

Andover Public Schools



**Language-Based Program Review for
Sanborn Elementary School LEAP
Doherty Middle School LEAP
and
Andover High School
Language-Based Program**

District Summary

May 2016

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of recommendations for Andover Public Schools in SY16-17. Parent Surveys, Teachers Surveys, Staff Interviews and Program Observations in each the Language Based Programs served as sources of information to help derive these recommendations. Many of the goals are in accordance with the tenets of a Response to Intervention Model using Scientifically-Based Reading Instruction.

General Recommendations for all grade levels:

- Establish a District-Wide Literacy Leadership Team
- Provide embedded professional development for all teachers in the science of reading and current evidence-based practices of instruction and assessment
- Critique all literacy programs and interventions by reviewing the findings of independent research entities (i.e. National Center for Intensive Intervention)
- Utilize Evidence-Based Reading Curricula and Interventions in LEAP
- Continue to provide professional development to ensure that all Elementary and Middle School staff are trained in the interventions provided in LEAP
- Examine and establish protocols for students who struggle prior to referral to LEAP (particularly in Elementary School)
- Articulate clear entrance/ exit criteria to all LEAP staff across the district
- Create a tracking system for logging staff have attended district mandated PD in order to identify gaps in staff development and plan for future PD opportunities
- Students in LEAP should be explicitly taught strategies with attention and focus on independent application
- Address the social/emotional issues of LEAP students due to learning challenges
- Improve home/school communication and involvement by implementing better ways to communicate and provide feedback
- Utilize the Speech Language Pathologist for co-planning and co-teaching of all curriculum areas

Elementary School

- Consistently use DIBELS-Next assessments for benchmark and progress monitoring in all K-5 schools
- Adopt a data management system to house all DIBELS Data (i.e. DDS)
- Investigate benchmark assessments for vocabulary and comprehension
- Examine Tiers of Instruction to ensure that a prevention model is in place before students come to the Elementary LEAP Program
- Use Evidence-Based Curricula with high reliability and validity statistics

Middle School

- Consistent use of benchmark assessments
- Initiate use of progress monitoring in order to ensure response to instruction

- Investigate a data management system to house all student data in the Middle School
- Refine the Curriculum/ Program Framework to eliminate isolated resources as a means of teaching content
- Continue to ensure all LEAP students are on the two teacher teams
- Assign no more than two Reading Teachers to work with LEAP students

High School

- Continue current assessment practices and document accommodations for future use
- Calibrate scoring of written compositions in order for teachers to use the same scoring rubrics and give consistent feedback to students.
- Utilize research-based assessments to document progress in all skill areas
- Refine the Curriculum/ Program Framework to eliminate isolated resources as a means of teaching content
- Implement methods of ensuring that students are carrying over strategy instruction to a variety of settings
- Continue to offer robust Professional Development opportunities and ensure a link to the assessment and curriculum framework documents
- Ensure that Language-Based teachers attend Departments Meetings in order to collaborate with teachers across the High School in the same area of instruction
- Ensure that Language-Based teachers also attend meetings with other Language-Based teachers in order to maintain consistent strategies and tools

Andover Public School District **Language Based Program Review Report**

Introduction

A. Purpose

A collaborative relationship between Eleni Steadman and the Andover Public School Special Education Department administrators and staff was established to provide a comprehensive in-depth analysis of the current status of literacy practices at the three levels of Language-Based Programs at the Elementary, Middle and High School levels. These programs are currently located at the Sanborn Elementary, Doherty Middle and Andover High School, respectively. Ms. Steadman has generated a district report based on data collected from all three schools that includes recommendations for improving the literacy achievement for all students in the Language-Based Programs.

B. Timeline

The review process began in October 2015 and was completed in May 2016. The completed report and recommendations will be shared with Central Office and each school according to a schedule developed by Andover Public School Administration.

The Review Process was initiated in October 2015 through a phone conversation with Dr. Valerie Flynn, Interim Director of Student Services, and Ms. Eleni Steadman, MS, CCC-SLP/ Literacy Specialist. The phone call was followed by a meeting with two principals in Andover: Patricia Barrett, Principal of the Sanborn Elementary School and Robin Wilson, principal of the Doherty Middle School. All subsequent planning meetings have included the aforementioned administrators and Amy Reese, Assistant Director of Student Services.

In addition to the planning meetings, two additional informational meetings were held throughout this review. The first was a presentation to School Committee members and other school personnel to provide an overview of the review process, which was held on October 27, 2015. The second meeting, a Parents' Forum, was held on December 17, 2015, in order to further share the process with families of students who are currently enrolled in one of the three programs, families of students who have left the district as an alternative to LEAP, and families of students who are candidates to enter the program next year. Attendees were invited to provide feedback in three ways: index cards with questions during the session, through written responses on a Feedback Form following the session, and through email sent to the Department of Student Services and forwarded to Eleni Steadman at any time during this process.

Parents/guardians of students currently enrolled in Language-Based Programs were invited to participate in an online survey, in addition to the opportunity to provide feedback during the Forum. The survey included 20 questions; 18 questions asked for a rating of 1-5 (1= completely disagree and 5= totally agree) and 2 questions about the

grade and number of years in the Language Based Program. Twenty-nine parents completed the survey and the results are summarized below. A list of the individual survey questions can be found in Appendix section of this report.

C. Methods

A program current state analysis was conducted using a variety of qualitative and quantitative tools. Information was gathered through self-reporting mechanisms, through focus group interviews, observations in each of the programs, and through the Effective School-wide Reading Program Survey. Information gathered by Ms. Steadman and the Andover School District is listed below:

- Planning and Evaluation Tool- Revised (PET-R) Program Survey
- Parent/ Family Survey
- Interviews with Staff and Administrators
- Program Observations in all three programs
- Assessment Inventory (by school)
- Curriculum/ Programs Inventory (by school)
- Professional Development History (by school)

Effective School-Wide Reading Programs Survey Results

An adapted version of the Planning and Evaluation Tool-Revised (PET-R, Kame'enui & Simmons, 2003) identifies key elements of effective programs. This survey includes 7 categories: goals and objectives, assessment, instructional practices, instructional time, differentiated instruction, administration, and professional development. The elements in the survey provide an independent and objective standard to use for comparison purposes with practices in Andover Elementary Schools.

Twenty-four teachers completed this survey using Survey Monkey and asked to rate each area. The items with the highest ratings were Goals, Objectives, and Priorities, Instructional Programs and Materials, and Instructional Time.

Results of the survey suggest that more professional development is needed in order ensure that all staff are trained in the necessary interventions to teach within the Language-Based Programs. This is especially true for the Elementary and Middle School LEAP Programs with so many new staff to each program. The High School staff also indicated the need for PD in order to continue to develop their repertoire of skills and strategies and to evolve with the increasing demands on high school students.

The survey results on assessment suggest that additional training on administering, interpreting and utilizing assessment data for all LEAP staff is a need. It appears that there is not a building “expert” or facilitator to oversee the collection and use of student data in LEAP or prior to coming to LEAP, particularly at the elementary level. Attention on setting goals across grade level and developing a system for articulating the goals is warranted. In addition, continuing the improvement of communication and evaluation

procedures for student learning and improved instructional practices across the Language Based Programs.

Parent/ Family Feedback

Beginning with the Parent's Forum in December of 2015, the Department of Student Services have welcomed the input of parents and families in the Language-Based Programs. Information was gathered from families in a variety of ways including letters, email, and phone calls. Parents were also encouraged to convey concerns during the Parent's Forum on index cards with specific questions and concerns, as well as, a Parent Feedback Form following the forum.

All of these written correspondences were aggregated and analyzed. Feedback was collected from 27 respondents. There was an overwhelming concern regarding the instructional programs, tools, and materials used in LEAP. In particular, this is true for the Elementary LEAP program. Many had questions about the transitions from Elementary to Middle and from Middle to High School. Others were eager to share their child's history in Special Education in Andover involving programs both in and outside of Andover.

After careful review, it became evident that there were some responses that were duplicates and that the data set did not include parents of students currently in LEAP. Thus, a survey was sent out only to the families of students who are currently enrolled in one of the Language-Based Programs. A total of 32 participants responded to the survey. See Appendix A.

Participants were asked to give a rating of 1-5 on the survey (1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree). Overall, parents "agree" with the statements on the survey. The large majority of parents feel that they are active participants in their child's programming. They feel that their concerns are well-documented and that they easily have access to teachers for collaboration. Parents also agree that all of the guidelines IEP are well-implemented including service delivery, receiving documents in a timely manner, as well as playing an active role.

Parents were also asked to write in three things they would like to see improve in the program. Many parents discussed the social/emotional issues their students are grappling with due to their learning challenges. They feel the school can help in this area. Parents also feel that programs and the assessments require some careful consideration and revamping, which is discussed throughout this report. Lastly, there was a trend in the comments that some parents would like to see less homework for their struggling students, while other parents are eager to have rigorous standards for their child. In summary, improved communication on making adjustments for individual students is warranted.

Recommendations: The following recommendations were generated based on the teacher survey and the parent survey. They are as follows:

Based on the Teacher Survey:

- Continue to provide professional development to ensure that all Elementary and Middle School staff are trained in the interventions provided in LEAP
- Continue professional development opportunities for High School staff so that they may enhance their repertoire of skills and strategies
- Further analyze evaluation procedures for all students in Andover prior to entry in LEAP and articulate this protocol
- Utilize Scientifically-Based Reading Interventions in LEAP
- General education and special education can work more collaboratively to implement the goals of LEAP students.
- Students in LEAP should be explicitly taught strategies with attention and focus on independent application
- Improve home/school communication

Based on the Parent Survey:

- Utilize high quality and data driven programs to teach decoding skills
- Students in LEAP should be explicitly taught strategies with attention and focus on independent application.
- Parents of High School students “strongly agreed” that their students are invited to be part of their meetings. It is recommended that Middle School offer this option to families if they would like their child to participate in meetings
- Address the social/emotional issues of LEAP students due to learning challenges
- Consider parents modifying homework on an individual basis. Some parents reported wanting less homework for their struggling students, while other parents are eager to have rigorous standards for their child
- Examine and establish protocols for students who struggle prior to referral to LEAP (particularly in Elementary School)
- Improve home/school communication

Elementary School LEAP Program

Assessment Inventory

The purpose of this analysis is not to review student outcomes data but to review the assessment tools used by the teaching staff in Language Based Programs. The goal is to determine if the assessments provide adequate information about students' abilities in oral language, phonemic awareness, decoding, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and writing. The underlying goal is to ensure that teachers will have appropriate instruments to inform instructional practices across the key areas of language and literacy.

At the Elementary School, staff reported assessments that gather information across the domains of literacy instruction. They reported 29 different assessments are used for grades 3, 4, 5. See Appendix B. While there are numerous assessments used for the 3 year re-evaluation battery and yearly Curriculum-Based Measures used for sub-skill mastery, there are no consistent instruments being used to monitor progress on a more frequent basis (ie. 1X/ month). One widely accepted benchmark assessment tool that also includes a means of progress monitoring is the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS-Next).

DIBELS Next is being used in all schools for Kindergarten students in Andover. However, it is not being used as a universal screener for all students in the district, nor are the Progress Monitoring features used. As part of this review Ms. Steadman also collected information regarding use of two screening measures used in Andover, which includes DIBELS Next and the DRA (Developmental Reading Assessment). The summary of how these assessments are used holds a critical piece of information regarding the lack of safety nets in place to identify students who are not responding to instruction with support prior to their referral to LEAP. This information is summarized in Appendix C.

It is also recommended that an Assessment Framework be developed and disseminated in order to eliminate redundancies and fill in gaps, specifically at the elementary level. A sample Assessment Framework for the Elementary Level is provided in Appendix D. It is important to note that this is a draft that requires revision from all Elementary administrators and should continue revision as the model evolves.

Programs and Curriculum Survey

The Elementary LEAP staff reported 24 different items on the Literacy Programs/Curriculum Summary Chart. See the table in Appendix E. The information on the surveys reflect some confusion between what constitutes program, materials, and the structural components contained in an effective program. For example, "book room" typically falls under the category of structural components or materials that provide opportunities for readers to practice strategies with teacher support. Structural components provide the framework for content teaching. Materials and programs are tools for teachers to use to accomplish the teaching of skills within a structure.

It is recommended that Andover modify and consolidate the entries on the summary sheets and eliminate the items that do not fit the definition of a program. Further, some initial work needs to occur with the administrators, specialists, and teachers to clarify the structural and content components currently in use, and then to identify those that are missing. This activity will lead to interventions that are delivered with a clear purpose and intention. It is necessary for an effective school to possess a variety of programs, materials (tools), and strategies to meet the needs of this diverse groups of learners. However, too many programs, used inconsistently loosens a school’s ability to operate in a tiered model of instruction. It is critical to develop a comprehensive and effective literacy program and to make it public. This is an essential step in gaining trust and acceptance from LEAP families and the community.

Elementary Staff Interviews and Observations:

Elementary School LEAP interview comments and observations are summarized below on the left. Noteworthy perceptions and recommendations are on the right. A summary and graph of these statements and categories is represented in Appendix F.

Elementary Interviews and Observations	
Interview/ Observation	Recommendation
Better to work with one grade level, than multiple in the past, with strong entrance criteria	District Administration should redefine LEAP at the Elementary level, as the program moves to the Bancroft School for SY16-17
A variety of assessments are administered to LEAP students (Diagnostic battery, Annual Review measures, formative assessments)	Analyze and refine an Assessment Framework for Elementary LEAP (Appendix D)
Consistent assessments and data collection are needed in the 5 elementary schools	Critical need to look at continual progress monitoring, outcomes measures, and data management system for all 5 elementary schools (see Appendix C)
Newly hired staff has been a nice addition to Teachers are committed and invested in the	Continue to foster the exceptional work environment with regard to their colleagues and an overall eagerness for teaching and learning
Students are integrated into Science and Social Studies	Continue to be integrated and generalize skills to the general education setting with a priority to generalize skills in regular education setting
Teachers are trying to group students for specific interventions (ie. Orton-Gillingham for decoding) and according to the recommendations of Reading A-Z	It is strongly recommended that the district critically look at the Tier 1 (general education) instruction, supplemental, and intervention supports in order to more clearly define the grouping, differentiation, and construct of LEAP
Some outside consultative support	All recommendations should be backed by a strong research base with practices that have strong validity and reliability data
Hard to meet family demands	Investigate parental involvement and identify home-school connection efforts

Elementary Interviews and Observations	
Interview/ Observation	Recommendation
Planning time is between LEAP teachers and the general education teachers, paras and SLP	Structure common planning time with LEAP, general education teachers, paras, and the SLP who assists with the program with planned topics for the year
Recent training in Orton-Gillingham and Reading A-Z is often used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use one research-based approach for literacy instruction • Create a Curriculum/ Program Framework to help identify overlap and eliminate gaps • Resources do not constitute a Program and the coordination of Scientifically Based Reading Instruction is imperative
LEAP teachers attend PD with their general education counterparts and have had EmPower, OG, LiPS	Identify and support teacher leaders for intensive interventions that the district adopts in order to build capacity and sustainability

Summary of Recommendations for Elementary LEAP:

1. Assessment:

- Consistently use DIBELS-Next Assessments for benchmark in K-5
- Initiate use of progress monitoring using DIBELS-Next
- Adopt a data management system to house all DIBELS Data (i.e. DDS)
- Investigate benchmark assessments for vocabulary and comprehension
- Articulate clear entrance/ exit criteria to Elementary LEAP staff across the district

2. Instruction:

- Examine Tiers of Instruction to ensure that a prevention model is in place before students come to the Elementary LEAP Program
- Articulate Tiered Instructional Model to all Elementary staff
- Refine the Curriculum/ Program Framework to eliminate isolated resources as a means of teaching content
- Use Evidence-Based Curricula with high reliability and validity statistics
- Continue to integrate students into Science and Social Studies with support

3. Leadership and Professional Development:

- Improve collaboration among elementary LEAP staff for moving students throughout the grades
- Establish a meeting schedule for LEAP teachers, paras, and ancillary personnel and determine topics of discussion at the beginning of the school year
- Create a tracking system for logging staff have attended district mandated PD in order to identify gaps in staff development and plan for future PD opportunities

4. Home/Family

- Improve home/school communication and involvement by implementing better ways to communicate and provide feedback

Middle School LEAP Program

Assessment Inventory

The Middle School LEAP program reported 14 measurements on their Assessment Inventory. See Appendix G. Just as in the Elementary School LEAP Program, many assessments are specific to the 3 year re-evaluation process. A variety of DDMs (District Determined Measures) are also noted as a means of providing information about skills at the start of the school year and then reassessing at the end of the school year. The difference in performance quantifies how much a student has gained over the course of one year. While this is a good start, DDMs do not help inform teachers modify their teaching over the course of the year. The Reading and Math Indicators are also unique to the Middle School. They are used in the fall to inform groups and need for support. While collecting this formative data is a great start, there is still a lack of monitoring progress and documenting the rate of response to instruction. Thus, it is recommended that the Middle School LEAP Staff also create an Assessment Framework to help eliminate the redundancies and fill in gaps in their assessment practices.

Curriculum/Program Inventory

The Middle School LEAP staff reported 15 different programs used with students and is summarized in Appendix H. It should be noted that not all students receive the same interventions with the same intensity. Instruction is carefully customized to the each student's needs, with the goal that students will be successful in the general education setting. The ultimate goal is for students to spend their instructional time in the Least Restrictive Environment, so many students are enrolled in a hybrid programmatic model. If/when students succeed in the general education setting, they are always encouraged to do so.

With some refinement, the "Literacy Programs/Curriculum Summary Chart" can be used as a guide for future curriculum discussions and purchases. Andover educators are encouraged to continue work on describing their curricular plan using a cross school, team process. The outcome of this work should be to identify Andover's core, supplemental, and intervention program and then to identify when and how teachers will use them with all of their students. While there is no optimal number of programs recommended, it is important to have an adequate number of dynamic "tools" across the literacy content domains that consider teachers' competency and responds to the diverse instructional needs of Andover's students. A more in-depth discussion regarding staff beliefs about the effectiveness of the current curriculum/ programs at the middle school in all the Tiers of Support is warranted.

Middle School Staff Interviews and Observations

During the interviews in Middle School LEAP, the categories with the highest percentages of comments coded as strength are Culture and Programs/Materials. The greatest area for enhancement identified was Professional Development. Graphs of all categories can be found in Appendix I and a summary is provided below.

Middle School Interviews and Observations	
Interviews and Observations	Recommendations
Two teacher teams for LEAP are more successful than the four teacher teams	Ensure all LEAP students are on the two teacher teams
Many students are referred to LEAP in 6th when they have never been in LEAP before	Examine the Tiers of Instruction at the elementary level in order to ensure that students are responding to instruction before coming to LEAP
LEAP teachers have created a template for assessments on IEPs, 504s, etc	Continue to build consistency of the interpretation of CBMs and measures used for IEPs and 504 plans, including instructional implications based on the measures
Need Progress Monitoring measures	Identify Progress Monitoring Measures to document the efficacy of instruction and to modify instruction based on response to the intervention
Collegiality and Culture: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff have a real desire to help their students • Lot of support from colleagues/ administration • Specialists- reading and SLPs are truly amazing 	Continue to foster a collaborative and professional work environment
“Some full time LEAP students and some part time LEAP students allows us to give student exactly what they need”	Continue to integrate students to mainstream content classes and observe students during ELA for transference of skills, when applicable
Team planning now happening in all grade levels for curriculum units and for students to be mainstreamed easily	LEAP teachers formally collaborate with the general education counterparts which allows for the more rigorous curriculum to be the expectation for students with accommodations
Need to be forward thinking and not reacting to the suggestions of outside evaluations and parents	Staff are truly committed to providing the best instruction for students, contributing to a professional learning community, and working collaboratively with families. Mechanisms for improved home/school communication should be explored and put in place.
Co-plan and co-teach is critical to the model	Continue to build in time to have additional PLCs by hiring substitutes
Need more tools to help students and what they need- not just individual resources	Develop a Program Framework to eliminate overlap and identify gaps. Add materials/tools- ipads, apps, and web-based tools as students become proficient with digital literacy skills.

Middle School Interviews and Observations	
Interviews and Observations	Recommendations
A good amount of PD is provided to Special Ed/ LEAP teachers and they attend conferences upon request	Continue to offer robust PD opportunities and ensure a link to the assessment and curriculum framework documents

Summary of Recommendations for Middle School LEAP

1. Assessment:

- Consistent use of benchmark assessments
- Initiate use of progress monitoring in order to ensure response to instruction
- Investigate a data management system to house all student data
- Ensure transparency of entrance/ exit criteria to Middle School LEAP

2. Instruction:

- Refine the Curriculum/ Program Framework to eliminate isolated resources as a means of teaching content
- Use Evidence-Based Curricula with high reliability and validity statistics
- Continue to ensure all LEAP students are on the two teacher teams
- Assign no more than two Reading Teachers to work with LEAP students
- Reading Teacher can collaborate to staff and serve as the in-house expert on Instruction and Assessment
- Provide time for the Reading Teacher to work with students in various content areas in order to ensure carry-over of strategy instruction to a variety of settings

3. Leadership and Professional Development:

- Continue to offer robust PD opportunities and ensure a link to the assessment and curriculum framework documents
- Improve collaboration among Middle School LEAP staff as students throughout the grades
- Establish a meeting schedule for LEAP teachers, paras, and ancillary personnel and determine topics of discussion at the beginning of the school year
- Create a tracking system for logging staff have attended district mandated PD in order to identify gaps in staff development and plan for future PD opportunities

4. Home/Family

- Improve home/school communication and involvement by implementing better ways to communicate and provide feedback

High School Language Based Program

Assessment Inventory

The High School Language-Based Program's Assessment Inventory is far more simplified. There are not many decoding measures or measures for subskill mastery. Students are assessed on a re-evaluation year using both IQ and Achievement Assessments. Additional questionnaires and work samples were also reported. Daily performance and mastery of content at the HS are measured with teacher created unit assessments. These are used formatively and on an ongoing basis. Teachers reported that they have started to share student work in order to have consistent scoring of written compositions. It is highly recommended that this work continue in order for teachers across the content areas to have similar scoring rubrics, to offer consistent feedback to students and to calibrate their scoring of written material. The High School Assessment Inventory can be found in Appendix J.

Curriculum Summary

The High School staff reported that all curriculum for the Language Based classes follow that of the general education curriculum. The basic difference is the amount of time spent in any one class. General Education classes are in session for 82 minutes, while Language-Based classes are smaller in size, have more student-teacher interaction, utilize multiple teaching modalities, and are 41 minutes in duration. These factors allow teachers to cover the same core content of the curriculum. Teachers may prune back on the breadth of information in favor of depth of the material. The curriculum units are documented using a web-based system called ATLAS. It is recommended that the Language-Based Program Staff continue to enhance, co-teach, and vet their lessons so that the effective instruction that is currently in place can become part of the High School culture. This will be important when maintaining and sustaining such a successful model.

High School Staff Interviews and Observations

The High School staff discussed strengths in Culture, Programs and Materials, and Differentiated Instruction/ Grouping/ Scheduling with. Instructional Prep Time, Home/ Family, and Professional Development were all identified as areas to enhance.

High School Interviews and Observations	
Interviews/ Observations	Recommendation
Formative assessments show growth, like open/ closed questions for a Beginning of Year/ End of Year	Use measurement monitors progress and show efficacy of instruction
Culture/ Collegiality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong sense of working as a TEAM and we speak with a unified voice • AHS staff is committed to adapting kids, keeping them feeling inclusive • Great stability and longevity with the LBP Staff and Instructional Assistants 	It is important to continue to support this strong collaboration and unique culture
Curriculum been co-planned with the SLP	Formalize the collaboration with the SLP, who is highly regarded as the resident expert for students with Language Based Learning Difficulties
Teachers report a benefit to have co-taught their subject in multiple grades and multiple levels within the High School	Continue to offer teachers opportunities to teach a variety of classes so that they can maintain high expectations for students in Language Based
Metacognitive strategies (“Tell me why”) is integrated for all the students in Language Based Program	Strategic plan from which to operate, which enumerates and describes their goals for consistency and understanding about how to best instruct the students in their programs
Staff are desperate to get parents to trust the program	Build in a formal way to communicate with and support families. Teachers and staff are adamant about gaining trust and respect of families in Andover.
Co-teaching and collaboration allows for all of the best practices to be taught and applied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structured PLC time should continue to provide opportunities for teachers to meet within and across departments • Collaboration within and across grade-levels and between the content areas is the most effective model
PD offerings have been great and staff are hungry for more	Continue PD offerings that are linked to the Curriculum and Assessment Framework

Summary of Recommendations High School Language Based Program:

1. Assessment:

- Continue to calibrate scoring of written compositions in order for teachers to use the same scoring rubrics and give consistent feedback to students.
- Continue current assessment practices and document accommodations for future use
- Consider utilizing research-based measures to document progress in general skill areas

2. Instruction:

- Refine the Curriculum/ Program Framework to eliminate isolated resources as a means of teaching content
- Use Evidence-Based Curricula with high reliability and validity statistics
- Continue to ensure all LEAP students are on the two teacher teams
- Continue to use the Speech-Language Pathologist as a resident expert to consult to teachers on designing curriculum and the delivery of instruction
- Implement methods of ensuring that students are carrying over strategy instruction to a variety of settings

3. Leadership and Professional Development:

- Continue to offer robust PD opportunities and ensure a link to the assessment and curriculum framework documents
- Ensure that LBP teachers attend Departments Meetings in order to collaborate with teachers across the HS in the same area of instruction
- Ensure that Language-Based teachers also attend meetings with other LBP teachers in order to maintain consistent strategies and tools

4. Home/Family

- Improve home/school communication and involvement by implementing better ways to communicate and provide feedback

V. Closing and Next Steps:

It has been a pleasure to conduct this review for the Andover Public School District. It is clear that the Department of Student Services is committed to improving the Language-Based Programs in all levels and for all students. This commitment extends to all of the teachers, staff, and families of the students. They are passionate about building a relationship of trust and mutual respect with the community by implementing some of these recommendations.

In addition to the school specific recommendations, there are three additional suggestions for Andover Public School District. They are as follows:

- 1. It is recommended to establish a District-Wide Literacy Leadership Team.** This team should be comprised of teachers of LEAP across all three programs, including general education staff. This team would craft overarching literacy

goals, an action plan to achieve those goals, and maintain the visibility of the goals while facilitating communication between school staff and the central administration.

2. **Provide embedded professional development in the science of reading and current evidence-based practices of instruction and assessment** for all teachers across the district. This will ensure a common, consistent teacher/administrator knowledge base and will help the fundamental understanding of Tiered Systems of Support.
3. **When reviewing any and all literacy programs and interventions, it is recommended that the district review the findings of the National Center for Intensive Intervention (NCII).** This is a federally funded organization that provides independent reviews and summaries of the validity and reliability of hundreds of programs and interventions. It is vital that the district leaders become critical consumers of the tools they adopt for all tiers of instruction. It is equally important that the district analyze their current use of early screening measures and research based teaching practices in order to prevent later reading difficulties and the ultimate need for LEAP.

Once this report and all of the data have been disseminated, Ms. Steadman will collaborate with the Andover Administrative Team to develop an Action Plan for the district in School Year 2016-2017.

Respectfully Submitted,

Eleni X. Steadman, MS, CCC-SLP

June 14, 2016

Date