

The Impact of Tiered Intervention on Fourth
Grade Students' State Test Scores in Reading

A Special Project
Presented to
Dr. Gordon Martinen
Heritage University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Education

Lisa S. Hopp

2012

FACULTY APPROVAL

The Impact of Tiered Intervention on Fourth
Grade Students' State Test Scores in Reading

Approved for the Faculty

_____, Faculty Advisor

_____, Date

ABSTRACT

The researcher conducted the Special Project to determine if Tiered Reading Intervention was an effective fourth grade curriculum. The researcher used data from the Washington State Measurement of Student Progress assessment (MSP). The project was conducted using the MSP scores from spring 2010 and spring 2011. During the 2010-2011 school year, students were placed in literacy groups (or tiers). Students received specially designed instruction that focused on the strategies that would help bring up literacy within the building. As a result of the data, the researcher found that Tiered Intervention (TI) did not help students gain additional reading skills. There was no significance in the scores as a result of using TI to differentiate instruction for fourth grade students.

PERMISSION TO STORE

I, Lisa S. Hopp, hereby irrevocably consent and authorize Heritage University Library to file the attached Special Project entitled, *The Impact of Tiered Intervention on Fourth Grade Students' State Test Scores in Reading*, and make such Project and Compact Disk (CD) available for the use, circulation and/or reproduction by the Library. The Project and CD may be used at Heritage University Library and all site locations.

I state at this time the contents of this Project are my work and completely original unless properly attributed and/or used with permission.

I understand that after three years the printed Project will be retired from the Heritage University Library. My responsibility is to retrieve the printed Project and, if not retrieved, Heritage University may dispose of the document. The Compact Disc and electronic file will be kept indefinitely.

_____, Author

_____, Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FACULTY APPROVAL.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
PERMISSION TO STORE.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background for the Project.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Purpose of the Project.....	2
Delimitations.....	2
Assumptions.....	4
Hypothesis.....	5
Null Hypothesis.....	5

	Page
Significance of the Project.....	5
Procedure.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	7
Acronyms.....	7
CHAPTER 2.....	9
Review of Selected Literature.....	9
Introduction.....	9
Washington State Testing.....	9
Second Language Learning	12
Reading Intervention Programs.....	14
Poverty and Learning.....	18
Summary.....	22
CHAPTER 3.....	24
Methodology and Treatment of Data.....	24

	Page
Introduction.....	24
Methodology.....	24
Participants.....	25
Instruments.....	27
Design.....	29
Procedure.....	30
Treatment of the Data.....	32
Summary.....	32

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data.....	34
Introduction.....	34
Description of the Environment.....	34
Hypothesis	38
Null Hypothesis.....	38

	Page
Results of the Study.....	38
Findings.....	41
Discussion.....	42
Summary.....	42
CHAPTER 5.....	44
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	44
Introduction.....	44
Summary.....	45
Conclusions.....	46
Recommendations.....	47
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDICES	
Appendix A	53
Appendix B.....	55
Appendix C	59

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Literacy MSP Scores for Fourth Grade Students 2009-10 and 2010-11.....	39
Table 2. t-test for Independent Samples – Fourth Grade Reading MSP Data....	40
Table 3. Distribution of t of Post MSP Data.....	41

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background for the Project

In previous years, fourth grade students at Meadow Ridge Elementary had not passed the Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) Washington State test in the area of reading. Reading skills were important and necessary for children to be able to succeed in a competitive society. Students were not reading at grade level, and were unable to perform the tasks needed throughout the school day. Reading skills were necessary to be competent in all core and content areas.

Various consequences for schools and districts were determined by the state when students did not make Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) as measured by the MSP. Schools needed to understand why they were not passing MSP, and find instructional practices that improve reading scores and created fluent readers who were strong in comprehension skills.

Tiered Intervention (TI) was a response to the reading crisis that Meadow Ridge Elementary faced due to AYP. Through this intervention, Meadow Ridge differentiated instruction and made reading both meaningful and relevant.

Statement of the Problem

Many Meadow Ridge fourth grade students did not pass the reading MSP. In order to be in compliance with No Child Left Behind (NCLB), the students at Meadow Ridge needed to pass the state assessment. Typically, if the students did not pass the MSP and the school did not meet AYP, schools were ordered to reduce/change staffing, replace the principal, and funding became limited. Students were also allowed to attend another school if they were currently attending a school that had not met AYP for two consecutive years. A large percentage of students did not pass the MSP in 2010. The evidence that Tiered Intervention (TI) was effective could be found in the increased percentage of students passing the MSP in 2011.

Purpose of the Project

The researcher intended to find out if Tiered Intervention in reading helped students' skills and strategies and improved reading. The improved reading ability of each student was reflected in the MSP scores.

Delimitations

The project included students in the fourth grade. The students attended Meadow Ridge Elementary and were in various fourth grade classrooms. They were enrolled in the Kent School District during the 2010 or 2011 school year.

Many of these students came from low income homes. Many of their parents did not have jobs or possible means of making money. The families had limited educational experiences. Many of the parents had not graduated from high school. Some students came to the United States from underdeveloped countries. And multiple students struggled with reaching the academic rigor and learning necessary for daily life in America.

Tiered Intervention utilized various materials and was used to intervene for students not passing the state and district standards. The school used a reading program called *Language* to reach the students who were at the greatest risk as reflected in the reading MSP. The school also used small strategic groups to teach concepts in the curriculum *Making Meaning*, *Sitton Spelling*, and *Units of Study Writing*. The children who were at benchmark were placed in classrooms with the greatest number, and the teacher was charged to enrich and differentiate the core curriculum. Children were placed in three different groups for reading based on their test scores. If a child was labeled a Level 4 or Level 3 student based on the MSP test, they were placed into a Tier I group. If a child was labeled a Level 2 student on the MSP test, they were placed into a Tier II group. If a child was listed as a Level 1 student, they were placed into the most intensive group, which was known as Tier III. The fourth grade homeroom teachers instructed the highest need children and para-educator support was provided throughout the intervention time. The intervention time took place each day

during the morning literacy block and lasted for 90 minutes. The goal for using such intentional instruction was for all students, from the lowest to the highest achieving student, to fare better on the MSP.

Assumptions

The researcher believed that with intentional instruction being implemented in a strategic fashion at Meadow Ridge, students would respond positively to the change in instructional methods. The researcher believed that children would quickly advance to higher levels of reading comprehension as they were taught intentionally.

The curriculum materials that were adopted by the Kent School District were tested, piloted, and thought to be the best curriculum to meet the needs of native English speakers and English Language Learners (ELLs) alike. Meadow Ridge set reasonable expectations for its students. The school based its intervention techniques on concepts that children of each age group could understand intellectually.

Meadow Ridge was a great place to learn. The teachers created lessons that had both meaning and rigor. The students came to school ready to learn and naturally wanted to please their teacher.

The student population at Meadow Ridge was economically, ethnically, and socially diverse. The students who were enrolled at Meadow Ridge in fall 2010 and took the spring MSP in 2011 were similar to those who were enrolled in the school in fall 2009 and completed the spring MSP in 2010.

Hypothesis

There was a significant relationship between intentional reading intervention and reading performance on the MSP test. Reading instruction was a focus at Meadow Ridge Elementary for fourth grade students

Null Hypothesis

There was no significant relationship between gains on the MSP in reading and specialized reading instruction. Significance was determined for $p \geq .05, .01, .001$.

Significance of the Project

State and Federal education standards became the focal point for many school districts. Tax dollars and funding were tied to schools performing at a specific set standard. Children were not competing against one another, but on a set of specific standards to mark progress.

Specialized interventions meant that schools invested more time in intentional and differentiated instructional techniques. Students were not looked at as the same, and one-size-fits-all instructional techniques had faded away and were replaced with best practices that acknowledged that all children learned at various rates.

Intervention was not an option, but was a mandated form of educating the children in elementary school. Children were seen as individuals in need of individualized teaching. Throughout this form of teaching, all children succeeded at a rate that was realistic for them.

Procedure

In order to complete this study, the researcher met with a data team to get reading MSP scores for both 2010 and 2011. These scores were closely analyzed and children were grouped into one of three reading groups. These groups were referred to as intensive, strategic, and benchmark. After placing these students in groups, teachers continued to compile classroom based assessments (CBAs), district assessments, and anecdotal notes to allow for students to move into various groups as they made gains. Teachers met with a data team once every two months to analyze the success and failures made, and implemented changes as needed. When the MSP scores were released, the data team and the teachers

analyzed the results to determine if the interventions were working and if changes needed to be made for the following year of instruction.

Definition of Terms

benchmark. A student who was considered benchmark was reading at grade level.

core. Core curriculum was the focused curriculum that the district had mandated.

intensive. Intensive students were those who were at the greatest risk of needing significant academic support.

at risk. Students who were at risk were those who had outside factors that made the typical education plan fail. These students required very specific goals and continuous follow up.

strategic. These students were falling behind the set standard, but close to reaching the given goals and standards.

Acronyms

AYP. Adequate Yearly Progress.

CBA. Classroom Based Assessment.

ELL. English Language Learner.

IEP. Individualized Educational Plan.

MSP. Measurement of Student Progress.

NCLB. No Child Left Behind.

OSPI. Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

PTA. Parent Teacher Association.

RTI. Response to Intervention.

TI. Tiered Intervention.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Literature

Introduction

Intervention was a new trend in the educational system. High poverty and minority issues left educators unsure of how to reach a new generation. Many classrooms were filled with students who spoke English as a second language, and No Child Left Behind required that all students succeed in passing the MSP test to show academic progress. How intervention was implemented often predicted its success. The researcher considered poverty and minority issues, and how 90/90/90 schools had gained such amazing results (Reeves 2009). The researcher focused on the unique needs of ELL students by looking at how intervention directly impacted them.

Washington State Testing

High stakes testing had become the new normal within the United States' educational system. To gain the competitive edge, students were required to test against a set of standards that were both rigorous and challenging. The most important test for teachers in the state of Washington was referred to as the Measurement of Student Progress (MSP). It was set up to measure what students knew based on what the state believed that students should know to be proficient

at their grade level. Based on OSPI (2011), the MSP was implemented because the state needed a core assessment to “serve as the basis of accountability for students, schools and districts” (OSPI, 2011). This test seemed to loom all year as teachers looked toward their instructional methods, trying to aim towards the target of the MSP standards.

There were various other reasons that the MSP was implemented. There were strict federal standards that were enforced at the state level. According to Washington State OSPI (2011), the MSP fulfilled the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. No Child Left Behind required annual assessments in reading and math for students in grades three through eight, and in high school. Washington’s MSP had both multiple-choice and short answer questions. The scoring of the MSP seemed to be understandable, and many school districts aligned their report cards to be similar to the same scoring system. According to OSPI, “MSP reading scores were reported using scale scores. Scale scores were three-digit numbers that were used to place students into one of four levels: Advanced (Level 4), Proficient (Level 3), Basic (Level 2) and Below Basic (Level 1). Students scoring a 4 were said to have exceeded the state standard” (OSPI, 2011).

Some parents asked teachers and schools what it took for a child to pass the MSP test. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction gave advice

to parents, claiming that “students do well on state tests when they come to class regularly and do their schoolwork” (OSPI, 2011).

Passing the Washington State MSP also helped schools meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). This was especially important because in order for schools to get the funding they needed, they had to prove that the funding was being used successfully to educate children. One significant way to prove this was through state test scores. Washington saw an enormous jump in schools that did not meet AYP in 2007 and 2008. Washington incorporated Annual Measurement Objectives (AMOs) to be changed and reconstructed every three years. According to the Center on Education Policy, “The large increase in schools not making AYP in 2008 was associated with a relatively large increase in AMOs” (Center on Education Policy, 2011).

The MSP was not a pass/fail assessment. The test result data was interpreted using a system that looked to see if schools (and individual students) had shown growth or progress. Safe Harbor described a school that had shown progress but had not completely passed the MSP. These schools were filled with students who had progressed from the past year, but had not met the state standards as reflected on the MSP. “Very few states provide data on the number of schools that made AYP as a result of safe harbor provision, which gives credit for certain decreases in the percentage of students scoring below the proficient

level” (Center on Education Policy, 2011). Schools were in a crisis as they aimed to instruct with measures focused on a standard that had been set. They wanted students to achieve this standard, but many times fell short of understanding why teaching to the standards had merit beyond test preparation.

The researcher wanted to better understand the motivation behind meeting AYP and passing the MSP. The researcher asked two teachers at Meadow Ridge what motivated them to prepare their students for MSP testing. They both replied with the same answer, that they had to pass the MSP for the year, or there were major repercussions. Schools that do not make AYP for two consecutive years were “identified for improvement and are subject to a series of consequences that become more stringent over time and culminate in a school having to undergo ‘restructuring’ of its governance and operations” (Center on Education Policy, 2011). Schools in AYP were under scrutiny with the public in various ways.

Second Language Learning

Children who did not have the skills and strategies necessary to read struggled throughout their school life on state mandated tests. “Research suggests that children with poor early reading skills continue to struggle with their reading and writing and are more likely to drop out of school” (Ransford, Sutton & Cristin 2011). The author believed that long-term reading deficiencies could be remedied by reading intervention programs. In the study performed by Ransford (2011)

and her associates, two schools were compared. The goal was to assess if literacy intervention programs increased the reading achievement of students when compared to students who had received only regular classroom instruction.

When looking closely at students who received additional intervention that targeted their learning deficiencies, Ransford concluded that “ELL and special education students can benefit from a literacy intervention program with strong and significant effects” (Ransford, Sutton & Cristin, 2011). English Language Learners carried an additional burden when entering the reading and writing classroom. They were expected to learn in an educational system that was built on concepts from past learning. These students were learning a new language, while also trying to build their literacy knowledge base in reading and writing. Krashen’s Five Hypothesis shed light on ELLs. The “Input Hypothesis” explained that ELLs had “acquire language in only one way – by understanding messages or by receiving comprehensible input” (Ingerson, 2011). With the Input Hypothesis model, two central points emerged with the students at Meadow Ridge. First, the fourth grade students had obtained comprehensible input slightly above their level of competence by highly skilled classroom teachers. Second, Meadow Ridge students had a low affective filter, so input was able to be relayed with a lower stress environment because information could be received without high stress. In her research, Ms. Ingerson found that 44.5% of teachers that she surveyed felt they were not modifying assignments or changing instruction for

ELLs. The same group of teachers was asked if they would be willing or interested in attending professional development that addressed the inclusion of ELLs, specifically focused on literacy intervention, and 91% of the teachers said that they would be very interested to attend. Students who were learning English needed comprehensible input that was slightly above their understanding to make the gains necessary to close the achievement gap (Echevarria, Vogt & Short 2008). Teachers needed to be properly trained to teach students who spoke English as their second language.

Reading Intervention Programs

Data drove instructional methods. The researcher wanted to ensure that Meadow Ridge was utilizing the intervention model properly, and that groups had fluidity and changes were occurring within groups on a regular basis. Intervention was considered a team effort. As Kent School District continued to implement a Response to Intervention (RTI) program, the important thing to remember was “assuring fidelity of implementation or treatment integrity will be a challenge” (Bianco 2010). Intervention was a strategy to teach children in a smaller, more intentional way. Meadow Ridge used intervention as a way to reach all children, regardless of ability. The goal was instruction given at the level of understanding and ability.

Reading and intervention went hand in hand. Many students were not performing at grade level for literacy (both in reading and writing). If students received instruction from multiple teachers, there came the dilemma of grading, conferring, and contacting the parents as well. It was vital that intervention had positive outcomes. These outcomes needed to be driven and evaluated by the data. Meadow Ridged aimed to be considered an effective school. According to authors Crawford and Torgesen (2007), there were seven common traits that were seen in successful schools. These traits were strong leadership, positive belief and teacher dedication, data utilization and analysis, effective scheduling, professional development, scientifically based intervention programs, and parent involvement. Crawford (2007) noted that successful schools claimed that instruction was not only done at the classroom level, but also by coaches and principals. A principal was interviewed for Crawford's article and claimed that the job of principal was no longer a desk job. The principal referred to herself as an instructional leader. "The teachers at high performing schools expressed a great deal of respect for their principals" (Crawford & Torgesen, 2007 p.3).

The researcher found that there were teachers in different buildings throughout the district that had differing belief systems about children and how they learn. The researcher had the opportunity to work in three different buildings in the Kent School District, each with unique sets of challenges and accomplishments. The researcher noted that at each school, there were teachers

who had given up on students and felt they were unable to reach these students academically. The rigor was low in these classrooms. This created a unique scenario when intervention meant sharing students. Teachers with high energy and a hard work ethic were often paired with teammates that were low energy and showed low motivation. The researcher saw many fabulous teachers get burned out as a result of being teamed with other teachers. “A belief that all children can learn to read is an important element of the equation of success at high performing schools” (Crawford & Torgesen, 2007 p.11). There were several different strategies that principals could use to get teachers to buy in to the idea that all children could learn to read.

Meadow Ridge had a data team that met regularly to analyze the data collected on students. “High performing schools had regular data meetings with systems in place to help them effectively use the data to inform instruction” (Crawford & Torgesen, 2007 p. 5). Meadow Ridge’s data team had members that were both serious and dedicated to attendance, which was vital for the success of implementing intervention strategies that would work. Meadow Ridge had an agenda to discuss the data which showed respect for the team members, the time, and the materials. In less successful schools, “the data teams knew they were supposed to discuss specific data, but there was no clear plan for making decisions, and when the teachers left the meetings, they were still unsure of where to go next or how to maintain any progress the children were making” (Crawford

& Torgesen, 2007 p 13). Crawford (2007) suggested hiring a substitute teacher during the data team meetings so that teachers were able to extend the meeting time past a typical staff meeting length.

Meadow Ridge Elementary dedicated 90 minutes per day to focus on literacy instruction. Thirty minutes of that time was for specific intervention. The less academically needy classrooms had a student to teacher ratio much larger than other classrooms. The most intensive students received the smallest group settings which was typically one teacher to every six students. The reading block at Meadow Ridge was done at the same time in every grade level. "Several successful schools staggered their reading blocks allowing their reading specialists and paraprofessionals to serve each grade during successful reading blocks throughout the day" (Crawford & Torgesen, 2007 p. 5). If schools bought into the fact that instructional methodology had a direct link to student learning, the instructional job would be taken much more seriously. Intervention worked successfully when students had consistent monitoring. Students who had timely progress monitoring showed greater success in intervention programs (Bianco 2010).

Meadow Ridge used the Walk to Reading model. Students were placed in several reading groups all over the building. They walked to their reading classroom. In this type of model, "children move during the reading block to

homogeneously grouped classrooms in order to better utilize all of their trained staff” (Crawford & Torgesen, 2007 p. 3). Many teachers at Meadow Ridge referred to the students who received the most intensive intervention as getting a double dose. In this model, the teacher gave a half hour of whole group instruction, and then met with each group for 20 additional minutes while the other children worked independently at centers and at their desks. Teachers brought the greatest success when they collaborated with one another and planned lessons to fill in instructional gaps (Bianco 2010).

Meadow Ridge had a small Parent Teacher Association (PTA) and a handful of parents who did alot of the work at the school. Meadow Ridge was a high poverty school with many ELL students. Getting parents involved with the school had been a challenge for Meadow Ridge and the staff. “You need to make the parents feel that they are welcome at the school and that they are a vital part of their child’s education” (Crawford & Torgesen, 2007 p.11).

Poverty and Learning

Meadow Ridge had 86% of their students on free and reduced lunch programs. Many of these children were transient and lived in apartments. There was a high turnover rate, and the door appeared to be revolving with a handful of students entering and exiting each week. Meadow Ridge consistently failed to pass the MSP, while other schools were successful. These successful schools had

similar demographics to Meadow Ridge, but they had specific plans in place to ensure that their students made gains.

Meadow Ridge had taken various steps to put programs into place that promoted positive character traits and good decision-making for their students. In doing this, Meadow Ridge created successful students. They believed that they were worthy of such an accomplishment. Poverty, linguistic differences, and culture impacted a child's educational achievement, but the research was clear that the variables that "teachers and leaders can control, are more influential over students achievement than the intractable variables of poverty, culture and language" (Accountability in Action, 2010). Meadow Ridge teachers worked collaboratively and installed life skills into core curriculum instruction.

High poverty schools achieved successful academic ranks. Many schools blamed low performance scores on the poverty situation at their schools. "There is no question that economic deprivation clearly has an adverse impact of student achievement" (Reeves, 2009 p. 1). In a recent study of effective schools, data showed over and over again that "effective teaching and leadership also have a profound and positive impact on student learning" (Reeves, 2009 p. 1). Reeves (2009) noted that high poverty schools would continue along a path of success, but that actions needed to be more deliberate and thought through compared to higher economic academic areas. Successful schools were schools that had 90%

of students in poverty, 90% of students of a minority, and 90% of students meeting the academic standard. These 90/90/90 schools have similar characteristics, such as “a focus on academic achievement, clear curriculum choices, frequent assessment of student progress with multiple opportunities for improvement, an emphasis on nonfiction writing, and collaborative scoring of students work” (Reeves, 2009 p. 2). Reeves found the collaboration on student’s work to be of interest. The researcher tried to find the tie between collaboration and intervention strategies thus resulting in passing MSP scores (Riddle 2011). Riddle noted that collaboration would help failing schools catch the students with the greatest need and immediately provide aid to that child’s deficiency.

A model school that used intervention to reach their entire student body was Crownhill Elementary School (Washington Board of Education 2009). This school was nationally recognized for closing the achievement gap and having their students perform at higher levels than other Washington state schools. Their goals were to close the gap for low income students, and in 2009-2010 they closed the gap through various interventions and passed the MSP. Their low income students “outperform all non-low income students in the rest of the state” (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction). Crownhill Elementary received many awards for superior performance. “Crownhill’s reading and behavior are an excellent example of Response To Intervention at work” (OSPI 2011). This school worked to collaborate within the staff of the school.

No doubt good literacy skills played a big part in successful programming. The Crownhill Elementary program noted evidence to support the idea that literacy could be taught, even if several barriers stand in the way. Intervention needed to meet children where they were. English Language Learners were in desperate need of intervention. Because of the achievement gap between ELLs and English-proficient students, there was a “need for increased teacher and staff preparation, whole school commitment to the English learner population” (Calderon 2011 p. 103). If ELLs and other struggling students were to succeed in school, then the school needed to be reformed. The school should be able to “provide innovative approaches to curriculum, assessment, and provisions for struggling students, professional development, and other elements” (Calderon 2011 p. 108). Many of the provisions for struggling students discussed interventions with intentional teacher-directed curriculum.

To be successful in life, one must learn to read. Intervention was a necessary tool for students who struggled to gain skills, confidence, and ability while being able to pass state tests which required a set standard. “One-third of fourth graders read so poorly they cannot complete their school work successfully” (National Institute for Literacy 2009 p. 1). The best way to improve literacy scores was to monitor and oversee the literacy programming according to the National Institute for Literacy. This monitoring was done at Meadow Ridge through data analysis and intervention.

Summary

Success could not be achieved overnight. It was clear that the school systems that achieved the greatest success were the systems where collaboration and data analysis were valued. They had intentional instruction and they had a plan. Meadow Ridge had the best intentions with the RTI model. Staggering reading blocks to allow several staff members to provide smaller, intentional reading groups worked (Crawford & Torgesen 2007). The MSP was a test that was standards based (OSPI). According to Crawford & Torgesen (2007), if teachers were teaching to the state standard, they should only build on the areas that they saw academic deficiencies in homogeneous groupings. The greatest successes were measured by the dedication of those who were instrumental in educating students. Many studies by Crawford & Torgesen (2007) and Ingerson (2011) proved that demographic alone cannot play the most significant role in student achievement. Schools with strong intervention programs worked to create an environment of collaboration and continued learning which proved to be successful. Students were the beneficiaries of teachers committed to success and willing to take all steps available to see the children achieve the standards set by the state. According to Reeves (2009), poverty played a critical role in the lives of children, but teachers had an even greater impact. Schools that succeeded, regardless of high percentages of students living in poverty and learning English

as a second language, took steps to “narrow the achievement gap for all students”
(Center on Educational Policy, 2011).

CHAPTER 3

Methodology and Treatment of Data

Introduction

The researcher reviewed the Washington State Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) reading scores from two fourth grade classrooms. In spring 2010, one of the two fourth grade classes was given this standardized assessment. The results proved that the group of fourth grade students had not met AYP. In the 2010-2011 school year, reading intervention groups were formed based on reading ability. The school called this Response to Intervention (RTI). The hope was that this focused-based intervention would benefit individual students and help schools pass standardized assessments. The researcher compared standardized scores from the 2009-2010 school year and the 2010-2011 school year. The purpose of the project was to find out if Tiered Intervention (TI) benefitted students on their reading MSP.

Methodology

The researcher used the experimental method to conduct the project. The researcher used two classrooms of fourth grade students. One classroom sample was from the 2009-2010 school year and the other was from the 2010-2011 school year. One group took the reading MSP in spring 2010, while the other

took the reading MSP in spring 2011. The students who took the MSP in the spring received 30 minutes of Tiered Intervention in reading each day, five days a week, in addition to the literacy workshop whole group model. The researcher's goal was to determine if TI helped increase fourth grade reading MSP scores.

Participants

The researcher was a Kent School District certified teacher with over 14 years of experience. The researcher graduated from Northwest College and completed focused reading courses through the University of Washington. The researcher also experienced a variety of instructional methods from Kindergarten through high school, and participated in professional learning community design groups and data collection teams throughout her school. The researcher worked in fourth grade.

The data collection was compiled from the MSP scores of fourth grade students. The data were collected from like groups of children. Each class had 25 students. These students were between nine and 10 years of age, with a high enrollment of ELLs in each classroom. The students had many different cultures and traditions. Both classrooms were ethnically and racially diverse.

The students lived in low income homes and apartments adjacent to the school. According to OSPI (2011), the free and reduced lunch percentile for

Meadow Ridge Elementary was in the 70% range for both of the years studied. There were 493 students enrolled in the school. In 2010, the school had 16.8% Latino, 32.0% White, 18.1% Black, 20.9 Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.3 Native American students. It was considered, and had been for many years, one of Kent School District's most diverse schools.

During the 2009-2010 school year, all students in fourth grade received instruction from the same curriculums for literacy: *Making Meaning*, *Units of Study*, *Sitton Spelling*, and *Word Sense*. The method of instruction consisted of a combination of whole group, with small groups pulled aside for conferring and book clubs. Students from this group stayed in their own classrooms and had various reading abilities ranging from intensive to above benchmark. This was the control group.

During the 2010-2011 school year, students received instruction using the same curriculums for literacy as were used in 2009-2010. In addition, these students were also assessed for their reading fluency and comprehension using an individualized reading inventory assessment. They were placed into tiers. The tiers were categorized as Tier I, Tier II and Tier III. Each tier received intervention time that was set apart to be individualized. Those who were in Tier III were the most intensive students. Those who were Tier II were below grade level. Those in Tier I were benchmark or above. The Tier I students received

enrichment as their specific intervention, and the goal was to bring them up another grade level. Each tiered group met in a specific classroom that taught whole group, and then an additional 30 minutes of focused reading intervention at their learning level.

The three fourth grade teachers from the school were assigned to a specific tier of students to give reading intervention instruction. The principal assigned the tiered groups of students to specific teachers. Each teacher was responsible for their tiered students. They completed report cards for these students and progress monitored each student. The tiered students were allowed to move up or down a tier based on their learning proficiency. The objective was to instruct students in literacy based on their current level of fluency and comprehension.

Instruments

Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) scores were used to complete the data collecting. According to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI), the goal of the MSP was to measure student progress. The OSPI also acknowledged that a student's performance must be considered in addition to the results of the MSP to show reading proficiency.

The MSP results showed reading scores that reflected whether the student was advanced, proficient, basic, or well below the standard. It gave a scaled score

along with the student's proficiency level. It confirmed if the student had passed in each area tested (reading, writing, and math). The MSP was also specific. In each content area, it provided a percentage gained. This allowed the reader to understand which focus area in reading specifically (comprehension, analysis, literary text and informational text) that their students had made gains in or needed further support. Proficiency was the goal, while exceeding the standard was always beneficial. The scored levels were as follows: 275-374 (Level 1/Tier III), 375-399 (Level 2/Tier II), 400-423 (Level 3/Tier I), and 424-475 (Level 4/Tier I). The levels were as follows: Level 4 (advanced), Level 3 (proficient), Level 2 (basic), and Level 1 (below standard).

The researcher looked at each level, score, and focused on the percentage gained in the four reading focus areas. This gave the researcher the ability to understand not only the basic score, but where each student made gains. The researcher used the level standard number to formulate a percentage per student. The comparisons led to the analyzing of the data and results were recorded.

Both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school year MSP reading scores were analyzed. Both samples were fourth grade students. Measurement of Student Progress scores reflected reading proficiency by measuring comprehension, reading analysis, and both literary and informational text understanding. The MSP was unlike more familiar standardized tests, which measured students'

performance against other students. The MSP measured students' performance against a set of learning standards, not against their peers. The reading MSP took one day to complete.

Design

The researcher conducted a study using a nonequivalent control group design within the quasi experimental design category (Gay, 2009 p.465). The history of the study was conducted between the years of spring 2010 to spring 2011. According to Gay (2009), maturation did not pose a threat as the children from both the control and treatment groups were the same age and developmentally alike at the time the MSP was conducted. The instrument used was the Washington State MSP. Because students from Meadow Ridge Elementary were given the MSP in 2010, the school was able to prepare for the 2011 MSP.

The statistical regression played a part in the treatment group (Gay 2009). Those who scored extremely low on the MSP received more intense intervention than those who had an average score. There was a range of results on the spring 2010 MSP. The groups of students in both study groups were of the same age, socio-economic background, and maturity. As reported by Gay (2009), the differential selection of participants did not impact the study's validity. Gay (2009) also noted that mortality did not threaten the results of the study. All

participants were given ample time and opportunity to take the test, with make-up dates given to all participants. Selection interaction did not threaten the study because all groups were the same age and at the same academic grade level. The external source of pretest interaction posed no threat because there was no pretest given prior to the MSP, although there were several MSP prep opportunities within the classroom setting (Gay 2009). The treatment group received the same intervention. Multiple-treatment interference did not impact the results of the study (Gay 2009). The treatment group received concurrent Tiered Intervention for 30 minutes per day, regardless of the academic ability. The treatment did not vary, nor did it build on itself.

Procedure

School began each year after Labor Day. In September 2009, a new group of fourth graders entered Meadow Ridge Elementary. They were taught literacy through whole group instruction within the adopted literacy workshop model. This instructional model was reinforced by the classroom teacher and differentiation was used as the teacher felt necessary. Teachers utilized the curriculums of *Units of Study*, *Making Meaning*, *Word Sense*, and *Sitton Spelling* to reinforce and support reading. The MSP test was given in spring 2010 and the scores were sent to parents in fall 2010 (at Open House when students were in fifth grade).

In September 2010, a new group of fourth grade students entered Meadow Ridge Elementary. They were taught literacy through whole group instruction, small group instruction, and focused RTI. Response to Intervention took place as a means to use the strategies that students were lacking in literacy, in an attempt to double dose students with whole group and individualized attention. The goal was to improve MSP scores. The MSP was given in the spring of 2011 and scores were given to parents at Open House in fall 2011 (student were in fifth grade when parents received their fourth grade MSP scores).

The control group received whole group, curriculum-based instruction by highly qualified certificated instructors. They were taught to the Washington State Standards and Essential Learning's (<http://www.k12.wa.us/>). They were given a two-hour block for literacy. In this specific group, students were placed into reading ability groups and instruction was differentiated continually.

The experimental group received curriculum-based instruction by highly qualified certificated instructors. They were taught to the Washington State Standards and Essential Learning's (<http://www.k12.wa.us/>). They were given a two-hour block for literacy. They were placed into tiered groups based on their understanding of literacy standards and their ability to be successful on classroom assessments. Within the two-hour literacy block, there were thirty minutes designed each day for specific learning targets and goals. These targets were

taught until completely mastered. The classroom tiers were placed into categories: benchmark, strategic, and intensive. Each group had specific strategies to use while implementing the reading process. The experimental group received interventions that were targeted for their specific reading level. Data supported the goals and follow-up was determined by grade level. The fourth grade team met weekly to discuss data to ensure that individual students were placed in the correct tier. Students were moved fluidly if they needed more/less intense intervention. Teachers analyzed data and discussed curriculum, moved students within tiers, and discussed ideas for reading strategy implementation.

Treatment of the Data

The researcher used a t-test for independent samples to evaluate test statistics and variables. The researcher compared the two reading MSP scores from 2010 and 2011 to evaluate if students who received intervention during the 2010-2011 school year improved when compared to the year prior to intervention. Significance was determined for $p \geq .05, .01, .001$.

Summary

The researcher studied two groups of fourth grade students at Meadow Ridge Elementary (one from the 2009-2010 school year and one from the 2010-2011 school year). There were 56 fourth grade students in 2010 and 67 fourth

grad students in 2011. There were three fourth grade teachers in both the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. The Washington State MSP scores for each class were used in the analysis. The control group received instruction in literacy that was district mandated and approved. The experimental group received a double dose in literacy instruction. They were given intensive intervention to support their weaknesses in literacy. They were closely monitored for growth. Intervention groups were fluid and movement was vital to the success of each student.

When the school started RTI in literacy, there was speculation that there was no way to meet all of the individual needs of the students in a classroom. It was assumed by a large majority of teaching staff that it would be one more measure to increase teacher work that would not prove productive in student achievement. There was hope at Meadow Ridge that RTI could help boost MSP scores, specifically for those who were in Tier II intervention and scored a two or below on the MSP in 2009-2010.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

The researcher wanted to determine if tiered literacy instruction would help students achieve passing scores on high stakes state testing. The researcher believed that if instruction was intentional, students would be more prepared to take the Washington State Measurement of Student Progress. This internationalized curriculum's success was measured by the scores of the 2011 MSP.

Description of the Environment

Fourth grade students at Meadow Ridge Elementary in Kent, Washington had not passed the Washington State MSP for over five years. This created a situation where both the state and district wanted a change in instructional methods to yield better test results. Reading and writing skills were vastly important, and Meadow Ridge was a school with a high English Language Learner (ELL) population. Time after time, the school assessments showed that the students at Meadow Ridge did not produce the results necessary for passing the MSP. Meadow Ridge was often referred to as a failing school. In order to stop being a failing school, it was vital that they took all measures that were

possible to yield improved results. Meadow Ridge staff began to research ways to improve test performance while also boosting staff morale. Learning communities were established and grade level teams met weekly to discuss and analyze testing data.

When schools did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and students did not pass the MSP, consequences occurred. After much reflection on the reasons that the students at Meadow Ridge were not making AYP, it became obvious that not all children were learning, even though all children were being taught. Reflecting on instruction and MSP scores helped teachers reflect on what was working and what needed fine tuning in their instructional strategies. Teachers at Meadow Ridge brainstormed ways to meet the needs of all children (both on grade level and below). The final answer was Tiered Intervention (TI). Tiered Intervention was a structure of instruction that placed all students in their appropriate academic group. If students were struggling readers, they were placed with other children that were struggling. If children were high achieving, they were placed with other high achieving students. The goal was to meet students where they were at, instead of making them move forward at an academic place that was too slow or too high for them.

Tiered Intervention allowed students to be placed into Tiers I, II, or III. A Tier III student needed the most intensive intervention and was placed in a small

reading group for over thirty minutes per day. The Tier II students were those who were below grade level and in need of strategic intervention. This group had thirty minutes each day of instruction that was specifically focused on their academic deficits. They were also placed in smaller groups, with the goal being under ten students per group. The Tier I students were also referred to as benchmark students. These students were above grade level and showed both reading and writing competency on state testing. These students were in a larger classroom setting and were given whole group instruction.

Meadow Ridge Elementary had a problem. In order to receive both state and federal assistance, the school needed to be in compliance with No Child Left Behind (NCLB). To adhere to NCLB, schools needed a certain percentage of students to pass MSP, or at least show growth as a whole. High standards were set for all children, not just those from affluent schools and communities. Meadow Ridge was a low income, transient, multicultural school. It considered a lot of factors prior to implementation of TI in 2011. The evidence that TI worked was found in MSP scores. The predictors of the MSP results were curriculum-based assessments, teacher-created tests and various summative and formative assessments.

Not passing AYP was a very big problem, and many thought that schools who had not met AYP had inept teachers and watered-down curriculum. Schools

that did not make AYP for several years in a row were in fear of losing jobs, students, and administrators. If students from a specific school did not pass the MSP, resulting in not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), parents had the right to move their child to a school that had passed the high stakes test. The principal and staff reminded parents at Meadow Ridge, who were concerned about the schools' continual failing grade, that with literacy intervention, the MSP results improved and children's skills grew. The success of Tiered Intervention was evidenced by students passing the MSP in spring 2011 and the school making AYP for the first time in five years.

The researcher was convinced that intentional instruction would best meet the needs of all students. The researcher thought that the Tiered Instructional model at Meadow Ridge benefitted all children. The researcher concluded that a well formulated intervention program would yield a passing grade on the MSP. The goal of this study was to find out if the strategy lessons and literacy skills practiced in a specific model would benefit all children. Seeing the benefits of TI in other Kent schools made the Meadow Ridge administration focus on this model throughout the entire year.

The goal of the TI program was fluidity. Children were expected to come in and out of tiers based on their current and updated understanding. If a child was behind and unable to perform at the tier they were placed in, they would be

moved. Likewise, if a child was able to move up, there was a group suitable for him/her as well. The logic behind this intervention was doing what was best for all children. The success of this program and adopting it for the 2011-2012 school year was found when interpreting the spring 2011 MSP results. The researcher noted that implementation of TI would yield positive academic success. The curriculum used for this intervention was adopted by the Kent School District and was geared to meet the needs of native English speakers and English Language Learners alike.

Hypothesis

There was a significant relationship between intentional reading intervention and reading performance on the MSP test. Reading instruction was a focus at Meadow Ridge Elementary for fourth grade students

Null Hypothesis

There was no significant relationship between gains on the MSP in reading and specialized reading instruction. Significance was determined for $p \geq .05, .01, .001$.

Results of the Study

The researcher collected reading MSP scores for all fourth grade students from spring 2010 and spring 2011. In Table 1, the control group was known as

Pre-Tiered Intervention 2010, and the treatment group was Post-Tiered Intervention Spring 2011. Table 1 displayed the raw scores for each student. It consisted of an abbreviated list of all student MSP scores. The data was made available to the researcher through the records kept at Meadow Ridge Elementary, and confirmed by checking OSPI for validity. Appendix A contained a complete list of the data.

Table 1

Literacy MSP Scores for Fourth Grade Students 2009-10 and 2010-11

Post-Tiered Intervention Spring 2011		Pre-Tiered Intervention 2010	
Student	MSP Score	Student	MSP Score
X1	357	Y1	359
X2	390	Y2	393
X3	354	Y3	408
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.
X65	383	Y54	359
X66	400	Y55	402
X67	424	Y56	408

Note. This was an abbreviated list of fourth grade reading MSP scores. Student names were replaced with X and Y.

The researcher conducted a t-test for independent groups, using the *STATPAK* software, available through Macromedia Director (1999). Sixty-seven student scores were used in the treatment group, and 56 student scores were used in the control group. The t-value determined was -1.23, as well as 121 degrees of freedom. Table 2 illustrated the complete *STATPAK* t-test data for all fourth grade students.

Table 2

t-test for Independent Samples – Fourth Grade Reading MSP Data

Statistic	Values
No. of Scores in Group X	67
Sum of Scores in Group X	26270.0000
Mean of Group X	392.09
Sum of Squared Scores in Group X	10331586.00
SS of Group X	31393.46
No. of Scores in Group Y	56
Sum of Scores in Group Y	22233.000
Mean of Group Y	397.02
Sum of Squared Scores in Group Y	8854673.00
SS of Group Y	27774.98
t-Value	-1.23
Degrees of freedom	121

$$t = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SS_1 + SS_2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{392.10 - 397.02}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{10331586.00 + 8854673.00}{67 + 56 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{67} + \frac{1}{56}\right)}}$$

$$t = -1.23$$

The t-value of -1.23 and 121 degrees of freedom from the t-test for independent samples was used to determine significance for $p \geq .05, .01, .001$. The author concluded that the null hypothesis was accepted at all three levels because there was no significant difference between the two groups of students. Since the null hypothesis was accepted the author also concluded that the students who were placed in TI performed lower than in the past, where heterogeneous instructional group formats were used. The t-value would have had to be at 1.980 to show significance for p at the level of .05.

Table 3

Distribution of t of Post MSP Data

df	P		
	.05	.01	.001
121	1.980	2.617	3.373

Findings

The researcher found that the null hypothesis was accepted and the hypothesis not supported at any level. Students at Meadow Ridge Elementary were receiving instruction tiered to their academic level. The actual result was that fewer students were meeting standard on the annual state assessment after participating in the TI model.

The researcher found that TI did not work and that students did not benefit from Tiered Instruction. The researcher concluded that further conversations

were necessary for corrections to be implemented. Tiered Intervention was a proven method of intentional teaching. The staff at Meadow Ridge must look at the way they are conducting intervention, in the hopes to provide better intervention for upcoming years.

Discussion

Meadow Ridge developed a TI program that was designed and created to focus on the reading strategies that were missing for many students. The results of this study concluded that the fourth grade students at Meadow Ridge did not respond positively to the intervention given, and scored lower on the reading MSP. The use of the literacy intervention showed no significance gained in fourth grade reading MSP scores at Meadow Ridge Elementary.

The Special Project did not yield the results that the researcher had anticipated. Tiered Intervention created an individualized program that focused on the various literacy needs of fourth grade students. English Language Learners were supported by the teachers as they looked to the English Language Development standards (ELDs) to incorporate into daily lessons. The researcher determined that more focus needed to be placed on the type of intervention being used, so that teachers could best use their skills and resources.

Summary

The researcher developed the Special Project to show that TI and intentional instructional methods do work. Literacy MSP scores were analyzed to

determine significance for $p \geq .05, .01, .001$. Data was reviewed for all fourth grade students, including a high population of ELLs.

The author found that the null hypothesis was accepted at all three levels of $p (.05, .01, .001)$. It was determined that Tiered Intervention did not show significant gains in helping ELLs or native speaking students succeed on the fourth grade reading MSP. The researcher concluded that additional research should be conducted to determine how to gear instructional practices to yield improvement on MSP scores.

Meadow Ridge attempted to provide reading interventions that were intentionally designed to meet the needs of each individual learner. The school provided necessary support staff to see that TI worked. The data showed a significant need for change in reading instruction and TI was the change provided for MSP success. Tiered Intervention provided fluidity in grouping students, which allowed students the opportunity to belong to a group that directly met their reading needs.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The study was designed to see the impact of Tiered Intervention on reading comprehension. The study took place during the 2011-2012 school year. The study analyzed the Measurement of Student Progress (MSP) results in both spring 2010 and 2011 tests.

Meadow Ridge Elementary had a problem – they had hit their fifth year of not passing the MSP and not making Adequate Yearly Progress. This had a direct impact on teachers, families, students, and administration at Meadow Ridge, which was receiving the type of funding and support necessary to run a successful school.

Tiered Intervention was the hopeful answer Meadow Ridge Elementary found to help students pass Washington State's high stakes testing. Meadow Ridge realized that they had a problem, and the staff was seeking a solution that would serve both the intensive and benchmark students. The school used teachers, administrators, and support staff to formulate a plan to respond to the growing need of intervention. The solution was thirty minutes of focused intervention matched to meet the specific reading needs of fourth grade students.

Summary

The researcher compiled both 2010 and 2011 spring Measurement of Student Progress scores. Meadow Ridge was a failing school in need of support that would bring literacy comprehension to a higher level. The goal of Meadow Ridge was success in literacy for all students. Additionally, all students would receive a quality education. The staff and principal understood the need for differentiation and accommodation in reading. With the help of the staff, a Tiered Intervention program was implemented.

All fourth grade students received the same time of intervention. Sixty-seven students received the specially designed intervention. If students were struggling, they received smaller group instruction geared for a specific strategy that the student needed. The intervention was done each day for thirty minutes. The researcher's goal was to see if TI worked. If it worked, the MSP scores of 2011 would be higher than that of 2010.

Teachers used the school district adopted curriculum and provided fluidity in groupings. Student data was closely analyzed and presented when changes were needed. Teachers met collaboratively to check and monitor the progress of the students in their assigned groups. During intervention time, the entire Meadow Ridge staff was used to help lower literacy group sizes and support the

needs of highly intensive students (Crawford 2007). Teachers worked side by side to grade work, create assessments, and monitor growth.

Schools that were in AYP suffered great scrutiny from the communities where they resided (Center on Educational Policy, 2011). Regardless of a child's race, poverty, culture or ethnicity, all students were expected to make successful gains at the grade level they were in (OSPI 2011).

The researcher used a t-test to show significance. The findings showed some significance. However, the researcher concluded that Tiered Intervention did not create great gains in literacy testing. Teachers needed to be reaffirmed in teaching literacy with the interventions in place. The researcher believed that the intervention used was a failure, and that greater rigor would need to be used to significantly impact MSP scores in the future. It appeared that the teachers had worked hard to give students the best instruction possible; but given the spring 2011 MSP results, it seemed necessary to establish better intervention models and methods. The study was used as a platform to understand how intervention worked in terms of test performance.

Conclusions

The findings from the study concluded that Tiered Intervention in reading was not productive in helping fourth grade students pass the MSP. The findings

proved that students placed in homogenous groups each day did not benefit the student's ability to perform and thus pass the MSP. The findings showed that fourth grade students needed a different form of intervention in order to pass the MSP.

Recommendations

The faculty believed that combining a group of teachers, administrators, and support staff would be the best way to figure out a solution to the problem of not passing the MSP. After much brainstorming came the idea of intervention. Differentiation and individualization was a focus at Meadow Ridge. The principal accepted the notion that the work was getting greater and the effort needed to be stronger.

The project provided interesting results. The researcher believed that there was a chance that TI could work at Meadow Ridge, with differing systems of instruction. The staff at Meadow Ridge was a divided staff with a strong union presence. There were many teachers who verbally communicated that the new way of teaching did not fit their style. Many of these teachers closed their classroom doors in refusal to commit to the intervention program. The format of the intervention also seemed vague. When asking the teachers about the fluidity of groupings, many said they did not make any changes for the entire year. The

plan was for continual assessment and change. Children did not receive the best instructional strategies and they did not achieve successful marks on the MSP.

The staff at Meadow Ridge should continue to use Tiered Intervention as a model to group students. The model that Meadow Ridge uses needs to be changed into a model that incorporates intervention with differentiation. The model that would be most effective is one that allows students of various academic abilities to be placed together in the classroom. Students can model correct learning behaviors for one another and learn from each other. Intervention should focus on specific skills rather than targeted to academic proficiency.

REFERENCES

- Bianco, S., (2010). Improving Student Outcomes: Data-Driven Instruction and Fidelity of Implementation in a Response to Intervention Model. *Teaching Exceptional Children*. Retrieved from <http://journals.cec.sped.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1770>
- Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011) Effective Instruction for English Language Learners. Retrieved from <http://futureofchildren.org>
- Center on Education Policy. (2011). *Is Achievement Improving and are Gaps Narrowing for Title I Students?* Retrieved from <http://www.cep-dc.org/publications/index.cfm?selectedYear=2011>
- Crawford., E., Torgeseen, J., Teaching All Students to Read: Practices from Reading First Schools With Strong Intervention Outcomes. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov.libdb.heritage.edu>
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D.J. (2008). *Making Content Comprehensible For English Learners: The SIOP Model*, Boston, MA: Pearson Education

Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research:*

Competencies for Analysis and Applications. Upper Saddle River, NJ:

Pearson Education

Ingerson, T., (2011) Helping ELLS Achieve Success in the Mainstream

Classroom Retrieved from

www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/recordDetail?accno=ED518704

Kober, N., McMurrer, J., & Silva M. (2011) State Test Score Trends. Retrieved

from <http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?DocumentSubTopicID=21>

National Institute for Literacy. *Early Literacy Leading the Way*. Retrieved from

http://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/EL_policy09.pdf

Macromedia Director. (1999). STATPAK Projector Skeleton (Version 6.0)

[Software].

Meadow Ridge Elementary School. (n.d.) *Washington State Report Card*.

Retrieved from

<http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/summary.aspx?groupLevel=District&schoolId=1592&reportLevel=School&orgLinkId=1592&yrs=&year=2010>

-11

- Olson, R (2010). Using State or Study Administered Achievement Tests in Impact Evaluations. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov.libdb.heritage.edu>
- Office of Public Instruction for Washington State. (n.d.) *State Testing* Retrieved from <http://www.k12.wa.us/assessment/StateTesting/>
- Ransford, C., Sutton, F., & Cristin. R., (2011) A Randomized Controlled Trial of a Response to Intervention Tier 2 Literacy Program. Retrieved from <http://20.132.48.254/ERICWebPortal/search/recordDetails.jsp?>
- Reeves, D., (2009) The 90/90/90 Schools. *Teachers of Color* (1) Retrieved from www.teachersofcolor.com/200904/uncovering-the-secrets-of-high-poverty-high-success
- Riddle, W. (2011) State Policy Differences Greatly Impact AYP Numbers *Center on Educational Policy* Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/search/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=ED518992
- Student Team Reading and Writing. (2011) *Institute of Education Sciences*. 17(4). Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/interventionreport.aspx?sid=591>

Washington State Board of Education (2009) Crownhill Elementary Case Study:

Closing the Economic Achievement Gap Retrieved from

<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/2010.08.29%20Crown%20Hill%20Elementary%20narrative.pdf>

APPENDIX A

Table 1 – Complete List of Data

Literacy MSP Scores for Fourth Grade Students 2009-10 and 2010-11

<u>Post-Tiered Intervention Spring 2011</u>		<u>Pre-Tiered Intervention 2010</u>	
Student	MSP Score	Student	MSP Score
X1	357	Y1	359
X2	390	Y2	393
X3	354	Y3	408
X4	388	Y4	416
X5	401	Y5	393
X6	424	Y6	365
X7	393	Y7	366
X8	424	Y8	409
X9	388	Y9	424
X10	364	Y10	402
X11	404	Y11	400
X12	401	Y12	400
X13	380	Y13	371
X14	378	Y14	405
X15	396	Y15	424
X16	431	Y16	401
X17	400	Y17	411
X18	375	Y18	402
X19	390	Y19	383
X20	380	Y20	388
X21	400	Y21	411
X22	401	Y22	431
X23	400	Y23	383
X24	393	Y24	362
X25	385	Y25	393
X26	383	Y26	408
X27	367	Y27	440
X28	407	Y28	431
X29	367	Y29	440
X30	361	Y30	404
X31	424	Y31	391
X32	357	Y32	351

X33	396	Y33	371
X34	383	Y34	409
X35	361	Y35	415
X36	431	Y36	412
X37	396	Y37	404
X38	354	Y38	380
X39	419	Y39	390
X40	393	Y40	432
X41	378	Y41	412
X42	393	Y42	379
X43	370	Y43	408
X44	424	Y44	416
X45	431	Y45	401
X46	396	Y46	382
X47	411	Y47	380
X48	393	Y48	388
X49	393	Y49	352
X50	415	Y50	425
X51	396	Y51	368
X52	388	Y52	409
X53	454	Y53	366
X54	407	Y54	359
X55	370	Y55	402
X56	393	Y56	408
X57	390		
X58	407		
X59	364		
X60	407		
X61	364		
X62	367		
X63	364		
X64	393		
X65	383		
X66	400		
X67	424		

Note. This was a list of fourth grade reading MSP scores. Student names were replaced with X and Y. The mean of the control group was 397.02 (2010) and the mean of the experimental group (2011) was 392.10.



APPENDIX B

Measurements of Student Progress School Roster of Student Performance GRADE 4 Spring 2011

MSP

DISTRICT: Kent School District
SCHOOL: Meadow Ridge Elementary School
CDS CODE: 17415-4465

	Reading
MSP Tested	Number of Students
Meets Standard	67
Level 4	0
Level 3	9
Level BA	15
Does Not Meet Standard	0
Level 2	28
Level 1	15
Writing - Insufficient	--
Not English (L)	
Off Mode (M)	
Illegible (N)	
Off Task (T)	
MSP Not Tested	1
Absent unexcused	0
Blank	1
Incomplete	0
Invalid	0
No booklet	0
Out of grade level	0
Refusal	0
MSP Exempt	3
Partially Enrolled	1
Not Enrolled	0
NNEP Exempt	1
Medical Exempt	0
Absent Excused	1
Previously Passed	0
WAAS-Portfolio	0

Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS):
BA = Meets standard on the WAAS HSP-Basic (score of 375 in reading, mathematics and science; minimum score of 13 in writing)
PORT = Participated in the WAAS Portfolio (WAAS PORT). Detail scores are available on a separate roster.

Exempt includes:
ABSENT EXC (Absent excused)
MED EXC (Medical exemption)
NNEP (New non-English proficient in 1st year of enrollment)
PARTIAL ENROLL (Partially enrolled during testing window)
PREV PASSED (Previously passed on grade level)

Not tested includes:
ABSENT UNEXC (Absent unexcused)
BLANK (No student responses)
INCOMPLETE (Incomplete)
INVALID (Invalidated)
NO BOOKLET (No booklet)
OUT OF GRADE LEVEL (Out of grade level)
REFUSAL

Continuous enrollment:
To be considered continuously enrolled, a student must be enrolled without a break in service of more than .30

Does not meet standard:
L2 = Level 2
L1 = Level 1

Meets or exceeds standard:
L4 = Level 4
L3 = Level 3

INSUFF = Insufficient; not eligible to generate a total score. Earned if either prompt is scored as L, M, N

Writing key:
B = Blank
I = Not English

Measurements of Student Progress School Roster of Student Performance GRADE 4 Spring 2011

Reading										Reading										Reading									
Minimum score 400 to meet standard										Minimum score 400 to meet standard										Minimum score 400 to meet standard									
Meets Standard		Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned							
				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text											
** meets or exceeds proficient range																													
YES	454 (L4)	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+	100+	94+						
YES	407 (L3)	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+	76+							
NO	370 (L1)	29	41	28	44	29	41	28	44	29	41	28	44	29	41	28	44	29	41	28	44	29							
NO	393 (L2)	65	59	67	56	65	59	67	56	65	59	67	56	65	59	67	56	65	59	67	56	65							
NO	390 (L2)	71+	47	56	63	71+	47	56	63	71+	47	56	63	71+	47	56	63	71+	47	56	63	71+							
YES	407 (L3)	71+	82+	78+	75+	71+	82+	78+	75+	71+	82+	78+	75+	71+	82+	78+	75+	71+	82+	78+	75+	71+							
NO	364 (L1)	24	35	22	38	24	35	22	38	24	35	22	38	24	35	22	38	24	35	22	38	24							
YES	407 (L3)	76+	76+	67	89+	76+	76+	67	89+	76+	76+	67	89+	76+	76+	67	89+	76+	76+	67	89+	76+							

Reading										Reading										Reading									
Minimum score 400 to meet standard										Minimum score 400 to meet standard										Minimum score 400 to meet standard									
Meets Standard		Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned							
				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text											
** meets or exceeds proficient range																													
ABSENT EXC							ABSENT EXC						ABSENT EXC						ABSENT EXC										
NO	354 (L1)	24	18	22	19		NO	354 (L1)	24	18	22	19		NO	354 (L1)	24	18	22	19		NO	354 (L1)	24	18					
YES	419 (L3)	80+	82+	89+	81+		YES	419 (L3)	80+	82+	89+	81+		YES	419 (L3)	80+	82+	89+	81+		YES	419 (L3)	80+	82+					
NO	393 (L2)	59	65	51	63		NO	393 (L2)	59	65	51	63		NO	393 (L2)	59	65	51	63		NO	393 (L2)	59	65					
NO	378 (L2)	47	41	50	38		NO	378 (L2)	47	41	50	38		NO	378 (L2)	47	41	50	38		NO	378 (L2)	47	41					
NO	393 (L2)	59	65	67	56		NO	393 (L2)	59	65	67	56		NO	393 (L2)	59	65	67	56		NO	393 (L2)	59	65					
NO	370 (L1)	47	24	28	44		NO	370 (L1)	47	24	28	44		NO	370 (L1)	47	24	28	44		NO	370 (L1)	47	24					
YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+					

Reading										Reading										Reading									
Minimum score 400 to meet standard										Minimum score 400 to meet standard										Minimum score 400 to meet standard									
Meets Standard		Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned							
				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text				Comprehension	Analysis	Literary Text											
** meets or exceeds proficient range																													
YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+					
NO	357 (L1)	24	24	22	25		NO	357 (L1)	24	24	22	25		NO	357 (L1)	24	24	22	25		NO	357 (L1)	24	24					
NO	396 (L2)	59	71	72+	56		NO	396 (L2)	59	71	72+	56		NO	396 (L2)	59	71	72+	56		NO	396 (L2)	59	71					
NO	383 (L2)	41	59	50	50		NO	383 (L2)	41	59	50	50		NO	383 (L2)	41	59	50	50		NO	383 (L2)	41	59					
NO	361 (L1)	18	35	28	25		NO	361 (L1)	18	35	28	25		NO	361 (L1)	18	35	28	25		NO	361 (L1)	18	35					
BLANK							BLANK							BLANK							BLANK								
YES	431 (L4)	88+	94+	83+	100+		YES	431 (L4)	88+	94+	83+	100+		YES	431 (L4)	88+	94+	83+	100+		YES	431 (L4)	88+	94+					
NO	396 (L2)	59	71	72+	56		NO	396 (L2)	59	71	72+	56		NO	396 (L2)	59	71	72+	56		NO	396 (L2)	59	71					

GRADE 4

Spring 2011

Reading							
Minimum score 400 to meet standard							
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)	
		Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text			Literary Text
		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of Total Points Earned	
NO	393 (L2)	65	59	61	63	*.* meets or exceeds proficient range	
NO	385 (L2)	65	41	56	50		
NO	383 (L2)	65	35	56	44		
NO	367 (L1)	41	24	22	44		
PARTIAL ENROLL							
YES	407 (L3)	71+	82+	72+	81+		
NO	367 (L1)	29	35	33	31		
NO	361 (L1)	18	35	28	25		

Reading							
Minimum score 400 to meet standard							
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)	
		Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text			Literary Text
		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of Total Points Earned	
YES	431 (L4)	88+	94+	94+	88+	*.* meets or exceeds proficient range	
YES	400 (L3)	59	76+	61	75+		
NO	375 (L2)	35	47	44	38		
NO	390 (L2)	59	59	67	50		
NO	380 (L2)	41	53	39	56		
YES	400 (L3)	55	71	72+	63		
YES	401 (L3)	65	76+	83+	56		
YES	400 (L3)	71+	65	72+	63		

Reading							
Minimum score 400 to meet standard							
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)	
		Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text			Literary Text
		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of Total Points Earned	
YES	424 (L4)	82+	94+	89+	88+	*.* meets or exceeds proficient range	
NO	388 (L2)	71+	41	61	50		
NO	364 (L1)	35	24	33	25		
YES	404 (L3)	76+	71	100+	44		
YES	401 (L3)	71+	71	72+	69+		
NO	380 (L2)	41	53	56	38		
NO	378 (L2)	41	47	44	44		
NO	396 (L2)	53	76+	72+	56		

Reading							
Minimum score 400 to meet standard							
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Percent of Total Points Earned			Meets Standard	Score (Level)	
		Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text			Literary Text
		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of Total Points Earned	
NO	357 (L1)	18	29	22	25	*.* meets or exceeds proficient range	
NO	390 (L2)	65	53	61	56		
NO	354 (L1)	12	29	33	6		
NNEP							
NO	338 (L2)	53	59	67	44		
YES	401 (L3)	53	88+	67	75+		
YES	424 (L4)	94+	82+	89+	88+		
NO	393 (L2)	65	59	61	53		

Measurements of Student Progress School Roster of Student Performance GRADE 4 Spring 2011

Reading		Percent of Total Points Earned			
Minimum score 400 to meet standard					
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text	Literary Text
* = "meets or exceeds proficient range"					
NO	364 (L1)	29	29	28	31
NO	367 (L1)	29	35	33	31
NO	364 (L1)	29	29	17	44
NO	393 (L2)	59	65	44	81+
NO	383 (L2)	35	65	50	50
YES	400 (L3)	65	71	67	69+
YES	424 (L4)	88+	88+	100+	75+

Measurements of Student Progress School Roster c Student Performance GRADE 4

Spring 2010

DISTRICT: KENT SD
SCHOOL: MEADOW RIDGE ELEMENT
CDS CODE: 17415-4465



Reading							
Minimum score 400 to meet standard		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of students proficient range	
Meets Standard	Score (level)	Comprehension		Analysis		Informational text	
		Literary Test		Informational Test		Literary Test	
YES	400 (L3)	65	71+	56	78+		
NO	371 (L1)	41	35	31	44		
YES	405 (L3)	76+	71+	56	89+		
YES	424 (L4)	82+	88+	94+	78+		
YES	401 (L3)	59	82+	56	83+		
YES	411 (L3)	82+	76+	81+	78+		
YES	402 (L3)	59	82+	75+	67		
NO	383 (L2)	47	53	44	56		
NR/EP							
NR/EP							
NO	388 (L2)	59	53	56	56		

Reading		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of Students Proficient Range			
Minimum score 400 to meet standard		Meets Standard				Meets or exceeds proficient range			
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Comprehension		Analysis		Literary Test		Informational Test	
		Total Points Earned		Total Points Earned		Total Points Earned		Total Points Earned	
YES	411 (L3)	71+	88+	69+	89+	YES	411 (L3)	71+	89+
YES	431 (L4)	94+	86+	88+	94+	YES	431 (L4)	94+	94+
NO	383 (L2)	53	47	44	56	NO	383 (L2)	53	56
NO	362 (L1)	29	29	31	28	NO	362 (L1)	29	28
NO	393 (L2)	59	65	44	78+	NO	393 (L2)	59	78+
YES	408 (L3)	76+	76+	63+	89+	YES	408 (L3)	76+	89+
YES	440 (L4)	94+	94+	88+	100+	YES	440 (L4)	94+	100+
YES	431 (L4)	82+	100+	88+	94+	YES	431 (L4)	82+	94+
YES	440 (L4)	100+	88+	94+	94+	YES	440 (L4)	100+	94+
YES	404 (L3)	71+	75+	69+	78+	YES	404 (L3)	71+	78+
NO	391 (L2)	17	71+	50	57	NO	391 (L2)	17	57

Reading							
Minimum score 400 to meet standard							
Meets Standard		Score (Level)		Percent of Total Points Earned		Meets or Exceeds Proficient Range	
				Comprehension	Analysis		
NO	351 (L1)	12	26	19	22	NO	351 (L1)
NO	371 (L1)	35	41	44	33	NO	371 (L1)
YES	409 (L3)	65	88+	81+	72	YES	409 (L3)
YES	415 (L3)	82+	82+	69+	94+	YES	415 (L3)
YES	412 (L3)	76+	82+	63+	94+	YES	412 (L3)
YES	404 (L3)	65	82+	63+	83+	YES	404 (L3)
NO	380 (L2)	41	53	36	56	NO	380 (L2)
NO	390 (L2)	65	53	50	67	NO	390 (L2)
YES	432 (L4)	82+	100+	88+	94+	YES	432 (L4)
YES	412 (L3)	86+	71+	75+	83+	YES	412 (L3)
NO	379 (L2)	59	35	25	67	NO	379 (L2)

Reading		Percent of Total Points Earned				Percent of Students Proficient Range					
Minimum score 400 to meet standard		Meets Standard				Meets or exceeds proficient range					
Meets Standard	Score (Level)	Comprehension				Analysis		Informational Text		Literary Test	
		Total Points Earned									
Literary Test		Informational Text				Literary Test		Informational Text			
NO	359 (L1)	29	24	13	39	NO	359 (L1)	29	24	13	39
NO	393 (L2)	59	65	44	78+	NO	393 (L2)	59	65	44	78+
YES	408 (L3)	76+	76+	75+	78+	YES	408 (L3)	76+	76+	75+	78+
YES	416 (L3)	82+	82+	69+	94+	YES	416 (L3)	82+	82+	69+	94+
NO	393 (L2)	65	59	44	73+	NO	393 (L2)	65	59	44	73+
NO	365 (L1)	53	12	38	28	NO	365 (L1)	53	12	38	28
NO	366 (L1)	18	47	19	44	NO	366 (L1)	18	47	19	44
YES	409 (L3)	82+	71+	69+	83+	YES	409 (L3)	82+	71+	69+	83+
YES	424 (L4)	94+	76+	81+	89+	YES	424 (L4)	94+	76+	81+	89+
YES	402 (L3)	76+	65	50	89+	YES	402 (L3)	76+	65	50	89+
YES	400 (L3)	71+	65	44	89+	YES	400 (L3)	71+	65	44	89+

Measurements of Student Progress
School Roster (Student Performance
GRADE 4

Spring 2010

Reading				
Minimum score 400 to meet standard				
Meets Standard	Percent of Total Points Earned			
	Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text	Literary Text
Score (Level)				
** meets or exceeds proficient range				
YES	71+	82+	83+	89+
408 (L3)				
YES				
410 (L3)	82+	81+	83+	
YES				
401 (L3)	76+	65	63+	78+
NO				
382 (L2)	53	47	19	78+
NO				
380 (L2)	41	53	56	39
NO				
368 (L2)	41	71+	38	72
NO				
352 (L1)	29	12	6	33
YES				
425 (L4)	94+	82+	81+	94+
NO				
368 (L1)	35	35	31	39
YES				
409 (L3)	82+	71+	69+	83+
NO				
366 (L1)	35	29	38	28

Reading				
Minimum score 400 to meet standard				
Meets Standard	Percent of Total Points Earned			
	Comprehension	Analysis	Informational Text	Literary Text
Score (Level)				
** meets or exceeds proficient range				
NO				
359 (L1)	35	18	25	28
YES				
402 (L3)	76+	65	63+	78+
YES				
408 (L3)	71+	82+	81+	72