Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report

Goal Progress Measure 1.1 2nd Grade Literacy Intervention

Board Meeting Date: August 14, 2025

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	*Organizational Culture, Accountability, Communication, Outreach*	
Early Learning	*Enrollment, Literary, Outreach, Partnerships, Expansion*	⬤
Middle Years	*Engagement, Staffing, Funding, Scheduling and Support*	
Post Secondary Success	*College-Readiness, Equity, Enrollment, CTE and Graduation*	
Special Education	*Inclusiveness, Compliance, Sustainability*	

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

Data reported shows the percentage of students who are scoring at recommended-for-intervention levels. Positive progress means a reduction in the percentage, showing that less students would be identified for intervention in literacy.

- In comparing end-of-year results between Spring 2024 and Spring 2025, there were improvements in the All Students category as well as every student population. The largest gains were:
    - American Indian (decrease of 18 percentage points)
    - Hispanic/LatinX (decrease of 6 percentage points)
    - Economic Disadvantage (decrease of 6 percentage points)
    - Emergent Bilingual (decrease of 6 percentage points)
    - Special Education (decrease of 5 percentage points)
- The district exceeded the All Students 2025 target of 30% by 4 percentage points, scoring at 26%.
- The district exceeded the 2025 targets in 8 of 9 student populations.
- The district did not meet the 2025 target for the African American student population, scoring at 50% and therefore falling short by 2 percentage points of the goal of 48%.

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 <u>decrease</u> from 30% in June 2024 to 29% by June 2029.

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

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2025/2026 - GPM 1.1

Key Takeaways

- In comparing end-of-year results between Spring 2024 and Spring 2025, there were improvements in the All Students category as well as every student population (see Appendix 2). The largest gains were:
  - American Indian (decrease of 18 percentage points)
  - Hispanic/LatinX (decrease of 6 percentage points)
  - Economic Disadvantage (decrease of 6 percentage points)
  - Emergent Bilingual (decrease of 6 percentage points)
  - Special Education (decrease of 5 percentage points)
- The district exceeded the All Students 2025 target of 30% by 4 percentage points, scoring at 26%.
- The district exceeded the 2025 targets in 8 of 9 student populations.
- The district did not meet the 2025 target for the African American student population, scoring at 50% and therefore falling short by 2 percentage points of the goal of 48%.
- When looking at the past three years of Spring results, the district has improved by the following percentage points from Spring 2023 to Spring 2025 (See Appendix 2):
  - All Students - decrease of 14 percentage points
  - American Indian - decrease of 6 percentage points
  - Asian - decrease of 10 percentage points
  - African American - decrease of 13 percentage points
  - Hispanic/LatinX - decrease of 21 percentage points
  - Two or More - decrease of 4 percentage points
  - White - decrease of 4 percentage points
  - Economic Disadvantage - decrease of 20 percentage points
  - Emergent Bilingual - decrease of 23 percentage points
  - Special Education - decrease of 26 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 2025, there is still a 25 percentage point gap between white students and Hispanic/LatinX students, and a 40 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 more consistency with 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
- Austin ISD continues to study clear root causes of the comparatively slower progress of African American student outcomes. Although explorations of correlated factors such as concentrations of teacher vacancies, remaining effects from inconsistency in delivery of instruction, a need for tighter MTSS systems, and systemic barriers have yielded some theories, still work must be intensified to more concretely identify root causes through observation, evaluation, and active classroom-level and campus-level strategies to accelerate student outcomes.

Outliers

Of the 40 Band 1 and 2 campuses, the percentage of students recommended for intervention ranged from 10% to 81%, with an average of 45% for Band 1 and 36% for Band 2—resulting in a combined average of 42%. Notably, 15 campuses emerged as outliers, with fewer than 35% of students falling in the recommended for intervention range. Among these 15 campuses, 13 demonstrated a reduction in the percentage of students recommended for intervention from BOY to EOY—several by more than 15 percentage points. This is particularly significant given that the complexity of the assessment increases across the year, making it more common to see improvement when comparing the same testing window year over year. Furthermore, 9 of our Band 1 and 2 campuses showed a decrease in the percentage of students recommended for intervention across all primary grade levels from BOY to EOY, highlighting consistent progress in early literacy interventions and core instruction.

Palm Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 30% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 75% certified, 6% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 323 students, DL, Headstart, Bil. Resource, Bil. ECSE, SBS

- Demographics: 90% Hispanic/LatinX, 3% AA, 5% White, 2% Two or More, 35% special education, 85% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 75% favorable (-1 compared to district)
- Success factors: Progress was driven by consistent, high-quality instruction and a strong collaborative culture. Teachers implemented the HQIM with fidelity. Weekly PLCs focused on data analysis, which guided responsive small group instruction and timely interventions. The team maintained a student-centered mindset, working closely together and supporting one another—including creating shared plans to keep students on track when a teammate was absent.

Guerrero-Thompson Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 39% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 82% certified, 9% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 518 students, Bil. Resource, ECSE, Bil. ECSE, DL, Head Start, Project Lead the Way: STEM
- Demographics: 90% Hispanic/LatinX, 5% AA, 2% White, 2% Asian, 1% Two or More, 21% special education, 98% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 88% favorable (+13 compared to district)
- Success factors: Teachers are eager to work collaboratively to plan in PLCs and review student progress in weekly data meetings, especially with TIA potential at $29K. Teachers, IC, and specialists worked hard to provide consistent interventions throughout the year. The campus leadership team provided consistent observation and feedback to monitor and improve instruction and interventions.

Campbell Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 54% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 82% certified, 11% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 179 students, LS, Fine Arts Academy, Digital Media, CLI
- Demographics: 29% Hispanic/LatinX, 40% AA, 17% White, 6% Asian, 8% Two or More, 26% special education, 73% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 80% favorable (+5 compared to district)
- Success factors: An ongoing system of regular PLCs meetings to internalize lessons and analyze student progress was strengthened by a focus on learning HMH and foundational literacy routines, as well as the adopted intervention resources. Small group interventions were consistently provided, and the leadership team engaged in consistent observation and feedback protocols to strengthen instruction.

Wooten Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 26% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 74% certified, _% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 267 students, Bil. Resource, Bil. ECSE, ECSE, LS, DL, CLI
- Demographics: 90% Hispanic/LatinX, 3% AA, 7% White, 25% special education, 90% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 63% favorable (-13 compared to district)

- Success factors: Teachers were committed to learning HMH and trying to implement the tier 1 routines effectively. Teachers were consistent with interventions.

Hart Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 36% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 83% certified, 11% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 565 students, Bil. Resource, Bil. LS, LS, SBS, DL, AVID Project Lead the Way: STEM
- Demographics: 83% Hispanic/LatinX, 7% AA, 5% White, 4% Asian, 1% Two or More, 21% special education, 93% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 75% favorable (+/- 0 compared to district)
- Success factors: Success stemmed from a strong campus-wide commitment to using K-2 HQIM resources (HMH) with fidelity. One key factor was the consistent support provided by the content interventionist, which laid a strong foundation for small group instruction and early intervention. Alongside our instructional coach, teams regularly analyzed student data to adjust, support, and regroup students as needed. Teachers were intentional in balancing targeted intervention with strong Tier 1 instruction. During PLCs, teachers came prepared to discuss student progress, and the instructional coach provided ongoing support through coaching cycles. The admin team consistently monitored tiered intervention groups, beginning with focused professional development and reinforcing expectations throughout the year.

Overton Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 30% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 81% certified, 9% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 432 students, DL, ECSE, SBS/SCORES, rec. center
- Demographics: 81% Hispanic/LatinX, 16% AA, 2% White, Two or More 1%, 18% special education, 91% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 69% favorable (-6 compared to district)
- Success factors: Primary grade teams have strong literacy expertise and collaborate effectively within and beyond PLCs to support all students. Fidelity to HMH was strengthened and increased campus leadership team focus on early literacy, in addition to STAAR tested grade levels, led to better monitoring of targeted student supports in K–2nd grade. With stronger use of HQIM and increased classroom observation and feedback, primary teachers experienced meaningful progress around shared goals.

Pickle Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 37% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 86% certified, 12% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 381 students, Bil. Resource, LS, ECSE, SCS/SBS, AVID, DL, CLI
- Demographics: 91% Hispanic/LatinX, 6% AA, 1% White, 1% Pacific Islander, 1% Two or More, 23% special education, 96% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: Climate score: 82% favorable (+7 compared to district)

- Success factors: Improvements in literacy were due to several factors. First, being a Lighthouse School was instrumental in advancing instructional leadership. Through this coaching model, the leadership team developed a deeper understanding of the lessons and the curriculum, which strengthened HMH implementation. Frequent observation and feedback, with teacher coaching from the leadership team also advanced the work. Above all, consistent adherence to the curriculum was the key to success.

Andrews Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 46% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 90% certified, 3% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 300 students, Bil. Resource, Bil. ECSE, Bil. SCS, DL, CLI
- Demographics: 79% Hispanic/LatinX, 7% AA, 6% White, 1% American Indian, 6% Asian, 1% Two or More, 20% special education, 96% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: Climate score: 81% favorable (+6 compared to district)
- Success factors: Growth was driven by flexible student grouping and the consistent implementation of UFLI and *El próximo paso al éxito* for reading interventions. Teachers regularly analyzed student data and made ongoing adjustments to small group instruction. Additionally, a consistent reading buddies program gave DL and non-DL students opportunities to interact and apply literacy skills in a low-risk, supportive setting. This initiative also fostered a sense of inclusivity among both students and staff.

Langford Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 52% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 82% certified, 5% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 403 students, Bil. Resource, Bil. ECSE, LS, ECSE, SCS, DL, AVID, CLI
- Demographics: 91% Hispanic/LatinX, 4% AA, 2% White, 2% Pacific Islander, 1% Two or More, 28% special education, 95% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: Climate score: 66% favorable (-9 compared to district)
- Success factors: Progress was driven by a strong focus on student goal setting and accountability. Students set individual goals and tracked them with teacher support, and teachers reviewed progress regularly in PLCs. Teacher buy-in and confidence with progress monitoring grew through consistent PLC collaboration. The IC, campus leadership team, and special education staff participated in PLCs, which led to more aligned and consistent instructional strategy implementation and the use of accommodations. Consistent observation and feedback routines increased accountability. A culture of high expectations was strengthened with celebrations of student effort and growth.

Widen Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 32% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 92% certified, 5% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 414 students, Bil. Resource, Bil. ECSE, ECSE, SCS, DL, CLI
- Demographics: 88% Hispanic/LatinX, 7% AA, 3% White,2% Two or More, 26% special education, 91% economically disadvantaged

- Climate score: Climate score: 76% favorable (+1 compared to district)
- Success factors: Implementation of HQIM, with clear expectations to use HMH, positively impacted growth. Additionally, improving interventions and using district intervention resources positively impacted outcomes for students receiving small group interventions.

Perez Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 35% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 95% certified, 7% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 470 students, DL, Bil. ECSE, Bil. LS, LS, CLI
- Demographics: 91% Hispanic/LatinX, 3% AA, 3% White, 1% Asian, 2% Two or More, 30% special education , 91%economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 74% favorable (-1 compared to district)
- Success factors: Tiered interventions were consistently implemented throughout the year and Title I-funded support for staff and students, including an instructional coach and a content interventionist, contributed to a reduction in the number of students needing intervention.

Rodriguez Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 51% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 87% certified, 6% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 385 students, DL, Bil. Resource, Life Skills, Bil. Life Skills, ECSE, Bil. ECSE, Head Start, CLI
- Demographics: 91% Hispanic/LatinX, 7% AA, 1% White, 1% Two or More, 29% special education, 97% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 69% favorable (-6 compared to district)
- Success factors: Teachers used data to set individual student goals, monitor progress during PLCs, and collaborate closely with special education staff, who participated in PLCs regularly. Targeted interventions included *Really Great Reading*, with additional reading support provided specifically for 2nd grade students. Positive classroom environments, strong teacher-student relationships, and an emphasis on growth mindset further contributed to increased student engagement and academic progress.

Houston Elementary:
- Teacher Tenure: 43% of teachers have 0-5 years experience
- Teacher Certification & Vacancy Rate: 80% certified, 9% vacancy
- Campus size & programs: 492 students, Bil. Resource, Bil. LS, Bil. ECSE, Bil. SCS, ECSE, LS, DL, CLI
- Demographics: 90% Hispanic/LatinX, 6% AA, 3% White, 1% Two or More, 33% special education, 93% economically disadvantaged
- Climate score: 74% favorable (-1 compared to district)
- Success factors: The campus leadership team and teachers prioritized weekly progress monitoring and targeted small group instruction to address student needs in real time. Additionally, content interventionists and part-time tutors provided additional focused support to 1st and 2nd grade students in small group reading intervention, three times a week.

Outlier Trends: Campus progress was fueled by consistent instruction, purposeful use of data, strong collaboration, and a shared commitment to meeting the needs of every learner. The alignment of instructional strategy, support systems, and a positive school culture created the conditions for meaningful academic progress. Campus leaders consistently attributed gains in K–2 achievement—and a reduction in the number of students requiring intervention—to several key factors:

High-Quality Instructional Materials (HQIM)
- Consistent implementation of HQIM, especially HMH for literacy
- Strengthened Tier 1 instruction routines across classrooms

Data-Driven Planning & Small Group Instruction
- Weekly PLCs focused on progress monitoring and student outcomes
- Targeted small group support based on real-time data
- Consistent use of structured intervention tools

Collaborative Culture & Teacher Leadership
- Strong grade-level collaboration beyond PLCs
- Shared planning and problem-solving to support all learners
- Teachers leading discussions and goal tracking in PLCs

Student-Centered Practices
- Student goal setting and progress tracking
- Emphasis on growth mindset, engagement, and positive classroom environments

Strategic Supports & Leadership Focus
- Increased administrator focus on early literacy and coaching
- Use of support staff to expand interventions
- Frequent walkthroughs and targeted feedback

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

A critical part of this progress has been the actual progress monitoring throughout the year of this initiative, which has been made possible through our early literacy partnership. We have been able to monitor key aspects of implementation, such as the usage of high-quality instructional materials, the presence of quality literacy practices in the classroom, and the connection between high-quality resources and quality of instruction. The table below summarizes some, but not all, observed indicators from this progress monitoring.

Percentages reflect observed practices that scored "Mostly" and "Yes" and do not reflect lessons that scored "Somewhat" or "Not Yet"

	Spring 2024 (baseline)	Fall 2024	Spring 2025
Does instruction explicitly and systematically provide all students with the opportunity to master foundational skills?	32%	47%	56%
Does the teacher make the foundational skills of the lesson clear & explicit?	47%	55%	67%
Do students practice foundational skills in a variety of ways to support mastery during the lesson?	27%	44%	53%
Is the lesson focused on a high-quality text(s)?	54%	76%	88%
Does this lesson employ questions and tasks, both oral and written, which integrate the standards and build student comprehension of the text(s) and its meaning?	35%	36%	51%
Overall, did instruction provide students with effective comprehension instruction?	32%	40%	52%
Is instruction based on adopted materials?	48%	77%	84%
Does instruction align to the intentions of the adopted materials in foundational skills?	31%	74%	69%
Does instruction align to the intentions of the adopted materials in comprehension?	40%	54%	55%

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

- Percentage of third graders meeting or exceeding STAAR Reading Assessment expectations.
- Percentage of second graders in the intervention range on NWEA MAP - Overall, longitudinal data reveals progress across all student groups, while year-over-year spring assessment data shows improvement in 9 out of 10 student groups (including All Students).
- 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 our progress by continuing to provide systematic, targeted professional learning:
- Clear and consistent communication of expectations for all campuses, with ongoing investment in campus leaders as instructional leaders.
- Increase from three to six "Lighthouse Schools" that will serve as intensive leader and teacher coaching models and learning labs for our highest need campuses (an increase from three schools in 2024-25). These schools will focus on fidelity of implementation of both content and pedagogical practices, improvement of leadership structures that support student outcomes, and improvement of PLC structures that support teacher collaboration and growth.
- Engagement in learning labs at each Lighthouse School so that 36 total campuses can participate. Campus instructional leaders will attend monthly learning labs and have opportunities to walk classrooms and learn from peers to improve practice.
- Ongoing professional learning sessions for principals, assistant principals, and instructional coaches focused on literacy practices, the AISD literacy curriculum, and high-quality resources.
- Principal and campus leadership team coaching provided by executive directors on a cadence differentiated by data-driven decision making. This campus leadership team coaching includes cycles for all campuses on literacy, and focuses on observation of instruction, calibration of expectations, and providing feedback to differentiate support to teachers.

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 coaching for improvement.
- Providing increased support to campuses according to our Support & Resource Index and identification of School Improvement campuses, 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.

Additional strategies in 2025-26 for improvement of the overall literacy system and engagement in the work:
- 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.
- Intervention support: Continue to allocate content interventionists to campuses with larger populations of underserved students, and begin to provide centralized professional learning for all campus content interventionists.
- Identify and learn from teacher and campus outliers to expand successful practices.
- Conduct root cause analyses for student groups and campuses and student populations not showing equitable progress in literacy outcomes, with a focus on African American students, and actionably responding. This is partnered with a strategic placement of Lighthouse Schools at several campuses with higher than the district's average populations of African American students.
- Family Engagement: Increase parent participation in progress monitoring and literacy initiatives, especially for historically underserved groups.

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	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	31.9%	*	*	*	32.4%	-	-	*	27.9%	32.5%	55.6%
Barrington ES	1	43.4%	-	*	*	42.6%	-	*	-	43.1%	43.6%	87.5%
Brown ES	1	61.0%	-	60.0%	85.7%	62.1%	-	-	*	62.8%	61.2%	76.9%
Cook ES	1	47.1%	-	*	*	44.7%	-	-	*	44.7%	45.0%	66.7%
Dawson ES	1	53.8%	-	-	*	59.1%	-	*	*	63.6%	66.7%	60.0%
Galindo ES	1	43.8%	-	-	*	43.6%	-	*	*	44.2%	32.3%	54.5%
Govalle ES	1	58.6%	-	-	75.0%	58.3%	-	*	*	64.0%	68.4%	83.3%
Harris ES	1	38.7%	-	*	*	20.8%	-	*	-	38.5%	15.0%	50.0%
Hart ES	1	25.4%	-	*	*	22.0%	-	*	*	26.2%	26.8%	38.9%
Houston ES	1	34.8%	-	-	*	34.4%	-	*	-	36.7%	32.5%	36.8%
Jordan ES	1	66.2%	-	*	62.5%	66.7%	-	*	83.3%	66.2%	68.9%	81.8%
Langford ES	1	32.0%	-	*	*	33.3%	-	-	-	31.9%	27.3%	50.0%
Linder ES	1	40.0%	-	*	*	41.0%	-	*	*	37.6%	41.3%	31.3%
Norman-Sims ES	1	61.3%	-	-	80.0%	52.4%	-	-	-	60.7%	50.0%	80.0%
Oak Springs ES	1	81.3%	-	-	75.0%	82.6%	-	-	*	83.3%	*	90.9%
Ortega ES	1	57.7%	-	-	66.7%	58.8%	-	-	*	63.6%	58.3%	80.0%

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2025/2026 - GPM 1.1

Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Overton ES	1	30.4%	-	-	20.0%	31.1%	-	-	*	28.0%	32.4%	61.5%
Padron ES	1	35.2%	-	-	*	35.3%	-	-	*	34.8%	35.9%	50.0%
Pecan Springs ES	1	59.3%	-	-	83.3%	55.0%	-	*	-	57.7%	53.3%	*
Perez ES	1	33.8%	-	-	*	33.3%	-	*	-	35.1%	33.3%	48.1%
Pickle ES	1	31.3%	-	-	*	31.9%	-	-	-	30.4%	31.1%	66.7%
Rodriguez ES	1	34.5%	-	-	*	36.5%	-	-	-	34.0%	40.9%	66.7%
Sanchez ES	1	44.6%	-	-	*	44.3%	-	*	-	40.0%	43.2%	68.8%
Walnut Creek ES	1	36.5%	-	16.7%	*	35.3%	-	-	*	36.7%	36.5%	33.3%
Widen ES	1	32.2%	-	-	*	34.0%	-	*	*	33.9%	23.3%	61.5%
Winn Montessori	1	46.8%	-	*	60.0%	54.8%	-	*	14.3%	60.0%	60.0%	58.3%
Wooldridge ES	1	62.7%	-	-	*	63.0%	-	*	*	66.7%	63.0%	100.0%
Wooten ES	1	25.0%	-	-	-	23.1%	-	-	*	25.6%	20.6%	55.6%
Allison ES	2	59.1%	*	-	*	57.6%	-	-	*	61.9%	63.6%	66.7%
Blackshear ES	2	33.3%	-	*	50.0%	50.0%	-	*	9.1%	65.0%	-	78.6%
Campbell ES	2	24.2%	-	*	33.3%	20.0%	-	-	20.0%	28.0%	16.7%	50.0%
Graham ES	2	38.9%	-	-	83.3%	33.9%	-	-	42.9%	46.7%	34.0%	68.2%
Guerrero-Thompson ES	2	19.4%	-	*	*	20.0%	-	-	-	18.6%	19.7%	55.6%
McBee ES	2	35.6%	-	-	*	34.1%	-	-	*	35.7%	33.3%	37.5%
Odom ES	2	43.6%	-	-	*	45.9%	-	-	*	43.2%	57.1%	50.0%
Palm ES	2	10.0%	*	-	*	9.3%	-	*	*	11.6%	4.3%	22.7%
Pillow ES	2	37.0%	-	*	*	35.3%	-	*	20.0%	38.5%	43.5%	46.2%

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2025/2026 - GPM 1.1

Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Pleasant Hill ES	2	37.5%	-	*	50.0%	34.8%	-	-	*	38.8%	36.0%	45.0%
St Elmo ES	2	50.0%	-	*	*	55.2%	-	*	33.3%	54.8%	50.0%	81.8%
Zavala ES	2	39.3%	-	*	50.0%	40.0%	-	-	*	44.0%	*	54.5%
Blanton ES	3	17.2%	-	*	85.7%	20.0%	-	0.0%	2.2%	34.0%	20.8%	46.7%
Blazier ES	3	22.7%	-	14.3%	42.9%	23.3%	-	22.2%	12.9%	34.7%	32.0%	44.0%
Boone ES	3	31.7%	-	*	*	40.0%	-	20.0%	17.4%	32.0%	50.0%	66.7%
Casey ES	3	27.7%	-	*	60.0%	26.2%	-	*	21.4%	37.8%	15.4%	54.2%
Cowan ES	3	17.6%	*	0.0%	*	20.6%	-	37.5%	12.1%	37.0%	12.5%	27.8%
Cunningham ES	3	23.6%	-	*	-	36.4%	-	-	4.8%	47.8%	66.7%	39.3%
Davis ES	3	17.3%	-	*	33.3%	24.0%	-	0.0%	14.5%	35.5%	21.4%	38.2%
Doss ES	3	13.4%	-	11.1%	20.0%	50.0%	-	0.0%	3.2%	51.5%	57.1%	34.6%
Joslin ES	3	33.3%	-	*	*	38.5%	-	*	27.3%	47.1%	60.0%	60.0%
Kocurek ES	3	25.9%	-	*	*	21.9%	*	66.7%	14.3%	30.8%	8.3%	42.9%
Menchaca ES	3	25.7%	-	*	50.0%	35.1%	-	*	10.0%	43.6%	28.0%	54.2%
Oak Hill ES	3	28.3%	*	*	*	39.2%	-	40.0%	6.5%	45.8%	45.2%	54.2%
Patton ES	3	28.7%	-	*	37.5%	42.1%	-	0.0%	22.2%	50.0%	55.6%	58.3%
Reilly ES	3	29.4%	-	*	*	39.4%	-	20.0%	0.0%	40.9%	50.0%	25.0%
Summitt ES	3	20.7%	-	18.2%	*	40.0%	-	8.3%	8.8%	40.0%	26.1%	31.3%
Sunset Valley ES	3	21.6%	-	*	*	32.4%	-	*	0.0%	53.3%	46.2%	61.5%
Travis Heights ES	3	21.1%	-	42.9%	50.0%	23.3%	-	0.0%	9.1%	30.4%	25.0%	40.0%
Williams ES	3	22.4%	-	*	-	20.9%	-	*	*	24.3%	16.7%	36.8%
Baldwin ES	4	19.0%	-	9.1%	-	26.9%	-	*	17.9%	50.0%	38.5%	40.0%

Austin ISD Board Monitoring Report 2025/2026 - GPM 1.1

Campus	SRI Band	All Students	American Indian	Asian	African American	Hispanic or Latino	Pacific Islander	Two or More Races	White	EcD	EB	Special Ed
Baranoff ES	4	9.6%	-	*	*	16.2%	-	33.3%	3.0%	17.6%	28.6%	28.6%
Barton Hills ES	4	0.0%	-	-	-	*	-	*	0.0%	*	-	0.0%
Bear Creek ES	4	4.5%	*	0.0%	-	11.8%	-	0.0%	4.5%	*	0.0%	20.0%
Becker ES	4	14.7%	-	*	*	18.2%	*	0.0%	8.7%	30.8%	22.2%	47.1%
Brentwood ES	4	10.2%	-	*	*	13.0%	*	7.7%	7.9%	30.8%	*	30.4%
Bryker Woods ES	4	17.1%	-	*	-	33.3%	-	14.3%	15.0%	*	*	40.0%
Casis ES	4	6.5%	*	0.0%	*	11.1%	-	*	6.8%	16.7%	*	5.7%
Clayton ES	4	5.3%	-	0.0%	-	10.5%	-	16.7%	4.0%	*	*	19.0%
Gullett ES	4	2.8%	-	-	-	10.0%	-	0.0%	1.8%	*	*	5.6%
Highland Park ES	4	5.0%	-	*	*	4.2%	-	0.0%	4.5%	25.0%	*	10.0%
Hill ES	4	7.9%	-	0.0%	*	6.9%	-	0.0%	9.9%	20.0%	22.2%	28.0%
Kiker ES	4	12.4%	-	6.3%	*	25.0%	*	20.0%	9.0%	40.0%	33.3%	18.2%
Lee ES	4	4.7%	-	-	*	12.5%	-	*	3.9%	0.0%	*	8.3%
Maplewood ES	4	18.6%	-	*	60.0%	26.7%	-	12.5%	10.3%	43.8%	33.3%	60.0%
Mathews ES	4	10.1%	-	*	*	18.5%	-	*	3.1%	13.0%	0.0%	25.0%
Mills ES	4	12.0%	-	0.0%	*	19.0%	-	0.0%	13.1%	15.4%	22.2%	22.7%
Ridgetop ES	4	10.3%	-	*	*	18.2%	-	0.0%	4.0%	33.3%	40.0%	12.5%
Zilker ES	4	13.0%	-	*	*	20.8%	-	16.7%	5.8%	26.1%	*	39.1%
Austin ISD		**26.1%**	**27.3%**	**15.6%**	**50.2%**	**34.8%**	*****	**14.1%**	**9.7%**	**40.3%**	**37.5%**	**43.7%**

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

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: District Comparison Data Tables

Spring EOY Longitudinal Comparison - Percentages

	Spring 2023 Baseline	Spring 2024 Change	Spring 2025 Change	Overall Change
All Students	40	-10	-4	-14
American Indian	33	+12	-18	-6
Asian	26	-8	-2	-10
African American	63	-11	-2	-14
Hispanic/LatinX	56	-15	-6	-21
Two or More	18	-1	-3	-4
White	14	-3	-1	-4
Economic Disadvantage	60	-14	-6	-20
Emergent Bilingual	61	-17	-6	-23
Special Education	69	-21	-5	-26

Spring to Spring Comparisons - Percentages

	Spring 2024	Spring 2025	Change
All Students	30	26	-4
American Indian	45	27	-18
Asian	18	16	-2
African American	52	50	-2
Hispanic/LatinX	41	35	-6
Two or More	17	14	-3
White	11	10	-1
Economic Disadvantage	46	40	-6
Emergent Bilingual	44	38	-6
Special Education	48	43	-5

Appendix 3: 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 4: 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 2025-26.

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 5: 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 6: 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.