



Essential School-Wide and Center-Wide Practices in Literacy

Prekindergarten and Elementary Grades. A document of the Michigan General Education Leadership Network (GELN) Early Literacy Task Force

This document was developed by the **Early Literacy Task Force**, a subcommittee of the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA) General Education Leadership Network (GELN), which represents Michigan's 56 Intermediate School Districts. For a full list of representatives, please see the back page.



ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICES

This document is intended to be read in concert with Essential Instructional Practices in Early Literacy, Prekindergarten and Essential Instructional Practices in Early Literacy, Grades K to 3. The systems and practices outlined here provide school-level and program-level support for effective classroom instruction in prekindergarten and elementary literacy.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to increase Michigan's capacity to improve children's literacy by identifying systematic and effective practices that can be implemented at the organizational level in educational and care settings that serve young children. To meet the needs of all young learners, organizational practices must support literacy development in ways that systematically impact learning throughout elementary schools, early childhood learning centers, and other literacy-oriented learning environments and programs.¹

Each of the ten recommended school-level or center-level systems and practices should occur in all Michigan prekindergarten and elementary school learning environments. These essential practices should be viewed, as in practice guides in medicine, as presenting a minimum 'standard of care' for Michigan's children.

The practices listed can be used in a variety of educational settings for young children. The document does not specify any particular programs or policies but focuses on research-based practices that can apply to a number of programs and settings. As the local systems and practices occur at the building or center level, it is the responsibility of the school, center, or program leadership to ensure that these systems and practices are implemented consistently and are regularly enhanced through strategic planning.

1. The *leadership team* is composed of instructional leaders committed to continuous improvements in literacy and ongoing attention to data.

Under the guidance of the lead administrator, the school or program leadership team:

- includes members with considerable and current expertise in literacy and early childhood education;
- promotes the implementation of evidence-based, high-quality literacy curriculum, instruction, and assessment aligned across the learning environment;²
- develops a vision, mission, set of goals, and educational philosophy that guide school climate and children's learning and that are shared school-wide and aligned across all ages and grade levels, including Pre-K, and across all professional roles for the purpose of continuous improvement;³
- maintains a comprehensive system for assessing children's strengths and needs and using that information to inform children's education;⁴
- focuses on multiple points of data and keeps the best interests of children paramount in assessment, knowing the primary purpose is to improve teaching and learning;⁵
- ensures a collaborative problem-solving approach that may include administrators, teachers, parents, aides, reading specialists, library media specialists, special educators, and others as needed;⁶ and
- distributes leadership throughout the organization for the purpose of building leadership capacity among all staff.⁷

2. The *organizational climate* reflects a collective sense of responsibility for all children and a focus on developing child independence and competence in a safe space.

All adults—administrators, teachers, specialists, aides, and support staff—throughout the organization:

- share and act upon a sense of responsibility for the literacy growth and overall wellbeing of every child that is grounded in the shared belief that every child can and will be successful, regardless of location, demographic, or program funding;⁸
- ensure that the entire learning environment is emotionally and physically safe, such that there are positive adult-child relationships and positive child-child relationships throughout the building;⁹

- support the development of children's independence by engaging them in such practices as planning for their own reading and writing growth, observing and regulating their own reading and writing, and monitoring their own growth toward their reading and writing goals;¹⁰ and
- help all children develop perceptions of competence and self-efficacy in reading and writing through such practices as helping children identify and build on their academic strengths, providing specific feedback to help children grow, and modeling the thoughts and practices of successful readers and writers.¹¹

3. The *learning environment* reflects a strong commitment to literacy.¹²

Throughout the learning environment, there is evidence that:

- literacy is a priority (e.g., amount, type, and nature of print experience);¹³
- instruction is built on explicitness, continuity, and responsiveness;
- literacy occurs throughout the day and is integrated into daily math, science, and social studies learning;¹⁴
- children and teachers are actively engaged with the school library, media center, and library media specialist;¹⁵
- children regularly read, write, speak, and listen for multiple purposes and across content areas and their written work is made prominently visible;¹⁶
- books and learning materials reflect diversity across cultures, ethnic groups, geographic locations, genders, and social roles (see also Essential #8);¹⁷
- guest readers and volunteers (e.g., parents, college students) are recruited and trained to support literacy in an ongoing manner;¹⁸
- events and activities generate excitement around books and other texts, for example through the announcement of the publication of the latest book in a series and posting of book reviews and recommendations throughout the school; and
- school staff aim to foster intrinsic motivation to read, making only temporary and sparing, if any, use of non-reading-related prizes such as stickers, coupons, or toys, and avoiding using reading and writing as "punishment."¹⁹

4. Ongoing *professional learning* opportunities reflect research on adult learning and effective literacy instruction.

School, center, and program leaders ensure that professional learning opportunities are:

- data informed so that they meet the needs and best interests of teaching staff and their students;²⁰
- focused on the “why” as well as the “how” of effective whole-class and small-group instructional practices, with opportunities for teachers to observe effective practice and to be observed and receive feedback from mentors and coaches;²¹
- driven by a belief that teacher expertise is a strong predictor of child success;²²
- collaborative in nature, involving colleagues working together (e.g., study groups, collaborative inquiry, and problem solving)²³ and inclusive of other classroom and school staff;
- focused on research-based instructional practices that are age, developmentally, and culturally appropriate and that support children’s literacy development (see Essential Instructional Practices in Early Literacy for Prekindergarten and Grades K-3);
- based in an understanding of knowledge and skills to be learned (see Essential Instructional Practices in Early Literacy for Prekindergarten and Grades K-3)²⁴
- utilizing current research on motivation and engagement to support children’s learning; and²⁵
- inclusive of modeling and instructional coaching with colleagues who demonstrate effective practices with children and provide opportunities for teachers to reflect on their knowledge, practice, and goals in an ongoing and continuous manner (see Essentials Coaching Practices in Early Literacy).²⁶

5. There is a system for determining the allocation of *literacy support* in addition to high-quality classroom instruction with multiple layers of support available to children who are not reading and/or writing at a proficient level.²⁷

School, center, and program leaders ensure that:

- instruction and additional supports are layered across learning environments, including the home, and:
 - are coherent and consistent with instruction received elsewhere in the school day and occur in addition to, not instead of, regular literacy instruction,²⁸
 - are differentiated to the individual child’s specific profile of literacy strengths and needs,²⁹

- highly trained educators are those teaching the children needing the most support;³⁰ and
- teachers are supported in using and reflecting on analyses of multiple, systematic internal assessments (e.g., universal screening, diagnostic, progress monitoring tools) and observation as appropriate in an on-going basis to: identify individual child needs early and accurately; tailor whole group, small group, and one-on-one instruction; and measure progress regularly.³¹

6. Organizational systems assess and respond to *individual challenges* that may impede literacy development.

School, center, or program systems and leaders ensure that:

- any potential learning, physical, visual, regulatory, and social-emotional needs that require specific conditions and supports are identified;³²
- all assessments of such needs are culturally unbiased;³³
- every adult has access to research-informed strategies and tools to address each child’s demonstrated needs, including, for example, strategies for improving socio-emotional skills such as emotional understanding and techniques for helping children develop executive function skills such as planning;³⁴
- children with significant needs receive coordinated, intensive supports and services that include continued collaboration among teachers, interventionists, family, and others whose expertise is relevant (e.g., special education teacher, school psychologist, school nurse, social worker);³⁵ and all adults intentionally work to:
 - identify child behaviors that may impede literacy learning and the conditions that prompt and reinforce those behaviors;
 - modify learning environments to decrease problem behaviors;
 - teach and reinforce new skills to increase appropriate behavior and preserve a positive learning environment;
 - draw on relationships with professional colleagues and children’s families for continued guidance and support; and
 - assess whether school-wide behavior problems warrant adopting school-wide strategies or programs and, if so, implement ones shown to reduce negative behaviors and foster positive interactions,³⁶ with particular attention to strategies or programs that have been shown to have positive impacts on literacy development.³⁷

7. Adequate, high-quality *instructional resources* are well maintained and utilized.

Leaders and systems within the school, center, or program ensure that:

- teachers have consistent access to resources, including technological and curricular resources, that support research-informed instruction in all components of literacy instruction and that provide continuity across ages and grade levels;
- teachers have appropriate professional development and support for effective use of available technologies, materials, and resources;³⁸
- each child has access to many informational and literature texts in the classroom and school, with culturally diverse characters and themes, that they want to read and that they can read independently or with the support of others;³⁹ and
- well-stocked school libraries and/or media centers, with library media specialists, offer a large collection of digital books, print books, and other reading materials for reading independently and with the support of others to immerse and instruct children in varied media, genres of texts, and accessible information.⁴⁰

8. A consistent *family engagement* strategy includes specific attention to literacy development.

Members of the learning organization engage with families by:

- prioritizing learning about families and the language and literacy practices in which they engage to inform instruction, drawing from families' daily routines that build on culturally developed knowledge and skills accumulated in the home (e.g., inviting families to share texts they read and write as part of their lives at home or at work);⁴¹
- providing regular opportunities for families to build a network of social relationships to support language and literacy development (e.g., connect families with community organizations that provide access to books or other educational supports);⁴²
- working collaboratively, as teachers and specialists, to plan various levels of instructional supports, assess the efficacy of those supports, and adjust accordingly;
- fostering familial and community participation in the education of children and the work of the learning environment;⁴³

- empowering families to communicate about and impact the educational environment at school, as well as strengthen the educational environment in the home, regardless of education level, income, or native language of the primary caregivers;⁴⁴ and
- offering research-based guidance on how families can support literacy development (see *Essential Instructional Practices in Early Literacy for Prekindergarten and Grades K-3*).⁴⁵

9. An ambitious *summer reading* initiative supports reading growth.⁴⁶

The school, center, or program supports summer reading development by:

- facilitating opportunities for every child to read books and access texts during the summer, including summer reading programs offered through school and public libraries;⁴⁷
- emphasizing books of high interest to children and offering book selections within the likely range of reading levels within each class;⁴⁸
- providing instruction at the end of the school year to re-emphasize reading comprehension strategies and orient children to summer reading by encouraging use of effective strategies while reading at home;⁴⁹ and
- providing structured guidance to parents and guardians to support reading at home, such as by encouraging parents and guardians to listen to their child read aloud, discuss books with their child, and provide feedback on their child's reading.⁵⁰

10. A network of *connections in the community* provides authentic purposes and audiences for children's work and helps facilitate use of quality out-of-school programming.

Connections beyond the school, center, or program walls provide:

- organization-wide and classroom-level partnerships with local businesses and other organizations that facilitate opportunities for children to read and write for purposes and audiences beyond school assignments;⁵¹
- access to opportunities for individualization, for example through one-on-one tutoring;⁵² and
- opportunities for children to develop literacy outside of the school hours, including through engaging in out-of-school time library, community, and school programs in the summer and after school.⁵³

(Endnotes)

- 1 For example, Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Peterson, D. S., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2004). The CIERA school change framework: An evidence-based approach to professional development and school reading improvement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40*(1), 40-69; Wilcox, K. C., Lawson, H. A., & Angelis, J. (2015). Classroom, school, and district impacts on diverse student literacy achievement. *Teacher College Record, 117*, 1-38.
- 2 For example, Foorman, B., Beyer, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furguson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). *Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in kindergarten through 3rd grade* (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linnan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. (2008). *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to intervention and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades*. Institute for Educational Services; Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D'Acoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCEE 2012-4058). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide* (NCEE 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Slavin, R. E., Cheung, A., Holmes, G., Madden, N. A., & Chamberlain, A. (2013). Effects of a data-driven district reform model on state assessment outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(2), 371-396.
- 3 For example, Michigan State Board of Education. (2005, revised 2013). *Early childhood standards of quality for freikindergarten*. Lansing, MI: Author; Kurland, H., Peretz, H., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2010). Leadership style and organizational learning: The mediate effect of school vision. *Journal of Educational Administration, 48*(1), 7-30; Hoffman, J. V. (1991). Teacher and school effects in learning to read. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research, volume II*. New York: Longman; Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University.
- 4 For example, Taylor, B., Pearson, P., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade reading instruction in low-income schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*(2), 121-165.
- 5 For example, Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; *Standards for the assessment of reading and writing* (2010). Newark, DE: International Reading Association, Joint Task Force on Assessment of the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English; Burns, M. K., Vanderwood, M., & Ruby, S. (2003). Evaluating the readiness of pre-referral intervention teams for use in a problem-solving model: Review of three levels of research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 20*, 89-105.
- 6 For example, Bean, R. M. (2004) Promoting effective literacy instruction: The challenge for literacy coaches. *The California Reader, 37*(3), 58-63; Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement, University of Minnesota. Bean, R. M., Kern, D., Goatley, V., Ortlieb, E., Shettel, J., Calo, K., & Cassidy, J. (2015). Specialized literacy professionals as literacy leaders: Results of a national survey. *Literacy Research and Instruction, 54*(2), 83-114.
- 7 For example, Spillane, J. P., Diamond, J. B. & Jita, L. (2003). Leading instruction: The distribution of leadership for instruction. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 35*(3), 533-543.
- 8 For example, Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Seashore Louis, K. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(Supplement), 751-781; Murphy, J. (2004). Leadership for literacy: A framework for policy and practice. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 15*(1), 65-96; Tomlinson, C. A. & Jarvis, J. M. (2014). Case studies of success: Supporting academic success for students with high potential from ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 37*(3), 191-219.
- 9 For example, Osterman, K. F. (2000). Students' need for belonging in the school community. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(3), 323-367; Dennis, S. E. & O'Connor, E. (2013). Reexamining quality in early childhood education: Exploring the relationship between the organizational climate and the classroom. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 27*, 74-92.
- 10 For example, Joseph, L. M. & Eveleigh, E. L. (2011). A review of the effects of self-monitoring on reading performance of students with disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education, 45*(1), 43-53; Allan, N. P., Hume, L. E., Allan, D. M., Farrington, A. L., & Lonigan, C. J. (2014). Relations between inhibitory control and the development of academic skills in preschool and kindergarten: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(10), 2368-2379; Sporer, N. & Schunemann, N. (2014). Improvements of self-regulation procedures for fifth graders' reading competence: Analyzing effects on reading comprehension, reading strategy performance, and motivation for reading. *Learning and Instruction, 33*, 147-157.
- 11 For example, Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*(2), 193-158; Schunk, D. H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2007). Influencing children's self-efficacy and self-regulation of reading and writing through modeling. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 23*(1), 7-25.
- 12 For example, International Reading Association. (2001). Integrating literacy and technology in the curriculum: A position statement of the International Reading Association. Newark, DE: Author; Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. E., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read*. Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- 13 For example, Duke, N. (2000). For the rich it's richer: Print experiences and environments offered to children in very low- and very high-socioeconomic status first-grade classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 441-478.
- 14 For example, Michigan Department of Education. (2015). *Michigan K-12 Standards Science*. Lansing, MI: Author. Retrieved June 2, 2016 from http://www.michigndoe.gov/documents/mde/K-12_Science_Performance_Expectations_v5_496901_7.pdf; Michigan Department of Education. (2007). *Social studies grade level content expectations grades 1-8*. Lansing, MI: Author. Retrieved June 2, 2016 from http://www.michigndoe.gov/documents/mde/SSGLCE_218368_7.pdf
- 15 For example, Scholastic Library Publishing Company (2016). *School libraries work! A compendium of research supporting the effectiveness of school libraries*. New York: Scholastic.
- 16 For example, Michigan Department of Education. (nd). *Michigan K-12 Standards for English Language Arts*. Lansing, MI. Retrieved May 30, 2016 from https://www.michigndoe.gov/documents/mde/K-12_MI_ELA_StandardsREV_470029_7.pdf; Hoffman, J. V., Sailors, M., Duffy, G. R., & Bertvas, S. N. (2004). The effective elementary classroom literacy environment: Examining the validity of the TEX-IN3 observation system. *Journal of Literacy Research, 36*(3), 303-334.
- 17 For example, National Council of Teachers of English and International Reading Association (2012). *Standards for the English Language Arts*. Urbana, IL, and Newark, DE: Authors
- 18 For example, Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T. & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(4), 605-619.
- 19 For example, Marinak, B. A. & Gambrell, L. B. (2008). Intrinsic motivation and rewards: What sustains young children's engagement with text? *Literacy Research and Instruction, 47*, 9-16; Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. *The Journal of Educational Research, 96*(6), 299-310; Becker, M., McElvany, N., & Kortenbruck, M. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation as predictors of reading literacy: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 102*(4), 773-785.
- 20 Hayes, L. L., & Robnolt, V. J. (2007). Data-driven professional development: The professional development plan for a reading excellence act school. *Reading Research and Instruction, 46*(2), 95-119.
- 21 For example, Lane, C., Prokop, M. J. S., Johnson, E., Podhajski, B., & Nathan, J. (2013). Promoting early literacy through the professional development of preschool teachers. *Early Years: An International Research Journal, 34*(1), 67-80; Porche, M. V., Pallante, D. H., & Snow, C. E. (2012). Professional development for reading achievement: Results from the Collaborative Language and Literacy Instruction Project (CLLIP). *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(4), 649-671.
- 22 For example, Podhajski, B., Mather, N., Nathan, J., & Sammons, J. (2009). Professional development in scientifically based reading instruction: Teacher knowledge and reading outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42*(5), 403-17.
- 23 For example, Cunningham, A. E., Etter, K., Platas, L., Wheeler, S., & Campbell, K. (2014). Professional development in emergent literacy: A design experiment of teacher study groups. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 31*, 62-77; Wilson, S., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of the research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173-209; Nelson, T. H., Slavit, D., Perkins, M., & Hathorn, T. (2008). A culture of collaborative inquiry: Learning to develop and support professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record, 110*(6), 1269-1303.
- 24 For example, Lane, C., Prokop, M. J. S., Johnson, E., Podhajski, B., & Nathan, J. (2013). Promoting early literacy through the professional development of preschool teachers. *Early Years: An International Research Journal, 34*(1), 67-80; Wasik, B. A., & Hindman, A. H. (2011). Improving vocabulary and pre-literacy skills of at-risk preschoolers through teacher professional development. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103*(2), 455-468; Porche, M. V., Pallante, D. H., & Snow, C. E. (2012). Professional development for reading achievement: Results from the Collaborative Language and Literacy Instruction Project (CLLIP). *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(4), 649-671.
- 25 For example, Marinak, B. A. & Gambrell, L. B. (2008). Intrinsic motivation and rewards: What sustains young children's engagement with text? *Literacy Research and Instruction, 47*, 9-16; Guo, Y., Sun, S., Breit-Smith, A., Morrison, F. J., & Connor, C. M. (2015). Behavioral engagement and reading achievement in elementary-school-age children: A longitudinal cross-lagged analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 107*(2), 332-347.
- 26 For example, Porche, M. V., Pallante, D. H., & Snow, C. E. (2012). Professional development for reading achievement results from the collaborative language and literacy instruction project. *The Elementary School Journal, 112*(4), 649-671; Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A. S., & Dexter, E. R., Jr. (2010). Assessing the value-added effects of literacy collaborative professional development on student learning. *The Elementary School Journal, 111*(1), 7-34; Helen, L. B. (1996). Using research to inform practice in urban schools: Ten key strategies for success. *Educational Policy, 10*(2), 223-252; Powell, D. R. & Diamond, K. E. (2013). Implementation fidelity of a coaching-based professional development program for improving Head Start teachers' literacy and language instruction. *Journal of Early Intervention, 35*(2), 102-128; Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.
- 27 For example, O'Connor, R. E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of reading intervention in kindergarten through third grade: Changes in teaching and student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(5), 440-55.
- 28 For example, Torgesen, J. K., Alexander, A. W., Wagner, R. K., Rashotte, C. A., Voeller, K. K. S., & Conway, T. (2001). Intensive remedial instruction for children with severe reading disabilities: Immediate and long-term outcomes from two instructional approaches. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 34*(1), 33-58.
- 29 For example, Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linnan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. D. (2008). *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention and multi-tier intervention for reading in the primary grades: A practice guide*. (NCEE 2009-4045). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; Vadasy, P. F. & Sanders, E. A. (2008). Benefits of repeated reading intervention for low-achieving fourth- and fifth-grade students. *Remedial and Special Education, 29*(4), 235-249.
- 30 For example, McGill-Franzen, A., Payne, R., & Dennis, D. (2010). Responsive intervention: What is the role of appropriate assessment? In P. H. Johnston (Ed.), *RTI in literacy: Responsive and comprehensive*, (115-132). Newark, DE: International Reading Association; Scanlon, D. M., Gelsheiser, L. M., Vellutino, F. R., Schatschneider, C., & Sweeney, J. M. (2010). Reducing the incidence of early reading difficulties: Professional development for classroom teachers versus direct interventions for children. In P. H. Johnston (Ed.), *RTI in literacy: Responsive and comprehensive*, (115-132). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- 31 For example, Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F. & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read*. Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Ann Arbor, Michigan; O'Connor, R. E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of reading intervention in kindergarten through third grade: Changes in teaching and student outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 38*(5), 440-55; Taylor, B. M., Pearson, P. D., Clark, K. F. & Walpole, S. (2000). Effective schools and accomplished teachers: Lessons about primary-grade instruction in low-income schools. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*, 121-165.
- 32 For example, Montroy, J. J., Bowles, R. P., Skibbe, L. E., & Foster, T. D. (2014). Social skills and problem behaviors as mediators of the relationship between behavioral self-regulation and academic achievement. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 29*(3), 298-309; Weiland, C., Barata, C. M., & Yoshikawa, H. (2014). The co-occurring development of executive function skills and receptive vocabulary in preschool-aged children: A look at the direction of the developmental pathways. *Infant and Child Development, 23*(1), 4-21; Kulp, M. T., Ciner, E., Maguire, M., Moore, B., Pentimonti, J., Pistilli, M., Cyert, L., Gandy, T. R., Quinn, G., & Ying, G. (2016). Uncorrected hyperopia and preschool early literacy: Results of the vision in preschoolers-hyperopia in preschoolers (VIP-HIP) study. *Ophthalmology, 123*(4), 681-689; Allan, N. P., Hume, L. E., Allan, D. M., Farrington, A. L., & Lonigan, C. J. (2014). Relations between inhibitory control and the development of academic skills in preschool and kindergarten: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(10), 2368-2379.
- 33 For example, Snow, C. E. & Van Hemel, S. B., (Eds.) (2008). *Early childhood assessment: Why, what and how*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- 34 For example, Fuhs, M. W., Nesbitt, K. T., Farran, D. C., & Dong, N. (2014). Longitudinal associations between executive functioning and academic skills across content areas. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(6), 1698-1709; Nix, R. L., Bierman, K. L., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gill, S. (2013). Promoting children's social-emotional skills in preschool can enhance academic and behavioral functioning in kindergarten: Findings from Head Start REDI. *Early Education and Development, 24*, 1000-1019; Blair, C. & Raver, C. C. (2014). Closing the achievement gap through modification of neurocognitive and neuroendocrine function: Results from a cluster randomized controlled trial of an innovative approach to the education of children in kindergarten. *PLoS ONE, 9*(11), 1-13; Jones, S. M., Brown, J. L., & Aber, J. L. (2011). Two-year impacts of a universal school-based social-emotional and literacy intervention: An experiment in translational developmental research. *Child Development, 82*(2), 533-554.
- 35 For example, Hunt, P., Soto, G., Maier, J., Liboiron, N., & Bae, S. (2004). Collaborative teaming to support preschoolers with severe disabilities who are placed in general education early childhood programs. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 24*(3), 123-142; Mattern, J. A. (2015). A mixed-methods study of early intervention implementation in the commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Supports, services, and policies for young children with development delays and disabilities. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 43*(1), 57-67.
- 36 For example, Epstein, M., Atkins, M., Cullinan, D., Kutash, K., & Weaver, R. (2008). *Reducing behavior problems in the elementary school classroom: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- 37 For example, Muñoz, M. A. & Vanderhaar, J. E. (2006). Literacy-embedded character education in a large urban district: Effects of the child development project on elementary school students and teachers. *Journal of Research in Character Education, 4*(1&2), 47-64; Rimm-Kaufman, S. E., Larsen, R. A., Baroody, A. E., Curby, T. W., Ko, M., Thomas, J. B., Merritt, E. G., Abry, T., & DeCoster, J. (2014). Efficacy of the *Responsive Classroom* approach: Results from a 3-year, longitudinal randomized controlled trial. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(3), 567-603.
- 38 For example, Wilcox, K. C., Lawson, H. A., & Angelis, J. (2015). Classroom, school, and district

impacts on diverse student literacy achievement. *Teachers College Record*, 117, 1-38; Knezek, G. & Christensen, R. (2007). Effect of technology-based programs on first- and second-grade reading achievement. *Computers in Schools*, 24(3-4), 23-41; Cheung, A. C. K. & Slavin, R. E. (2013). Effects of educational technology applications on reading outcomes for struggling readers: A best-evidence synthesis. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 48(3), 277-299.

39 For example, Neuman, S. B. (1999). Books make a difference: A study of access to literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34(3), 286-311; Bell, Y. R. & Clark, T. R. (1998). Culturally relevant reading material as related to comprehension and recall in African American children. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 24(4), 455-475; Cartledge, G., Keeseey, S., Bennett, J. G., Ramnath, R., & Council, M. R. (2016). Culturally relevant literature: What matters most to primary-age urban learners. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 32(5), 399-426.

40 For example, Scholastic Library Publishing Company (2016). *School libraries work! A compendium of research supporting the effectiveness of school libraries*. New York: Scholastic.

41 For example, Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.

42 For example, Ren, L. & Hu, G. (2013). A comparative study of family social capital and literacy practices in Singapore. *Journal of Early Childhood*, 13, 98-130.

43 For example, Warren, M. R. (2005). Communities and schools: A new view of urban education reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 75(2), 133-173.

44 For example, Auerbach, S. (2007). Visioning parent engagement in urban schools. *Journal of Family Leadership*, 17(6), 699-734; Auerbach, S. (2009). Walking the walk: Portraits in leadership for family engagement in urban schools. *School Community Journal*, 19(1), 9-32.

45 For example, Sénéchal, M., & Young, L. (2008). The effects of family literacy interventions on children's acquisition of reading from kindergarten to grade 3: A meta-analytic review. *Review of Educational Research*, 78, 880-907; Jordan, G. E., Snow, C. E., & Porche, M. B. (2000). Project EASE: The effort of a family literacy project on kindergarten students' early literacy skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 35(4), 524-546.

46 For example, Kim, J. S. & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's literacy achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386-431.

47 A target number of 6 books over the course of a summer originated with Heyns, B. (1978). *Summer learning and the effects of schooling*. New York: Academic Press. Based on Heyns' finding that students in the sixth and seventh grades who read at least 6 books during the summer had greater gains in reading than those who did not, experimental studies of summer reading interventions tend to provide participating students with 6-10 books.

48 For example, Allington, R. I., McGill-Franzen, A., Camilli, G., Williams, L., Graff, J., Zeig, J., & Nowak, R. (2010). Addressing summer reading setback among economically disadvantaged elementary students. *Reading Psychology*, 31(5), 411-427.

49 For example, White, T. G., Kim, J. S., Kingston, H. C., & Foster, L. (2014). Replicating the effects of a teacher-scaffolded voluntary summer reading program: The role of poverty. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(1), 5-30.

50 For example, Cooper, H., Charlton, K., Valentine, J. C., Muhlenbruck, L., & Borman, G. D. (2000). Making the most of summer school: A meta-analytic and narrative review. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 65(1), 1-127; Kim, J. S. & White, T. G. (2008). Scaffolding voluntary summer reading for children in grades 3 to 5: An experimental study. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 12(1), 1-23.

51 For example, Purcell-Gates, V., Duke, N. K., & Martineau, J. A. (2007). Learning to read and write genre-specific text: Roles of authentic experience and explicit teaching. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 42(1), 8-45; Teale, W. H. & Gambrell, L. B. (2007). Raising urban students' literacy achievement by engaging in authentic, challenging work. *The Reading Teacher*, 60(8), 728-739.

52 For example, Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T. & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605-619; Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006, July). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 275-313.

53 For example, Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Apthorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Glenn, M. L. (2006, July). Out-of-school-time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at-risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76(2), 275-313; Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE #2009-012). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Process for Development and Review

This document was developed by the Early Literacy Task Force, a subcommittee of the Michigan Association of Intermediate School Administrators (MAISA) General Education Leadership Network (GELN), which represents Michigan's 56 Intermediate School Districts. The Task Force included representatives from the following organizations, although their participation does not necessarily indicate endorsement by the organization they represent:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Early Childhood Administrators' Network, MAISA | Michigan Reading Association |
| English Language Arts Leadership Network, MAISA | Michigan State University |
| General Education Leadership Network, MAISA | Michigan Virtual University |
| Kalamazoo Public Schools | Reading NOW Network |
| Michigan Association for Computer Users in Learning | REMC Association of Michigan |
| Michigan Association of Supervisors of Special Education | Southwest Michigan Reading Council |
| Michigan Department of Education | Technology Readiness Infrastructure Grant |
| Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association | University of Michigan |
| Michigan's Integrated Behavior and Learning Support Initiative | |

Feedback on drafts of the document was elicited from other stakeholders, resulting in a number of revisions to the document.

Essential School-Wide and Center-Wide Practices in Literacy

