Mental Health & Behavior Support Services.
- Our school has a parent liaison who coordinates multiple events to improve parent and community engagement and educational opportunities for parents.

Weaknesses –

- K-3 students need more phonics practice.
- We have inconsistent use of the curriculum routines for foundational skills
- There are inconsistent opportunities for English Language Development training among staff
- We inconsistently progress monitor foundational skills.

Taft:

Strengths –

- Our teachers want and welcome training to improve their pedagogy. Their desire to be a part of change makes them open to learning new ideas and ways to approach student mastery of reading in grades K-3. This strength combined with their willingness to embrace change and do the hard work gives Taft the positive outlook for success with the teachers changing their practices as well as increased student achievement as they master all of the components of reading skills.

Weaknesses –

- Lack of good first instruction (teachers have not received sufficient in depth focused training on teaching foundational reading standards, and all of the components of the Scarborough’s Rope in a systematic way that builds capacity.)
- Curriculum deficiency reading foundational skills are not spiraled from year to year to “catch students” who miss the first instruction. Our curriculum is also not strong in phonemic and phonics instruction.

- Our reading instruction hasn't targeted all of the components of Scarborough's Rope.
- In the classroom only none of our teachers use read-alouds two-years above grade-level daily to help bridge our EL learners & Title 1 low socioeconomic learners that come to school with a lack of background knowledge, vocabulary and concepts of how language works.
- A weakness of our local educational agency (SUSD) is that our district does not have much in place that is systematic or uniform for monitoring student progress

Taylor:

Strengths –

- Our school has been addressing attendance and behavior issues as a site focus the last few years. We provide monthly super recess for students with exceptional attendance and attendance growth.
- District and school wide PBIS initiatives are already in place.
- Taylor and SUSD are utilizing the Second Step curriculum program to provide SEL lessons and professional development throughout the year. The program offers a research and evidenced based digital program and classroom kits that have already begun to be implemented by counselors and classroom teachers at Taylor.
- Our school library has age appropriate books for students K-8 and is available to students weekly.
- We have a PBIS team and two counselors onsite who are trained on trauma-informed practices and supports and provide PD and supports for teachers in this area. We also have an onsite Mental Health Clinician that provide supports, services, and programs and is trained in and incorporates trauma -informed practices. .

Weaknesses –

- We currently do not have a site specific assessment calendar for Foundational Skills testing K-3.
- We have some testing in place but lack consistency and a systemic plan for administering assessments.
- Our students K-3 do not have a strong foundation/grasp of phonics and phonemic awareness skills.
- We need to increase teacher capacity in systemic/explicit phonics instructional practices and strategies.

Van Buren:

Strengths –

- Our teachers have a desire to be a part of the change which gives Van Buren a positive outlook for increasing student achievement.

Weaknesses –

- Our site does not have systematic screening, diagnostic, and monitoring processes in place to ensure students receive timely support when they are not meeting learning goals.
- We also do not have a systematic tier 2 intervention prior to the referral to SPED testing.

- Teachers have not received sufficient in-depth focused training on teaching foundational reading standards, or how to effectively implement our core curriculum, especially in the area of phonological awareness and phonics instruction.
- We also have limited knowledge of how to implement small group instruction to support the foundational skill deficient, not all teachers have the knowledge and capacity needed to use data to drive their small instructional groups.
- Our teachers lack knowledge and training on how to effectively work as a PLC.

4. Explain how the LEA consulted with stakeholders, including school staff, school leaders, parents, and community members, at each eligible school about the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment and proposed expenditures of the grant funds. If the School Site Council (SSC) was used for this purpose, describe how the school provided public notice of meetings and how meetings were conducted in the manner required by Section 35147 of the *Education Code*.

Hamilton:

In order to gather and engage in dialogue with Hamilton Elementary stakeholders, the school held a variety of meetings to share our vision and plan to meet the literacy needs of our students.

- Hamilton shared the school's SPSA, specifically our literacy plan, professional development plan and literacy intervention plan with parents at a School Site Council Meeting. Both parents and teachers expressed the need for a "level playing field" - for both new and veteran teachers to have the opportunity to learn new skills or to perfect their craft. Thus, our plan will allow for all TK-3rd grade teachers the opportunity to attend professional development.
- In a regular school year when parents were allowed on campus, our ELAC meetings would have 30-40 participants but with parents of our English Language Learners virtual meeting attendance was very low. Despite the low turnout, we did ask for the parents/families feedback that did attend. They shared that Hamilton's most pressing concerns should include time in front of the teachers, extra support in class - instructional assists, student-parent conferences/workshops, and maybe summer school. The Site Team reviewed these suggestions and they felt that all were valid points and will be addressed in our Literacy Action Plan.
- At Hamilton's AVID Leadership meeting, with every grade level represented including Special Education, the planning phase (root-cause analysis and needs assessment) was shared in our Google Staff Folder. Leadership members reviewed and approved the plan. Our upper grade teachers asked if their students will be included, ELSB Site Team members clarified that the grant is grade-level specific but that it could be replicated using site funds. Their question of what would be the plan for students who do not achieve with the prescribed intervention, our ELSB Site Team considered this and decided to add our primary SDC teacher and Resource Teacher to our team of teachers who will participate in the grant, so that they could help guide the discussions of next steps for those students.
- Though we did not have a high turnout of parents that attended the monthly Virtual Principal Coffee Hour, the families and staff that did attend were asked for their feedback. Parents agreed in moving forward with applying for the Early Literacy Grant because we need to do whatever needs to be done for our kids. Our counselors suggested that we needed a uniform intervention to ensure continuity and they specifically asked for a way to track interventions

school wide to ease the SAP process for those students who may not progress academically. With this feedback, our Site Team chose to include the purchase of ESGI to warehouse student assessment data and to consider all TK-3rd grade teachers when purchasing the SIPPS intervention program.

- Lastly, our SMARTe goals and our Literacy Action Plan were shared at a schoolwide staff meeting. Teachers and staff were asked for their feedback, allowed to ask for clarification and to ask questions. Throughout the presentation, a handful of staff members asked specific questions related to training and scheduling, but agreed overall and no changes were made or added to the Literacy Action Plan.

Hazelton:

School Staff:

Teachers (K-3) on the ELSB team shared the planning process and team ideas (a) with their grade levels at their PLC collaboration meeting(s) (b) The team provided updates at these meetings as they came, to keep their grade level as informed about the process as possible and get feedback from the grade level team.

A special staff meeting (b) was called to introduce the grant and share out the planning process with all kindergarten through third grade teachers who will be involved (a) The purpose of this meeting was to introduce teachers to the process and share the teams ideas based on data and our Root Cause Analysis/Problem of Practice. We explained the process of how we developed SMART goals and the resources that will be required to meet the goals. Teachers had the opportunity to provide feedback on what the team presented.

School Site Council/Leadership Team:

The plan was presented to both the Hazelton School Site Council and Leadership teams (c/d) to inform them of them of the purpose of the Early Literacy Grant and the process we are going through to allocate how the grant money is spent, based on the data from our Root Cause Analysis (a) Members had the opportunity to ask questions and provide any ideas or feedback after the presentation of the ELSB documents (a).

Parents/Families/Community:

The plan was also introduced to family and community stakeholders at a monthly Parent Coffee Connection gathering (e). Data points (f) that helped to determine our Problem of Practice were shared with parents and community members so that it is clear how our SMART goals were developed and justify the resources that will be purchased through the Grant to improve student achievement in literacy.

Pulliam:

Throughout this school year the operations team and school leadership team have been engaged in conversations about school data and the need to align practices that improve student outcomes, especially in the area of literacy. Once the grant opportunity arrived, our site principal sought team members in grades TK-3, the librarian, the literacy coach, and reached out to the NAACP chapter head to be a part of the grant writing team. Our site principal was aware of the need to engage stakeholders in conversations regarding the grant and our goal for improving student outcomes in literacy. Information regarding our school site data, including identifying areas where our students are falling behind and not making adequate growth were discussed. She also shared information regarding the possibilities through the ELSB grant, our direction, use of the grant funds, and hopeful outcomes. This

information was disseminated at the following meetings: staff meetings, leadership, school site council, parent coffee hour, and was mentioned in a parent newsletter.

Roosevelt:

The literacy team (principal, ELA coach, and K-3 teacher representatives) was created in January and began to attend both ELSB grant sessions and site team meetings. The literacy team had met over the course of several months to discuss effective literacy instruction, assessments, data, achievement challenges, possible solutions, and needs. While there were many possible causes at the beginning, the team looked at which ones were in their control. From that list, the team narrowed down problems into three main groups of inconsistent training in ELD strategies, inconsistent assessments, and inconsistent collection and analysis of data. Once those problems were narrowed down, the team investigated possible solutions to address the root causes of low reading scores. Their work, discoveries, and ideas were then shared with other teachers, school staff, and parents.

The Root Cause Analysis Jamboard was presented to the staff during a staff meeting (April 20, 2021) and to parents during a School Site Council meeting (May 19, 2021). During both of these meetings the principal and the ELA coach shared the process that was used to create our problem statement and identify the root causes of low reading proficiency scores as measured on the iReady assessments. It was shared that this process revealed that there was an inconsistent assessment/screening process, ELD training, vertical planning time, and intervention program. Further discussions around root causes to our current situation of 78% of our K-8 students not being on grade level in reading occurred during a leadership meeting (May 18, 2021). Those discussions also identified that inconsistencies with school wide strategies, practices, routines, and intervention has played a role in low reading scores. The principal shared how funding additional personnel like the coach and program specialist would help with continued professional development for teachers and intervention for students, respectively.

To provide the staff with more information on the program that the team was looking into to address foundational reading skills concerns a representative from Collaborative Classrooms attended the May 4th Staff Meeting to share the components of the SIPPS program and how they could address the needs reflected in the school data.

Taft:

Throughout the 2020-2021 school year Taft School Early Literacy Team along with the Taft Cabinet (Principal, VP, Counselors, Coaches and Program Specialists) have been examining data to not only address unfinished learning but to also determine what the data informs us about the literacy needs of our students. The Early Literacy Team began their meetings by attending the first ELSB grant meeting on 1/28/2021 and have been meeting weekly (dates linked in evidence) examining data to determine the root cause of student's literacy deficiencies and are working on plans for solving those deficiencies.

At the PTA meeting, ELSB team member, Ms. Garcia shared that in the Early Literacy Block Grant, there is a parent workshop component where parents will be taught literacy skills to assist their children at home. She discussed how teaching parents literacy strategies will help them work with their child at home reinforcing literacy skills. Parents stated they would like to have literacy training so they can help their child at home.

Taylor:

School Staff:

Our principal introduced the grant with a general information session to all teachers K-3rd. Teachers were given the opportunity to discuss in their PLCs and determine a representative per grade level. Once the team was determined the team started to meet immediately to discuss the grant generally.

Principal created a google folder/document as a space to share ideas/resources related to the grant. From there the grant was discussed with stakeholders in different capacities.

Leadership Team

The plan/grant information was presented to the leadership team. The purpose of sharing with the leadership team was to gather perspective/ideas from members of our staff that do not necessarily teach K-3rd but could contribute ideas about where students are lacking long term. These ideas were added to our root cause analysis document as well.

School Site Council

The plan was also presented at a school site council meeting to inform the council members/community members and stakeholders of the purpose of the grant. Principal discussed the process of the grant and fund allocations based on our root cause analysis. Members were provided an opportunity to ask questions/contribute ideas or feedback about the grant.

Parent Informational Meeting

A parent informational meeting was offered via zoom to discuss the components of the grant. This was an opportunity for parents and stakeholders to understand our current data to understand where our problem of practice came from. As well as review our SMARTe goals and how we will utilize the grant funds.

Van Buren:

Since the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year, the operations team (principal, vice-principal, coaches, counselors, and program specialist) and school leadership team have been engaged in conversation about school data and the need to not only address unfinished learning, but also to align school instructional practices to improve student outcomes, especially in the area of literacy. Traditionally, Van Buren's iReady scores have shown that 80% of students were reading below grade level. (Winter iReady Data). When looking specifically at the foundational skills, phonemic awareness (tested K-2) averaged 44% proficiency, and phonics in K-3rd averaged 28% proficiency. The need for foundational skills is urgent. Once the grant was announced to the staff, the principal solicited individuals to participate as team members. These included the program specialist, ELA instructional coach, and a teacher the K, 1, and 2nd grade.

Information about the literacy needs of Van Buren and the ELSB grant was also shared with the greater community during School Site Council and ELAC meetings. During these meetings, the principal shared the process used to create a problem statement (brainstorming problems and potential solutions), what our problem statement is (80% of 1-3rd grade students are reading below grade level) and our SMARTe goals to address the problems as well as what resources will be needed to do so (see slideshow in evidence). She ended the presentation by encouraging stakeholders to share any questions or concerns they had about the plan, expenditures, and to share any ideas they might have to address the identified needs.

The grant team met both during grant meetings/training and independently to continue the work started during the meetings/training. The team attended their first ELSB grant meeting

on 1/28/2021. During these first three training/meetings (1/28, 2/11, 2/25) the team were led through a training intended to help develop an understanding of evidence-based instruction and assessment practices and what key data was needed to complete a root cause analysis and needs assessment. During this time, K, 1, 2, and 3 (one class per grade) were given the Dibels assessments so our team could gain familiarity with the assessment tool and gain another point of data in addition to the iReady scores. We reviewed this data to ensure we had a collective understanding of the realities of our student's literacy skills.

5. Justify LEA partnerships with literacy experts from the county office of education for the county in which the LEA is located, a geographic lead agency established, or the Expert Lead in Literacy in the development of the Root Cause Analysis and Needs Assessment and the Literacy Action Plan. If applicable, describe any partnership with a member of an institution of higher education or nonprofit organization with expertise in literacy for this purpose, which may also involve experts in participatory design and meaningful community involvement.

Stockton Unified School District:

The District conducted an LEA Needs Assessment led by the San Joaquin County Office of Education's Continuous Improvement and Support staff. Lisa Bowman from the SJCOE also participated in ELSB trainings and helped support our principals in leading their teams. This was very helpful to have an outside objective person so closely involved.

Hamilton:

The Hamilton team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

Hazelton:

The Hazelton team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

Pulliam:

The Pulliam team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely

important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

In addition, the local NAACP's Educational Division participated in the building of the plan, and attended ELSB trainings.

Roosevelt:

The Roosevelt team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

Taft:

The Taft team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

Taylor:

The Taylor team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

Van Buren:

The Van Buren team worked closely with the Expert Lead in Literacy (Sacramento County Office of Education). Alison McKeeman specifically worked with all SUSD sites. She helped support building each plan with team members. In addition, CORE provided expert training and support in understanding the need for explicit reading instruction. This support was extremely important. The teams needed a great deal of assistance tightly focusing their plans to truly best meet the needs of their students.

In addition, the local NAACP's Educational Division participated in the building of the plan, and attended ELSB trainings.

6. Describe how enrollment, program participation, and stakeholder engagement were leveraged to address the literacy needs of students enrolled in grades TK–3 at participating eligible schools, and include a brief narrative of analytical findings (see chart on page 8).

Stockton Unified School District: Overall, more participation by stakeholders at each site would have been better to help leverage this work. SUSD did not return to in-person instruction until April 29th. Basically, families who chose to send their children back in-person only were on campus for about a month for the 2020-21 school year. This may have impacted stakeholder engagement. Hopefully, moving forward, site staff will be able to include more folks in this continued effort. These sites will be encouraged to continue updating School Site Council and parents attending parent meetings regarding the goals of the plan and progress. In addition, District-wide there is a need to expand lessons learned and PD for all elementary sites. Recent changes in leadership positions and unfilled vacancies will be a challenge, but the continued support of the Sacramento County Office of Education and CORE will help guide us through the work.

NOTE: Use the chart below to identify the anticipated number of students enrolled who will be served by ELSB Grant-funded activities and the **primary** stakeholders (teachers, administrators, parents, community members, etc.) who were active participants in the Root Cause Analysis, Needs Assessment, and development of the three-year Literacy Action Plan.

Description	Student Enrollment (List only the number for each grade level, TK–3, by eligible participating school)	Participating Teachers (List only the number for each grade level, TK–3, by eligible participating school)	Participating Administrator(s) (List only role and number of each by district office and eligible participating school.)	Other Stakeholder Input (List all participating stakeholder groups by eligible participating school. For example, SSC, English Learner Advisory Committee [ELAC], school board, etc., and the number of participants for each.)
School Sites	<p>Hamilton Elementary TK = 17 K = 64 1 = 71 2 = 73 3 = 77</p> <p>Hazelton Elementary K = 73 1 = 70 2 = 81 3 = 74</p> <p>Pulliam Elementary TK = 17 K = 74 1 = 61 2 = 90 3 = 91</p>	<p>Hamilton Elementary TK = 1 K = 3 1 = 3 2 = 3 3 = 4</p> <p>Hazelton Elementary K = 3 1 = 4 2 = 4 3 = 4</p> <p>Pulliam Elementary TK = 1 K = 4 1 = 3 2 = 4 3 = 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Curriculum Director = 1 • District Literacy Coaches = 7 • District Curriculum Specialists = 2 • District Project Leader = 1 • District Budget Technician = 1 • Hamilton Admin = 1 • Hazelton Admin = 2 • Pulliam Admin = 1 • Roosevelt Admin = 1 • Taft Admin = 1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hamilton Elementary. SSC (10), ELAC (6), Leadership (12), Staff (31) • Hazelton Elementary SSC (8), ELAC (9), Leadership (), Staff (12) • Pulliam Elementary SSC (12), Staff (28) • Roosevelt Elementary SSC (15), ELAC (6), Leadership (6), Parent (5) Staff (18) • Taft Elementary

	<p>Roosevelt Elementary K = 25 1 = 26 2 = 36 3 = 45</p> <p>Taft Elementary TK = 24 K = 48 1 = 49 2 = 46 3 = 49</p> <p>Taylor Elementary TK = 28 K = 40 1 = 46 2 = 65 3 = 49</p> <p>Van Buren Elementary TK = 14 K = 49 1 = 67 2 = 66 3 = 73</p>	<p>Roosevelt Elementary K = 1 1 = 2 2 = 2 3 = 2</p> <p>Taft Elementary TK = 1 K = 2 1 = 2 2 = 2 3 = 3</p> <p>Taylor Elementary TK = 2 K = 2 1 = 2 2 = 3 3 = 2</p> <p>Van Buren Elementary TK = 1 K = 2 1 = 3 2 = 3 3 = 4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taylor Admin = 2 • Van Buren = 1 	<p>SSC (8), Leadership (5), Staff (28), Parent/PTA (13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taylor Elementary SSC (7), ELAC (11), Leadership (8), • Van Buren Elementary SSC (6), ELAC (21), Leadership () • School Board (7) for all
Numbers	<p><i>Hamilton = 302</i> <i>Hazelton = 298</i> <i>Pulliam = 333</i> <i>Roosevelt = 132</i> <i>Taft = 216</i> <i>Taylor = 228</i> <i>Van Buren = 269</i></p>	<p><i>Hamilton = 14</i> <i>Hazelton = 15</i> <i>Pulliam = 16</i> <i>Roosevelt = 7</i> <i>Taft = 10</i> <i>Taylor = 11</i> <i>Van Buren = 13</i></p>	<p><i>District = 12</i> <i>Hamilton = 1</i> <i>Hazelton = 2</i> <i>Pulliam = 1</i> <i>Roosevelt = 1</i> <i>Taft = 1</i> <i>Taylor = 2</i> <i>Van Buren = 1</i></p>	<p><i>Hamilton = 59</i> <i>Hazelton = 29</i> <i>Pulliam = 40</i> <i>Roosevelt = 50</i> <i>Taft = 54</i></p>

				<i>Taylor = 26</i> <i>Van Buren = 27</i> <i>School Board = 7</i>
Overall Participant Totals	1,778	86	21	292