

Atkinson Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP)

Rationale

The CSIP is a plan developed by the school council with the input of parents, faculty and staff based on a review of relevant data that includes targets, strategies, activities, a time schedule to support student achievement and student growth and to eliminate achievement gaps among groups of students. Through the improvement planning process, leaders focus on priority needs, funding and closing achievement gaps among identified subgroups of students.

While the focus of continuous improvement is student performance, the work must be guided by the aspects of teaching and learning that affect performance. An effective improvement process should address the contributing factors creating the learning environment (inputs) and the performance data (outcomes).

Please note that the objectives (yearly targets) set by your school under the Achievement Gap section of this planning template will be used by the district's superintendent to determine whether your school met its targets to reduce the gap in student achievement for any student group for two consecutive years as required by KRS 158.649. Likewise, operational definitions (and general information about goal setting) for each required planning component can be found on page 2 of this planning template.

For those schools operating a Title I Schoolwide Program, this plan meets the requirements of Section 1114 of the Every Student Succeeds Act, as well as state requirements under 703 KAR 5:225. **No separate Schoolwide Program Plan is required.**

Operational Definitions

When completing the template sections that follow, please refer to the following operational definitions:

- **Goal:** Long-term three- to five-year targets based on the school level state assessment results. Long-term targets should be informed by the Phase Two: Needs Assessment for Schools;
- **Objective:** Short-term yearly target to be attained by the end of the current academic year. Objectives should address state assessment results and/or aligned formative assessments. There can be multiple objectives for each goal;
- **Strategy:** An approach to systematically address the process, practice or condition that the school will focus its efforts upon, as identified in the Needs Assessment for Schools, in order to reach its goals or objectives. There can be multiple strategies for each objective. The strategy can be based upon Kentucky's six Key Core Work Processes listed below or another established improvement approach (i.e., *Six Sigma, Shipley, Baldrige, etc.*);
- **Key Core Work Processes:** A series of processes identified by the Kentucky Department of Education that involve the majority of an organization's workforce and relate to its core competencies. These are the factors that determine an organization's success and help it prioritize areas for growth;

[KCWP 1: Design and Deploy Standards](#)

[KCWP 2: Design and Deliver Instruction](#)

[KCWP 3: Design and Deliver Assessment Literacy](#)

[KCWP 4: Review, Analyze and Apply Data Results](#)

[KCWP 5: Design, Align and Deliver Support](#)

[KCWP 6: Establish Learning Environment and Culture](#)

- **Activity:** Actionable steps the school will take to deploy the chosen strategy. There can be multiple activities for each strategy;
- **Progress Monitoring:** Process used to collect and analyze measures of success to assess the level of implementation, the rate of improvement and the effectiveness of the plan. The measures may be quantitative or qualitative but are observable in some way. The description should include the artifacts to be reviewed, specific timelines, and responsible individuals; and
- **Funding:** Local, state or federal funds/grants used to support (or needed to support) the activities.

Goal Setting:

When developing goals, all schools must establish achievement gap targets and set goals in the area of state assessment results in reading and mathematics. Other goals aligned to the indicators in the state's accountability system and deemed priority areas in the Phase Two: Needs Assessment for Schools are optional.

IP #1

Monitor and adjust the walkthrough tool, coaching and feedback system to identify and address individual teachers' needs, improve professional practices, strengthen instructional rigor, increase student engagement and embed high-yield instructional and formative assessment.

IP #2

Refine, monitor and adjust the MTSS system to effectively address the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 needs of each student to improve academic outcomes.

[Atkinson 2026-2027 Needs Assessment](#)

Required Goals

Achievement Gap

KRS 158.649 requires the school-based decision making (SBDM) council, or the principal if no council exists, to set the school's yearly targets for eliminating any achievement gap. The targets should be established with input from parents, faculty and staff and submitted to the superintendent for consideration and the local board of education for adoption. In addition to being a statutory requirement, intentionally focusing on the achievement gaps that exist among a school's underserved student populations is also a vital component of the continuous improvement process. Schools should use a variety of measures and analysis when conducting its review of its achievement gaps, including a review of the school's climate and culture. Schools are not required to establish long term achievement gap goals; however, schools must establish yearly targets. Additional rows may be added for multiple targets, strategies and activities.

Objective(s):

By May of 2027, Achievement Gap will go from 9% to 20% P/D for AA students on KSA Reading.

Strategy:

1.4 The Instructional Leadership Team(s) establish annual SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, time-bound) goals aligned to the Goals & Guardrails metrics for Literacy.

1.5 The Instructional Leadership Team(s) review disaggregated literacy assessment data (Screeners, Diagnostics, HQIR assessments, Milestones) at least three times per year AND communicates progress toward the vision and goals to relevant stakeholders.

2.5 Vibrant student-centered learning is supported by classroom instructional routines, which prioritize engaging experiences through community building, total participation techniques and student-to-student discourse.

2.6 School leaders support systems to build capacity and sustainability of implementation of HQIRs and best practices in literacy and math, including regular teacher observations, coaching and feedback cycles, and HQIR professional learning.

2.7 Systems of support for students to attain mastery of grade level standards include in-class differentiated acceleration strategies and/or additional learning opportunities outside the instructional day.

3.2 Collaborative teams intentionally reflect on how student learning experiences encompass diversity of voice, representation, and ways of knowing. Teams utilize the ARE tool.

3.4 Collaborative teams use a protocol to refine culturally responsive instructional practices, student activities, and small group learning based on student data, coaching, feedback, professional learning, and district resources.

Activities:

- ILT is also the Racial Equity Committee
- Focus on student mastery of 5 essential learning targets for literacy per quarter
- Focus on high-quality Tier 1 Instruction
- Small Literacy Groups taught in All Block & Skills Block
- WIN Time (Eagle Hour) centered on interventions
- Bell to Bell Instruction
- Flexible Review Days to Reteach missed skills/standards
- Master Schedule adjustment
- Strategic Clustering of Students for co-teach effectiveness
- UFLI
- Teach EL with Integrity
- ECE and ML Supports for Clustered Classrooms
- Lesson/Unit Internalization through Extended Planning
- Adjusting IEP for additional support
- Tracking data on digital data board
- Peer Observations for Teachers
- Attendance Interventions, including home visits and Americorps support
- SEL for Students with specific Character Traits highlighted monthly
- PBIS monthly rewards
- Common Formative Assessments bi-quarterly
- Reading Intervention Time for all grade levels in master schedule
- MTSS once a month
- Use of Leveled Readers for small groups
- PLC-weekly review and analysis of literacy data
- Faculty Meetings all PD based
- 1-1 text for Tier 1 lessons
- Teachers Teach Teachers during EAGLES' Nest
- Co-teaching professional development and planning with KDE consultant.
- Monthly Super Planning to include ARE Tool
- Team Leads to Solution Tree PLC Conference
- Principal Coaching through Solution Tree
- Literacy Coach to model for teachers

- Individualized Coaching Cycles for every teacher

Progress Monitoring:

- Assessment Calendar updates
- Walkthroughs
- Coaching and Feedback
- Principal Playbook Short Cycle Monitoring
- Monthly Racial Equity Committee agendas
- Monthly analysis of racially disaggregated data for academics, behavior, attendance, etc. with ILT. (*Vital Signs*)
- Quarterly Curriculum Unit Analysis for Racial Sensitivity Vertical Work.
- Quarterly ECE PD with Assistant Principal
- Tri-annual analysis of MAP data with ECE teachers and PLC first, then ILT.
- Unit and Lesson Plans
- MTSS Cycles

Funding:

- School Improvement Funds
- Title 1
- Equity Funds
- Extended School Services
- General (900XN)

State Assessment Results in Reading and Mathematics

Kentucky's accountability system uses multiple academic and school quality measures, with each indicator contributing to the overall score. Reading and math proficiency are foundational to student success, and state assessment results in reading and mathematics carry the greatest weight when calculating the overall score at each level (elementary, middle and high school). This indicator is a required goal area for all schools.

Three- to Five-Year Goal:

By May of 2028, Reading will go from 18% to 47% P/D for All students on KSA.

By May of 2028, Math will go from 14% to 44% P/D for All students on KSA.

Objective(s):

By May of 2026, students in grades 3-5 will be on grade level in math (25% P/D) as measured by KSA.

By May of 2026, students in grades 3-5 will be on grade level in reading (35% P/D) as measured by KSA.

Strategy:

1.4 The Instructional Leadership Team(s) establish annual SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, results-oriented, time-bound) goals aligned to the Goals & Guardrails metrics for Math, Literacy & Journey to Success.

2.3 Daily grade level and appropriate learning targets/goals are posted, unpacked with students, and referenced throughout the lesson. Learning targets/goals are aligned to HQIRs as adopted.

2.5 Vibrant student-centered learning is supported by classroom instructional routines, which prioritize engaging experiences through community building, total participation techniques and student-to-student discourse.

2.6 School leaders support systems to build capacity and sustainability of implementation of HQIRs and best practices in literacy and math, including regular teacher observations, coaching and feedback cycles, and HQIR professional learning.

2.7 Systems of support for students to attain mastery of grade level standards include in-class differentiated acceleration strategies and/or additional learning opportunities outside the instructional day.

3.3 Collaborative teams use the HQIRs in conjunction with student work and data to engage in planning, data analysis, and internalization of lessons and protocols.

4.2 The school establishes and maintains an intentional data system that is individualized to track each student's progress on a continual basis and is used in conjunction with a multi-tiered system of support.

4.5 The school utilizes a monitoring protocol that requires an analysis of disaggregated data for all student populations including but not limited to students of color, ECE students and ML students. Collaborative teams utilize this data to develop differentiated systems of support for students.

5.1 The school communicates the priorities of Math and Literacy to stakeholders. Communication is culturally and linguistically responsive to meet family needs and ensure equitable access.

5.3 Families are informed of grade-level expectations for math and literacy skill development and are regularly updated on individual progress toward meeting those expectations.

Activities:

- Intentional focus on student mastery of 5 essential literacy and math targets per quarter
- Coaching and Feedback on the teaching of the 5 essential targets per quarter
- ILT members will attend The Summit and PLC at Work conference (See SIF).
- Math Cohort, JBA professional development led by AIC and Instructional Coaches (monthly, See SIF)
- Comprehensive MTSS system
- Anchor charts
- Math centers to reinforce skills/standards
- Skills block
- Super planning monthly
- Monthly Half-Day Planning
- Math flashbacks
- WIN TIme (Eagle Hour)
- Coaching Cycles for Individual Teachers based on Tier
- Small group Literacy Instruction during ALL & Skills block
- Staff Led PD
- UofL Buddies
- Number Talks
- Bell to Bell Instruction
- Flexible Review Days to Reteach missed skills/standards
- Master Schedule adjustment
- Strategic Clustering of Students for co-teach effectiveness
- UFLi
- CFAs in addition to EL Curriculum.
- Teach EL with Integrity
- ECE and ML Supports for Clustered Classrooms, using Co-teaching
- Unit/Lesson Internalization
- Adjusting IEP for additional support
- Student Support Groups
- Principal's Advisory Club
- Tracking data on digital data board
- Schedule adjusted for math time cohesiveness
- Attendance Interventions, including home visits and Americorps support
- SEL for Students with specific Character Traits highlighted monthly
- PBIS monthly rewards.
- Literacy and Math Interventionists/Coaches
- Creating assessment to be as rigorous as the standard
- Monthly Vertical Data Analysis in ILT
- Using Skills Block and All Block to Intervene for Literacy
- Reading Intervention Time for all grade levels in master schedule
- Small Literacy Group Instruction
- 1-1 Texts for Tier 1
- Use PD Days for differentiated Professional Development based on teacher need
- Eagle's Nest (In-house PD) focused on new teacher needs with teaching pedagogy
- Golden Eagle Awards-students excelling in SEL and reading and math achievement recognized and celebrated

- Principal Coaching through Solution Tree

Progress Monitoring:

- Assessment Calendar updates
- Walkthroughs
- Coaching and Feedback
- Principal Playbook Short Cycle Monitoring
- Monthly Racial Equity Committee agendas
- Monthly analysis of racially disaggregated data for academics, behavior, attendance, etc. with ILT. (*Vital Signs*)
- Quarterly Curriculum Unit Analysis for Racial Sensitivity Vertical Work.
- Quarterly ECE PD with Assistant Principal
- Tri-annual analysis of MAP data with ECE teachers and PLC first, then ILT.
- Unit and Lesson Plans
- MTSS Cycles

Funding:

- School Improvement Funds
- Title 1
- Equity Funds
- Extended School Services
- General (900XN)

Addendum for Schools Identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement

A turnaround plan created by schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement (CSI) pursuant to KRS 160.346(8)(g) must be embedded in the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) required by 703 KAR 5:225.

This addendum outlines the specific requirements that must be addressed in the CSIP to meet federal and state expectations for schools identified for CSI. These requirements include targeted strategies and activities to support improvement in the identified areas of need addressed in the goal building template. Evidence-based practices and activities chosen to address any priority goal area must be informed by the Needs Assessment for Schools and feedback from any onsite review conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE).

Special Considerations for CSI Schools

Schools identified for CSI must complete the CSIP process and meet all applicable deadlines while identified for CSI. Following the completion of the school audit, CSI schools must revise their CSIP to account for the improvement priorities identified by the audit team. The newly revised CSIP, referred to as a turnaround plan, must include the following items: (1) evidence-based interventions to be utilized to increase student performance and address the critical needs identified in the school audit, (2) a comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts and the specific roles each shall play in the school’s turnaround process, and (3) a review of resource inequities, which shall include an analysis of school level budgeting to ensure resources are adequately channeled towards school improvement (703 KAR 5:280). Each of the three aforementioned requirements must be embedded throughout the CSIP document. Once the CSIP has been revised, the turnaround plan must be submitted to the local education agency (LEA) for approval before it is submitted to the Commissioner of Education for final approval.

Provide narrative information regarding the additional requirements for CSI schools in the following chart:

<p>Turnaround Team:</p> <p>Consider: Provide a comprehensive list of persons and entities involved in the turnaround efforts and the specific roles each shall play in the school’s turnaround process</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Dr. Arivia Parks, Principal Brooke Schlise, Assistant Principal Heather Cicchiolo Wright, Assistant Principal Olivia Hyer, UofL Teacher in Residence Nichole Demotte, Math Interventionist Kimberly McClure, 1st Grade Teacher Jenna Bushong, 5th Grade Teacher Tim Godbey, JCPS Executive Administrator Lorri Stivers, KDE Education Recovery Leader</p> <p>Identification of Critical Resources Inequities:</p>
--

Consider: Describe the process used to review the allocation and use of resources (people, time and money), any resource inequities that were identified that may contribute to underperformance, and how identified resource inequities will be addressed.

Response: Atkinson engaged in a comprehensive, multi-step process to review the allocation and use of resources, including people, time, and funding, as part of its response to the Diagnostic Review and the development of the school's turnaround plan. This process began on March 18, 2026, when the principal shared the Diagnostic Review findings and ELEOT scores, including narrative feedback, with the full faculty. This initial communication ensured that all staff members had a shared understanding of the school's current performance, areas of strength, and areas requiring urgent improvement.

On March 20, 2026, four school team members participated in a KDE-facilitated deconstruction of the Diagnostic Review, with a specific focus on Improvement Priorities 1 and 2. This session allowed the team to analyze the findings in depth, identify root causes, and begin examining how current resource allocations, staffing patterns, instructional time, intervention structures, and financial investments, may be contributing to underperformance.

To support this work, the Atkinson Turnaround Team was established, and a series of structured meetings were scheduled. The first meeting, held on March 25, 2026, focused on unpacking the improvement priorities with the full faculty, ensuring transparency and collective ownership of the work ahead. The team reconvened on March 27, 2026, to select KCWP foci and heat-map progressions, a process that required examining how people, time, and money were currently being used and whether those allocations aligned with the school's highest-leverage needs.

On April 1, 2026, the turnaround team reviewed recent school performance data to determine strengths, areas of leverage, and the "as-is" state of the school academically and culturally. This analysis highlighted several resource inequities, including inconsistent deployment of staff to support Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, uneven access to high-quality instructional materials, and insufficient protected time for collaborative planning and data analysis. These inequities were identified as contributing factors to underperformance and became central to the turnaround planning process.

The school's administrative team met on April 3, 2026, to review the needs assessment and begin drafting an improvement driver diagram aligned to the Diagnostic Review priorities. During this meeting, leadership actions were discussed and selected based on their potential to address the identified resource gaps—such as reallocating staff to strengthen intervention blocks, restructuring schedules to increase instructional time in core content areas, and prioritizing funding for professional learning and high-quality materials.

The turnaround team reviewed the draft driver diagram and proposed turnaround actions on April 13, 2026, making revisions to ensure that resource allocation decisions were directly tied to the improvement priorities. The Needs Assessment was then shared with the ILT on April 14, 2026, allowing instructional leaders to provide feedback on how resources could be more equitably and effectively deployed.

On April 15, 2026, the turnaround team finalized the turnaround plan, including adjustments to address resource inequities, before presenting it to the Advisory Leadership Council and the full faculty. Finally, on April 28, 2026, the team created and shared a presentation that allowed staff to deconstruct the improvement priorities and understand how resource decisions would support the school's path forward.

Through this structured, collaborative process, Atkinson identified key resource inequities, particularly in staffing deployment, instructional time, and access to rigorous materials, and developed targeted strategies to address them. The resulting turnaround plan ensures that people, time, and funding are aligned to the school's highest needs and that resources are distributed equitably to support improved student outcomes.

We decided as a team the following:

- We coordinate with the University of Louisville with Mentor Teachers, Oxley grant funding, ...
- We will continue to utilize and refine our process of peer observations to improve instruction.
- The systems of support in both Reading and Math will continue to be used to increase our Reading and Math P/D.

- The coaching and feedback system that is put in place will support Tier 1 instruction in both Reading and Math.
- The MTSS system put in place will be used to continue to support students needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions in Reading and in Math.
- We will continue to leverage our systems in professional development including onboarding of new teaching staff at Atkinson.
- We will continue to implement our clear and consistent PLC / collaborative teams work driven by student data.
- We will continue to build systems and improvement plans around the school’s established “Big 3”: Positive, Professional, and Collaborative.
- We will focus our improvement work around both priorities from the diagnostic review: monitoring and adjusting our coaching and feedback system to build strong instructional practice reflective of high levels of student engagement and use of high-yield teaching strategies, and refining our MTSS system to address specific academic needs of each student at Atkinson Elementary.
- SST(Student Support Team-MTSS behavior) meets and focuses on data and interventions bi-monthly.

CSI Evidence-based Practices

CSI improvement/turnaround plans must include at least one evidence-based practice (EBP) that is implemented to improve student outcomes that meet the definition of “evidence-based” under ESEA section 8101(21). The definition of “evidence-based” in ESEA section 8101(21) includes four levels of evidence from which interventions may be selected:

- **Strong evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *experimental study*;
- **Moderate evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *quasi-experimental study*;
- **Promising evidence** from at least one well-designed and well-implemented *correlational study* with statistical controls for selection bias; or
- **Demonstrates a rationale** based on high-quality research findings or positive evaluation that such activity, strategy or intervention is likely to improve student outcomes or other relevant outcomes and includes ongoing efforts to examine the effects of such activity, strategy, or intervention.

More specific information regarding EBPs can be found on the Kentucky Department of Education’s [Evidence-based Practices website](#).

Complete the table below to document the evidence that supports the evidence-based intervention outlined in this plan.

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
Example: Train staff to implement inductive teaching strategies.	Example: Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: a synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge: New York, NY.
Teacher Coaching	<p>Kraft MA, Blazar D, Hogan D. The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. Review of Educational Research [Internet] 2018; 88 (4): 547- 588.</p> <p>Killion, Joellen. (2017, March 31). Meta-Analysis Reveals Coaching's Positive Impact on Instruction and Achievement. Learning Professional, 38 (2), pp. 20-23 Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141732</p>
Coaching and Feedback	<p>Kraft MA, Blazar D, Hogan D. The Effect of Teacher Coaching on Instruction and Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of the Causal Evidence. Review of Educational Research [Internet] 2018; 88 (4): 547- 588.</p> <p>Killion, Joellen. (2017, March 31). Meta-Analysis Reveals Coaching's Positive Impact on Instruction and Achievement. Learning</p>

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
	<p data-bbox="763 240 1876 269">Professional, 38 (2), pp. 20-23 Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1141732</p> <p data-bbox="763 305 2510 402">Garet, M.S., Wayne, A.J., Brown, S., Rickles, J., Song, M., and Manzelske, D. (2017). The Impact of Providing Performance Feedback to Teachers and Principals, Executive Summary (NCEE 2018-4000). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.</p>
Continuous Improvement Systems	<p data-bbox="763 435 2529 500">Park, Sandra, et al. "Continuous Improvement in Education." Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2013, pp. 1-48.</p> <p data-bbox="763 535 2556 600">Rowland, C., Feygin, A., Lee, F., Gomez, S., & Rasmussen, C. (2018). Beyond Accountability. Improving the Use of Information to Support Teaching and Learning Through Continuous Improvement Cycles, 1-74.</p> <p data-bbox="763 636 2416 734">Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., & Darwin, M. (2008). Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools. IES Practice Guide. NCEE 2008-4020. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.</p> <p data-bbox="763 769 2502 834">Langley, G.J., Moen, R.D., Nolan, K.M., Nolan, T.W., Norman, C.L., & Provost, L.P. (2009). The Improvement Guide: A Practical Approach to Enhancing Organizational Performance. San Francisco, CA:</p>
MTSS	<p data-bbox="763 867 2548 964">Bohanon, H., Wu, M.-J., Kushki, A., LeVesseur, C., Harms, A., Vera, E., . . . Shriberg, D. (2021). The role of school improvement planning in the implementation of MTSS in secondary schools. Preventing school failure: Alternative education for children and youth, 230-242. doi:10.1080/1045988x.2021.1908215</p>
EL Education (HQIR) K-5	<p data-bbox="763 997 1811 1026">https://edreports.org/reports/overview/el-education-k-5-language-arts-2017</p> <p data-bbox="763 1062 2569 1127">https://files.ededucation.org/web/downloads/Evaluating-the-Use-of-EL-Education%E2%80%99s-K-2-Language-Arts-Curriculum-Feedback-2021.pdf?_ga=2.113660932.2056183503.1619439984-1381497840.1587138987</p>
IM Math (HQIR) Elementary	<p data-bbox="763 1159 2403 1188">Illustrative Math (K-5) https://edreports.org/reports/overview/imagine-learning-illustrative-mathematics-k-5-math-2021</p>
Kagan Professional Learning and Coaching	<p data-bbox="763 1240 2548 1305">Mourning, E. (2014). Kagan Cooperative Learning Model and Mathematical Achievement of Economically Disadvantaged Middle School Students (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University) [Abstract].</p> <p data-bbox="763 1341 1239 1370">Classroom Instruction that Works</p>
Teacher Clarity	<p data-bbox="763 1403 1696 1432">Hattie, John. (2008). Visible Learning. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.</p> <p data-bbox="763 1468 2126 1497">Hattie, J., & Zierer, K. (2017). 10 Mindframes for visible learning: Teaching for success. Routledge.</p>

Evidence-based Activity	Evidence Citation
PLCS	DuFour, R., DuFour, R. Eaker, R., & Many, T. (2010). <i>Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work</i> (2nd ed.). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
RTI	<p>Assisting Students Struggle with Mathematics: Response to Intervention (Rtl) for Elementary and Middle Schools</p> <p>Assisting Students Struggle with Reading: Response to Intervention (Rtl) and Multi-Tier Intervention in the Primary Grades</p>
Embedding Professional Learning	<p><i>Biancarosa, G., Bryk, A.S., & Dexter, E.R. (2010, September). Assessing the value-added effects of Literacy Collaborative professional development on student learning. The Elementary School Journal, 111(1), 7-34.</i></p> <p><i>Saunders, W.M., Goldenberg, C.N., & Gallimore, R. (2009, December). Increasing achievement by focusing grade-level teams on improving classroom learning: A prospective, quasi-experimental study of Title I schools. American Educational Research Journal, 46(4), 1006–1033.</i></p>
Teacher Efficacy	<p>The Power of Collective Efficacy</p> <p>https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/bc03/411ce97636ae4b21bbf8a05f28b8cffe535e.pdf</p>