



Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report

Goal Progress Measure 1.1 2nd Grade Literacy Intervention

Board Meeting Date: March 13, 2025

Reporting Period: December 02-20, 2024

GOAL 1 3rd grade Literacy

The percentage of 3rd-grade students earning meets grade level or above on the STAAR Reading Assessment in English or Spanish will increase from 47% in June 2024 to 59% by June 2029.

GPM 1.1 2nd Grade Literacy Intervention

The percentage of 2nd-grade students scoring in the recommended for intervention level on the NWEA MAP Reading Achievement Score Proficiency Indicator (below 30th percentile in English/40th percentile in Spanish) will decrease from 30% in June 2024 to 29% by June 2029.

District Initiatives Priority Alignment

District Initiative	Overview (Needs to be developed)	GPM Alignment
AISD Stronger Together	<i>Organizational Culture, Accountability, Communication, Outreach</i>	
Early Learning	<i>Enrollment, Literacy, Outreach, Partnerships, Expansion</i>	
Middle Years	<i>Engagement, Staffing, Funding, Scheduling and Support</i>	
Post Secondary Success	<i>College-Readiness, Equity, Enrollment, CTE and Graduation</i>	
Special Education	<i>Inclusiveness, Compliance, Sustainability</i>	



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

Austin ISD has long recognized literacy as key to student success. Our commitment to bilingual education and personalized learning has shaped a comprehensive framework that meets the diverse needs of our students. In recent years, we've reinforced our focus on research-based literacy practices, particularly early identification of reading challenges, structured literacy instruction, and rich, knowledge-building comprehension instruction. Through these efforts, we aim to equip students with foundational skills, comprehension, and biliteracy to excel in school and beyond.

Goal Progress Measure (GPM) 1.1 focuses on preventing reading challenges through proactive strategies, data-driven instruction, and ensuring that interventions are implemented early and consistently, helping more students achieve grade-level reading proficiency. The intention of this GPM is to decrease the percentage of students that, according to our literacy screener, should be considered for early reading interventions.

Our literacy philosophy is rooted in the Science of Reading, emphasizing phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. We use high-quality instructional materials with a Structured Literacy model delivering explicit, systematic teaching of foundational skills, and we use rich comprehension instruction focused on building knowledge and students' understanding of topics through diverse texts and discussion. We also focus on early support through a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) framework, which ensures timely, data-driven interventions and high-quality intervention materials to support all students, particularly those at risk for reading difficulties.

Austin ISD Beliefs

- The development of literacy and biliteracy is foundational to personal, cultural, and academic identity and successful life outcomes.
- Life-long success in literacy is rooted in a whole-child approach to education that fosters academic, social, and emotional development within dynamic and supportive school communities.
- Literacy includes the development of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and thinking in all languages and requires a thoughtful approach and knowledge of developmentally appropriate practices centered on the reading process.
- Families are partners with AISD in creating a strong, supportive environment for children to thrive academically, and we endeavor to provide resources and opportunities for families to support literacy development.



Practices We Embrace

- Science of Reading and Structured Literacy: Instruction is based on evidence and aligned with high-quality practices, focusing on phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension using high-quality texts.
- Early Literacy and Intervention: We focus on improving early literacy outcomes, using research-based interventions and consistent progress monitoring to support students. By tracking 2nd-grade reading data through NWEA MAP, we can intervene early, adjusting instruction and providing additional support to keep students on track for success in 3rd grade and beyond.
- Data-Driven Instruction: We utilize multiple data points to identify at-risk students, track progress, and adjust interventions to ensure students meet grade-level expectations.
- Culturally and Linguistically Responsive and Inclusive Teaching: Instruction is adapted to students' cultural backgrounds and varied abilities, ensuring that all programs, including dual language and ESL, among others, are accessible and meaningful with rich, cross-linguistic connections and tailored instruction that supports individualized literacy development.
- Collaborative Professional Learning: Teachers engage in continuous professional development through activities embedded into the school day, including PLCs and instructional coaching, equipping them with strategies to improve literacy instruction.
- Literacy Instruction Observation and Feedback: District and campus leaders observe classroom practices to ensure fidelity and provide actionable feedback for improvement.
- Family and Caregiver Engagement: We engage stakeholders—families, community partners, trustees, teachers, and campus leaders—through targeted outreach, tools for learning, and ongoing communication.

Alignment with District Initiatives

This Goal Progress Measure aligns with our draft district initiative, *Foundation First: Early Childhood*. This initiative positions Austin ISD as a leader in early childhood education by ensuring equitable, high-quality learning experiences for children from birth to grade 2. *Foundation First: Early Childhood* addresses enrollment challenges, expands early childhood programs, and prioritizes foundational literacy, numeracy, and social/emotional development to close achievement gaps and prepare students for long-term academic success.

The initiative includes several key projects regarding enrollment of our youngest learners and high-quality programming from birth to PK, but the initiative project most closely associated with this goal and goal progress measure is:

- K–2 Outcomes: Implementing robust foundational literacy and numeracy practices, strengthening Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and enhancing instructional alignment.

Milestones include efforts to develop high-quality, developmentally appropriate early childhood experiences for students and families, the development of foundational curriculum, and the implementation of new K–2 instructional frameworks as part of a more considerable plan to adopt one coherent and aligned District-wide Instructional and Assessment Framework. To achieve these



milestones and embrace a learning community mindset, Austin ISD leaders and schools will focus on embracing the idea that rigorous, high-quality learning experiences for all students are necessary for us to close the achievement gaps. By integrating evidence-based practices and providing ongoing professional development, we aim to disrupt inequitable outcomes, especially for historically underserved populations.

Key Data Findings

- Overall, we are decreasing the percentage of second-grade students scoring in the recommended-for-intervention level on the NWEA MAP Reading when comparing the winter of 2023 assessment to the winter of 2024 assessment, and when analyzing assessments longitudinally since spring of 2021. Specifically, we decreased the percentage of second-grade students scoring in the “recommended-for-intervention level” for all student groups from spring 2021 to spring 2024, and for eight out of ten student groups from winter 2023 to winter 2024.
- The following student groups have made the most progress when comparing the winter of 2023 to winter of 2024 NWEA MAP Reading assessment: Hispanic/LatinX, Two or More, Economic Disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and Special Education.
- The following student group stayed the same from the winter of 2023 to winter of 2024 NWEA MAP Reading assessment: African American.
- The following student group increased in the percentage of students scoring in the recommended-for-intervention level from winter 2023 (12 total students) to winter of 2024 (10 total students): American Indian. It is noted that this small group size predicts increased variability year to year.
- There is not an “On Track” methodology recommended by the administration or approved by the board; this will be part of our work as we refine our board monitoring reports. However, the data is showing improvement trends, which is encouraging. This is true for all student groups when analyzing end of year (spring) results, which is the final goal for yearly targets.



DATA ANALYSIS

The percentage of 2nd-grade students scoring in the recommended-for-intervention level on the NWEA MAP Reading Achievement Score Proficiency Indicator (30th percentile or below in English/40th percentile or below in Spanish) will decrease from 30% in June 2024 to 29% by June 2029.

Group	Past Years			Prior Year			Current Year			Yearly Targets (Spring End-of-Year)				
	20-21 (Spring)	21-22 (Spring)	22-23 (Spring)	23-24 (Fall)	23-24 (Winter)	23-24 (Spring)	24-25 (Fall)	24-25 (Winter)	24-25 (Spring)	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28	28-29
All Students	48	47	40	34	32	30	29	30	TBD	30	≤29	≤29	≤29	≤29
American Indian	71	25	33	10	13	45	30	30	TBD	42	38	35	32	29
Asian	21	25	26	23	21	18	15	19	TBD	≤25	≤25	≤25	≤25	≤25
African American	64	59	63	55	59	52	50	59	TBD	48	43	39	35	31
Hispanic/LatinX	64	61	56	43	42	41	37	38	TBD	39	36	33	31	29
Pacific Islander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	TBD					
Two or More	19	16	18	21	22	17	18	16	TBD	≤20	≤20	≤20	≤20	≤20
White	18	19	14	17	14	11	14	13	TBD	≤15	≤15	≤15	≤15	≤15
Economic Disadvantage	68	64	60	48	48	46	38	44	TBD	43	39	35	32	30
Emergent Bilingual	71	67	61	43	42	44	38	38	TBD	42	38	34	31	29
Special Education	70	69	69	51	53	48	39	46	TBD	45	41	37	33	29

GPM 1.1 is regarding 2nd grade reading performance on the NWEA MAP Assessment. Percentages reflect the percent of students performing at a level at which NWEA has indicated interventions are necessary to continue growth. The prescribed value is at or below the 30th percentile in Reading (English), or at or below the 40th percentile in Reading (Spanish). * = data masked due to <5 tests. - = no data available.



Key Takeaways

Due to the test design and its within-year moving targets, we analyze data by comparing the same points of time year-over-year, such as fall-to-fall, winter-to-winter, or spring-to-spring, rather than comparing across different seasons like fall-to-winter or winter-to-spring.

- The following student groups showed the most progress from winter 2023 to winter 2024: Hispanic/LatinX, Two or More Races, Economically Disadvantaged, Emergent Bilingual, and Special Education.
 - The Hispanic/LatinX, Economically Disadvantaged, and Emergent Bilingual groups saw a 4 percentage point improvement from winter to winter.
 - The Two or More Races group saw a 6 percentage point improvement from winter to winter.
 - The Special Education group saw a 7 percentage point improvement from winter to winter.
- The African American student group remained the same from winter to winter (59% to 59%) but showed progress from spring 2023 to spring 2024 (63% to 52%) and fall 2023 to fall 2024 (55% to 50%). Despite not making progress from winter 2023 to winter 2024, African American students have made a 12 percentage point improvement in spring comparisons since 2021, indicating ongoing longitudinal progress.
- The American Indian student group showed a decline from winter to winter. However, due to the small size of the group, data can show larger fluctuations. Despite the recent winter-to-winter decline, the American Indian group has made significant longitudinal progress, with a 26 percentage point improvement in spring comparisons since 2021.
- Overall, longitudinal spring data (2021-present) reveals progress across all student groups, with the largest percentage points of progress taking place in historically marginalized groups:
 - American Indian: decrease 26 percentage points
 - African American: decrease 12 percentage points
 - Hispanic: decrease 23 percentage points
 - Economically Disadvantaged: decrease 18 percentage points
 - Emergent Bilingual: decrease 17 percentage points
 - Special Education: decrease 21 percentage points
- Gaps between performance of white students and marginalized groups persist: There was a 46 percentage point gap between white students and both groups of Hispanic/LatinX & African American students in Spring 2021. As of Spring 2024, there was still a 30 percentage point gap between white students and Hispanic/LatinX students, and a 41 percentage point gap between white students and African American students. There is a need to improve learning gains for marginalized students, and gains at an accelerated rate for African American students.



The Root Cause

- Initial, post-COVID student outcomes are reflective of a lack of consistent and rigorous instruction, academic challenges, and inadequate instructional materials, limiting student growth and learning outcomes on many campuses and particularly for historically marginalized student groups.
- A national staffing shortage in education has led to a rise in the number of teachers who are new to the profession, and larger numbers of those alternatively certified or uncertified.
- The strategies that Austin ISD began putting into place in the 2023-24 school year and implemented more fully and with fidelity in the 2024-25 school year have resulted in improvement in scores and demonstrated their effectiveness, namely:
 - Alignment of curriculum guiding documents and HQIM to incorporate the evidence-based practices of Science of Reading
 - Content and pedagogy-based, ongoing professional learning for campus instructional leaders
 - High-quality literacy intervention materials, instruction, and a system of support (MTSS)
 - A focus on classroom implementation through observation, coaching, and feedback using common tools

Outliers

Overall, our band 1 schools have a higher percentage of students scoring at the recommended-for-intervention level on the winter 2024 NWEA MAP Reading assessment. The following campuses are outliers:

- Band 1 - Andrews, Barrington, Hart, Overton, Padron, Perez, Pickle
- Band 2 - Guerrero-Thompson, Palm

We engaged with administrators and teachers at the seven Band 1 outlier campuses. Themes that came out in every response include:

- Fidelity to curriculum: Explicit and systematic instruction in foundational skills, comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency is supported by district academic team and curriculum documents.
- Consistent use of high-quality resources: HMH, UFLI, Próximo Paso al Éxito, and Camino al Exito were specifically named. HMH supports Tier 1 instruction, and the intervention resources are valued for their ease of use and targeted approach to addressing specific learning gaps.
- PLC collaborative work: Teachers engaged in planning to build alignment and make refinements, also developing teacher capacity and team cohesion.



- Support from Instructional Coaches: These roles provide PLC support, lesson modeling, teacher coaching, and support campus alignment of instructional practices.
- Ongoing Professional Learning in early literacy has been and will continue to be systematically provided to Principals, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coaches, and PLC leads. These groups create campus vision and alignment and turn around the learning to teachers.
- Instructional Leadership Teams: The teams conduct observation and feedback coaching cycles, assess trends, and support campus planning and implementation. They are regularly aligned on expectations and support to ensure consistency and effectiveness.
- Fidelity to MTSS processes: Data-driven decision making begins with assessment, interventions, setting meaningful, time-sensitive goals for students, and intentionally monitoring progress to refine instructional strategies.
- Improved Tier 1 instruction as a result of all of the above.

Progress of Initiatives

The key project of the Early Learning Initiative that relates to GPM 1.1 is K–2 Academic Outcomes: Implementation of robust foundational literacy and numeracy practices, strengthening Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and enhancing instructional alignment. This is a five-year initiative, beginning with SY 2024-25 and culminating in SY 2028-29.

Work specific to the K-2 Outcomes project within the Foundation First: Early Childhood District Initiative has already begun in the 2024-25 school year. Substantial, district-wide work includes:

- Implementation of instructional resources that are aligned to research on high-quality early literacy and early numeracy practices that support student learning and achievement
- Implementation of walkthrough documents with practices specific to early literacy, early numeracy, behavior, and social/emotional well-being
- Continued walkthrough calibrations with district and campus leadership to ensure common understanding and identification of best practices in the early grades
- Ongoing, frequent professional learning sessions for campus instructional leaders with a primary focus on K-2 literacy content and practices, but also including K-2 math

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

- Percentage of third graders meeting or exceeding STAAR Reading Assessment expectations - Last year, 47% of students met or exceeded STAAR reading expectations. STAAR results for this year are not yet available.
- Percentage of second graders in the intervention range on NWEA MAP - Overall, longitudinal data reveals progress across all student groups, while year-over-year winter assessment data shows improvement in 8 out of 10 student groups.
- Percentage of students performing on grade level by the end of kindergarten and first grade through NWEA MAP achievement percentiles as early indicators of performance leading into second grade.



- Percentage of students who are receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and the longitudinal movement of those students across tiers. Additionally, qualitative monitoring of intervention and progress monitoring plans in eCST.
- Year-over-year data results and analysis on the NWEA MAP Reading assessment to determine allocation of supports and resources in order to address achievement gaps and decrease the predictability of who succeeds and who fails.
- Observational data of teacher implementation from literacy walkthroughs.
- Participation in professional development focused on literacy.

The Plan Forward

We will build on the growth by continuing to provide systematic professional learning:

- Monthly professional learning focused on early literacy and the AISD literacy curriculum and resources for principals, assistant principals, instructional coaches, and teacher leaders.
- Explicit support to these groups to provide high quality campus based professional learning for all teachers.
- Principal coaching provided by executive directors on a cadence differentiated by data-driven decision making.
- Campus leadership team coaching cycles on literacy, including observation of instruction, calibration of expectations, and feedback to teachers.
- Differentiating these opportunities for campuses based on campus- and student-level outcomes.
- Evaluate the outcome of these efforts through quantitative and qualitative feedback loops.

We will also continue to provide systematic support to strengthen the MTSS system on elementary campuses, including:

- Continuous improvement in all tiers of instruction: Monitoring and providing feedback for adjustment of Tier 1 instruction through frequent classroom visits with campus leadership teams and refining and strengthening Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions and resources.
- Monitoring universal screening assessments and placement of students in Tier 2 and 3 to monitor the effectiveness of interventions.
- Providing extensive guidance for campus instructional schedules, including reviewing and providing feedback for adjustments as needed.
- Providing disaggregated data to inform intervention grouping, goal setting with and for students, progress monitoring, and instructional adjustments and coaching on how to accomplish these goals.
- Monitoring and coaching observation and feedback cycles on campus, including identifying teachers in need of additional support and providing commensurate coaching for improvement.
- Providing increased support to campuses according to our Support & Resource Index, including frequency of instructional leadership coaching, support with monitoring practices, allocation of resources, prioritizing responses, prioritized professional development, and assisting with data-based planning for improvement.
- Evaluating the outcome of these efforts through quantitative and qualitative feedback loops.



Other strategies for improvement of the overall literacy system and engagement in the work:

- Deepen Data Use in Literacy Walkthroughs: Engage in exemplar learning walks with priority & high-priority leaders and teachers
- Enhance coaching and professional development by adjusting the PLC format to improve understanding of high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) and provide differentiated professional development at level meetings.
- Family Engagement: Increase parent participation in progress monitoring and literacy initiatives, especially for historically underserved groups.
- Intervention support: Allocate content interventionists to campuses with larger populations of underserved students.
- Identify and learn from teacher outliers to expand successful practices.
-



APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Campus-Level Data

The percentage of 2nd-grade students scoring in the recommended-for-intervention level on the NWEA MAP Reading Achievement Score Proficiency Indicator (30th percentile or below in English/40th percentile or below in Spanish)

Campus Level Data, Disaggregated by Groups, Ordered by SRI Band (Winter 24-25)

Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Andrews ES	1	36.0	*	*	*	36.6	-	-	*	34.8	39.5	70.0
Barrington ES	1	35.8	-	*	*	34.0	-	*	-	36.5	35.0	75.0
Brown ES	1	63.9	-	62.5	85.7	62.5	-	-	*	65.0	66.7	69.2
Cook ES	1	42.6	-	*	*	40.0	-	-	*	40.4	34.9	66.7
Dawson ES	1	52.2	-	-	*	52.6	-	*	*	61.1	55.6	*
Galindo ES	1	42.2	-	*	*	40.5	-	*	*	40.5	27.6	55.6
Govalle ES	1	49.1	-	-	66.7	46.7	-	-	*	52.1	50.0	70.0
Harris ES	1	54.5	-	*	80.0	44.0	-	*	-	51.9	40.0	70.0
Hart ES	1	35.3	-	*	*	33.3	-	*	*	36.7	32.7	47.1
Houston ES	1	50.0	-	-	*	47.8	-	*	-	47.6	41.5	63.2
Jordan ES	1	62.5	-	*	58.3	61.9	-	*	50.0	61.9	64.1	87.5
Langford ES	1	45.1	-	*	*	44.9	-	-	-	46.0	32.4	64.7
Linder ES	1	43.9	-	*	*	44.9	-	*	*	43.8	41.8	55.6



Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Norman-Sims ES	1	55.9	-	-	55.6	56.0	-	-	-	56.3	47.1	66.7
Oak Springs ES	1	80.6	-	-	75.0	82.6	-	-	*	82.4	*	75.0
Ortega ES	1	62.5	-	-	85.7	57.1	-	-	*	64.3	66.7	75.0
Overton ES	1	30.6	-	-	41.7	29.2	-	*	*	30.4	27.0	63.6
Padron ES	1	30.6	-	-	-	31.0	-	-	*	31.0	30.3	33.3
Pecan Springs ES	1	63.3	-	*	71.4	61.9	-	*	-	63.3	52.9	*
Perez ES	1	34.4	-	-	*	35.1	-	*	-	37.5	39.5	30.4
Pickle ES	1	20.8	-	-	*	21.3	-	-	-	19.6	18.2	33.3
Rodriguez ES	1	48.3	-	-	*	48.2	-	-	-	50.0	37.5	61.5
Sanchez ES	1	46.4	-	-	*	46.2	-	*	-	44.4	41.7	53.8
Walnut Creek ES	1	39.1	-	16.7	*	41.1	-	-	40.0	40.3	31.6	60.0
Widen ES	1	37.9	-	-	*	38.5	-	*	*	38.2	20.7	75.0
Winn Montessori	1	52.9	-	-	57.1	63.6	-	*	12.5	70.6	65.0	63.6
Wooldridge ES	1	61.9	-	*	*	61.4	-	*	*	66.7	61.2	78.6
Wooten ES	1	34.2	-	-	-	32.4	-	-	*	35.1	26.7	60.0
Allison ES	2	60.6	*	-	*	57.6	-	-	*	61.9	43.5	50.0
Blackshear ES	2	25.0	-	*	37.5	35.3	-	*	9.1	50.0	-	57.1
Campbell ES	2	38.2	-	*	53.3	55.6	-	*	0.0	50.0	20.0	50.0
Graham ES	2	35.2	-	-	71.4	31.6	-	-	28.6	37.7	29.5	60.0



Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Guerrero-Thompson ES	2	24.3	-	*	*	23.9	-	-	-	23.6	21.2	57.1
McBee ES	2	38.8	-	-	*	35.6	-	-	*	41.3	32.6	66.7
Odom ES	2	50.0	-	-	*	50.0	-	-	*	52.8	66.7	41.7
Palm ES	2	19.2	*	-	*	17.8	-	*	*	22.2	16.7	32.0
Pillow ES	2	54.9	-	*	60.0	60.5	-	*	20.0	55.6	66.7	45.5
Pleasant Hill ES	2	41.5	-	*	50.0	39.5	-	-	*	41.7	44.4	55.6
St Elmo ES	2	35.0	-	*	*	36.7	-	*	20.0	35.5	34.6	70.0
Zavala ES	2	47.1	-	*	71.4	43.5	-	*	*	48.4	57.1	50.0
Blanton ES	3	22.7	-	*	85.7	27.3	-	0.0	9.1	45.0	34.8	70.0
Blazier ES	3	34.8	-	28.6	60.0	38.3	-	27.3	12.9	48.1	40.9	51.3
Boone ES	3	39.1	-	*	*	54.8	-	40.0	17.4	40.0	66.7	66.7
Casey ES	3	46.4	-	*	60.0	50.0	-	*	35.7	52.5	46.7	64.7
Cowan ES	3	29.8	*	0.0	*	34.3	-	50.0	25.0	53.6	28.6	62.5
Cunningham ES	3	32.1	-	*	-	39.4	-	*	19.0	45.8	50.0	31.6
Davis ES	3	13.7	-	0.0	37.5	28.0	-	0.0	7.0	34.4	12.5	30.3
Doss ES	3	12.8	-	5.6	20.0	41.9	-	9.1	4.4	41.2	40.7	39.1
Joslin ES	3	40.0	-	*	*	42.9	-	20.0	36.4	58.8	50.0	81.8
Kocurek ES	3	26.3	-	*	*	25.0	*	20.0	28.6	32.4	0.0	53.8
Menchaca ES	3	30.6	-	*	83.3	29.6	-	*	22.0	48.6	28.0	35.3



Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Oak Hill ES	3	25.6	*	*	*	34.0	-	20.0	16.1	34.8	34.1	46.7
Patton ES	3	29.8	-	20.0	62.5	36.1	-	11.1	22.2	53.3	66.7	52.6
Reilly ES	3	32.1	-	*	*	33.3	-	20.0	36.4	40.0	37.0	33.3
Summitt ES	3	23.9	-	32.0	80.0	25.0	-	0.0	17.6	51.9	40.7	33.3
Sunset Valley ES	3	15.4	-	*	*	22.9	-	*	0.0	33.3	35.7	38.5
Travis Heights ES	3	23.6	-	50.0	60.0	26.7	-	14.3	8.7	34.8	25.0	26.7
Williams ES	3	23.9	-	*	-	17.5	-	*	*	28.6	14.3	64.3
Baldwin ES	4	15.0	-	10.0	*	23.1	-	*	12.8	41.7	50.0	29.4
Baranoff ES	4	11.8	-	*	*	10.0	-	33.3	8.8	15.8	28.6	14.3
Barton Hills ES	4	0.0	-	-	-	*	-	*	0.0	*	-	0.0
Bear Creek ES	4	12.4	*	0.0	-	22.2	-	0.0	15.9	20.0	0.0	42.9
Becker ES	4	21.1	-	*	*	20.5	*	0.0	25.0	50.0	16.7	40.0
Brentwood ES	4	16.8	-	*	*	33.3	*	8.3	10.4	46.2	*	27.8
Bryker Woods ES	4	20.6	-	*	-	16.7	-	0.0	31.6	*	*	40.0
Casis ES	4	6.4	*	0.0	*	30.0	-	*	4.1	33.3	*	9.1
Clayton ES	4	5.4	-	0.0	-	11.1	-	14.3	4.0	*	*	18.8
Gullett ES	4	8.5	-	-	-	20.0	-	0.0	7.1	*	*	5.9
Highland Park ES	4	12.6	-	*	*	18.5	-	0.0	10.4	28.6	*	47.4
Hill ES	4	15.1	-	0.0	*	24.1	-	8.3	12.9	37.5	25.0	39.1
Kiker ES	4	12.6	-	12.5	*	26.3	*	20.0	9.1	*	44.4	10.5



Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Lee ES	4	3.2	-	*	-	0.0	-	*	3.9	0.0	*	11.8
Maplewood ES	4	26.7	-	*	83.3	35.7	-	12.5	13.8	62.5	50.0	75.0
Mathews ES	4	19.1	-	*	*	26.9	-	*	12.1	30.4	14.3	38.5
Mills ES	4	15.0	-	0.0	*	10.5	-	12.5	19.0	40.0	11.1	27.0
Ridgetop ES	4	9.5	-	*	*	16.0	-	11.1	3.8	37.5	42.9	10.0
Zilker ES	4	18.3	-	*	*	28.0	-	16.7	9.6	30.4	*	38.9
District Total	NA	30	30	19	59	38	*	16	13	44	38	46

*GPM 1.1 is regarding 2nd grade reading performance on the Winter NWEA MAP Assessment. Percentages reflect the percent of students performing at a level at which NWEA has indicated interventions are necessary to continue growth. The prescribed value is at or below the 30th percentile in Math or Reading, and at or below the 40th percentile in Reading (Spanish). * = data masked due to <5 tests. - = no data available.*



Appendix 2: Defining the Progress Measure

This goal progress measure uses the NWEA MAP achievement percentile measure, and identifies the percentage of students in Austin ISD 2nd Grade who are scoring at or below the 30th percentile in reading for English or the 40th percentile in reading for Spanish. All students in 2nd Grade in Austin ISD take the reading MAP assessment three times a year.

In NWEA MAP, the "achievement percentile" represents the percentage of students nationwide at the same grade level who scored lower than or equal to a particular student's RIT score, essentially indicating how well a student performed compared to their peers across the country based on their test results; a higher percentile means the student performed better compared to others in their grade level.

Key points about achievement percentile:

- Norm-based: This percentile is calculated based on a national norm group of students at the same grade level.
- Interpretation: A 50th percentile indicates the student scored at the national average, while a higher percentile means they scored above average.
- Used in reports: The achievement percentile is displayed on NWEA MAP reports to show a student's relative standing compared to their peers.

Austin ISD adheres to NWEA's recommendations that students who are scoring at or below the 30th or 40th percentile in reading might be at risk for reading difficulties and may need targeted reading interventions.

Appendix 3: Root Cause and Theory of Change

Our root cause analysis of this current data set uncovered several areas of focus that are needed to continue as areas of strength where successes are evident, as well as areas of improvement:

- Initial, post-COVID student outcomes are reflective of a lack of consistent and rigorous instruction, academic challenges, and inadequate instructional materials, limiting student growth and learning outcomes on many campuses and particularly for historically marginalized student groups.
- A national staffing shortage in education has led to a rise in the number of teachers who are new to the profession, and larger numbers of those alternatively certified or uncertified.
- The strategies that Austin ISD began putting into place in the 2023-24 school year and implemented more fully and with fidelity in the 2024-25 school year have resulted in improvement in scores and demonstrated their effectiveness, and should be refined for continued implementation in the coming year.

There is a need for continued analysis and root causes that identify why the African American student population is improving at a slower rate than other marginalized student populations.



Theory of Change

By prioritizing structured literacy instruction, and equitable access to high-quality instructional materials (HQIM), and early identification of possible reading difficulties, we will improve reading outcomes and long-term academic success for all students. Research shows that early literacy proficiency is crucial, particularly in meeting grade-level reading benchmarks by the end of third grade, which strongly predicts high school graduation and postsecondary success ([Lesnick et al., 2010](#)).

Key Elements of Our Theory of Change

- **Structured Literacy Instruction:** Emphasizes explicit, systematic, and cumulative instruction aligned with the Science of Reading. This approach ensures mastery of foundational skills in phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension ([Schwartz, 2025](#)). Explicit instruction benefits struggling readers by eliminating guesswork and promoting consistent skill acquisition ([Cabell & Hwang, 2020](#); [Connor et al., 2009](#)).
- **Early Intervention and Progress Monitoring:** Timely support through early intervention and progress monitoring is critical to improving student outcomes. Regular assessments help identify students in need of targeted interventions, allowing teachers to provide support at the earliest signs of difficulty ([Zhang et al., 2023](#)). The response to intervention in the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) framework ensures that students receive differentiated and evidence-based interventions based on their specific needs ([Majeika et al., 2024](#)).
- **High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM):** Using high-quality instructional materials (HQIM) that are research-based and aligned with rigorous standards is essential for ensuring equitable access to a high-quality education. These materials support teachers in delivering grade-level content and promote deeper learning and comprehension for all students ([Steiner, 2024](#)). When implemented effectively, HQIM can close learning gaps and accelerate student growth.
- **Professional Development and Coaching:** Ongoing professional development and instructional coaching are key to empowering educators to implement evidence-based practices with fidelity. Professional learning focuses on translating research into practice, providing teachers with the tools and strategies necessary to deliver effective literacy instruction ([Dilgard et al., 2022](#)). Personalized coaching supports continuous growth and fosters reflective practices that improve student outcomes ([Connor et al., 2009](#)).
- **Culturally Responsive Practices:** Culturally responsive teaching is integral to our literacy framework, promoting engagement and academic success by recognizing and honoring students' languages, cultures, and lived experiences ([Min & Orosco, 2024](#)). This approach strengthens students' connections to learning, builds on their existing knowledge, and helps them see themselves reflected in the curriculum ([Noguerón-Liu, 2020](#)). Research underscores the importance of culturally relevant practices in improving literacy outcomes for English learners and historically marginalized populations.



Appendix 4: Supporting Implementation Data / Research

Reading on Grade Level in Third Grade: How Is It Related to High School Performance and College Enrollment?

"Students who are reading on grade level by third grade are significantly more likely to graduate from high school and enroll in college compared to their peers who are not reading proficiently." (Lesnick et al., 2010)

Individualizing Student Instruction Precisely: Effects of Child × Instruction Interactions on First Graders' Literacy Development

"Individualized literacy instruction tailored to the specific needs of first graders significantly improves literacy development compared to more general instructional approaches." (Connor et al., 2009)

Building Content Knowledge to Boost Comprehension in the Primary Grades

"Building background knowledge in the early grades has a direct and positive impact on comprehension, particularly in content-rich texts." (Cabell & Hwang, 2020)

Expanding the Knowledge Base in Literacy Instruction and Assessment: Biliteracy and Translanguaging Perspectives from Families, Communities, and Classrooms

"Leveraging biliteracy and translanguaging practices in classrooms empowers students by connecting their home languages and cultures to their academic learning." (Noguerón-Liu, 2020)

Beyond Decoding: A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Language Comprehension Interventions on K–5 Students' Language and Literacy Outcomes

"Language comprehension interventions play a crucial role in improving students' reading and overall literacy outcomes beyond phonics and decoding." (Silverman et al., 2020)

Researchers Created a Phonics Program With “Dramatic” Results: How It Works

"Implementing research-based phonics programs can result in significant improvements in students' reading skills." (Schwartz, 2025)

Embracing Oral Traditions in the Early Literacy Classroom

"Oral traditions provide a foundation for early literacy skills by promoting listening comprehension, storytelling, and language development."

Response to Intervention (RTI): Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS): A Nationwide Analysis

"Nationwide data highlights the importance of multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS) in identifying and supporting students with academic challenges early on." (Zhang et al., 2023)

Integrated Multi-Tiered Systems of Support in Elementary Schools: Practical Applications

"Integrating MTSS into elementary schools helps address the diverse needs of students through data-driven decision-making and evidence-based interventions." (Majeika et al., 2024)



The Unrealized Promise of High-Quality Instructional Materials

"High-quality instructional materials have the potential to greatly improve student learning outcomes, but their promise is often unrealized due to inconsistent implementation." (Steiner, 2024)

Promoting English Learners' Literacy Development Through Culturally Responsive Teaching

"Culturally responsive teaching promotes English learners' literacy development by incorporating students' cultural backgrounds into instruction." (Min & Orosco, 2024)

References

- Cabell, S. Q., & Hwang, H. (2020). Building content knowledge to boost comprehension in the primary grades.
- Connor, C. M., Piasta, S. B., Glasney, S., Schatschneider, C., Crowe, E., Underwood, P., Fishman, B., & Morrison, F. J. (2009). Individualizing student instruction precisely: Effects of child × instruction interactions on first graders' literacy development. *Child Development*, 80(1), 77–100.
- Dilgard, C., Hodges, T. S., & Coleman, J. (2022). Phonics instruction in early literacy: Examining professional learning, instructional resources, and intervention intensity. *Reading Psychology*, 43(8), 541–575.
- Lesnick, J., Goerge, R. M., Smithgall, C., & Gwynne, J. (2010). Reading on grade level in third grade: How is it related to high school performance and college enrollment? A longitudinal analysis of third-grade students in Chicago in 1996-97 and their educational outcomes. A report to the Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Majeika, C. E., Pierce, J., Smith, H., Lembke, E., & Gandhi, A. (2024). Integrated multi-tiered systems of support in elementary schools: Practical applications. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 60(1), 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10534512241254031>
- Min, K. M., & Orosco, M. (2024). Promoting English learners' literacy development through culturally responsive teaching. In *Promoting English learners' literacy development through culturally responsive teaching* (pp. 7–1). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40858-8_7-1
- Noguerón-Liu, S. (2020). Expanding the knowledge base in literacy instruction and assessment: Biliteracy and translanguaging perspectives from families, communities, and classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S307–S318).
- Schwartz, S. (2025). Researchers created a phonics program with “dramatic” results: How it works. *Education Week*, 44(16), 4–5.
- Silverman, R. D., Johnson, E., Keane, K., & Khanna, S. (2020). Beyond decoding: A meta-analysis of the effects of language comprehension interventions on K–5 students' language and literacy outcomes. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 55(S207–S233).



- Steiner, D. (2024). The unrealized promise of high-quality instructional materials. State Education Standard, 24(1).
- Zhang, J., Martella, R. C., Kang, S., & Yenioglu, B. Y. (2023). Response to intervention (RTI)/multi-tiered systems of support (MTSS): A nationwide analysis. Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, 7(1).

Appendix 5: Glossary

- **HQIM** – High-Quality Instructional Materials. Research-based, standards-aligned resources designed to support rigorous and equitable instruction.
- **GPM** – Goal Progress Measure. A tool used to track progress toward achieving specific goals, ensuring accountability and continuous improvement.
- **MTSS** – Multi-Tiered Systems of Support. A comprehensive framework for providing differentiated instruction and interventions based on students' needs.
- **PLC** – Professional Learning Community. A group of educators that collaborates regularly to reflect on and improve teaching practices, focusing on student learning outcomes.
- **eCST** – Electronic Child Study Team. A digital platform used to monitor student progress, manage interventions, and facilitate collaboration among educators to support student success.
- **KPI** – Key Performance Indicator. A measurable value that indicates how effectively an individual, team, or organization is achieving specific objectives.