

HALIFAX REGIONAL SCHOOL BOARD

Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report

- PURPOSE:** To inform the Governing Board of the progress of students supported through the Early Literacy Support model in 2011-2012.
- BUSINESS PLAN GOAL:** To continue to improve student achievement and learning for all students.
- BACKGROUND:** On April 26, 2011 the Department of Education released the “Succeeding in Reading: An Early Literacy Support Framework” document, which included the support replacement for Reading Recovery. Individual School Boards were asked to design models of support that aligned with the guiding parameters, approach and roles outlined in the framework document.
- The Halifax Regional School Board developed the Early Literacy Support model which included the Department of Education’s parameters of; focusing support at grades primary and one, basing student need on current assessment information, providing small group support within the classroom environment, using a flexible approach to instruction and ensuring on-going teacher professional learning and support.
- CONTENT:** Please see Appendix A - Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report
- COST:** n/a
- FUNDING:** Included in the general fund
- TIMELINE:** On-going with a year-end report available in the fall
- APPENDIX:** Appendix A – Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report
- RECOMMENDATION:** It is recommended the Governing Board receive the Early Literacy Support 2011-2012 Year End Report for information.

COMMUNICATIONS:

AUDIENCE	RESPONSIBLE	TIMELINE
Governing Board	Geoff Cainen	Jan 30, 2013
Elementary Schools	Geoff Cainen	Jan 31, 2013

- From:** Heather Syms, Coordinator EQA hsyms@hrsb.ca
Geoff Cainen, Director Program gcainen@hrsb.ca
- To:** Governing Board January 30, 2013

Early Literacy Support



2011-2012
Year End Report



General Overview of Early Literacy Support

In April 2011 the Department of Education released “Succeeding in Reading: An Early Literacy Support Framework”, which included the intervention intended to replace Reading Recovery. Individual school boards were required to use this framework to develop board level models of support. The Halifax Regional School Board (HRSB) developed the HRSB Early Literacy Support model, which was implemented in both English and French Immersion programs in the 2011-2012 school year.

During this first year of implementation the HRSB Early Literacy Support Model included the following components:

- Early literacy support was provided to English and French Immersion grade one students in the earliest stage of their literacy development.
- Once all literacy needs were met in the grade one population support was provided to grade primary students in the earliest stage of literacy development.
- Support was provided a number of ways:
 - Small group or one on one or a combination
 - In-class or outside of the classroom, or a combinationWith small group, in-class support being the preferred model.
- All decisions related to support are made at the school level through the Department of Education’s school planning team process
- The school planning team, including grades P-1 teachers, completed the selection of students for early literacy support.
- Selection of students was based on the review of current student assessment information in relation to benchmarks provided by HRSB.
- Support was provided in both English and French Immersion by trained early literacy teachers.
- Support was primarily provided to students in small groups (maximum 3 students) within the regular classroom.
- The average lesson for a group of students was 45 minutes long, 30 minutes if the support was provided to a student individually.
- Lessons consisted of a reading component, a writing component and word and oral language instruction.
- Lessons provided to grade primary students followed a different lesson structure that enabled more extensive shared and guided practice and stressed the development of oral language skills.
- Generally students received support until they reached designated reading and writing benchmarks or until the school planning team determined other support was warranted.

Support Allocation

Time for early literacy teachers to provide support to students was allocated to each school site containing English and French Immersion program grades P-2 students. Schools were given a separate allocation for English and French Immersion support.

In English program all schools with a P-3 English program student population were provided with allocation ranging from 10% in the smaller school sites to 70% in larger or higher needs schools.

In French Immersion program all schools with a P-3 French Immersion program student population (19 school sites) were provided with allocation ranging from 20% in the smaller school sites to 50% in larger or higher needs schools.

The English program allocation was allotted as follows:

English Program Early Literacy Support Allocation			
	Number of Schools	Percentage Allocation	Full Time Equivalent Total
	3	10%	0.3
	26	20%	5.2
	3	30%	0.9
	40	40%	16.0
	13	50%	6.5
	4	60%	2.4
	3	70%	2.1
Totals	92	n/a	33.4 FTE

The French Immersion program allocation was allotted as follows:

French Immersion Early Literacy Support Allocation			
	Number of Schools	Percentage Allocation	Full Time Equivalent Total
	4	20%	0.8
	4	30%	1.2
	8	40%	3.2
	3	50%	1.5
Totals	19	n/a	6.7 FTE

Early Literacy Teachers

Support was provided by 104 early literacy teachers, of which 85 teachers provided the support to English program students only, 11 teachers provided support to French Immersion program students only and 8 teachers provided support to both English and French Immersion program students. In almost all instances the allocation was paired with a lower elementary classroom assignment to create a 100% position for the early literacy teacher. There were a few early literacy teachers who were also vice principals and paired the early literacy support allocation with their administrative time to create a 100% assignment and one teacher who only worked part time. All

104 early literacy teachers had a minimum of 5 years of classroom experience and of the 104, 60 were Reading Recovery trained.

Student Selection

Students were selected for support by the school planning team which consisted of grade primary and one English and French Immersion classroom teachers, resource teacher(s), early literacy teacher(s), principal and in some schools the vice principal. Selections were based on a review of the following assessment information:

- Running Record – an instructional text level a student is able to read accurately, fluently and with comprehension
 - The texts used for this assessment in English program were from either the PM Benchmarks Assessment Resource or Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment kit
 - The texts used for this assessment in French Immersion were the texts identified by the provincial working group
 - Fluency for both English and French Immersion was scored using the HRSB Oral Reading Fluency Scale - revised October 2011
 - Comprehension was determined using the HRSB Comprehension Rubric using questions for the selected assessment resource
- Concepts About Print (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Dated Writing sample scored using the HRSB Developmental Writing Continuum
- Letter Identification (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Word Reading (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Writing Vocabulary (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- Hearing and Recording Sounds (from Observation Survey / du Sondage d'observation)
- BURT Word Reading Test (not applicable in French Immersion)

It was recommended that students earliest in their literacy development were selected for support.

Literacy Benchmarks

Reading and writing benchmarks for both English and French Immersion grade primary and one Early Literacy Support were established. These benchmarks were used by school planning teams to inform decisions in relation to student support.

Ending Support

The goal of the model of support is to ensure all students are able to achieve year end benchmarks for reading and writing. The school planning team determines when a child is no longer in need of additional support from the early literacy teacher. The assessments identified for determining if a student requires support are re-administered to inform decisions in relation to further student support. It was recommended support not be discontinued unless a student met the appropriate benchmarks or alternate support could be put in place for a student.

Data Collection

Early literacy teachers were asked to submit entry, exit and year end assessment results for all students who received early literacy support. This data was compiled at a board level and analyzed to inform decisions in relation to continued implementation of the support model.

Summary of Results

The following information is a summary of the student results from data collected during the first year of Early Literacy Support implementation (2011-2012).

General Summary of Students Supported (September to June)

The total grade one population for 2011-2012 was 3444 students

- 48% female
- 52% male

From this total grade one population 1069 students (both English and French Immersion programs) were supported through Early Literacy Support

- 397 female (37%)
- 672 male (63%)

Of the 1069 students supported

- 846 students were in English program
- 223 students were in French Immersion program

English Program Results

In relation to meeting/not meeting year-end benchmarks:

Of the 846 English program grade one students supported 40 were unavailable for year-end assessment (moved, etc.).

806 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 289 (36%) females
- 517 (64%) males

Of the 806 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 454 (56%) **met** year-end benchmarks
 - 185 (41%) females
 - 269 (59%) males
- 352 (44%) **did not meet** year-end benchmarks
 - 104 (30%) females
 - 248 (70%) males

In relation to growth in reading level:

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 641 (80%) students began their support reading in the limited category (reading level 0-6).

Of the 641 students who began their support reading in the limited category

- 309 (48%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 15+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 145 (23%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 11 to 14) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 112 (17%) students were reading in the developing category (reading at level 7 to 10) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 75 (12%) students remained in the limited category (reading at level 0-6) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 133 (17%) students began their support reading in the developing category (reading level 7-10).

Of the 133 students who began their support in the developing category

- 116 (87%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 15+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 17 (13%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 11 to 14) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 28 (3%) students began their support reading in the approaching category (reading level 11-14).

Of the 28 who began their support reading in the approaching category:

- 27 (96%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 15+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 1 (4%) student remained in the approaching year-end benchmarks category (reading at level 11 to 14) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 806 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 4 students began their support reading in the meeting year end benchmark category (reading level 15+).

Although these students met the benchmarks for reading they were provided support because their writing levels did not meet expectations. They remained in the meeting benchmarks category for reading at the end of the year.

There was no statistically significant difference between males and females in relation to growth in reading level. The method of instruction for both boys and girls created the same results for both genders.

In relation to how support was provided:

Small Groups versus Individual Support

Of the 806 students who received support:

- 654 (81%) received support in a small group
- 58 (7%) received individual support
- 94 (12%) received support in a combination of individual and small group
-

Progress of Students in Relation to Small Group versus Individual Support

Type of Support (N = 806)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 15 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small Group	654	387	59.2%	389	59.5%	134	20.5%	87	13.3%	44	6.7%
Individual	58	25	43.1%	25	43.1%	9	15.5%	9	15.5%	15	25.9%
Combination	94	42	44.7%	42	44.7%	20	21.3%	16	17.0%	16	17.0%

Although the percentage meeting expectations are higher for Small Group support, we cannot conclude that Type of Support made a difference in the program outcomes. Rather, students may have been placed in Individual support for example because of concentration difficulties, behavioural concerns, etc. that could have had a larger impact on student reading success.

In Class versus Out of Class Support

Of the 806 students who received support:

- 300 (37%) received support in class
- 263 (31%) received support out of class
- 243 (30%) received support in a combination of in class and out of class

Of the 300 students who received support in class, 195 (65.0%) met year end reading benchmarks.

Of the 263 students who received support out of class, 123 (46.8%) met year end reading benchmarks.

Of the 243 students who received support in a combination of in class and pull out, 136 (56.0%) met year end reading benchmarks.

Progress of Students in Relation to In Class versus Out of Class Support Overall

Location of Support (N = 806)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 15 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Out of Class	263	123	46.8%	124	47.1%	61	23.2%	49	18.6%	29	11.0%
Combination	243	136	56.0%	136	56.0%	54	22.2%	29	11.9%	24	9.9%
In Class	300	195	65.0%	196	65.3%	48	16.0%	34	11.3%	22	7.3%

Students receiving the **In Class** support location experienced a higher degree of success in meeting Year End Reading Benchmarks and Level 15 (Accuracy) compared to students receiving the Combination or Out of Class location.

Progress of Students in Relation to In Class versus Out of Class Support by Entry Level

Location of Support (N = 806)	Total N	Limited at Entry		Developing at Entry		Approaching at Entry		Meeting at Entry	
		N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE
Out of Class	263	221	38.9%	37	86.5%	4	100%	1	100%
Combination	243	200	50.0%	32	81.3%	11	90.1%	n/a	n/a
In Class	300	220	55.0%	64	90.6%	13	100%	3	100%

For students who began receiving early literacy support in the Limited category (0-6), more students in the Combination and In Class Locations met the year end reading level 15 than those in the Out of Class Location.

French Immersion Program Results

In relation to meeting/not meeting year-end benchmarks

Of the 223 French Immersion program grade one students supported 23 were unavailable for year-end assessment (moved, etc.).

Of the 200 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 84 (42%) females
- 116 (58%) males

Of the 200 students who participated in year-end assessment

- 123 (61%) **met** year-end benchmarks
 - 54 (44%) females
 - 69 (56%) males
- 77 (39%) **did not meet** year-end benchmarks
 - 30 (39%) females
 - 47 (61%) males

In relation to growth in reading level:

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 169 (85%) students began their support reading in the limited category (reading level 0-4).

Of the 169 students who began their support reading in the limited category

- 93 (55%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 9+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 30 (18%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 7 to 8) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 31 (18%) students were reading in the developing category (reading at level 5 to 6) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 15 (9%) students remained in the limited category (reading at level 0-4) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 19 (10%) students began their support reading in the developing category (reading level 5-6).

Of the 19 students who began their support reading in the developing category

- 18 (95%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 9+) when assessed at the end of the school year.
- 1 (5%) students were approaching year-end benchmarks (reading at level 7 to 8) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 10 (6%) students began their support reading in the approaching category (reading level 7-8).

Of the 10 students who began their support reading in the approaching category

- 10 (100%) students were meeting year-end benchmarks (reading at level 9+) when assessed at the end of the school year.

Of the 200 students that received support and participated in the year-end assessment, 2 (1%) students began their support reading in the meeting year end benchmark category (reading level 9+). Although these students met the benchmarks for reading they were provided support because their writing levels did not meet expectations. They remained in the meeting benchmarks category for reading at the end of the year.

There was no statistically significant difference between males and females in relation to growth in reading level. The method of instruction for both boys and girls created the same results for both genders.

In relation to how support was provided:

Small Group versus Individual Support

Of the 200 students who received support:

- 178 (89%) received support in a small group
- 3 (2%) received individual support
- 19 (10%) received support in a combination of individual and small group

Progress of Students in Relation to Small Group versus Individual Support

Type of Support (N = 200)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 9 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Small Group	178	111	62.4%	111	62.4%	29	16.3%	30	16.9%	8	4.5%
Individual	3	2	66.7%	2	66.7%	n/a	n/a	1	33.3%	n/a	n/a
Combination	19	10	52.6%	10	52.6%	2	10.5%	n/a	n/a	7	36.8%

Although the numbers meeting expectations are higher for Small Group support than Combination, we cannot conclude that Type of Support made a difference in the program outcomes. Rather, students may have been placed in Combination support because of concentration difficulties, behavioural concerns, etc. that could have had a larger impact on student reading success.

In Class versus Out of Class Support

Of the 200 students who received support:

- 109 (55%) received support in class
- 38 (19%) received support out of class
- 53 (27%) received support in a combination of in class and out of class

Progress of Students in Relation to In Class versus Out of Class Support Overall

Location of Support (N = 200)	Total N	Meets Reading Benchmark		Meets Reading Level 9 YE		Approaching YE		Developing YE		Limited YE	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Out of Class	38	23	60.5%	23	60.5%	6	15.8%	4	10.5%	5	13.2%
Combination	53	30	56.6%	30	56.6%	7	13.2%	12	22.6%	4	7.5%
In Class	109	70	64.2%	70	64.2%	18	16.5%	15	13.8%	6	5.5%

Students receiving the In Class support location experienced a similar degree of success in meeting Year End Reading Benchmarks and Level 11 (Accuracy) as students receiving the Combination or Out of Class location.

Progress of Students in Relations to In Class Versus Out of Class Support by Entry Level

Location of Support (N = 200)	Total N	Limited at Entry		Developing at Entry		Approaching at Entry		Meeting at Entry	
		N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE	N	% Meets YE
Out of Class	38	29	51.7%	6	83.3%	1	100%	2	100%
Combination	53	47	51.1%	5	100%	1	100%	n/a	n/a
In Class	109	93	58.1%	8	100%	8	100%	n/a	n/a

Students receiving the In Class support location experienced similar progress in reading as students receiving the Combination or Out of Class support location.

Early Learning Opportunities Results

Of the 70 students who participated in the Early Learning Opportunities program and are currently registered in HRSB, 33 students (47%) received Early Literacy Support.

- 11 **met** year end reading benchmarks
- 20 **did not meet** year end reading benchmarks
- 2 students moved before the year end assessment

Board Response to the Data

- Professional development for early literacy teachers will focus on strengthening instructional skills and supporting accelerated student progress
- French Immersion Early Literacy Support will begin at grade two in the first half of the school year
- Continue to support the development of classroom teacher practice so teachers can further develop students' skills, in particular in the area of oral language development
- Continue to support decision making at the school level; particularly focusing on supporting administrators in their role as instructional leaders
- Participate in the provincial development of a new Atlantic Collection of French books focusing on appropriate gradient levels for French Immersion
- Share the data internally, using the results as a starting point for discussion and further investigation with board partners and school based administrators
- Examine ways to better support the varied needs of all learners and to strengthen programs offered prior to early literacy support intervention.