OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Community Schools, Thriving Students

Board Cover Memorandum

To   Board of Education

From   Kyla Johnson-Trammell, Superintendent
Sondra Aguilera, Chief Academic Officer
Wesley Jacques, Executive Director of Academics and Instruction
Romy Trigg-Smith, Director of Early Literacy

Meeting Date   June 29, 2022

Subject   Review of Early Literacy State Block Annual Reports

---

Ask of the Board   Review the Early Literacy State Block Annual Reports by Site.

Background   During the 2020-2021 school year, 10 elementary schools were awarded an Early Literacy State Block grant based on their 3rd grade ELA SBAC results from 2018-2019:
● Brookfield
● Global
● Hoover
● Horace Mann
● Lockwood STEAM (previously Futures and CUES)
● Manzanita Community School
● Markham
● New Highland
● Parker
● Prescott
These schools were identified as 10 of the 75 lowest performing schools in California. They were tasked with engaging in professional development to learn more about the Science of Reading and evidence-based literacy instruction. Each school conducted a needs assessment and root cause analysis in order to determine key priority areas for their grant Literacy Action Plan and use of the funds. This current school year 2021-2022, schools implemented their Literacy Action Plans and have each written an Annual Report to share the impact of their ELSB funded action items.

Discussion   Each school has now finalized an Annual Report, included in the attachments, and brought that report to review at their School Site Council (SSC) meetings. The state is requesting for our Oakland Unified School District Board to review the Annual Reports.

Fiscal Impact

The Early Literacy State Block grant has a positive fiscal impact on these ten schools as it is providing a total of $5,713,474 over four years, one planning year and three implementation years. Each school has an allocation based on their enrollment for each of the three implementation years:

- Tier 1 Schools (Up to 40 students): $338,823 over 3 years ($112,941/year)
  - Prescott
  - Parker
- Tier 2 Schools (41-80 students): $563,140 over 3 years ($187,713.33/year)
  - Brookfield
  - Markham
  - New Highland
  - Hoover
  - Horace Mann
  - Global
  - Manzanita Community School
- Tier 3 Schools (81+ students): $943,848 over 3 years ($314,616/year)
  - Lockwood STEAM

Attachment(s)

- Brookfield ELSB Annual Report
- Global ELSB Annual Report
- Hoover ELSB Annual Report
- Horace Mann ELSB Annual Report
- Lockwood STEAM ELSB Annual Report
- Manzanita Community School ELSB Annual Report
- Markham ELSB Annual Report
- New Highland ELSB Annual Report
- Parker ELSB Annual Report
- Prescott ELSB Annual Report

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. **Brookfield Elementary School**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Our school is implementing school culture and state-approved core curriculum deepening our implementation of the curriculum to support instruction. Support Tier 1, PBIS strategies, in classrooms during ongoing professional development on Caring Schools Community curriculum.Tier 1 instructional strategies will support all teachers and classrooms with the conditions for high quality early literacy instruction.	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Our school is already implementing a state-approved core SEL curriculum and will be deepening our implementation of the Caring Schools Community	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

			curriculum for leading Morning Meetings.	
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit*	Based on skill scores on the test (see data here), the team identified root cause clusters of needing more rigorous classroom (tier 1) instruction in vocabulary, foundation skills in reading, and comprehension. We identified a need for instruction of high frequency words as there are no opportunities currently to practice high frequency words outside of SIPPS time. Also within this cluster, we identified additional practice necessary in the category of phonological awareness.	The school recognized there has been a continuous lack of rigor in instruction, as well as inconsistent use of the current school curriculum. There has been no systematic foundational skill instruction across the grades K-2. There has been no monitoring of English Language Development for English Language Learners.

		vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.		
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	Full time Community School Manager (CSM) to provide ongoing parent engagement and training for parents around at-home literacy to begin in September 2021 in TK-3.	The CSM was new to the role and was not given proper training to implement the expectation of engaging and training parents around at-home literacy.

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2%*	Although the majority of students are performing below grade level, there are a few students who are performing at or above grade level.	The root cause analysis was completed by the ELSB team on March 11, 2021 based on current i-Ready and SBAC data for Brookfield. Given this data, 65% of students cannot

	of students not meeting standard by 1%. *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.*	*of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*		read grade level complex texts as per i-Ready and SBAC scores. A majority of our K–3 students are testing below proficiency in vocabulary, in addition to phonemic awareness and phonics.
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric*	N/A as no data was collected on effective practices.	One of the weaknesses, based upon our root analysis, was that no data was collected to determine if there were effective academic practices being used.

	the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.	*ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*		
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	As seen in our data, via walkthroughs and lesson plans, teachers were using the curriculum ranging from no use to high level use.	As seen in our data, our root cause analysis, via walkthroughs shows our need for more structured PD with evidence of backwards planning reflected in weekly lesson plans. We will also have planning for foundational skills to align with the EL curriculum.
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

		islander students met or exceeded standard. *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready*		

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to ***high-quality teaching***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils,	1. Provide explicit, systematic phonics instruction. 2. Provide explicit, systematic comprehension instruction.	By September 2021 hire two Early Literacy Tutors to support additional literacy instruction of students, in support of goals 1, 2, and 3.	SIPPS Mastery Test i-Ready diagnostic data Walkthrough data	**Positive:** All Grade levels K-3 had a positive percentage increase reflected in the assessments.

including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	3. Provide explicit, academic vocabulary instruction.	By Sept 2021 hire full time TSA, focused specifically on ELA in Tk-3, in support of goals 1, 2, and 3. Provide extended contract to TK-3 teachers to tutor students before or after school in support of goals 1, 2, and 3		**Negative:** The Early Literacy Coach left mid year and we were unable to hire replacement due to no applicants.
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	No Action	No Action	No Action	Site budget will be used for culture and equity team support.
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and	1. Provide explicit, systematic phonics instruction. 2. Provide explicit, systematic comprehension instruction. 3. Provide explicit, academic vocabulary instruction.	Provide extended contract to Tk-3 teachers to engage in Professional Development aligned to the Science of Reading in support of goals 1, 2, and 3.	Weekly PD Per Master Calendar During PLC: reviewing iReady data, SIPPS data, and other assessments	Positive outcomes based upon the weekly lesson plans, discussions in PLCs, attendance outcomes at all district PD sessions for SIPPS, EL Education, and Heggerty

support struggling pupils				
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address ***support for literacy learning***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	1. Provide explicit, systematic phonics instruction. 2. Provide explicit, systematic comprehension instruction. 3. Provide explicit, academic vocabulary instruction. We will provide coherent, explicit, and systematic delivery of foundational skills across the grades. Utilizing the SIPPS curriculum and ensuring fidelity of instruction will allow students to be placed in differentiated groups based on the ongoing SIPPS placement and mastery assessments.	By August 2021, purchase supplemental SIPPS materials for K-3 classrooms. By August 2021, purchase additional EL Education materials (recommended texts) for K-3.	During walkthroughs and observations, as well as reflected on weekly lesson plans, all teachers were using SIPPS and EL Education daily. In addition, teachers discussed the assessment data during PLCs to see how well students were making progress in English Language Arts and Literacy.	Brookfield has overall positive outcomes. Many student's scores on iReady, DIBELS, SIPPS and other assessments, showed growth. Rationale: Almost all teachers followed the assessment calendar, used the adopted curriculum with integrity, and followed the ELA block as designed. We did not see much growth, and some decline in 2nd grade. Rationale: Lack of following the adopted curriculum with integrity and at other times, using the curriculum but incorrectly.
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school	No Action	No Action	No Action	Assessments and Assessment Calendar provided by district.

staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments			

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *pupil supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	1. Provide explicit, systematic phonics instruction. 2. Provide explicit, systematic comprehension instruction. 3. Provide explicit, academic vocabulary instruction.	By September 2021, hire early literacy tutors (see 3.1.A) for ELA in support of goal 1 including SIPPS instruction and after school literacy support (additional TK-3 reading groups, TK-3 family check-ins, TK-3 reading nights, etc.).	SIPPS Mastery Test i-Ready diagnostic data Walkthrough data	**Positive:** Majority of students' iReady, SIPPS, and other assessments increased in the amount of growth students made in ELA. **Negative:** Some students' assessments did not demonstrate any growth throughout the year.
Extended school day to enable implementation of	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction				
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Expanded access to the school library	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	No Action	No Actions	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

environment in the home			
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	No Action	No Action	No Action	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	We have a Community School Manager (CSM) who supports the climate and implementation of MTSS practices	We need to order posters to ensure all classrooms have them displayed and teachers use them to help students follow the guidelines and support behavioral expectations

	four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	We have a partnership with STARS (counselors) as well as a SENECA counselor working with small groups	Some students who do not qualify for the services offered need more support in SEL
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided*	Students made great gains this year helping to close the achievement gap	A few students are impacted emotionally and academically due to performing below grade level

	EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*		
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what*	Offer trainings to parents with strategies to help them support their children academically at home	Many parents are working and trying to survive and do not have time to attend trainings or conferences

	and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.	*the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*		

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness

Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	*Over all, student scores in SIPPS, EL Education Assessments, and iReady mastery tests increased significantly. As measured by iReady, scores are as follows:* *Kindergarten teacher: iReady Reading: 85% improved one or more performance levels* *1st grade teacher: iReady Reading: 75% improved one or more performance levels* *2nd grade teacher (1): iReady Reading: 71% improved one or more performance levels* *2nd grade teacher (2): iReady Reading: 46% improved one or more performance levels* *3rd grade teacher: iReady Reading: 71% achieved at least 100% of their annual typical growth*	*Although we increased significantly, we still need support in some areas of SIPPS, classroom management, and integrity to the curriculum. As measured by iReady, areas of concern are as follows:* *Kindergarten teacher: iReady Reading: 10% had no change in improvement* *1st grade teacher: iReady Reading: 17% had no change in improvement* *2nd grade teacher (1): iReady Reading: 28.6% had no change in improvement* *2nd grade teacher (2): iReady Reading: 46% had no change in improvement* *3rd grade teacher: iReady Reading: 19% had no change in improvement*
	18,000+ students learning with EL	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across*	*Teachers met in PLC weekly with grade level*	*After meeting in PLCs some teachers did not*

Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum. 1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning 300+ learning walks across every elementary school This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.*	*the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction. Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	*partner and discussed student work, lesson implementation, and results, and necessary changes to improve; all teachers used the curriculum*	*implement the changes to improve instructional practice; some teachers did not use the curriculum with integrity*
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured*	*2nd grade data on iReady indicated no growth each cycle for majority of students*	*1st and 3rd grade teachers impacted with 10 second grade students moved to their classes in March*

	Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.	*Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*		
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	*During Staff Meetings and Development, trainings took place regarding equity and its impact on achievement*	*Despite training, some staff members struggled with understanding how privilege mindsets negatively impact student equity and thus negatively harm students academically*

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

				Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	*Hire two Early Literacy Tutors to support additional literacy instruction of students, in support of goals 1, 2, and 3.*	*Not implemented Year 1 and will implement in Year 2.*	*No Applicants Applied*	*SIPPS Mastery Data iReady Mastery Tests*
Support for literacy learning	*No Action*	*No Action*	*No Action*	*No Action*
Pupil supports	*Provide extended contract to TK-3 teachers to tutor students before or after school in support of goals 1, 2, and 3*	*Offer extended contracts to coaches and additional teachers if they are willing to support students from grades TK-3, after and before school, allowing for more staffing, and additional K-3 allowing students to participate*	*Only the Kindergarten and First Grade Teacher participated in tutoring, supporting 12 students. If extended contracts were made available to coaches and other teachers, we would be able to meet the needs of more K-3 students.*	*Show SIPPS data and iReady growth data for teachers who tutor their students as an incentive for others. Support by recruiting students personally.*
Family supports	No Action	No Action	No Action	No Action

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. **Global Family**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*As seen in our* Root Cause Analysis *and* Needs Assessment*, new strategies to improve school culture and climate is not a priority because Global Family has a Community Schools Manager and the district already provides guidance and resources (LINK to district Community Schools & Student Services).*	N/A
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*As seen in our* Root Cause Analysis *and* Needs Assessment*, research-based social-emotional learning is not a priority as it is already provided by district (LINK to district Social Emotional Learning Resources).*	N/A
Experience of pupils below grade-level	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around*	Students below grade level were invited to intervention	Too many absences and lack of consistency in staff and students.

standard on the ELA content standards	*analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).*	*explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.*	and provided Tier 2 supports in class.	
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights,*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for*	As seen in our root cause analysis ([Jamboard slide 5 under family](#))	Through authentic teacher to family engagement, teachers will have a better reach to help support and

ELA content standards	*and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	engagement) and our stakeholder feedback sessions ((link to SSC notes and Town Hall notes) our school does not currently do enough to establish the meaningful partnerships with families necessary to begin leaning on families to reinforce foundational skills at home.	engage parents at home with early literacy and their child. Teachers and parents will have the rapport necessary to motivate families to work with their children on reading and foundational skills. Examples include teachers providing materials such as flash cards, markers, and short videos on simple songs and foundational skills activities that parents could easily do at home with their child to help reinforce and review what they have learned in school that week or that same day.

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*	In 2020-2021, we had a 19.7% growth in K-2 students on grade level in iReady Overall reading from Fall 2020 to spring 2021 .	Jamboard See slide 4-6 and 8 for ELSB root cause analysis/thought process **ELSB Session 6 Needs Analysis** In 2020-2021 Spring iReady Assessment we had 64.4% of students in K-2 below grade level in Overall reading 60.6% of students in K-2 are below grade level in the phonics iReady Domain.
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on*	Teachers have access to multiple literacy programs (e.g., Benchmark and SIPPS) that include materials and guidance to boost instruction.	Jamboard See Slide 1 for mid-year data & 3 for end-of-year data. At Global, Teachers need training in not only literacy programs, but also early

	students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.	*effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*		literacy foundations so that they have a deeper understanding of the basic pedagogy taught in their teacher credential programs. Additionally, many of us have not been exposed to the most current methodology being taught in the universities now.
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	Previously we did not have systematic data in foundation skills for grades K-2. Began implementing iReady which collected diagnostic foundational skills data in all grades at Global.	Jamboard See Slide 1 for mid-year data & 3 for end-of-year data. Teachers have difficulty providing Tier 1 and 2 support due to issues with time management and lack of training on how to develop a schedule that supports the wide range of student proficiencies.
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of*	K-2 Students whose home language is Mam grew 27.1% on grade level from Fall to Spring in iReady overall reading	Jamboard See Slide 1 for mid-year data & 3 for end-of-year data.

	met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.	*white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready.*		Students with disabilities in K-2 had a 2.3% growth from Fall 2020 to Spring 2021 compared to 21.8% growth for students without disabilities in Overall Reading on-grade level.

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to **high-quality teaching**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome

Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	By May 2022, we will build the capacity of staff to provide aligned, systematic phonics/PA/HFW instruction as measured by PD calendar, PD cycle planner, PLC note catcher, coaching schedule, intervention/small group schedule, and data talks. By May 2023, we will improve small group instruction through support for and professional development of high-leverage vocabulary building routines as measured by a faculty-developed rubric for students' application of vocabulary during student talk, instructional rounds and teacher self-assessment of Oakland Effective Teaching Framework indicators related to vocabulary lesson planning/instruction (i.e., Domain 1: Planning & Preparing Rigorous	In support of Goal 1, we will hire a 0.6 FTE bilingual Early Literacy Tk-3 coach to increase the capacity of teachers. In support of Goal 1 and 2, we will hire a STIP Sub to deliver more effective foundational skills instruction and cover teachers to participate in PLCs, data conferences and do vocabulary focused learning walks by December 2021. In support of Goal 1, we will hire 0.6 FTE bilingual Early Literacy coach to support Early Literacy Tk-3 PLCs (45 minutes once every 3 weeks for each grade level team) so that teachers are able to	• PD Plan • Invoices • Placement assessment data • SIPPS Mastery test data • Classroom implementation observation data • iReady diagnostic data • Curriculum-embedded formative assessment data (core curriculum and Academic Vocabulary Toolkit) • ELPAC data • i-Ready Phonics/PA/HFW/vocab scores from beginning-of-year to end-of-year. • Professional development on phonics instruction and theory professional development on embedding phonics	Hiring a 0.6 Bilingual Early literacy coach had a positive impact because we were able to provide K-2 teachers with coaching, guidance and oversight of PLCs for foundational skills, and training in SIPPS. Hiring a STIP Sub had a positive impact because we were able to provide targeted Tier 2 interventions for students in K-2 through the SIPPS intervention program. We fell short of the Stip sub maximizing impact at times because of the high number of teacher absences. Due to absences, vocabulary learning walks and coverage to participate in PLC was not possible.

	Standards Aligned Lessons & Domain 3: Teaching to Ensure Ownership and Mastery for ALL Students.	consistently analyze their assessment data and use it to inform their foundational skills instruction by January 2022 In support of Goal 1, we will hire additional substitutes to provide TK-3 teachers release days over 40 Wednesdays. They will provide the necessary coverage for Tk-3 teachers to participate in Early Literacy PLCs, learning walks, and data conferences that will improve their foundational skills instructional practice September 2022.	mini-lessons into small group differentiated instruction. ● Student phonics/HFW/phonemic awareness and reading placement assessment data in DIBELS/IDEL (e.g. LNF, PSF,	
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	By May 2023, we will improve small group instruction through support for and professional development of high-leverage vocabulary building routines as measured by a faculty-developed rubric for students' application of	In support of Goal 2, purchase additional classroom library books by April 2021 to support Tk-3 teachers in enhancing their classroom libraries to represent the interests, backgrounds and cultures of our diverse learners in both	Inventory of classroom libraries and bookroom materials. Align funding to increase the number of books that are culturally relevant. . Walkthrough	Our school is currently implementing a state-approved curriculum that includes children's literature written by diverse authors. The purchase of additional classroom library books had a positive impact on

	vocabulary during student talk, instructional rounds and teacher self-assessment of Oakland Effective Teaching Framework indicators related to vocabulary lesson planning/instruction (i.e., Domain 1: Planning & Preparing Rigorous Standards Aligned Lessons & Domain 3: Teaching to Ensure Ownership and Mastery for ALL Students	languages of instruction which will support students developing robust vocabularies through reading rich, complex texts.instruction by January 2022		supporting this goal and vocabulary learning. As part of an attempt to enhance and diversify our classroom libraries the school has made an initial investment in the **Authentic Voices** supplemental resources which provide additional aligned print and digital culturally relevant literature resources. An additional small investment next year will allow us to bring parity to the English and Spanish classrooms. We believe that a first step towards supporting students in growing rich vocabulary knowledge is to provide them with increased time for independent reading and robust classroom libraries that are aligned to the topics and concepts they are studying
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional	By May 2022, we will build the capacity of staff to provide aligned, systematic phonics/PA/HFW instruction as measured by	In support of Goal 1, we will pay for extended contract and the course fees for one cohort of Tk-3 teachers to attend	Attendance/Course Completion of the OERA Training (certificate)	We used only a limited amount of funds for this action. We used it to pay extended contracts for teachers who attended

aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	PD calendar, PD cycle planner, PLC note catcher, coaching schedule, intervention/small group schedule, and data talks.	Spanish English Biliteracy Transfer (SEBT) Institute to acquire the knowledge necessary to adapt the pacing of our existing foundational skills scope and sequence to our 50/50 dual-immersion English-Spanish context and lead other Tk-3 teachers through professional development to increase the alignment of our systematic foundational skills instruction sitewide beginning July 2021 and ending September 2021, In support of Goal 1, we will pay extended contract to provide professional development to TK-3 teachers to align and refine Benchmark foundational skills scope & sequence and pacing for PA/phonics within and across grade level teams (in 50/50	Teachers were provided time to look at the scope and sequence and adapt it to our 50/50 model. Teachers will provide team agenda/notecatchers Refinement of the foundation skills implementation throughout grade levels.	OERA, there were four teachers who completed the course this year. We still have a few teachers in K-2 who have not completed OERA. Using extended contracts to support teachers attending OERA supported a positive impact at our site as it allowed for common understanding around the Science of Reading. However, we still have collaboration and work to do to gain alignment across grade levels in the implementation of foundational skills. This area needs more attention in 2022-2023. We were not able to provide release days for teachers to participate in additional PLCs and conferences as there was a sub shortage in our district. So this action did not have an impact as we weren't able to complete it.

		In support of Goal 1, we will hire additional substitutes to provide TK-3 teachers release days over 40 Wednesdays. They will provide the necessary coverage for Tk-3 teachers to participate in Early Literacy PLCs, learning walks, and data conferences that will improve their foundational skills instructional practice September 2022. In support of Goal 1, we will pay extended contract to provide professional development to TK-3 teachers to align and refine Benchmark foundational skills scope & sequence and pacing for PA/phonics within and across grade level teams (in 50/50 English-Spanish dual-immersion context) by August 2021 with follow-up April/May 2022.		We will hope to do so next year. Additionally, we did not spend funds on additional PD to refine Benchmark Foundational Skills Scope and sequence but hope to do so next year.

		In support of Goal 1, we will fund four additional Tk-3 teachers to attend OERA and pay all Tk-3 teachers extended contract for the PD. These Tk-3 teachers will then lead professional development on the components of a comprehensive Early Literacy program and lead the Tk-3 faculty in refining implementation of foundational skills instruction by January 2023.		
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the	N/A	N/A	N/A	This was not funded by ELSB grant

Education Code and the use of data to support effective instruction			

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *support for literacy learning*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional	By May 2023, we will improve small group instruction through support for and professional development of high-leverage vocabulary building routines as measured by a faculty-developed rubric for students' application of vocabulary during student talk, instructional rounds and teacher self-	In support of Goal 2, we will provide extended contract for Tk-3 teachers to spend time inventorying, organizing and enhancing classroom library collections so that they are poised for PD on how to use their library to facilitate text-based student discussions that include high-leverage vocabulary routines.	Teachers were provided with PD on how to maximize their classroom library. Teachers were provided 5 hours of extended contract to work on their classroom libraries Teachers were provided $250 to purchase books for their classroom library.	Overall, there was a positive outcome in providing teachers with time and professional development to maximize classroom libraries. Leaders dedicated a budget and limited funds to maximize their classroom libraries.

development for staff on effective use of these materials	assessment of Oakland Effective Teaching Framework indicators related to vocabulary lesson planning/instruction (i.e., Domain 1: Planning & Preparing Rigorous Standards Aligned Lessons & Domain 3: Teaching to Ensure Ownership and Mastery for ALL Students.	In support of Goal 2, we will by August 2022 identify and purchase a dedicated Spanish Language Development program/manual that provides explicit guidance for Tk-3 teachers on how to provide students with opportunities to talk and practice target vocabulary and language structures/objectives during designated SLD, and we will provide professional development on the newly acquired manual for year 2.	A faculty-developed rubric has not been created	Not enough professional learning time was dedicated to the development of the vocabulary application rubric. We hope to provide more funds next year along with the professional development mentioned.
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments	N/A	N/A	N/A	This was not funded by ELSB grant

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *pupil supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	We do not need to create an action item around the provision of expanded learning programs because these supports are already provided by the school.
Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction	By May 2022, we will build the capacity of staff to provide aligned, systematic phonics/PA/HFW instruction as measured by PD calendar, PD cycle planner, PLC note catcher, coaching schedule, intervention/small group schedule, and data talks.	In support of Goal 1, we will by January 2022 hire an after school instructor for Tk-3 students to reinforce foundational skills, language metacognition and leverage the potential of transferability for our Mam speaking students with intent to expand the program in Years 2 & 3.		Unfortunately we were not able to hire an after school instructor and we will not be hiring one in the upcoming school year.

Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	*N/A*	N/A	N/A	We do not need to create an action item around culture and climate because this work is already represented in our SPSA and is taking place outside of early literacy work.
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	*N/A*	N/A	N/A	We do not need to create an action item around the implementation of SEL because we already have the curriculum and necessary resources to provide research-based social-emotional learning to our students through the district
Expanded access to the school library	*N/A*	N/A	N/A	We do not need to create an action item to expand access to the school library because this work is already represented in our SPSA and is taking place outside of early literacy work.

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	N/A	N/A	N/A	We do not need to create an action item around the development of trauma-informed practices and support for pupils and families because our school already has a dedicated Community Schools Manager who works in partnership with community organizations, school counselors and psychologists, school newcomer teacher leader and corresponding district newcomer/refugee supports, district behavior and SEL specialists to support the development of trauma-informed school and classroom practices.
	N/A	N/A	N/A	We do not need to create an action item around the

Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning				provision of mental health resources because these supports are already provided through our school and district.
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	N/A	N/A	N/A	As seen in our root cause analysis (Jamboard), the need for additional strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and response to intervention did not come up as an urgent need. Global Family has a coordination of services team (COST) that meets weekly to review student referrals made through the district dashboard (LINK to OUSD Department of Research, Assessment, and Data COST referrals dashboard).
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home	By May 2022, we will build the capacity of staff to provide aligned, systematic phonics/PA/HFW instruction as measured by PD calendar, PD cycle planner, PLC note catcher, coaching schedule,	In support of Goal 1, a family engagement calendar will, by April 2022, be created to and we will fund capacity-building workshops for Tk-3 families to reinforce foundational skill through	The creation of a calendar and scope and sequence for parent workshops.	Unfortunately, Restriction caused by the pandemic did not allow us to engage our families to the scale we were hoping.

	intervention/small group schedule, and data talks	strategies, activities, and home use foundational skills materials for the 2022-23 school year.		
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	N/A	N/A	N/A	No action funded by grant

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	N/A	N/A - root cause/not funded

	of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	N/A	N/A
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through*	Implementation of: Foundational Skills Heggerty SIPPS Provide Intervention (During School/After School)	More resources to provide biliteracy transference (no phonics program for SLA)

	Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*		
Families of pupils below grade-level	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights,*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the*	COST system to provide support where needed to boost student success	<mark>Not funded by ELSB</mark>

standard on the ELA content standards	*and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.*	*information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*	SST for students who are significantly below grade level	Improve communication on COST referrals Increase family engagement through Cafecitos, Town Halls Workshops especially for families of students below grade level

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	Yes, There was growth in Phonological Awareness and Phonics. Students in grade K-2 demonstrated the highest growth in Phonemic awareness and Phonics K: There is a 39% percent increase in students in the Phonics on grade level domain 1st: There is a 28% percent increase in students in the Phonics on grade level domain 2nd: There is a 41% percent increase in students in the Phonological Awareness on grade level domain	Students did not meet the growth desired in the vocabulary on the grade level domain. Student did not meet the growth desired in the vocabulary on grade level domain. K: 62% of the students are below grade level in vocabulary domain in iReady 1st: 87% of the students are below grade level in vocabulary domain in iReady 2nd: 87% of the students are below grade level in vocabulary domain in iReady

	from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May			
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum.* *1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning* *300+ learning walks across every elementary school* *This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.*	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction.* *Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	Implementation of SIPPS and Heggerty *All teachers (K-2) implemented Heggerty 15 min a day and SIPPS was provided as Tier 2 intervention (pullout)*	Lack of differentiation and consistent student exposure to vocabulary instruction through the curriculum *We noticed a lack of differentiation and lack of consistent student exposure to vocabulary instruction through the Benchmark curriculum.*

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	Previously we did not have a common PLC time with all grade level teachers. PLC were structured to analyze data and align with PD content. Previous need for a phonics curriculum was met with the implementation of SIPPS. Previously we did not have a common PLC time with all grade level teachers. PLC were structured to analyze data and align with PD content. Previous need for a phonics curriculum was met with the implementation of SIPPS. 13% of students in K-2 completed at least 1 SIPPS monthly mastery test at a 75% average SIPPS Mastery test pass rate (for students who	Learning walks have been unstructured and informal creating inconsistent coaching support for teachers. Additional actionable feedback for teachers should lead to change. *Learning walks have been unstructured and informal creating inconsistent coaching support for teachers. Additional actionable feedback for teachers should lead to change.*

			needed additional supports)	
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	K-2 Students with Mam as a home language went from 0% on grade level in the Fall to 25% on grade level in the Spring on the iReady overall reading domain K-2 Students with Mam as a home language went from 0% on grade level in the Fall to 25% on grade level in the Spring on the iReady overall reading domain	Global has a significant equity gap for students in Special Education. While 31.6% of K-2 students without disabilities are on grade level only 7.6% of students in special education are on grade level. Global has a significant equity gap for students in Special Education. While 31.6% of K-2 students without disabilities are on grade level only 7.6% of students in special education in the same grade levels are on grade level.

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

				Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	1.) In support of Goal 1, we will hire a 0.6 FTE bilingual Early Literacy Tk-3 coach to increase the capacity of teachers. 2.) In support of Goal 1 and 2, we will hire a STIP Sub to deliver more effective foundational skills instruction and cover teachers to participate in PLCs, data conferences and do vocabulary focused learning walks by December 2021. 3.) In support of Goal 1, we will hire 0.6 FTE bilingual Early Literacy coach to support Early Literacy Tk-3 PLCs (45 minutes once every 3 weeks for each grade level team) so that	1.) No Change 2.) No Change 3.) No Change 4.) No Change 5.) No change /Carry over to next school year 6.) No Change/ Carry over to next school year. 7.) ==Content will be provided during contractual professional learning time (not funded by the grant)== 8.) No Change/Carry over to next year.	1.) N/A 2.) N/A 3.) N/A 4.) N/A 5.) Spending funds on books had a positive impact but we were not able to get all the desired books due to a lack of inventory. 6.) Only teachers attended the SEBT training. Unfortunately, we were not able to include the staff training in the professional development calendar. Next year, we would like to offer the opportunity for other teachers to participate in SEBT. 7.) Not enough teachers used the extended contract option to unpack the Benchmark curriculum.	• PD Plan • Invoices • Placement assessment data • SIPPS Mastery test data • Classroom implementation observation data • iReady diagnostic data • Curriculum-embedded formative assessment data (core curriculum and Academic Vocabulary Toolkit) • ELPAC data • i-Ready Phonics/PA/H FW/vocab scores from beginning-of-year to end-of-year. • Professional development on phonics instruction and theory

	teachers are able to consistently analyze their assessment data and use it to inform their foundational skills instruction by January 2022 4.) In support of Goal 1, we will hire additional substitutes to provide TK-3 teachers release days over 40 Wednesdays. They will provide the necessary coverage for Tk-3 teachers to participate in Early Literacy PLCs, learning walks, and data conferences that will improve their foundational skills instructional practice September 2022. 5.) In support of Goal 2, purchase additional classroom library books by April 2021 to support Tk-3 teachers in enhancing their classroom libraries to represent the interests, backgrounds and cultures of our diverse learners in	8.) We would like to offer the opportunity for all teachers in primary grade levels to take the course and lead professional learning.	professional development on embedding phonics mini-lessons into small group differentiated instruction. ● Student phonics/HFW/phonemic awareness and reading placement assessment data in DIBELS/IDEL (e.g. LNF, PSF, ● Inventory of classroom libraries and bookroom materials. ● Align funding to increase the number of books that are culturally relevant. . ● Walkthrough Attendance/Course Completion of the OERA Training (certificate) Teachers will be provided time to look at the scope and sequence and adapt it to our 50/50 model.

	both languages of instruction which will support students developing robust vocabularies through reading rich, complex texts instruction by January 2022		team agenda/note catchers Refinement of the foundation skills implementation throughout grade levels.
	6.) In support of Goal 1, we will pay for extended contract and the course fees for one cohort of Tk-3 teachers to attend Spanish English Biliteracy Transfer (SEBT) Institute to acquire the knowledge necessary to adapt the pacing of our existing foundational skills scope and sequence to our 50/50 dual-immersion English-Spanish context and lead other Tk-3 teachers through professional development to increase the alignment of our systematic foundational skills instruction sitewide beginning July 2021 and ending September 2021,		

	7.) In support of Goal 1, we will pay extended contract to provide professional development to TK-3 teachers to align and refine Benchmark foundational skills scope & sequence and pacing for PA/phonics within and across grade level teams (in 50/50 English-Spanish dual-immersion context) by August 2021 with follow-up April/May 2022. 8.) In support of Goal 1, we will fund four additional Tk-3 teachers to attend OERA and pay all Tk-3 teachers extended contract for the PD. These Tk-3 teachers will then lead professional development on the components of a comprehensive Early Literacy program and lead the Tk-3 faculty in refining implementation of foundational skills instruction by January 2023.			

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Support for literacy learning	1.) In support of Goal 2, we will provide extended contract for Tk-3 teachers to spend time inventorying, organizing and enhancing classroom library collections so that they are poised for PD on how to use their library to facilitate text-based student discussions that include high-leverage vocabulary routines. 2.) In support of Goal 2, we will by August 2022 identify and purchase a dedicated Spanish Language Development program/manual that provides explicit guidance for Tk-3 teachers on how to provide students with opportunities to talk and practice target vocabulary and language structures/objectives during designated SLD, and we will provide professional development on the newly acquired manual for year 2.	1.) No Change 2.) Carryover to next year	1.) N/A 2.) SLD manual has not been purchased	Teachers will be provided with PD on how to maximize their classroom library. Teachers will be provided with 5 hours of extended contract to work on their classroom libraries Teachers will be provided with $250 to purchase books for their classroom library. Faculty-developed rubric

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Pupil supports	1.) In support of Goal 1, we will by January 2022 hire an after school instructor for Tk-3 students to reinforce foundational skills, language metacognition and leverage the potential of transferability for our Mam speaking students with intent to expand the program in Years 2 & 3.	1.) Remove from plan and budget	1.) This action item was difficult to meet due to no applicants and the budget cannot be used for an outside contract.	N/A
Family supports	1.) In support of Goal 1, a family engagement calendar will, by April 2022, be created to and we will fund capacity-building workshops for Tk-3 families to reinforce foundational skill through strategies, activities, and home use foundational skills materials for the 2022-23 school year.	1.) Carry Over	Calendar and list of workshops is in the development stages, but we see great value in supporting our families with literacy strategies to use at home.	The creation of a calendar and scope and sequence for parent workshops. Parent workshop sign-in sheets. PPTs from workshops

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a non consent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on the progress of implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. Hoover Elementary	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

[Hoover Root Cause Analysis](#)

[Literacy Action Plan](#)

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	African American and Special Needs students receive URFs and suspensions at higher rates than other demographics. Students lose class time, which impacts their access to grade level instruction.	PBIS training for all teachers, new teacher PLCs to align on discipline and culture expectations, training on trauma informed response.
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across*	Our instruction and intervention is inconsistent and lacking emphasis on explicit phonics instruction, therefore our students are not able to comprehend and fluently read grade level text, even though	Consistent Phonics instruction across K-3 grade bands. Appropriate curricular materials in each classroom (SIPPS kits), El Ed and SIPPS training for all K-3 teachers. Aligned routines according to

	Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).	all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. *Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.*	they may have discrete skills. This is largely due to lacking complete curricular materials and training for new teachers on ELA curriculum (as well as teachers changing grade level). Because not all teachers have received training in the adopted curriculum, ELA instruction is taught differently at each grade level. Students have inconsistency in program routines such as phonics cues from year to year so teachers waste instructional time teaching routines.	curriculum, so students may fluidly move among groups to get their needs met.
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g.*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for*	As indicated in our Needs Assessment, a key component of student success is parent partnerships and supporting families to work with their children at home on early literacy skills. We have a core group of	Family workshops to increase knowledge of early literacy among families, and bridge the needs of families with student experience during the school day.

	outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.	*progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	families that engage in SSC, however we struggle to increase participation among more families.	

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more*	Only 7.8% of Students scoring at or above in SBAC in 2017-18, increased to 17.3% in 2018-19 (3rd, 4th, and 5th grades). Percentage of 3rd-5th students not meeting Standard decreased from 67.8% to 65.5%. 5.8% of 3rd grade students scoring at or above in 2017-18, increased to 16.3% in 2018-19. Students not meeting Standards decreased from 73.5% in 2017-18, to 65.1% in 2018-19.	Percentage of students not meeting Standard remains high, and percentage of students at or above remains low. While we have made significant progress, our scores fall far below the district wide average.

	Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.	*grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	● Use of formative assessment data and to set goals and make instructional decisionsl ● Kinder readiness supports in place. ● Regular PD with school-wide focus ● Leadership teams ● Regular feedback on instruction	Our problem statement is: our instruction and intervention is inconsistent and lacking emphasis on explicit phonics instruction, therefore our students are not able to comprehend and fluently read grade level text, even though they may have discrete skills. This is largely due to lacking complete curricular materials and training for new teachers on ELA curriculum (as well as teachers changing grade level). Because not all teachers have received training in the adopted curriculum, ELA instruction is taught differently at each grade level. Students have inconsistency in program routines such as phonics

			cues from year to year so teachers waste instructional time teaching routines.
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	We have teacher buy-in to changing to El Education, and have piloted it at 2nd, 3rd, and 4th grade levels for a year prior to the pandemic. Teachers recognise the need for systematic structured literacy instruction and are eager to begin. Kinder classrooms have been implementing Heggerty routines for 5 years.	As indicated in our Root Cause Analysis, we have inconsistent interventions that do not build across tiers. Each year the RTI process is reinvented, therefore students often get the same intervention from year to year and ultimately are not given the opportunity to build on their skills. As a result of the inconsistent interventions (among other factors), 49% of current third graders are reading two to three years below grade level and another 29% are one year below.
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students,*	African American students in 3rd grade had the highest percentage of meeting or exceeding Standards on ELA SBAC (at 6.7% in 2017-18, and 10.5% in 2018-19). Number of Latinx 3rd grade students meeting or	In 2017-18, 73.3% of African American students not meeting Standard on ELA SBAC, and In 2018-19, 73.7% of African American students not meeting Standard. In 2017-18, 72.7% of Latinx students not meeting

	Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.	*23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready*	exceeding increased from 0% in 2017-18, to 22.3% in 2018-19.	Standard on ELA SBAC, and In 2018-19, 55.6% of Latinx students not meeting Standard (a decrease, but below district average).

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to **high-quality teaching**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual	Early Literacy TSA will support the school-wide goal: 100% of K-3 teachers will explicitly and systematically teach grade-	By May 2021, we will hire a 1.0 literacy coach to work with K-3 teachers and tutors in grades, focusing specifically on	Early Literacy TSA hired, fulfilling job duties as outlined: TSA Job Description	Teachers have met the goal. By hiring an Early Literacy TSA, teachers were supported to understand and meet the expectations through 1:1

reading specialists to support English learner programs.	level phonics by implementing consistent, aligned instruction in SIPPS and formatively assessing at each Mastery benchmark, as measured by observational and walkthrough data, (and teacher self-reflection?). As a result, 80% of students in grades 1-3 will achieve grade level mastery benchmarks in iReady fluency assessments by May 2022, and 75% of Kindergartners will meet Winter benchmark goals for letter name, sound recognition, and phonological awareness on Foundations Assessment by January 2022	foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum. Reading coach will work with teachers to support fidelity to the program, alignment across the grades, and assessment analysis. -Walkthrough to observe classrooms and help align practices. -coach teachers 1:1 weekly on SIPPS practices and data. -schedule peer observation to align practices across K-3 band	Use of literacy tutors to conduct SIPPS groups with K-2 students. One 1-2 group exited Challenge level, One 1-2 group will be completing Ext and entering Challenge, One 1-2 group receives additional tutoring to address unfinished phonics skills. SIPPS Schedule	coaching on practices and data, whole group PD and feedback on lesson observations. Data Reflection sheet detailing how we implemented a robust testing system to track student progress.
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	N/A Year 2	N/A Year 2	N/A Year 2	N/A Year 2
Evidence-based professional development	100% of K-3 teachers will explicitly and systematically teach grade-	-By May 2022, we will pay extended contract to K-3 teachers participating in	-Walkthroughs, observational data tracking	By doing regular walkthroughs, coaching, and increasing quality

for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	level phonics by implementing consistent, aligned instruction in SIPPS and formatively assessing at each Mastery benchmark.	OEAR and other PD to support K-3 teachers with strong phonics instructional practices and be supported through ongoing professional development in phonics instruction. PD cycles through the 2021-22 school year focusing on phonics instruction and data, SIPPS implementation, and Mastery Test data analysis.	fidelity to SIPPS implementation -Coaching Logs for New Teachers: Kinder 2nd grade Professional Development Calendar (with agendas and slides linked)	professional development, Our Walkthrough data analyzing teacher practice and fidelity to curriculum improved greatly from baseline compared to final walkthroughs, in the follow areas: Designated ELD, El Ed, Early Literacy Foundations. As a result of ongoing walkthroughs, professional development, and coaching, In the Early Literacy Implementation rubric, our initial data in November indicated that we were approaching in many areas around teacher professional learning and aligned instructional strategies. In our final data (May 5, 2022) we made progress in the following areas: teacher professional learning, aligned expectations for teachers, and instructional strategies.

Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	N/A Year 2	N/A Year 2	N/A Year 2	N/A Year 2

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy	100% of K-3 teachers will explicitly and systematically teach grade-level phonics by implementing consistent, aligned instruction in SIPPS and formatively assessing at each Mastery benchmark.	In support of goal 1, we will purchase additional SIPPS materials for K-3 staff. We will ensure teachers have materials for all SIPPS levels they are teaching in their classroom (including	All teachers have access to the SIPPS materials at their level, in complete kits. All teachers received tier 1 SIPPS training in our first PD cycle, and ongoing training from central PD.	By purchasing the materials, teachers were able to accomplish: balancing multiple SIPPS groups and managing their own materials, instead of sharing kits like we have done in the past, using updated sound wall cards

action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials		push-in support staff) by September 2021. By August 2021, we will inventory and purchase SIPPS materials for K-3 teachers that may be missing from kits and provide initial and ongoing training of the curriculum throughout the year.	(DATES OF SIPPS TRAININGS AND SIPPS PD CYCLES) K-2 SIPPS Mastery Tracker	with the updated cueing system (4th edition), so that our instruction is aligned with the rest of OUSD. The additional materials purchased also allowed us to complete kits that were previously missing materials, such as Challenge posters, or complete sound card sets. We also purchased additional sound wall cards to post in common areas such as the library, hallway, and cafeteria. By providing class sets of El Ed core module texts, students are able to cite evidence from text individually and with partners/small groups by referring directly to the text.
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding	N/A: District Purchased	N/A: District Purchased	N/A: District Purchased	N/A: District Purchased

the use of those assessment instruments				

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address ***pupil supports***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	100% of K-3 teachers will explicitly and systematically teach grade-level phonics by implementing consistent, aligned instruction in SIPPS and formatively assessing. As a result, 80% of students in grades 1-3 will achieve grade level mastery benchmarks in iReady fluency assessments by May 2022, and 75% of Kindergartners will meet Winter benchmark goals for letter name, sound recognition, and phonological awareness on Foundations Assessment by January 2022	By September 2021, hire a literacy coach to work with teachers in grades K–3 as well as support staff and intervention teachers, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum. The Literacy Coach will also serve as a liaison between our outside partners who are supporting literacy instruction.	K-2 SIPPS Mastery Tracker Monthly collaboration between After School director, Literacy Coach, and teacher liaison in order to provide continuity of academic support. Monthly check in meetings between Literacy Coach and Program directors / on site tutors to provide continuity of academic support. We will include After School staff in relevant curriculum and instruction PD and nominate a	As a result of hiring a K-3 literacy coach, we were able to collaborate with our after school program and align our literacy strategies. The coach served as a liaison with our after school program and was able to check in with After school program staff and ensure SIPPS fluency practice and other strategies happened in after school programming. We had a challenging time including after school program staff in our PD as the timing often conflicted.

			teacher liaison to align practices between the school day and after school programming.	
Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	This action is not funded by the ELSB Grant.
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	N/A	N/A	N/A	This action is not funded by the ELSB Grant.
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	N/A	N/A	N/A	This action is not funded by the ELSB Grant.

Expanded access to the school library	N/A: Using measure g to provide	N/A: Using measure g to provide	N/A: Using measure g to provide	N/A: Using measure g to provide. This action is not funded by the ELSB Grant.

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Development of literacy training and education for	N/A	N/A	N/A	We are addressing this need through other funds.

parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home				
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	N/A	● N/A	N/A	We are addressing this need through other funds.

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that*	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*	All teachers have access to Caring Schools Community curriculum. PBIS walkthroughs and feedback. Consultancy for students' unmet behavioral and SEL needs. Peer observation of PBIS strategies.	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*

	incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.		
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	All teachers have access to Caring Schools Community curriculum. PBIS walkthroughs and feedback. Consultancy for students' unmet behavioral and SEL needs. Peer observation of PBIS strategies.	We have a need to set school-wide expectations about curriculum implementation of Caring School Community and Toolbox, including adequate training on the programs for all teachers, inventory and organization of materials, and time for planning and prepping daily lessons. Support staff has not yet been trained in PBIS strategies, so implementation of PBIS is consistent in Prep, on the yard at recess, and during after school programming.
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through*	Aligned SIPPS instruction in K-3. Weekly 1:1 coaching and data analysis with Early Literacy TSA and classroom teachers. >90% completion on iReady and DIBELS assessment. Regular	MTSS Academic In-Class Interventions: We still see the need to support students who are struggling to pass through SIPPS lessons and mastery tests with further interventions and need to

	Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*	SIPPS Mastery Test progress monitoring. Movement of students between groups to address needs in phonics and sight words.	determine what those will be and who can provide them.
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights,*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the*	Monthly family workshops centered around early literacy skills (Phonological Awareness, understanding	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*

	and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.	*information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*	iReady data, Sight Words, understanding SIPPS Mastery assessment, Vocabulary). Access to complex text read alouds and early readers for home. Teachers communicate regularly with families about their child's progress. Robust COST system with regular SSTs and family meetings.	

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness

2021–2022				
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	The percentage of students scoring at or above grade level increased from 8% in the fall to 27% in May . The Fall to Spring % of students scoring at or above grade level also increased by 9 % in phonological awareness, 18 % in phonics, 16% in high frequency words, 18% in vocabulary, 18 % in literature comprehension and 13% in informational text comprehension.	While we had a significant increase in all domains, we still have 36% of students in K-5 scoring below grade level across domains. The lowest scoring domain is Informational Text Comprehension, in which 19% of students scored 1-2 years below grade level.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

| Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*) | *18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum.* *1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning* *300+ learning walks across every elementary school* *This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.* | *Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction.* *Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.* | By doing regular walkthroughs, coaching, and increasing quality professional development, Our Walkthrough data analyzing teacher practice and fidelity to curriculum improved greatly from baseline compared to final walkthroughs, in the follow areas: Designated ELD, El Ed, Early Literacy Foundations. As a result of ongoing walkthroughs, professional development, and coaching, In the Early Literacy Implementation rubric, our initial data in November indicated that we were approaching in many areas around teacher professional learning and aligned instructional strategies. In our final data (May 5, 2022) we made progress in the following areas: teacher professional learning, aligned | We will continue to work towards improving the quality of EL Ed and SIPPS lesson implementation across our classrooms. Our walk-through data showed that we improved but still have discrepancies in the quality of practice across classrooms. |

			expectations for teachers, and instructional strategies	
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	The percentage of African American students scoring at or above grade level increased from 8% to 29% in iReady Spring Diagnostic, compared with the Fall diagnostic. The percentage of English Learner students scoring at or above grade level increased from 7% to 23% in iReady Spring Diagnostic, compared with the Fall diagnostic.	While we had a significant increase in all domains, however we still have 34% of African American students in K-5 scoring 3-4 years below grade level across domains on iReady Diagnostic. Also, 41% of Learner students in K-3 scored 2-3 years below grade level across domains in the Spring iReady Diagnostic.

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	1. By May 2021, we will hire a 1.0 literacy coach to work with K-3 teachers and tutors in grades, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum. Reading coach will work with teachers to support fidelity to the program, alignment across the grades, and assessment analysis. 2. By May 2023,We will purchase the recommended texts that reflect student cultural	No Change	Select to enter text.	See LAP

	identities and interests that align with our EL Education modules. We will fully implement the El Education Curriculum Modules, including the recommended text sets. 3. By May 2022, we will pay extended contract to K-3 teachers participating in OERA and other PD to support K-3 teachers with strong phonics instructional practices and be supported through ongoing professional development in phonics instruction. PD cycles through the 2021-22 school year focusing on			

	phonics instruction and data, SIPPS implementation, and Mastery Test data analysis.			
Support for literacy learning	1. In support of goal 1, we will purchase additional SIPPS materials for K-3 staff. We will ensure teachers have materials for all SIPPS levels they are teaching in their classroom (including push-in support staff) by September 2021.	No Change	Select to enter text.	See LAP
Pupil supports	1. By September 2021, hire a literacy coach to work with teachers in grades K–3 as well as support staff and intervention teachers, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS	1. No Change	Select to enter text.	See LAP

	curriculum. The Literacy Coach will also serve as a liaison between our outside partners who are supporting literacy instruction.			
Family supports	No action funded by grant.		Select to enter text.	See LAP

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a non consent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. **Horace Mann Elementary School**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Aspects of this area will be supported by funding outside of the ELSB grant.	N/A This area was not considered during our root cause analysis.
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Our school has adopted Caring School Community as our SEL curriculum. This is supported	N/A This area was not considered during our root cause analysis.
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support.*	K-2 teachers are using a variety of curriculum to teach foundational skills. 3rd grade teachers do not have a curriculum to teach foundational skills. 1st grade teachers do not have a curriculum to teach phonemic awareness in order to prepare students for phonics instruction. The data analysis that we	As a site, at the time of the root cause analysis, we had not developed a scope and sequence for word study instruction across the school. Professional development had been focused on schoolwide ELA and was not differentiated to build foundational knowledge of K-2 teachers. Teachers

	materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).	*Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.*	focused on was the results of iReady diagnostic data.	were implementing the SIPPS curriculum at varying degrees which did not lead to consistent results for students. Teachers didn't have enough collaborative time to analyze SIPPS data to inform/create new small groups and identify instructional responses to the data.
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	Our school has the practice of holding space for families to gain knowledge and strategies to help their child through our monthly Parent Cafe's. Our kindergarten teachers hold Parent Workshops to provide strategies for parents to support reading with their child at home.	This is not funded by the grant. Parent workshops were not happening across the school in all grades. Participation in the Parent Cafes were low and we struggled to find a good time for parents to attend.

	and host relevant events for the site.		

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.*	*First Grade increased 12.3% of students scoring at/above grade level as compared to midyear 2019. * 3rd - 8% of AA students moved from standards not met to nearly met.	Students continue to need additional support in the area of phonics and high frequency words. Students continue to struggle with vocabulary and comprehension in both literature and informational text.

	80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.	*We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	*First and second grade teachers implemented SIPPS curriculum in differentiated groups.	*SIPPS instruction was inconsistent throughout the year and not all students got instruction at their level.
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	Implementation of new ELA curriculum provided access to complex text at all grade levels. Teachers had access to curriculum for Word Study. Teachers attempted to share student work during Professional	Effective implementation of the new curriculum varied throughout the school due to distance learning. No explicit instruction in vocabulary happened. Teachers struggled to find ways to

	not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).		Learning Communities. Instructional coach worked with all content areas and all teachers.	consistently share student work. It was hard for the Instructional coach to focus on a coaching cycle as she was working in all content areas.
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to*	We made growth in our Interim Assessment Block data from 18-19 to 19-20 for our African American and Latino students. In the 18-19 school year 30% of AA students scored near standard and 63% scored below standard. In the 19-20 8% of AA students score above, 50% scored near standard and 41% scored below standard. In the 18-19 school year 52% of Latino students scored near standard, 41.7% scored below. In the 19-20 school year 13.6% scored above,	Based on the data, Latino students are progressing more than African American students.

		81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready	53% scored near and 33% scored below.	

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to **high-quality teaching**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	Goal 1: 80% of K-3 students will read grade level HFW and fluently decode grade level text by building teacher capacity to explicitly teach Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and High Frequency Words as measured by PD calendar, Coaching Cycles, iReady Diagnostic, SIPPS Mastery and DIBELS assessments by May 2024. We are	Hired a 1.0 TSA to focus specifically as a literacy coach to work with teachers in grades K-3 by facilitating PD, leading PLCs, conducting data conferences and cycles of observation and feedback. The focus will be in foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum and reading comprehension using the EL Education curriculum in support of goals 1, 2, and 3.	Based on our iReady data, root cause analysis and needs assessment (ELSB Presentation Slides- data included), students' access to targeted, evidence based foundational reading skills instruction needs to begin as soon as possible so that we are able to monitor their skills. Metrics used: Consistent SIPPS Mastery Tests Administration; iReady Diagnostic; DIBELS; SIPPS Placement Test **End of Year 21-22 Data:**	Hiring a coach had a positive impact because the coach: ● Created a Consistent structure for delivering SIPPS instruction for the year. ● Monitored student progress through Mastery Tests to regroup students based on assessments ● Supported teachers to Differentiate

	implementing this goal this year and it will be ongoing through May 2024. Goal 3: We will improve the teacher's ability to consistently collect and analyze DIBELS, SIPPS Mastery and iReady data during PLCs to identify gaps in student learning and next instructional steps as measured by assessment calendar, complete data collection forms/trackers/analysis tools, scheduled data conference note catchers and improved student outcomes by May 2022.		**Students that scored early-mid-late grade-level (green) in Kinder**: 80% in P.A., 42% in Phonics, 61% in HFW. **Students that scored scored early-mid-late grade-level (green) in First:** 30% in PA; 23% in Phonics, 33% in HFW **Students that scored scored early-mid-late grade-level (green) in Second:** 55% in PA; 15% in Phonics; 48% in HFW **Students that scored at scored early-mid-late grade-level (green in Third:** 100% in PA; 29% in Phonics; 67% in HFW	groups based on assessment data
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	No action funded by ELSB grant.	No action funded by ELSB grant.	No action funded by ELSB grant.	No action funded by ELSB grant.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	Goal 3: We will improve the teacher's ability to consistently collect and analyze DIBELS, SIPPS Mastery and iReady data during PLCs to identify gaps in student learning and next instructional steps as measured by assessment calendar, complete data collection forms/trackers/analysis tools, scheduled data conference note catchers and improved student outcomes by May 2022.	In August 2021, we will use grant funds to pay Solution Tree to facilitate PD for K-3 teachers to build their capacity to understand the foundations of Professional Learning Communities that will be used to analyze benchmark and SIPPS data. This aligns to goals 1 and 2 in year 1 and 2. We will also use grant funds to pay extended contract to K-3 teachers to attend PD.	21-22 PD Arc Teacher PD Feedback Responses Teacher Data Analysis Template End of cycle data reflections	The positive impact of teachers analyzing data: ● Teachers consistently brought student work to PLCs and were able to determine students who did and did not master lesson objectives and determine the instructional response for struggling students. ● Teachers were able to determine instructional next steps based on student data.
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction			

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **pupil supports**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

Expanded access to the school library	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB Grant	No action funded by ELSB grant	No action funded by ELSB grant

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	Aspects of this area will be supported by funding outside of the ELSB grant.	N/A This area was not considered during our root cause analysis.

	Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	As a school, we are using Caring Schools Community for our SEL Curriculum. This is funded by other sources.	Not funded by the grant
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD,*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic*	Students who are below grade level receive 1:1 tutoring through an outside organization.	Small group intervention systems are not in place as a school.

	and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*	Students are introduced to Tier 2 vocabulary words through the ELA curriculum.	Direct, intentional, explicit instruction of the vocabulary does not happen consistently throughout the school.

Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*	Annual Family Literacy Night and parent workshops happen throughout the year. Parents are given strategies to use at home with their child to support their reading growth.	The invitation is given to all families, however the families of pupils scoring below grade level do not attend the events.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	Students made growth based on iReady diagnostic data and SIPPS Mastery Data. Students who passed more SIPPS Mastery tests made more growth on the phonics portion of the iReady diagnostic.	Students struggled to move through SIPPS mastery tests. Students who didn't pass the same mastery tests more than once were not given targeted instruction.

	We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May			
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum.* *1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning* *300+ learning walks across every elementary school This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that*	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction.* *Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	27 students tested out of SIPPS. 70% of students who passed mastery tests throughout the year grew almost one level on iReady diagnostic phonics section.	We had 85% of students taking master tests, but had a 33% passing rate of those mastery tests.

	number had increased to 30 schools.			
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	Students made little growth in vocabulary on iReady diagnostic. 43% of students are multiple years below grade level. Vocabulary is not explicitly taught above curriculum guidance.	Direct explicit vocabulary instruction is inconsistent across the school Currently have a goal to address this area during year 2 of the plan.
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	Students made growth scoring at proficient in Phonemic Awareness and High Frequency Words. 79% scored at early on or above grade level in PA and 66% scored at early on or above grade level in HFW.	76.7% Latino and 66.7% African American students are below grade level in vocabulary. Parents of students who are performing below grade level are not attending Parent Workshops.

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	Hire a literacy coach to focus on Word Study implementation and PD for teachers. Provide PD for teachers to establish PLCs to support analyzing data and determining instructional responses Teachers will have extended contract time to analyze Word Study data	No adjusted items		
Support for literacy learning	Item was not part of original action plan.	Purchase additional Word Study materials are needed to support differentiated groups	Curriculum materials need to be updated and replenished.	SIPPS Tracker
Pupil supports	No action funded by the grant	● No adjustments	● No action needed	● No action needed
Family supports	Item was not part of original action plan.	● Provide extended contracts for teachers to facilitate parent workshops each trimester.	● Many students struggled with reading at home and families were unable to support.	Agenda Parent Sign in Sheet

		● Provide support materials for teachers to distribute to families.	● Parents requested training and strategies to use at home with their child.	

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

X. **Lockwood STEAM Academy**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE
 LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:
https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant
NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Our school is currently implementing a social-emotional curriculum that includes diverse literature. We have been focused on deep implementation of this curriculum this school year with the intention of having teacher leaders next year. We are currently working with a hybrid model with the curriculum. In addition, our school social worker pushes in classrooms for social-emotional lessons. Our school also has various incentives including: PBIS (Ocelot Paws, an Ocelot store, and Attendance Awards). Our school is currently implementing various practices that reduce exclusionary discipline, including: Check	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

			in Check Out and Culture Keepers. To improve the school climate, our school hosts monthly Town Halls for all students and these include attendance shoutouts.	
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	PBIS systems support SEL strengths of the site which include Toolbox Curriculum and school-wide student incentives (Ocelot Paws/Incentives) and Bi-monthly Town Halls.Our school has trained teachers in the Toolbox Curriculum. For the last 2 school years, the school has had a partnership with a Toolbox trainer who has trained teachers on the curriculum and provided a range of weekly resources. All parents have also been invited to Toolbox trainings. The school currently has a Toolbox teacher leader for each grade level.	*N/A* *N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Experience of pupils below grade-level	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around*	Identified strengths include access to books (physical or digital) through library	Foundational skills are taught arbitrarily. Teachers decide independently what

| standard on the ELA content standards | analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). | explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD. | visits twice per month, guest readers several times a year, i-Ready Reading Challenges, Raz-Kids, Sora (online library platform) and leveled libraries in every classroom. Students also participate in reading small groups.

Students also have one-to-one access to Chromebooks. | components of various programs they choose to teach to their students so not components of word recognition are addressed in each classroom. Different curriculums across different and same grade levels for foundational skills instruction |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the | In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, | However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for | We do not need to create an action item around parent and community engagement. Our school | N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis. |

ELA content standards	*and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	currently hosts various engagement events, including: Academic Parent-Teacher Teams where parents are taught reading skills to support their student(s) at home and the iReady Reading Campaign. During summer school, parents are provided with weekly Spring Board reading skills trainings. Teachers have received training in the significance and the methodology of Academic Parent-Teacher Teams. Teachers have also received training from Teneh Weller from High Expectations on how to best conduct parent-teacher conferences. She also leads the parent leadership team.	

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*	Grade level curriculum alignment in SEI classes - K-5th. LSA increased the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level on the i-Ready Reading diagnostic from 5.5% in Fall to 15.5%.	We had only 15.5% students meet or exceed standard in the ELA as measured by the i-Ready Reading Diagnostic and 76.7% students were below grade level.
	Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root*	A large majority of TK-3 classes had differentiated direct small group	Observation cycle and feedback were inconsistent due to staff absences and

Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	instruction and intentional, engaging, differentiated independent reading activities (digital and non-digital). We also used progress monitoring through SIPPS Mastery Tests We used PD/PLC for data analysis and pacing (High, Medium, Low)	we found when observation cycle are consistent, there was great gain in teacher implementation of curriculum
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	We knew exactly what teachers had experience with SIPPs and Heggerty and who needed training/support.	Beginning the year in different PDs, the early lit teachers were not on the same page and it took time for all of us to get on the same page and ensure schedules were aligned, people were trained and students were receiving the early lit instruction in small groups daily.
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in*	African American students grew from 1.9% at or exceeding grade level in	73.4% of American American students are not

	percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.	*our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready*	the beginning of the year to 16.5% at the end of the year. Latino students grew from 5.7% at or exceeding grade level at the beginning of the year to 14.7% at the end of the year.	meeting grade level standards in reading. 79% or Latino students are not meeting grade level standards in Reading.

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to ***high-quality teaching***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	*By September 2021, hire a literacy coach to work with students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum.*	In support of the Goal #1, hire one 1.0 FTE bilingual primary TSA to work with teachers in grades K–3, focusing specifically on aligning teaching strategies and practices using protocols found in SIPPS curriculum and curriculum development. TSA will provide professional development for teachers and support personnel by August 2021. In support of the Goal #2, hire one 1.0 FTE TSA to work with teachers in grades K–3, focusing specifically on data collection, reporting, analysis and coaching based on trends. TSA will provide professional development for teachers and support personnel by August 2021.	As seen in our screening data [Futures i-Ready Data/ CUES i-Ready Data], our Root Cause Analysis, and Needs Assessment, alignment across grade levels and curriculum is an urgent need. Attached is our job description for the hiring of our 1.0FTE bilingual primary TSA [Job Description] Attached is our job description for the hiring of our 0.5FTE TSA [Job Description]. Attached is our job description for the hiring of 2 STIP subs [Job Description].	Data for Kinder 80% Data for 1st Data for 2nd K-2 DATA_i-READY OVERALL, LETTER ID, DIBELS, IDELS, SIPPS Positive: We used professional connection to hire qualified tutors. Hired a qualified bilingual academic mentor. Hired TSA/Coaches to hold Early Literacy training, data analysis and align teaching strategies and all of this was accomplished this school year. Negative: Teacher and student attendance impacted due to Covid.

		In support of Goal #2, hire 1 STIP substitute to focus on relieving classroom teachers for collaboration, peer observations, assessments, data collection and small group reading instruction by August 2021.		
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	In support of Goals #1 and #2, evidence-based professional development for Tk-3 teachers will be provided by the hired 1.0 TSA by May 2022.	TSAs/Coaches provided cycles of observations, led PD focus on Early Literacy, facilitated 3 data summits and supported teachers in creating 6-12 week cycles of inquiry based on the data.	K-Teachers used district resources, Heggerty, pacing guides for LN and LS and backwards mapped and created pacing guides for SIPPS lessons and MT (Mastery Tests) and used data to direct pacing 1-Teachers used district resources, Heggerty, pacing guides for LN and LS and backwards mapped and created pacing guides for SIPPS lessons and MT	**Positive**: Early Literacy Coaching provided, 1-1. Scheduled 2 meetings a month, **evidence**: District provided PD for Academic Mentors that were on the scope and sequence for K-2, such as letter name and letter sound, SEEDS, and SIPPS focused. **Negative**: Virtual PD, not enough planning time (too much output, not enough time for next steps).

			(Mastery Tests) and used data to direct pacing 2- Academic mentor used Heggerty, LN/LS Kinder curriculum and SIPPS pacing to test for Mastery Test and used data to direct pacing	Starts and stops to cycle and not having time to continue. January was the month an academic tutor coach was hired to work with our academic mentors, this was late in the year.
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *support for literacy learning*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	By August 2021 (Year 1), purchase extra SIPPS curriculum kits to supplement district provided kits in each classroom and for academic mentors.	*LEA purchased SIPPS curriculum and provided initial and ongoing training of the curriculum throughout the implementation year*	SIPPs kits were provided by the district	Positive: All teachers and tutors had materials needed

Negative: |
| Purchase of diagnostic assessment | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments			

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address ***pupil supports***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction				
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Expanded access to the school library	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

environment in the home				
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

6. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	N/A	N/A

	four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.		
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	N/A	N/A
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided*	N/A	N/A

	EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*	
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what*	N/A	N/A

	and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.	*the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*		

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	Grade level curriculum alignment in SEI classes - K-5th. LSA increased the percentage of students meeting or exceeding grade-level on the i-Ready Reading diagnostic from 5.5% in Fall to 15.5%.	We had only 15.5% students meet or exceed standard in the ELA as measured by the i-Ready Reading Diagnostic and 76.7% students were below grade level.
	18,000+ students learning with EL	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across*	A large majority of TK-3 classes had differentiated	Observation cycle and feedback were inconsistent

Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum. 1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning 300+ learning walks across every elementary school This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.*	*the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction. Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	direct small group instruction and intentional, engaging, differentiated independent reading activities (digital and non-digital). We also used progress monitoring through SIPPS Mastery Tests We used PD/PLC for data analysis and pacing (High, Medium, Low)	due to staff absences and we found when observation cycle are consistent, there was great gain in teacher implementation of curriculum
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured*	We knew exactly what teachers had experience with SIPPs and Heggerty	Beginning the year in different PDs, the early lit teachers were not on the same page and it took time

	Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.	*Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	and who needed training/support.	for all of us to get on the same page and ensure schedules were aligned, people were trained and students were receiving the early lit instruction in small groups daily.
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	African American students grew from 1.9% at or exceeding grade level in the beginning of the year to 16.5% at the end of the year. Latino students grew from 5.7% at or exceeding grade level at the beginning of the year to 14.7% at the end of the year.	73.4% of American American students are not meeting grade level standards in reading. 79% or Latino students are not meeting grade level standards in Reading.

8. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

LSA Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	In support of Goals #1 and #2, evidence-based professional development for Tk-3 teachers will be provided by the hired 1.0 TSA by May 2022.	n/a	n/a	Early Literacy focused PLCs 2x/month and PDs 1x/month.
Support for literacy learning	In support of the Goal #1, hire one 1.0 FTE bilingual primary TSA to work with teachers in grades K–3, focusing specifically on aligning teaching strategies and practices using protocols found in SIPPS curriculum and curriculum development. TSA will provide professional development for teachers and support personnel by August 2021. In support of the Goal #2, hire one 1.0 FTE TSA to work with teachers in grades K–3, focusing specifically on data collection, reporting, analysis and coaching based on trends.TSA will	n/a	n/a	Hired TSA/Coaches to hold Early Literacy training, data analysis and align teaching strategies and all of this was accomplished this school year.

	provide professional development for teachers and support personnel by August 2021. In support of Goal #2, hire 1 STIP substitute to focus on relieving classroom teachers for collaboration, peer observations, assessments, data collection and small group reading instruction by August 2021.			
Pupil supports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Family supports	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. Manzanita Community School	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*School-level practices include professional development, walkthroughs and coaching from the Climate and Culture Team, incorporating Restorative Justice practices, and monthly Anti-Racist Book Study.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*School-level practices include implementing the Caring Schools Community SEL Curriculum and whole class and small group social skills lessons from school social worker.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*

Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.*	*Manzanita Community School, at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, identified the cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be inconsistent instruction in sight words, phonological awareness, and phonics.* [Manzanita Community Root Cause Jamboard](#) [Data Sheet](#)	*Based on our root cause analysis the evidence led us to the following areas of need:* *We will improve in our knowledge and skill of implementing phonics and phonemic awareness in grades K-3 by explicitly and consistently teaching SIPPS and providing individualized academic supports as measured by professional development calendar, coaching cycles, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.* *We will improve in our TK/K-3 collection of valid, predictive and reliable data by administering and analyzing DIBELS and i-Ready data three times a year as measured by assessment calendar, data collection forms, and data conference schedules.* *We will improve in language comprehension*

				instruction by implementing direct vocabulary instruction and access to grade level complex text as measured by teacher participation in professional learning of new curriculum, EL Education, instruction coaching, cycles of inquiry, and observations and feedback .
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	*MCS engages families through SSC meetings, parent-teacher conferences, Parent Square Messages, newsletters, and monthly family workshops.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis*

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests,*	*In the 2020-2021 school year, 19% of K-5 students met their typical growth goal on the i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Assessment despite being in a year of distance learning.* ELSB Grant MCS Data	*In the 2020-2021 school year, 60% of students scored at least one grade level below on the Spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Assessment.*

		DIBELS, or letter naming.		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	*In 2020-2021, at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, some teachers were implementing the SIPPS and Heggerty curriculums to support students with phonics and phonological awareness.*	*In 2020-2021, at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, not all teachers had the materials and training to implement SIPPS, Letter Naming, and Heggerty to support students with phonics and phonological awareness. We were not collecting academic practice data on % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum.*
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	*At the time of ELSB root cause analysis, our school had not yet adopted the EL Education curriculum. Some teachers were using Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing Workshop. Our school was using the i-Ready Diagnostic as our universal screener, but were inconsistently collecting data through progress monitoring assessments.*	*At the time of ELSB root cause analysis, our school had not yet adopted the EL Education curriculum. Some teachers were using Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing Workshop.Our school was using the i-Ready Diagnostic as our universal screener, but were inconsistently collecting data through*

	Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).			*progress monitoring assessments.*
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to*	*In the 2020-2021 school year, 21% of English Learners met their Annual Typical growth goal on the spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic Assessment. 17% of English Only students met their Annual Typical Growth Goal.*	*In the 2020-2021 school year, only 10% of special education students met their Annual Typical growth goal on the spring i-Ready Reading Diagnostic assessment compared to 26% of students not in special education.*

		81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready		

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to **high-quality teaching**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	**Goal #1** *We will improve in our knowledge and skill of implementing phonics and phonemic awareness in grades K-3 by explicitly and consistently teaching SIPPS and providing individualized academic supports as measured by professional development calendar, coaching cycles, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.*	*By September 2021, hire a literacy coach to work with students in grade K-3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum.* *By September 2021, hire four early literacy tutors to work with students in grades K-3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum.*	*TSA-Early Literacy Instructional Coach-job description* *Early Literacy Tutor-job description* *PLC Schedule 2021-2022*	*This year we were able to hire a coach, but next year she will be moving back into the classroom so we will need to hire a new Early Literacy Instructional Coach TSA* *Hiring an Early Lit Coach had a positive impact on our ability to improve our knowledge and skill of implementing phonics and phonemic awareness because our coach was able to provide observations/feedback on phonics/PA instruction, facilitate PLCs focused on*

			phonics/PA instruction, and organize PD for phonics/PA instruction.
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	*No action.*	*No action.*	*No action.*	*Our school is currently implementing a state-approved core curriculum that includes culturally responsive curriculum and instruction. We have been focused on improving and deepening our implementation of the curriculum. During the needs assessment work, this appeared as an area of strength. Therefore, we are not including it in the action plan.*
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	**Goal #1** *We will improve in our knowledge and skill of implementing phonics and phonemic awareness in grades K-3 by explicitly and consistently teaching SIPPS and providing individualized academic supports as measured by professional development calendar, coaching cycles, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.*	*By September 30, 2021, all K-3 teachers will be trained in SIPPS curriculum, including how to effectively and efficiently complete placement and mastery assessments.*	● *PD Calendar* ● *Assessment Calendar* ● *Teachers' knowledge of data dashboards*	*With the support of our Network 2 Early Literacy Coach, we were able to provide all teachers and tutors with SIPPS training.* *Using PLC time to go over assessments and giving Early Literacy tutors Illuminate training and access helped with the effective and efficient completion of placement tests and mastery*

				assessment. *MCS Foundational Skills Site Implementation | 21-22 Indicators*
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	***Goal #3*** *We Will improve in language comprehension instruction by implementing direct vocabulary instruction and access to grade level complex text as measured by teacher participation in professional learning of new curriculum EL Education, instructional coaching, cycles of inquiry, and observations and feedback by June 2022.*	*By September 30, 2021, all K-5 teachers will be trained In EL Education, by attending district approved training.* *OUSD Summer Literacy Institute* *OUSD Summer Institute Schedules*	• Teachers attendance to EL Education PD and subsequent trainings • Collaboration and Communication with Instructional Coach • Feedback from focused classroom observations	*Note: This action/activity was not funded by ELSB funds but critical to advancing towards our Goal #3.* *With the support of site and district trainings all teachers were trained in EL Ed. Weekly grade level PLCS supported teachers in unpacking and implementing EL Ed.* *PD opportunities for teachers to attend EL Education PD, debrief conversations with their coach, and grade-level PLCs, had a positive impact because it allowed our teachers to become more comfortable with implementing an ELA curriculum that had rigorous complex text instruction.*

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	*Goal # 1* *We will improve in our knowledge and skill of implementing phonics and phonemic awareness in grades K-3 by explicitly and consistently teaching SIPPS and providing individualized academic supports as measured by professional development calendar, coaching cycles, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.*	*By August 2021, inventory current SIPPS Curriculum kits and if necessary request SIPPS Curriculum and provide initial and ongoing training of the curriculum throughout the implementation year.*	● purchase and distribution of SIPPS and Heggerty Materials ● Professional development for teachers and early literacy tutors	*This action did not have an impact on our progress as we did not fund materials out of our ELSB budget this year as the district was purchasing additional SIPPS kits.* *Although there was paper shortage that led to the back order of some items [SIPPS Challenge and Heggerty Manuals], the district created virtual resources for Early Literacy Materials and the One Stop SIPPS document*

				ensured that teachers and tutors had all material to implement Foundational Skills instruction. *Collaboration with the Network 2 Early Literacy Coach ensured there was professional development for staff on how to use Heggerty and SIPPS materials.* *MANZANITA_Foundational Skills Site Implementation | 21-22 Indicators | EOY Comparison*
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments	*Goal #2* *We will improve in our TK/K-3 collection of valid, predictive & reliable data by administering and analyzing DIBELS and I-Ready data three times a year as measured by assessment calendar, data collection forms, and data conference schedules by June 2022.*	*By August 2021, develop a monitoring plan to include data collection from DIBELS screening and i-Ready diagnostic to assess implementation of professional learning plan as well as cycles of improvement.* *By September 30, 2021, teachers in grade K-2 will be trained in DIBELS and i-Ready administration, administer these*	• *DIBELs Screening Assessment* • *I-Ready Diagnostic Data* • *SIPPS Mastery Test Participation* • *Assessment Calendar* • *Teachers knowledge of data dashboards* • *Data conference outcomes*	*Through implementing the action steps identified in our goal teachers were supported in building systems to consistently collect DIBELS, i-Ready, and SIPPs Mastery Test Data.*

		assessments, and participate in data analysis, by attending training, completing necessary data collection forms, and participating in literacy data dives.	

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **pupil supports**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	*No Action*	*No Action*	*No Action*	*We do not need to create an action item around the provision of expanded learning resources because these supports are already provided through our school and district.* *EBAYC afterschool program* *21-22 MCS Budget*
Extended school day to enable	*No Action*	*No Action*	*No Action*	*Students are already able to bring breakfast into the classroom.*

implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction			
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	*Goal #3* *We Will improve in language comprehension instruction by implementing direct vocabulary instruction and access to grade level complex text as measured by teacher participation in professional learning of new curriculum EL Education, instructional coaching, cycles of inquiry, and observations and feedback by June 2022.*	*By September 2021, purchase complex texts that are culturally relevant and classroom libraries that are representative of our students in order to improve pupil connectedness and engagement in literacy instruction.*	*# of culturally relevant books purchased for classroom libraries* *-classroom walk through data would show increased student engagement due to culturally relevant texts* *-i Ready data focused on the vocab domain wo see if increased student engagement increases vocabulary*	*This did not happen but we plan to purchase these materials for next year to support progress towards this goal. Therefore at this time, this activity has not had an impact on progress towards this goal.*
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches,	*No Action*	*No Action*	*No Action*	*Our school is currently implementing a state-approved core SEL curriculum and will be deepening our implementation of the Caring School*

including restorative justice				*Communities curriculum. During the needs assessment work, this appeared as an area of strength. Therefore, it was not included in the action plan.*
Expanded access to the school library	*No Action*	*No Action*	*No Action*	*Our school library is open everyday an hour before and after school with a school librarian so that families of students can access books and participate in programming with our school librarian.*

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **family supports**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	*Goal #3* *We Will improve in language comprehension instruction by implementing direct vocabulary instruction and access to grade level complex text as*	*By December 2021, provide professional development for staff on Culturally Responsive Pedagogy and anti-racism, to support student literacy instruction.*	● *Monthly anti-racism book study* ● *PD Calendar*	We provided the monthly PD focused on anti-racism for our staff. We did not see a change in the demographics of our office referrals or students missing classroom

	measured by teacher participation in professional learning of new curriculum EL Education, instructional coaching, cycles of inquiry, and observations and feedback by June 2022.	*Monthly professional development will follow.*		instruction. This is a practice we will continue next school year in order to increase student engagement for all of our students.
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	No action	No action	No action	*We do not need to create an action item around the provision of mental health resources because these supports are already provided through our school and district.*
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	No action.	No action	No action	*We do not need to create an action item around the implementation of multi-tiered systems of support because these supports are already provided through our school and district.*
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home	No action.	No action	No action	*We did not need to include this in year 1 because we already have monthly literacy training offered to families.*

Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	No action.	No action	No action	*We currently have a monthly newsletter that goes out to all families that provides information on how to support their child's literacy needs.*

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming*	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*	*School-level practices include professional development, walkthroughs and coaching from the Climate and Culture Team, incorporating Restorative Justice practices, and monthly Anti-Racist Book Study.*	*A majority of our K–3 students are testing below proficiency in reading comprehension . We need to become more targeted in instruction of complex and culturally relevant texts to improve engagement and pupil connectedness to learning. Instructional Coach, EL Education training, and professional*

	around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			*learning will be leveraged to target this instruction.*
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*	*School-level practices include implementing the Caring Schools Community SEL Curriculum and whole class and small group social skills lessons from school social worker.*	*N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter*	*Consistent SIPPS K-3 implementation on a daily basis* *Daily Heggerty lessons K-2* *Analyzing SIPPS data to differentiate and make groups*	*We will continue to provide this support*

	and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*		
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand*	*Engage families in ways to supports students at home*	*Families need support supporting students at home*

	family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.	*our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*		

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level*	*34% of students met their typical growth goal on the i-Ready Diagnostic Reading Assessment. This is a 15%*	*Only 18% of K-5 students scored on or above grade level in comprehension of informational texts*

	48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level 43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level 52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level Letter Names: 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students. SIPPS Mastery Test: We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May	30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level SIPPS Mastery Test: Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.	improvement from the 2020-2021 school year. 71% of K-5 students scored proficient or above proficient in phonological awareness on the Spring i-Ready assessment. ELSB Grant 2021-2022_Data	according to the spring i-Ready Diagnostic.
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum.	Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9	Teachers built consistency around foundational literacy skill instruction through implementing the SIPPS and Heggerty Curriculums. According to	There is an imbalance in instruction between veteran teachers and newer staff. Not all students are receiving the

	1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning *300+ learning walks across every elementary school* *This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.*	*schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction.* *Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	*the Foundational Skills Implementation Rubric, 100% teachers received training and materials in SIPPS, Heggerty and Letternaming instruction:* *MANZANITA Foundational Skills Site Implementation	21-22 Indicators	EOY Comparison*	*same quality of instruction across teachers.*
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of*	*There is an imbalance in instruction between veteran teachers and newer staff. Not all students are receiving the same quality of instruction across teachers.*	*-inconsistency with staffing* *-skill level of staff*

	the "change management" around literacy instruction.	*building out their SIPPS instruction.*		
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	-all tutors SIPPS trained	-inconsistant staffing -skill level of staff

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Access to high-quality instruction				
Support for literacy learning	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Pupil supports	*By September 2021, purchase complex texts that are culturally relevant and classroom libraries that are representative of our students in order to improve pupil connectedness and engagement in literacy instruction.*	*We were unable to implement in year 1-carry over to year 2.* *By September 2022, purchase complex texts that are culturally relevant and classroom libraries that are representative of our students in order to improve pupil connectedness and engagement in literacy instruction.*	Select to enter text.	Lack culturally relevant texts for students
Family supports	*We did not have an original action item in this domain.*	*Family workshops 3 times a year focused on Early Literacy support*	*We want families to continue the literacy work at home and have concrete strategies to do so.*	*Attendance to workshops*

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐ **Markham Elementary**

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to:

   a. <mark>specify the practices and</mark>

   b. <mark>unmet needs,</mark>

<mark>identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1</mark> achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*Markham has supported teachers and students by developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	*Markham leadership has supported teachers in building out SEL practices aligned to our PBIS and MTSS resources.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across*	*Markham within our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis followed Units of Study and the Words Their Way curriculum for Word Recognition instruction.*	• *Opportunities for PD around classroom discussion, small-group instruction, and implementation* • *Implementation of*

	Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).	*all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.*	*Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).*	*instruction to implement instruction and address student needs* ● *Teachers needing instruction on how to teach phonics and/or the science of reading* ● *Technology or programs that builds phonics* ● *Teachers and parent connections and training on phonics training.* ● *Addressing older learners who have challenges reading* ● *Home- school connections to support and engage families with reading foundations* ● *Parent literacy engagements* ● *Two enrichment teachers to support PD/PLC process*

				• *Purchase extra sets of SIPPS books to practice at home* • *Hiring tutors to teach the small groups*
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	*Markham engages families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, coffee with the principal bi-weekly parent engagements, and events in partnership with organizations like K2 College, and Oakland Edfund. Additionally our Network 4 Partners supports the family engagement staff (e.g. CSM and Attendance Specialist and Admin Assistant) to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	• *Little to no engagement around literacy and families for teachers or other workshops* • *Effective and timely communication to increase family attendance* • *Classroom based incentives: i.e. raffle gift cards, care kits, baskets of donation materials and or outside resources.* • *Teacher buy-in for student* • *website and marquee working*

				● *Advance notice for parent communications on paper*

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more*	* 100% of all 3rd Graders are mid or above grade level in the domain of Phonological Awareness as indicated on the 2021-22 EOY Overall Placement iReady Reading Diagnostic	* 10% of all 3rd Graders are mid or above grade level in Reading across all domains as indicated on the 2021-22 EOY Overall Placement iReady Reading Diagnostic

	proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.	*grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	* 6 of 12 teachers regularly implemented SIPPS instruction as indicated on formal Walk-throughs at each Trimester with TSA, Network Partners and Principal * 4 of 6 teachers completed 3 official observations cycles for effective instruction	* 6 of 12 teachers did not implement SIPPS instruction as indicated on formal Walk-throughs at each Trimester with TSA, Network Partners and Principal * 3 teachers, 1 TSA , and a PE (EEIP teacher) (of a staff of 12 teachers and 2 TSAs and 1 EEIP teacher) were absent 6 weeks or more from instruction
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for*	See Above	See Above *Root cause analysis* and *needs assessment*

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

	schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).	*Word Recognition instruction.*	
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to*	* Black Students: 23% tested at or above grade level overall in iReady Diagnostic results with 98% participation rate. * Asian Students: 33% tested at or above grade level overall in iReady Diagnostic results with 100% participation rate. * Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 20% tested at or above grade level overall in iReady Diagnostic results with 83% participation rate.	* Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 80% tested at 2-3 grades below overall in Reading iReady Diagnostic results with 83% participation rate.

	81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready		

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to *high-quality teaching*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	1. *Provide explicit, systematic Word Recognition instruction (Phonemic Awareness; Phonics; Sight word; and Decoding instruction)* 2. Develop robust assessment and data analysis practices to inform instruction	In support of goal #1 and #2, by August 2021, we will hire 2 additional early literacy tutors (full time) to work with teachers in grades K–3, for teaching SIPPS and Bookshop Fonetica In support of goal #1 and 2, by August 2021, hire 0.5 TSA to directly provide word recognition instructional support (SIPPS) to K-3 students. In support of goal #1 and #2, by August 2021, hire 0.2 ISS to expand iSPIRE	Grades K-5th Overall In the Domain of Phonological Awareness, 65% of students are mid or above grade level at EOY, 2021-22 as indicated by iReady Overall Reading Placement	SIPPS pull out & push-in, along with TSA coaching support made these gains possible,

		and SPIRE instruction to Tk-3 students demonstrating tier 3 needs.		
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction			

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials				
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments	N/A *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address ***pupil supports***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-	N/A *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction			
Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Strategies to implement research-	*N/A*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	*We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*			
Expanded access to the school library	*N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	No action funded by grant.	identify the action items to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]	identify the action items to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]	
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	No action funded by grant.			
	No action funded by grant.			

Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach				
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home	No action funded by grant.			
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	No action funded by grant.			

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	Attendance Team PBIS systems COST team systems	* Recess * Equal voice * Tier 1 procedures and protocols can be improved; supervision has not been there from the beginning; personnel has been an issue * Supervision needs to walk around, present * Clear expectations on transitional procedures
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	* consistent school-wide morning meeting SEL community building practices supported with breakfast in the classroom across all grade levels * case manager small groups for SEL skills building	* Need exists for a common SEL curriculum that all teachers are teaching from so that everyone is speaking the same language and the same strategies * Tier 1 academic and socio-emotional is not consistent across grades and classrooms.

	students' experiences during the Pandemic.		* case manager push-in SEL restorative circles and 1:1 student support	* Teachers feel the need for a curriculum that can be used and relevant for use with OUR student community * CSC lessons this year really didn't work, or needed to be modified * another resource that might address our needs: *Toolbox*; books, literature, and other materials–as it has a common terminology across content areas and is familiar to many educators.
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter*	* teacher stipends available and used to provide additional after school literacy support * volunteer reading support for academically underperforming students	* only one tutor was hired to support TSA to serve underperforming students with SIPPS intervention groups.

	and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*	
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand*	* bi-weekly data shares to parent community with Coffee with the Principal engagement events * school quality review focus group surveys for parent opinion and feedback on schoolwide practices	* no funded events for parent education on early literacy support strategies or advocacy for early literacy in lower grades.

	family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.	*our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*	* parent teacher conferences at each report card trimester	

8. <mark>Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness</mark> of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level*	69% Overall Markham students are at or above grade level in the domain of Phonological Awareness	61% Overall Markham students are one grade or more below in the area of vocabulary, informational

	48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May*	*30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*		text comprehension and fictional text comprehension.
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum.*	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9*	There is a group of veteran teachers at the school who expressed a desire to improve their practice, and may be open to more	Professional development could be much more robust, teacher opportunities for leadership could be more robust, and there have been limited

	1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning *300+ learning walks across every elementary school* *This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.*	*schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction. Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	leadership opportunities as indicated on the May 2022 School Quality Review assessment	opportunities for teachers to improve their practice while a strong desire to do so has been expressed as indicated on the May 2022 School Quality Review assessment
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of*	25% of teachers completed 3 cycles of formal review with support to improve effective practice.	75% of teachers did not have the benefit of multiple cycles of observation, lesson planning, with feedback to improve effective practice.

	the "change management" around literacy instruction.	*building out their SIPPS instruction.*		
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	Bi-weekly data and status reports to the parent community through Coffee with he Principal family engagement events. Data has been monitored and tracked to impact instructional decisions for our, African American, Latinx, SpEd, EL's, and other focal student groups in iReady diagnostics 100% of teachers express an interest in more training, push-in and pull-out support to implement SIPPS intervention groups at all grade levels.	lack of personnel and staff training in the areas of the science of reading and applicable research-based strategies have left an area of weakness to address LAP goals #1 and #2 Two distinctive learning pathways and curriculums (Spanish Early Exit Transition- Adelante/ EL Education (Structured English Immersion) split the early literacy grades: Tk/K, 1st, and 2nd grades. Low teacher participation rates/lack of collective efficacy in professional development opportunities in the ELSB grant learning cycles.

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	*In support of goal #1 and #2, by August 2021, we will hire 2 additional early literacy tutors (full time) to work with teachers in grades K–3, for teaching SIPPS and Bookshop Fonetica* *In support of goal #1 and 2, by August 2021, hire 0.5 TSA to directly provide word recognition instructional support (SIPPS) to K-3 students.* *In support of goal #1 and #2, by August 2021, hire 0.2 ISS to expand iSPIRE and SPIRE instruction to Tk-3 students demonstrating tier 3 needs.* *By June 2022, we will fund extended contract for TK-3 teachers to attend CORE's OERA and build and share knowledge of the science*	1. no change 2. no change 3. no change 4. no cnange	*61% Overall Markham students are one grade or more below in the area of vocabulary, informational text comprehension and fictional text comprehension.*	*Goal:* *1. Provide explicit, systematic Word Recognition instruction (Phonemic Awareness; Phonics; Sight word; and Decoding instruction)* *2. Develop robust assessment and data analysis practices to inform instruction* *Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal:* *SIPPS mastery assessments* *iReady diagnostic assessment* *as measured by: iReady, DIBELS/IDEL district assessments (Phoneme Segmentation Fluency,*

	of reading in PLCs to build capacity across Tk-3. We will also create a PD calendar and professional development cycles in the Science of Reading knowledge/skills.			*Letter Naming Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, Oral Reading Fluency)*
Support for literacy learning		As seen in our root cause analysis, and our needs assessment, we need to provide our teachers with baseline/foundational PD in the Science of Reading and literacy instruction that aligns with it. As seen in our root cause analysis, and our needs assessment, we need to provide our teachers with baseline/foundational PD in SIPPS, Bookshop Fonetica, and the Science of Reading and literacy instruction that aligns with it. * stipends to provide additional coaching, peer video observations, and	61% Overall Markham students are one grade or more below in the area of vocabulary, informational text comprehension and fictional text comprehension.	Goal: 1. *Provide explicit, systematic Word Recognition instruction (Phonemic Awareness; Phonics; Sight word; and Decoding instruction)* 2. Develop robust assessment and data analysis practices to inform instruction Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal: SIPPS mastery assessments iReady diagnostic assessment

		ongoing professional development as measured by teachers rating 4 out of 5 in every routine on the SIPPS observation rubric by February 2022.		as measured by: iReady, DIBELS/IDEL district assessments (Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Letter Naming Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, Oral Reading Fluency)
Pupil supports		* funding for curriculum with literacy support through vocabulary engagement and social emotional competencies for pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards in the land stewardship program * additional training funding for land stewardship staff in strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach to support SEL competencies in pupils	61% Overall Markham students are one grade or more below in the area of vocabulary, informational text comprehension and fictional text comprehension.	Goal: 1. *Provide explicit, systematic Word Recognition instruction (Phonemic Awareness; Phonics; Sight word; and Decoding instruction)* 2. Develop robust assessment and data analysis practices to inform instruction Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal: SIPPS mastery assessments iReady diagnostic assessment

				as measured by: iReady, DIBELS/IDEL district assessments (Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Letter Naming Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, Oral Reading Fluency)
Family supports		* funding for **professional development:** strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs by support organizations such as Pique.	61% Overall Markham students are one grade or more below in the area of vocabulary, informational text comprehension and fictional text comprehension.	Goal: 1. *Provide explicit, systematic Word Recognition instruction (Phonemic Awareness; Phonics; Sight word; and Decoding instruction)* 2. Develop robust assessment and data analysis practices to inform instruction Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal: SIPPS mastery assessments iReady diagnostic assessment

				as measured by: iReady, DIBELS/IDEL district assessments (Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Letter Naming Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, Oral Reading Fluency)

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. **New Highland Academy**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	PBIS implementation including: - explicitly teaching school wide behaviors & routines - universal acknowledgement system	N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	PBIS Implementation alongside character education embedded in EL Ed curriculum and the support of a community schools manager to support SEL by including: - monthly core value assembly and awards - conflict resolution team	N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis

			- school clean up team - morning meetings	
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction*	- Differentiated block to provide explicit phonics skills instruction using *SIPPS* - *Heggerty* and *Handwriting Without Tears* to support phonemic awareness and letter id - Year 2 EL Ed implementation to provide access to complex text	- Teachers need more support from feedback and observations to improve their implementation of all our foundational skills programs - Teachers need more professional learning around the purpose and arc of our foundational reading skills programs - We have gaps in our data collection around phonemic awareness, phonics, ELD,

		around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.		and comprehension. - Need to determine and implement next steps from our data analysis - Need time to identify appropriate scaffolds in our EL Ed curriculum so that lessons are not over-scaffolded (i.e. where teachers do all the heavy lifting) or under-scaffolded (i.e. where students are provided too little support.) - Need to plan and prepare lessons so that lessons build on each other and clearly support the end of

			unit/module task - Need to provide training and clear expectations around designated ELD systems, curriculum, and instruction. See root cause analysis from 2021 LAP
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	Select to enter text.	N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery*	**K Letter id:** Increased by 20% in November & March. 72% of K students met the letter ID benchmark by the end of the year. **SIPPS mastery goals:** 54% meeting goal in 2nd grade at end-of-year	**K Letter Id:** 40% of K students SIPPS ready in November **SIPPS mastery goals:** 29% of K students and 22% of 1st grade students meeting goals **i-Ready Overall:** 10% on grade level **i-Ready Needs Analysis: Phonics:** 47% of K, 72% of 1s, and 71% of 2nd grade students are 1 or more grade levels below in phonics

		Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	-Differentiated block that allows teachers to teach at least 2 SIPPS groups -Year 2 in our implementation of EL Ed. which provides a standards based curriculum with rich complex text	-No system of regular coaching with observations and feedback for teachers to improve their practice
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	-Not using our data to improve our instruction. We need more time dedicated to analysis and identification of next steps for individuals or groups of students	-We need to incorporate analysis regularly into our PLC structures.

	their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).		
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready*	**i-Ready Needs Analysis: Phonics:** 58% of Black students are 1 or more grade levels below in phonics versus 62% of Latino students. **i-Ready Overall Placement:** 14% of black students are mid-above grade level versus 8% of Latino students	**i-Ready Needs Analysis: Phonics:** 62% of ELs are 1 or more grade levels below in phonics versus 55% of students who are not ELs **i-Ready Overall Placement:** 7% of English learners are mid-above grade level versus 20% who are not ELs

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to ***high-quality teaching***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	**Overall Goal:** 2a. *Instruction and PD: Decoding* By May 2022, We will improve in our knowledge and skills of systematic explicit instruction to improve instruction in our foundational skills program by providing: ● A foundational PD series on the arc of reading instruction and professional learning in the foundational skills programs that will be used at each grade level ● Regular, timely, relevant, constructive feedback from observations	1. By August 2021, hire a 1.0 literacy coach to work with teachers, tutors, and students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on systematic and explicit instruction of foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum and improving oral language using integrated and designated ELD. 2. By August 2021, stipend extra hours beyond their contract for ILT members to plan and lead professional learning.	1. Learning walks 2. Completing SIPPS pacing 3. Improvement in percentage of students meeting SIPPS mastery goals 4. PD, collaboration, and observation calendar	1. **Learning walks:** <mark>Met</mark> The action of hiring a literacy coach to work with teachers and tutors was met. This action was supported by participating in 3x a year learning walks with the district literacy team. This team supported our early literacy coach to observe and provide feedback to K-2 teachers. 2. **Completing SIPPS pacing: Partially Met** We improved our communication to teachers around SIPPS goals and pacing. K teachers got closer to meeting pacing goals, 1st grade teachers mostly met the pacing goals. 2nd grade teachers did not. Many 2nd

				grade students came in multiple years below grade level. In 2/3 classes students place in K level phonics. Still students did not meet differentiated goals in 2nd grade. This was partially due to having one new 2nd grade teacher and one 2nd grade teacher out on leave which affected the pacing of lessons. 3. **Improvement in percentage of students meeting SIPPS mastery goals:** <mark>Partially Met</mark> K: Improved in students meeting letter id target by November. +15% met goal of knowing 20+ letters from 38% last year to 53% this year. Additionally by the end of the year 90% of K students met goal of 20+ letters, a +18% gain from 72% the year before. However, in SIPPs the % meeting their goals stayed the same. 30% met SIPPS goals. 1st: Improved % meeting SIPPS goals from 22% to 49%.

				2nd: Decreased % meeting SIPPS goals from 54% to 29%. 4. **PD, collaboration, and observation calendar:** <mark>Partially Met</mark> Teachers had access to PD to improve designated ELD and EL ED comprehension and oral language instruction through 2 cycles of professional learning dedicated to these topics. They had a regular space to collaborate weekly which included time in the agenda to look at SIPPS data but the degree to which this happened is not clear. We also had regular data analysis days scheduled at the end of every trimester. But days were not scheduled in the PD calendar for targeted learning around foundational skills curriculum.
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

curriculum and instruction			
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	**Overall Goal:** 1. *Data Analysis and Progress Monitoring* By May 2022, we will improve in collecting and analyzing data to identify next steps by: ● Developing and regularly referring to the assessment calendar (ie. assessment windows/deadlines, specific days for PD or PLC analysis) ● Collecting data at regular intervals/progress monitoring ● Dedicating time in PD/PLC to analyze data and identify targeted next steps for instruction	1. By June 2022, fund extended contracts for K-3 teachers to engage in Professional Learning/PD focused on using data to improve instruction. Include at least one professional learning community (PLC) meeting a month dedicated to analyzing data and data conferences after every benchmark in support of goal 1 (data collection and analysis). By year 2 we will dedicate one meeting a month specifically for tutors to analyze tier 2 data. 2. By August 2021, hire a STIP sub to work with students in grades K–1, focusing specifically on providing tier 2 support in foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum, to support with data collection, and data	1. on-time assessment completion 2. complete data collection forms/trackers and analysis tools 3. improved student outcomes in the measures we are tracking	1. **on-time assessment completion: <mark>Met</mark>** The use of our STIP sub was very helpful to administer and collect all early literacy data on time. 2. **complete data collection forms/trackers and analysis tools: <mark>Met</mark>** The extra professional learning time was helpful to provide teachers time to analyze data and complete all trackers. 3. **improved student outcomes in the measures we are tracking: <mark>Partially Met</mark>** See specific data points from chart 3 item 3 above. Additionally, while we made time to analyze data at the

		conferences in order to meet goal 1 (data collection and analysis) and 3 (MTSS).		end of the trimester, teachers were focused on so many different data points they did not generate clear next steps. We did not ensure monthly time dedicated to analyzing formative SIPPS data and planning next steps to improve SIPPS instruction.
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	**Overall Goal:** 2b. *Instruction and PD: Comprehension* By May 2022, we will improve our implementation of EL Ed curriculum to extend student thinking and support academic discussion by providing: • A content-integrated, language-rich classroom environment through print, complex text selection, and academic discussion • Explicit instruction and word play in strategic Tier 2 vocabulary • Designated ELD focused on language structures through key strategies including: language dives and sentence patterning charts. • Time in PLCs to backwards plan	By June 2023, fund extended contract for K-3 teachers to engage in professional development around integrated ELD: academic discussion & tier 2 vocabulary in support of goal 2B (improving instruction in the oral language strand).	1. Improvement on focal EL indicators during learning walks: advance planning (1A), citing evidence (3A, 3B), and checks for understanding (2B) 2. increased student participation 3. evidence of key language features and elaboration in oral language & writing 4. students using academic vocabulary in oral language and written responses 5. fewer students needing vocabulary on i-ready diagnostic	1. **Improvement on focal EL indicators during learning walks: advance planning (1A), citing evidence (3A, 3B), and checks for understanding (2B): <mark>Partially Met</mark>** Improved on indicators 1A advanced planning and 2B checks for understanding. Made progress in citing evidence based on student work samples but not in EL Ed indicators. 2. **increased student participation: <mark>met</mark>** Improved student participation through use of

protocols including: turn and talk, equity sticks, triads, & lines of communication. Increased use of turn and talks from less than half of classes to 15/19 classes observed.

3. **evidence of key language features and elaboration in oral language & writing:** partially met

We focused on language features in our 1st cycle around designated ELD. We collected some data using the language growth tool overlay but we do not have sufficient data to identify if students continued to use language features. We focused on elaboration in our cycle focused on EL Ed Some grades used the EL Ed writing rubrics to analyze writing for elaboration but this data was not collected systematically and we are unable to determine if students used elaboration in their writing. 3rd grade standards mastery data suggests that this needs to

be a continued focus for us.

4. **students using academic vocabulary in oral language and written responses:** <mark>partially met</mark>

We have the same gaps in data collection of written assignments so we not able to fully assess if this outcome was met. However, we did see improvement in ELL focal indicator 2.3-students develop and use language to explain ideas, suggesting that students did use academic vocabulary in oral language.

5. **fewer students needing vocabulary on i-ready diagnostic**: <mark>not met</mark>

-4% decrease in students at grade level in vocabulary as measured by i-Ready diagnostic (from 11% to 7%) May be due to inaccuracies in our data from distance learning year to this year.

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	**Overall Goals:** 2a. *Instruction and PD: Decoding* 2b. *Instruction and PD: Comprehension*	1. By August 2021, purchase supplemental SIPPS/Heggerty materials and additional materials for additional K-3 student groups and levels of SIPPS instruction in support of goal 2A (improving instruction in the decoding strand). 2. By August 2022, purchase recommended EL ed texts for K-3 classrooms to support diverse language and reading levels that are complex and connected to the modules to support our goal of providing a content-integrated and language rich classroom environment as well as to support tier 2 vocabulary	1. All K-3 classes have required instructional materials 2. By August 2022 all K-3 classes have supplemental/recommended materials	1. **All K-3 classes have required instructional materials: met** Based on our end of year inventory all K-2 teachers have needed foundational skills curriculum: SIPPS, Heggerty, and Handwriting Without Tears. There is a loss of EL Ed curriculum that we will need to replace. 2. **By August 2022 all K-3 classes have supplemental/recommended materials: NA because not a goal for this year** We are making progress toward this goal already. 2nd grade teachers already have their recommended texts.

		development and instruction in support of goal 2B (improving instruction in the oral language strand).		See end of year inventory.
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments	Select to enter text.	No specific action. (Already provided by the district with the addition of DIBELS measures.)	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **pupil supports**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after- school programs or summer school, to	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

improve pupils' access to literacy instruction				
Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

approaches, including restorative justice				
Expanded access to the school library	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **family supports**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support	**Overall goal:** 3. *Multi-Tiered Systems and Support MTSS* By May 2022, we will improve in developing, building shared	● Dedicating a *protected* block of time for SIPPS (K-	1. Master calendar allocates uninterrupted time for SIPPS groups	1. **Master calendar allocates uninterrupted time for SIPPS groups**

and the response to intervention approach	knowledge, and clearly communicating a robust MTSS (multi-tiered systems of support) System in order to provide targeted instruction	2) and targeted differentiation (3-5) ● Ensuring tutors and intervention teachers are trained and supported to provide targeted Tier 2 supports ● Developing systems for regular communication between teachers and tutors using data trackers to progress monitor	and tier 2 instruction. 2. Teacher and tutor schedules 3. Progress monitoring trackers 4. Learning Walks	**and tier 2 instruction: Met** See calendar here: Master Calendar **2. Teacher and tutor schedules: Met** See calendar here: Master Calendar **3. Progress monitoring trackers: Met** Folder for Trackers **4. Learning Walks: Met** Data from our learning walks shows teachers and tutors were teaching SIPPS during the differentiated block.
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	No goal in our literacy action plan related to this category	No specific action	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	PBIS implementation including: ● explicitly teaching school wide behaviors & routines ● universal acknowledgement systems	N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis

	around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	PBIS implementation alongside character education embedded in EL Ed curriculum and the support of a Community Schools Manager to support SEL by including: ● monthly core value assembly and awards ● conflict resolution team ● school clean up team ● morning meetings	N/A We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided*	- Differentiated block to provide explicit phonics skills instruction using *SIPPS* - *Heggerty* and *Handwriting Without Tears* to support phonemic awareness and	- Teachers did not receive professional learning in foundational skills. We will add an PD day explicitly for K-2 teachers next year.

	instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*	letter id with tutors and teachers teaching at least 2 SIPPS and/or letters lesson. - Year 3 EL Ed implementation to provide access to complex text - Early literacy coach provided regular observations and feedback to K-2 teachers - Improved foundational skills data collection and analysis - Improvement in planning and preparing lesson; professional learning time dedicated backwards	- Teachers need more time to regularly monitor formative assessment data either in their weekly PLCs or in the PD dedicated to K-2 teachers. - Still need to work on planning El. Ed lessons that provide an appropriate level of rigor. We need to improve our use of formative data collection and analysis. We need to ask higher order thinking questions in our lessons. - We need to continue to

			planning, unit unpacking, and lesson planning - Improved designated ELD expectations, systems, and use of curriculum.	improve oral language and vocabulary instruction.
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones.*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.

	We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.		

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	**K Letter id:** +15% met goal of knowing 20+ letters from 38% last year to 53% in November. End of Year: 90% of K students met goal of 20+ letters, a +18% gain from 72% the year before **SIPPS mastery goals:** 1st grade: Improved from 22% meeting growth goal to 49% meeting growth goal. **i-Ready growth:** All K-2 students improved in meeting typical growth	**SIPPS mastery goals:** K: % of students meeting SIPPS mastery goals remained the same 2nd: Percent of students meeting SIPPS mastery goals decreased. **i-Ready Overall:** -5% decrease from 10% on grade level to 5% on grade level **i-Ready Needs Analysis: Phonics:** 86% of K, 84% of 1s,

	in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students. *SIPPS Mastery Test: We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May*		and 98% of 2nd grade students are 1 or more grade levels below in phonics
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum.* *1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning* *300+ learning walks across every elementary school* *This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational*	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction.* *Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but*	- Differentiated block to provide explicit phonics skills instruction using *SIPPS* - *Heggerty* and *Handwriting Without Tears* to support phonemic awareness and letter id with tutors and teachers teaching at least 2 SIPPS and/or letters lesson.	Select to enter text.

	training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.	*unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	- Year 3 EL Ed implementation to provide access to complex text - Early literacy coach provided regular observations and feedback to K-2 teachers - Improved foundational skills data collection and analysis - Improvement in planning and preparing lesson; professional learning time dedicated backwards planning, unit unpacking, and lesson planning - Improved designated ELD expectations,	

			systems, and use of curriculum.	
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	Select to enter text.	- Teachers did not receive professional learning in foundational skills. We will add an PD day explicitly for K-2 teachers next year. - Teachers need more time to regularly monitor formative assessment data either in their weekly PLCs or in the PD dedicated to K-2 teachers. - Still need to work on planning El. Ed lessons that provide an appropriate level of rigor. We

				need to improve our use of formative data collection and analysis. We need to ask higher order thinking questions in our lessons. - We need to continue to improve oral language and vocabulary instruction.
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3*	**i-Ready Needs Analysis: Phonics:** 52% of Black students are 1 or more grade levels below in phonics versus 69% of Latino students.	**i-Ready Needs Analysis: Phonics:** 69% of ELs are 1 or more grade levels below in phonics versus 66% of students who are not ELs **i-Ready Overall Placement:** We do not see the same gap

		students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".		in EL learners overall placement this year. We do see a new gap between black students and latinx students. 5% of Latinx students are mid-above grade level versus 0% of Black students

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	1. By August 2021, hire a 1.0 literacy coach to work with teachers, tutors, and students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on systematic and explicit instruction of foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum and improving oral language using integrated and designated ELD.	1. No Change 2. No Change 3. No Change 4. No Change 5. No change	1. Coach will continue to focus on professional learning, observation and feedback. 2. Continue to pay teacher leaders to be a part of the planning and implementation of this plan. Add teacher leaders to our ELSB PDSA cycles.	1. Learning walks 2. Completing SIPPS pacing 3. Improvement in percentage of students meeting SIPPS mastery goals 4. PD, collaboration, and observation calendar 5. on-time assessment

| | 2. By August 2021, stipend extra hours beyond their contract for ILT members to plan and lead professional learning.

3. By June 2022, fund extended contracts for K-3 teachers to engage in Professional Learning/PD focused on using data to improve instruction. Include at least one professional learning community (PLC) meeting a month dedicated to analyzing data and data conferences after every benchmark in support of goal 1 (data collection and analysis). By year 2 we will dedicate one meeting a month specifically for tutors to analyze tier 2 data.

4. By August 2021, hire a STIP sub to work with students in grades K–1, focusing specifically on providing tier 2 support in foundational reading skills | | 3. We only partially met this goal and we need to ensure adequate time for analysis of formative foundational skills data (i.e SIPPS mastery tests)

4. Our STIP sub was instrumental in supporting our data collection and providing release time for analysis

5. This was a goal for this year. We need to continue to address vocabulary development and both designated and integrated ELD. | completion

6. complete data collection forms/trackers and analysis tools
7. Improvement on focal EL indicators during learning walks: advance planning (1A), citing evidence (3A, 3B), and checks for understanding (2B)
8. increased student participation
9. evidence of key language features and elaboration in oral language & writing
10. students using academic vocabulary in oral language and written responses
11. fewer students needing vocabulary on i-ready diagnostic |
|---|---|---|---|---|

	using the SIPPS curriculum, to support with data collection, and data conferences in order to meet goal 1 (data collection and analysis) and 3 (MTSS). 5. By June 2023, fund extended contract for K-3 teachers to engage in professional development around integrated ELD: academic discussion & tier 2 vocabulary in support of goal 2B (improving instruction in the oral language strand).			
Support for literacy learning	1. By August 2021, purchase supplemental SIPPS/Heggerty materials and additional materials for additional K-3 student groups and levels of SIPPS instruction in support of goal 2A (improving instruction in the decoding strand).	1. No change 2. No change	1. We have some missing EL Ed materials we need to replace in K-2 2. This was a goal for 2023	1. All K-3 classes have required instructional materials 2. By August 2022 all K-3 classes have supplemental/recommended materials

	2. By August 2022, purchase recommended EL ed texts for K-3 classrooms to support diverse language and reading levels that are complex and connected to the modules to support our goal of providing a content-integrated and language rich classroom environment as well as to support tier 2 vocabulary development and instruction in support of goal 2B (improving instruction in the oral language strand)..			
Pupil supports	No goal or specific actions in our literacy action plan related to this category	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Family supports	By May 2022, we will improve in developing, building shared knowledge, and clearly communicating a robust MTSS (multi-tiered systems of support) System in order to provide targeted instruction	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	1. Master calendar allocates uninterrupted time for SIPPS groups and tier 2 instruction. 2. Teacher and tutor schedules 3. Progress monitoring trackers

				4. Learning Walks

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. **Parker K-8**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	We have held several Professional Development sessions on establishing positive classroom climate & culture; Tier 1 Behavior Health Supports, Social Emotional Learning & use of Tool Box Tool SEL curriculum, school wide behavior expectations, and the *Morning Meeting* to establish positive tone for the day.	Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff, and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our goals to the degree originally envisioned.
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	We use the Parker 5Bs, the Toolbox Tools program and morning meetings to help teach students to regulate their emotions and handle conflicts peacefully.	Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff, and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our

			goals to the degree originally envisioned.
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support. Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit*	We have provided PDs around foundational skills instruction, which included Heggerty and SIPPS. We observed teacher and tutors foundational skills instruction (SIPPS) and provided feedback and support with next steps to help improve/refine instruction and ultimately student achievement.	Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff, and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our goals to the degree originally envisioned.

		vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.		
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site.*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	Teachers attended monthly EL Education (ELA curriculum) professional development; Our EL Education Instructional Coach facilitated several Professional Learning Communities in backwards mapping of ELA lessons. In addition, our ELA Instructional Coach provided bi-monthly ELA coaching to teachers.	Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff, and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our goals to the degree originally envisioned.

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed*	K-3 students received more consistent SIPPS instruction than previous years	The learning loss experienced during distance learning and lack of student

	3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%. *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and 80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.*	*standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.* *We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*		engagement during the 20-21 school year has left below grade level. Therefore, requiring more time and a slower pace for students to truly master ELA content.
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational*	Our school, at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had decided that we would use SIPPS and Heggerty for our foundational skills program.	Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff, and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our goals to the degree originally envisioned.

	language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.	*skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*		As a result of losing our full-time Early Literacy Coach, teachers did not receive as much coaching and feedback as we originally planned.
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Lucy Calkins Reading and Writing workshop and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	The school site held summer retreats and other professional development sessions to plan for implementation. On the other hand, we lost several Early Literacy Tutors during the first few months of implementation. In addition, we lost several other key staff members, including a 2nd grade teacher which resulted in our Early Literacy Coach having to drastically change her priorities to teach a 2nd grade class full-time.	Our School, at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had
	Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in*	Parker's demographics are is	

| Equity and performance gaps | *percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.* | *our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.*

In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready | has a majority All K-3 SIPPS-ready students are assigned to a SIPPS group. All students have made progress with their reading. | |

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to ***high-quality teaching***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	By June 2024, we will improve in our knowledge & skill in implementing an explicit systematic foundational skills program with fidelity, across classrooms, as measured by our professional development calendar, coaching/observation schedule (2x/month), collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.	By September 2021, hired a lead early literacy tutor to work with students in grades K-3, focusing specifically on foundation skills using SIPPS curriculum and letter name mastery. By September 2021, hired 1 additional Early Literacy Tutor to implement SIPPS instruction, fluency groups, and other literacy support.	Metrics for assessment included: SIPPS Placement and mastery assessment data ● i-Ready & Dibels Data - BOY, MOY, EOY ○ Monthly or bi-monthly Dibels Progress Monitoring for students below grade level ● Quarterly Data Analysis/Reflection ● Weekly Progress Monitoring_Lett	-Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff, and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our goals to the degree originally envisioned. As a result of losing our full-time Early Literacy Coach, teachers did not receive as much coaching and feedback as we originally planned. -The school site held summer retreats and other professional development sessions to plan for implementation. On the other hand, we lost several Early Literacy Tutors during

			er Name Mastery	the first few months of implementation. In addition, we lost several other key staff members, including a 2nd grade teacher which resulted in our Early Literacy Coach having to drastically change her priorities to teach a 2nd grade class full-time. -In addition, we also lost a STIP Substitute whose role would have been to provide push-in & pull-out small group support for intervention groups.
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
Evidence-based professional	By June 2024, we will improve in our knowledge & skill in	By July/August 2021, created a calendar for professional development and professional learning	• 21-22 Draft TK-5 Literacy Assessment Calendar	Unfilled staffing positions, new staff, loss of teaching staff,

development for teachers, instructional aides, and school leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	implementing an explicit systematic foundational skills program with fidelity, across classrooms, as measured by our professional development calendar, coaching/observation schedule (2x/month), collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.	communities for teachers, tutors, instructional aides and school leaders regarding literacy instruction, literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling students. By July/August 2021, scheduled SIPPS and letter name identification training for all teachers and tutors for the year.	• PD Agendas (Summer PD Plan)Monthly PD/PLC Plan- link • Quarterly Data Analysis/Reflection • Weekly Progress Monitoring of Letter Name Mastery • Monthly or Bi-monthlyDibels • Progress Monitoring for students below grade level • Observations 2x/month for SIPPS teachers and Letter Name • Increase the frequency of professional development feedback collection from staff through administration of surveys. • Monthly PD with K-3 with foundational skills focus.	and staff shortages overall have impacted our effectiveness and ability to achieve our goals to the degree originally envisioned. As a result of losing our full-time Early Literacy Coach, teachers did not receive as much coaching and feedback as we originally planned.

			Differentiated PLC time for K-3 at least twice a month that includes updating SIPPS Tracker, refining SIPPS Routines, using SIPPS Guide for Decision Making. ●	
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.

staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments			

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address ***pupil supports***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.

Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction			
Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.

Expanded access to the school library			

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *family supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.
	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.

Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home				
Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	N/A	N/A	N/A	No ELSB budget was used for this expense.

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]Select

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and*	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no

	practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			year 2 implementation.
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word,*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation

	both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*		
	In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse	*We still have a need to engage parents around*	This section does not apply to our site due	This section does not apply to our site due

Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.*	*literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards are telling them. We would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*	the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:* *71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level* *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests*	*i-Ready:* *24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation

	from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum. 1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning 300+ learning walks across every elementary school This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.*	*Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction. Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation

<u>Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)</u>	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation
<u>Equity and performance gaps</u>	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation
Support for literacy learning	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation
Pupil supports	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation
Family supports	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation	This section does not apply to our site due the closure of the school site and no year 2 implementation

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a non consent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment conducted during the Planning Year (2020–21), Early Literacy Support Block (ELSB) Grant participating local educational agencies (LEAs) developed three-year literacy action plans that include goals and actions to improve literacy instruction at each eligible school. The literacy action plans identify metrics to measure progress toward the goals and planned expenditures, which fund supplemental activities targeted for kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive.

On an annual basis, each LEA with an eligible school shall submit to the California Department of Education, the school site council at each eligible school, and the governing board or body of the LEA a report on achievement towards the actions and goals described, and an assessment of progress made on the metrics identified, in its literacy action plan. These reports shall also be publicly posted on the LEA's website.

For Implementation Year 1 (2021–22), the LEA Program Lead shall complete the template below for each eligible participating school and submit this form to ELSBGrant@cde.ca.gov between **June 30, 2022** and **July 31, 2022**.

LEA Name: Oakland Unified School District

Program Lead: Romy Trigg-Smith   Email/Phone: romy.trigg-smith@ousd.org

Fiscal Lead: Troylynn Turner   Email/Phone: troylynn.turner@ousd.org

Eligible Participating School(s) – select box next to the site for which this report applies:

☐1. **Prescott School**	☐6. Select to enter text.
☐2. Select to enter text.	☐7. Select to enter text.
☐3. Select to enter text.	☐8. Select to enter text.
☐4. Select to enter text.	☐9. Select to enter text.
☐5. Select to enter text.	☐10. Select to enter text.

Supporting Agency or Agencies: (i.e. ELSB Grant Expert Lead in Literacy, local county office of education, etc.): CDE, SCOE, Pivot/CORE

LEA URL for public posting of ELSB Grant Reports:

https://www.ousd.org/earlyliteracysupportblockgrant

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: Please indicate N/A in all sections that do not apply.

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

1. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the practices and unmet needs, identified when conducting the root cause analysis, of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in English language arts (ELA). [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2020–2021	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	N/A *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	N/A *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community.*	*N/A* *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	N/A. *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*	N/A *We did not consider this the core issue during our root cause analysis.*
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction. Our LEA has identified a root cause of poor 3rd grade reading achievement to be insufficient curriculum*	*The district recognizes there has been a lack of expectation around explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students along with appropriate training and ongoing support.*	Our Kinder and 1st /2nd grade teachers implemented SIPPS instruction daily. All teachers received district PD and ongoing support as needed. Newly adopted complex text was used in read alouds.	Including 3rd grade in SIPPS Instruction. PD for non classroom teachers - was offered but we weren't able to get support staff to participate. Fully implementing new ELA Core curriculum.

	materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope).	*Additionally, the district has recognized a root cause in students' poor development of language comprehension due to lack of exposure to complex text through core curriculum and strong designated English Language Development. The district sees a need to adopt a new core curriculum and support leaders/teachers with implementing instruction around complex text including explicit vocabulary instruction as well as designated ELD.*		Explicit Designated ELD has not yet been implemented. (Year 2 goal)
Experience of families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g. outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships*	*However, our root cause analysis reflected a need for a central strategy and coherent support for schools to engage parents around literacy work (e.g. how to interpret data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy, clear communication around curriculum and program).*	We did not have any school level practices in place to address this.	Engage Parents in literacy work specifically in interpreting data/assessments, milestones to track for progress in literacy and clear communication around curriculum and program.

	and host relevant events for the site.		

2. In review, please complete the chart below to specify the previously identified areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2020–2021	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*Our LEA (Oakland School District) increased the percentage of students exceeding standard on the 3rd Grade ELA SBAC from 17-18 to 18-19 by 1% and decreased the percentage of students not meeting standard by 1%.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 51% of K-3rd grade students early-mid-above level on i-Ready reading.* *We had 90% of 3rd graders pass out of (show proficiency on) the Phonological Awareness domain in i-Ready, and*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) we had only 35.1% of all 3rd graders meet or exceed standard on the the ELA SBAC in 18-19 and 42.2% of students were below standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), Only 31% of 2nd graders were proficient in the Phonics domain of i-Ready.* *33% of 3rd graders were performing 2 or more grade-levels below in phonics.*	Kinder, 1st and 3rd grade had the highest percentage at or above level on i-Ready assessment of all grades.	2nd grade had fewer students "At or Above Level" (However they had tremendous growth.)

	80% pass out of the HFW domain in i-Ready.	*We did not have data collection practices around SIPPS Mastery Tests, DIBELS, or letter naming.*		
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis had piloted EL Education to support Language Comprehension instruction and providing students with exposure to rich complex text, robust vocabulary, and explicit language instruction. Additionally, 16 schools in the early literacy cohort were implementing SIPPS curriculum and DIBELS assessments.*	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, one of the weaknesses was that we were not collecting academic practice data on effective practices (e.g. % of classrooms implementing foundational skills curriculum, rubric ratings on implementation rubrics, etc.).*	By the end of the year we were getting a higher percentage of students completing the monthly assessments. School (with the help of district support) completed the rubrics on implementation of the ELA programs - guiding practice.	100% participation on all Early Literacy Assessments each month. Consistent growth in implementation of the new Core Curriculum.
Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*In our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, we knew which schools were implementing Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Units of Study and which schools were implementing EL Education. We also knew*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District), at the time of the ELSB root cause analysis, had different ELA curriculum used across schools and no explicit expectation for Word Recognition instruction.*	Teachers implemented some Word Recognition Instruction All teachers had the materials and opportunity to implement EL Education	Full and complete implementation of Heggerty for Word Recognition. All teachers using Labs and ALL Block in EL Education

	which schools had not incorporated or implemented Word Recognition instruction in their literacy program (eg. SIPPS or Heggerty).		
Equity and performance gaps	*Although minimal, OUSD did see an increase from 17-18 to 18-19 of the percentage of Latino students who met/exceeded standard on the 3rd grade ELA SBAC from 22.9% to 23.9% of Latino students meeting or exceeding standard.*	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has significant equity gaps in our 18-19 SBAC 3rd grade ELA data. While 74.5% of white students met or exceeded standard only 19% of African American Students, 23.9% of Latino students, and 12.5% of pacific islander students met or exceeded standard.* *In 20-21, by the Spring (May), we had 35.3% of Latino K-3 students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready Reading and 41.4% of African American K-3 Students at green (early-mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready, compared to 81.3% of white K-3 students at green (early-*	The majority of our ELLs showed growth.	50% of the students showing no growth were ELL students.

			mid-late grade-level) in i-Ready		

3. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address access to ***high-quality teaching***. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e1A-D)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Hiring of literacy coaches or instructional aides to provide support to struggling pupils, including, among others, bilingual reading specialists to support English learner programs.	By June 2022, will deepen our knowledge & skill in Word Recognition instruction by implementing SIPPS with fidelity as measured by our K-3 classroom data, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.	*In support of Goals #1 and #2, by September 2021, hire a 80% literacy coach (0.8 FTE) to work with teachers and students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum.* *In support of Goals #1, by September 2021, hire an additional Early Literacy tutor to work with teachers and students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum.*	EOY i-Ready data indicates 50% of Kinder students were at or above grade level 29% of 1st Grade 18% of 2nd Grade 31% of 3rd Grade	Positive: With TSA support (scheduling, organizing materials, supporting implementation with direct student services) teachers were able to focus on Foundational Skills using SIPPS Daily. District provided support was amazing. Providing PD, Assessment Resources, etc. Negative: Teacher and instructional aide (Lit Tutor) absences made consistency difficult. One 2nd/3rd class had a teacher leave in early October and given all the

				needed areas of support, SIPPS implementation did not happen for those students. Due to no Prep teacher PD time was given over for teacher "Prep" and therefore time for PD / PLC / Data Analysis was compromised. Assessments were inconsistent. Additionally, we did not hire our early literacy tutor through ELSB funds due to challenges recruiting and hiring during the return to in person instruction.
Development of strategies to provide culturally responsive curriculum and instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Evidence-based professional development for teachers, instructional aides, and school	2. Provide explicit Language Comprehension instruction. By the end of 2024, we will deepen our knowledge &	*In support of goal #2, by June 2022, we will pay K-3 teachers extended contract to engage in PD in the use of culturally*	# of PDs Satisfaction rate of teachers in PDs	Positive: District support in implementation was great. 2nd Wednesday Differentiate PD options.

leaders regarding literacy instruction and literacy achievement and the use of data to help identify and support struggling pupils	skill in Language Comprehension by implementing EL Education with fidelity as measured by end of unit EL curriculum embedded assessment, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.	*relevant text and the use of Accelerated Reader*		District Support - Implementation Rubrics, Walk Thrus, availability for support. Negative: Due to no Prep teacher PD time was given over for teacher "Prep" and therefore time for PD / PLC / Data Analysis was compromised. Assessments were inconsistent, so we did not hold the intended PDs and did not make progress in this action step. We did pay teachers extended contract this year for this purpose and not hold PD around the use of culturally relevant texts and AR.
Professional development for teachers and school leaders regarding implementation of the curriculum framework for ELA/English Language	By the end of 2024, we will deepen our knowledge & skill in Language Comprehension by implementing EL Education with fidelity as measured by end of unit EL curriculum embedded assessment, professional development calendar, coaching schedule,	In support of goal #1 and #2, by June 2022, K-3 teachers will be paid extended contract to attend the CORE Reading Academy in support of professional development on Word Recognition and Language Comprehension.	# of staff trained	Positive: We had a number of staff members trained in the science of reading through OERA. Negative: We have several staff who still need to be trained in the Science of Reading and attend OERA.

Development (ELD) adopted by the State Board of Education (SBE) pursuant to Section 60207 of the *Education Code* and the use of data to support effective instruction	collaborative lesson plans and peer observations. By June 2022, will deepen our knowledge & skill in Word Recognition instruction by implementing SIPPS with fidelity as measured by our K-3 classroom data, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.			

4. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **support for literacy learning**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e2A-B)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Purchase of literacy curriculum resources and instructional materials aligned with	By the end of 2024, we will deepen our knowledge & skill in Language Comprehension by implementing EL	*In support of goal #2, by June 2024, we will have purchased additional culturally relevant texts for K-3 classroom libraries*	*# of culturally relevant texts purchased* *# of AR licenses purchased*	*We did not see a positive outcome for this action as we did not purchase the culturally relevant texts that we intended to purchase*

the ELA content standards and the curriculum framework for ELA/ELD adopted by the SBE, but only if the literacy action plan also includes professional development for staff on effective use of these materials	Education with fidelity as measured by end of unit EL curriculum embedded assessment, professional development calendar, coaching schedule, collaborative lesson plans and peer observations.	*and Accelerated Reader for K-3 students to support language comprehension.*	# of students passing AR quizzes	*and we did not purchase Accelerated Reader with grant funds either. We hope to make progress towards this action this coming year.* *Through purchasing additional culturally relevant complex texts, our students will gain access and additional exposure to rich vocabulary, sentence structures, syntax, and figurative language to support language comprehension. Additionally, purchasing Accelerated Reader will allow our students to demonstrate their comprehension and us as educators to track their progress.*
Purchase of diagnostic assessment instruments to help assess pupil needs and progress and training for school	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

staff regarding the use of those assessment instruments			

5. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address *pupil supports*. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-E)]

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Expanded learning programs, such as before- and after-school programs or summer school, to improve pupils' access to literacy instruction	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Extended school day to enable implementation of breakfast in the classroom or library models to support expanded literacy instruction	N/A	N/A.	N/A	N/A

Strategies to improve school climate, pupil connectedness, and attendance and to reduce exclusionary discipline practices, including in-school suspensions, that may limit a pupil's time in school	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Strategies to implement research-based social-emotional learning approaches, including restorative justice	N/A	N/A	N/A	See Above
Expanded access to the school library	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

6. Based on the root cause analysis and needs assessment, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to address **family supports**. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e4A-E)]

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22
(REV. 04/2022)

2021–2022	Specific Goal	Specific Action	Metrics for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal	Rationale for Positive/Negative Outcome
Development of trauma-informed practices and supports for pupils and families	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Provision of mental health resources to support pupil learning	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Strategies to implement multi-tiered systems of support and the response to intervention approach	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Development of literacy training and education for parents to help develop a supportive literacy environment in the home	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Strategies to improve parent and community engagement and to improve communication with parents regarding how to address pupils' literacy needs	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

7. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current practices and unmet needs identified for addressing the root cause of having the highest percentage of pupils in grade three scoring at the lowest achievement standard level, also referred to as the Level 1 achievement level, on the consortium summative assessment in ELA. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2A)]

2021–2022	LEA Practices	LEA Unmet Needs	School-Level Practices	School-Level Unmet Needs
School climate	*Our district has supported schools developing climate and culture plans incorporating Restorative Justice principles and practices as well as PBIS principles. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL*	*N/A* *We still do not consider this the core issue.*	N/A	*We do not need to create an action item around the provision of School Climate because this was not identified as a priority for this grant and we are already working on School Climate practices across our site.*

	strategies and re-norming around school routines and procedures specific to supporting the return to in-person instruction.			
Social-emotional learning	*Our district has supported schools in building out SEL practices aligned to our adopted SEL curriculum, Caring School Community. During this year of on-site learning and return to in-person instruction, we curated first four week plans that incorporate explicit SEL strategies and lessons that spoke to students' experiences during the Pandemic.*	*N/A We still do not consider this the core issue.*	N/A.	*We do not need to create an action item around the provision of SEL because this was not identified as a priority for this grant and we are already working on SEL practices across our site.*
Experience of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*Our LEA (Oakland Unified School District) has made progress this year with providing sufficient curriculum materials, PD, and teacher support in both areas of Decoding and Language Comprehension (both strands of Scarborough's rope). Our district adopted EL Education to provide instruction around rich*	*The district recognizes we still need to improve our explicit, systematic and structured foundational skill (phonics, phonemic awareness, sight word, fluency) instruction across all sites for Kinder through 2nd grade students. Although we have set the expectation, provided training, provided coaching around*	*K - 2 students received SIPPS and iReady Instruction Daily Students were exposed to complex text through interactive read alouds.*	*Students were not always aware of personal goals or purpose of the work they were doing. The second half of the year students were only getting SIPPS (Foundational Instruction) 2 or 3 times a week. Students were not getting a high quantity of independent reading at their level.*

	complex texts, vocabulary and oral language/discussion. We also supported a suite of materials to master Foundational Skills (Heggerty, Handwriting Without Tears & OUSD Letter Naming Curriculum, SIPPS). We provided baseline PD to over 1000 teachers/leaders in the curriculum as well as ongoing monthly PD. Students were given access to complex text, provided daily differentiated foundational skill instruction, and given access to MyPath a differentiated online learning platform through i-Ready.	*SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter naming, there are still several sites that need support with implementation. Additionally, the district has worked to adopt a more Common Core aligned ELA core curriculum (EL Education) and is working to build out strong designated English Language Development lessons aligned to it. However, we need to deepen implementation of the curriculum and see the quality of lesson execution improve more consistently.*		*There was very little time for students to practice the skills they were learning. There was very little Comprehension instruction.* *There were not enough Instructional minutes for ELA built into the daily schedules.*
Families of pupils below grade-level standard on the ELA content standards	*In OUSD our schools engage families in diverse ways through SSC meetings, literacy nights, and parent-teacher conferences, Additionally our Office of Equity trains and supports the family engagement staff (e.g.*	*We still have a need to engage parents around literacy work, especially how to interpret the information from core district assessments and how to understand what the information on report cards is telling them. We*	*Most families received report cards at each Reporting window.*	*Families K -2 were not receiving regular communication regarding their students progress towards academic goals nor were they receiving specific strategies to support them with their students' literacy.*

	outreach coordinators and family navigators) at sites to build family relationships and host relevant events for the site. We also worked this year to implement Literacy Milestones workshops during which we provided family engagement staff with training on and "plug-n-play" presentations on literacy strategies aligned to key literacy milestones. We also built prototypes for home literacy kits to send home with students by grade-level to reinforce the key milestones of that grade-level.	*would also like to expand our Home Literacy Kit program to support every TK-2nd grade student in the district.*		

8. Following the first year of implementation, please reassess the needs by completing the chart below to specify the current areas of strength and weakness of both the eligible school and the LEA with regard to literacy instruction in kindergarten and grades one to three, inclusive. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(d2B)]

2021–2022	LEA Strength	LEA Weakness	School-Level Strength	School-Level Weakness
Pupil performance data in ELA	*i-Ready:*	*i-Ready:*	*The majority of students showed growth on iReady Diagnostic.*	*The Pre-assessments participation and SIPPS data was not consistent.*

	71% of Kinder students "green" early-mid grad-level *48% of 1st grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *43% of 2nd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *52% of 3rd grade students "green" early-mid grad-level* *Letter Names:* *86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year,* *including 85% of Black or African American students and 77% of Latino students.* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *We increased the percentage of students taking SIPPS Mastery tests from 13.7% in September to 55.8% in May*	*24% of 2nd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *30% of 3rd grade students "red" or two years below grade-level* *SIPPS Mastery Test:* *Even by May, we only had 55% of K-2 students with a Mastery Test recorded, which is far lower than necessary to see the progress we want.*	*A majority of students passed the SIPPS Mastery Assessment at the end of each segment taught.*	*Not all students were getting the appropriate instruction.* *There was very little teacher directed instruction based on the assessment data.* *Very few students made "Typical Growth" or Stretch Growth on iReady Diagnostics.* *Monthly SIPPS Mastery Tests.* *A majority of our K–3 students are testing below proficiency in phonemic awareness and phonics according to our screening data. We need to become more targeted in our instructional groupings of students so that they can be placed in differentiated groups based on ongoing formative assessment data. We need early literacy tutors who will help to provide key differentiated foundational skill instruction (Word*

				Recognition) using the SIPPS curriculum.
Data on effective practices (*reference previous chart*)	18,000+ students learning with EL Education,Benchmark Adelante and our foundational skills curriculum. 1,000+ teachers received high-quality, aligned professional learning 300+ learning walks across every elementary school This year, OUSD implemented the SIPPS curriculum at every elementary school, providing kits and foundational training for all K-2 teachers. OUSD also supported teachers and principals through walkthroughs at every school. At the beginning of the year, only five schools were fully implementing SIPPS; by April that number had increased to 30 schools.	Although implementation in SIPPS improved across the district and we saw an increase in schools implementing the program, we still have 9 schools with less than 50% of classes implementing SIPPS, which shows we still have considerable room to grow our practice around Word Recognition instruction. Additionally, we had our first cycle for Tk-2 teachers focused on foundational skill PD and Cycles of Inquiry, but unless a site continued to focus on these key skills during PD and PLCs at the site-level, we did not provide any more centrally provided PD towards Word Recognition instruction.	Teachers at Prescott were trained and provided PD in EL Education and SIPPS/Letter Naming Instruction. Teachers received curriculum materials to support both Word Recognition and Language Comprehension strands of Scarborough's rope. We used our Wednesday minimum days to provide prep and collaboration.	Teachers had curriculum materials but implementation for both EL Education and SIPPS/Heggerty/Letter Naming was variable across classrooms. Due to COVID we had teacher absences and interrupted instruction and did not begin our SIPPS groups until late Fall. Additionally, since we lost a prep teacher and moved prep time to minimum days we lost our PD and structured PLC time and did not engage in the type of peer learning and data analysis that would move our instructional practices forward.

Data on ineffective practices (*reference previous chart*)	*We targeted the handful of sites that have not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy to provide them site-based Science of Reading PD and support to their leadership team with the "change management" around literacy instruction.*	*We still had a handful of sites that had not made the shift from Balanced Literacy to Structured Literacy at the beginning of the year and who were implementing Guided Reading instead of building out their SIPPS instruction.*	*No Strengths to report.*	*SIPPS groups did not start on time and when they did teacher absences and student absences prevented regularity and students moving through the program as desired. Collaboration was not structured to support improvement in teaching practices and strong professional development.*
Equity and performance gaps	*We did not see the same huge equity gap that we often see when we looked at our end of year Letter Naming Data. 86% of Kindergarten students knew their letters in English by the end of the school year, including 85% of Black or African American*	*We do see an equity gap when we look across K-3 i-ready data. We have 49% of all K-3 students in green (early-mid level) and we have 41% of K-3 AA students at green (early-mid level).* *We see an equity gap in the i-Ready data with the % of students below grade-level or "red". We have 16% of all K-3 students in the "red" 2 or more grade-levels below and we have 19% of K-3 AA students in the "red".*	*No Strengths to report.*	*Our ELL Students are the majority of students not showing growth.* *African American students are showing only 50% growth when the goal is 100% growth.*

9. Based on the reassessment of the needs, identify the action items and metrics described in the literacy action plan for each eligible participating site to more effectively address the areas described in the literacy action plan. [SB98 Sec113 (b)(e3A-D)(e2A-B)(e3A-E)(e4A-E)]

2021–2022	Original Action Item(s)	Adjusted Action Item(s)	Justification for the Changes	Goal and Tools for Assessment Towards Achievement of the Goal
Access to high-quality instruction	1.In support of Goals #1 and #2, by September 2021, hire a 80% literacy coach (0.8 FTE) to work with teachers and students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum. 2.In support of Goals #1, by September 2021, hire an additional Early Literacy tutor to work with teachers and students in grades K–3, focusing specifically on foundational reading skills using the SIPPS curriculum. 3.In support of goal #2, by June 2022, we will pay K-3 teachers extended contract to engage in PD in the use	1. No Change, except extend to year 2 2. Increase to hire **TWO** Early Literacy Tutors 3. No Change except extend to year 2 4. No Change except extend to year 2	1. N/A 2. We would like to provide a tutor to each grade-level to support direct services to students for SIPPS and access to high-quality instruction. Hiring an additional tutor than originally desired during the root cause would allow our SIPPS instruction to happen daily in small,differentiated groups by level and ensure that students get the Word Recognition	For #2: Goal: By June 2023, will deepen our knowledge & skill in Word Recognition instruction and support stronger student literacy growth by implementing SIPPS with fidelity as measured by our K-3 classroom data and SIPPS implementation rubric, walk-throughs focused on Word Recognition instruction. Tools: ● SIPPS schedule for K-3rd that includes Tutors per grade-level ● Tutor PLC/PD to support SIPPS instruction

	of culturally relevant text and the use of Accelerated Reader *4.In support of goal #1 and #2, by June 2022, K-3 teachers will be paid extended contract to attend the CORE Reading Academy in support of professional development on Word Recognition and Language Comprehension.*		*instruction that they need.* 3. *N/A* 4. *N/A*	Metrics: # of tutors hired # of SIPPS MT passed by students served by tutors
Support for literacy learning	*In support of goal #2, by June 2024, we will have purchased additional culturally relevant texts for K-3 classroom libraries and Accelerated Reader for K-3 students to support language comprehension.*	*No Change, except extend to year 2*	N/A	*See LAP*
Pupil supports	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.
Family supports	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	Select to enter text.	

Early Literacy Support Block Grant Annual Report

Implementation Year 1: 2021–22

(REV. 04/2022)

NOTE: At the end of the second year of grant eligibility, a LEA with an eligible school shall, as a nonconsent agenda item at a regularly scheduled, publicly noticed meeting of its governing board or body, provide an update on progress implementing the literacy action plan. The LEA may modify the literacy action plan based on this update, consistent with the authorized uses of the grant funds. [SB98 Sec113 (f6)]