

K-5 LITERACY EVALUATION REPORT | 2019-2020

Research, Evaluation, and Assessment Department
July 2020

OVERVIEW

The 2019-2020 school year marked the third year of the district's K-5 Literacy evaluation. The research questions guiding this year's work included:

- How do schools implement literacy instruction? (Literacy instruction includes both Balanced Literacy and Benchmark Advance/Adelante (henceforth called "Benchmark" in this report))
- What kind of site level support has been helpful in supporting literacy instruction?
- What is the relationship between literacy instruction and student reading outcomes?
- How has the district supported implementation for sites?

The outbreak of COVID-19 and subsequent transition to distance learning and cancellation of the 2020 Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments forced the Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (REA) team to cut back on the initial data collection plan for this evaluation. As a result, the sole data sources available are a principal and teacher survey.

REA partnered with Literacy staff from the Teaching and Learning and School Improvement teams to develop the content of both surveys. In addition, the teacher survey was reviewed by a group of principals and teachers before administration.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Literacy Block Minutes Vary

- Seventy-one percent of principals indicated that their school schedule allows for a 145 minute literacy block, however, the majority (68%) of teachers indicated that they have between 80 to 139 minutes of continuous literacy instruction daily.

Principal Expectations and Teacher Perception of Expectations Varies

- While most principals and teachers would agree or strongly agree that clear expectations have been set for Balanced Literacy and Benchmark implementation, over 25% of teachers still disagree or strongly disagree.

Teachers Want Support with Implementation of Writing Practice

- Fifty-five percent of respondents stated a need for PD on writing practice.

Majority of Teachers are Implementing Foundational Skills

- Overall, 82% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they have built in time for phonics and 81% agreed or strongly agreed that they have built in time for phonological awareness.

Teachers who use Benchmark Phonics Resources Find Them Useful

- Overall, of the K-2 teachers who indicated they used the Benchmark phonics resources, 98% stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the resources were useful.

Teachers Agree that Culturally Relevant Teaching is Present in their Instruction

- Most teachers agree that CRT is part of their literacy instruction, however a larger number of teachers tended to disagree that they were implementing CRT in the following areas: engaging students in literary discussion that examines how power works in text (24%) and engaging in dialogue with students about how literacy can be a vehicle for social change (18%).

Teachers' Use of Benchmark Resources Varies

- The percent of respondents using each Benchmark resource varies considerably. More than 70% of respondents indicated that they use the Leveled Readers (88%), Teacher's Resource System (85%) and the Online Resources (72%), however, on the other hand, many fewer teachers indicated that they use the Read Aloud Handbook (33%), Text Evidence Comprehension Card (33%), ELD Materials (25%), and Steps to Advance (6.5%). Frequency of use varies considerably by resource, and, in general, if a teacher indicated they used a resource, they did tend to agree that it was useful.

Conflating Balanced Literacy and Benchmark

- When asked to comment on Balanced Literacy, some teachers are conflating the use of the Benchmark curriculum with Balanced Literacy.

Implementation Support Needs Identified

- Literacy specialists and time are needed to support Balanced Literacy implementation. Specific training and more engaging resources for students are needed to support Benchmark implementation.

SURVEY DETAILS

Principal Survey

In February, principals serving students in grades K-5 were surveyed on the following in their buildings, with an 88% response rate:

- Their perceptions of Benchmark curriculum use
- Their perceptions of Balanced Literacy implementation
- The supports (staff, PD, resources, etc.) in place for literacy instruction

Teacher Survey

In May, all MPS K-5 staff who were closely involved in literacy instruction in their building during the 19-20 school year were invited to take a survey covering the following content, with a 47% response rate*:

- Their perception of district and school support for Balanced Literacy and Benchmark implementation
- Their implementation of Balanced Literacy elements:
 - Planning and Preparation
 - Core Instruction
 - Assessment and Grouping
 - Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching
 - Benchmark Components
 - Benchmark Materials

*The teacher survey was administered after the start of distance learning, which impacted response rates. Please note, teachers were asked to reflect on their in-person literacy instruction and not distance learning instruction.

KEY FINDINGS

Key findings from this evaluation are outlined below. Additional data collected from the principal and teacher surveys can be found in the appendix. Some findings were a product of both quantitative and qualitative data. Qualitative data came in the form of open-ended question responses on the surveys and quotes identified in this report were pulled from those responses.

Literacy Block Minutes Vary

Principals and teachers were asked to report on the length of their literacy block. In the teacher survey, respondents were asked to indicate the number of minutes of *continuous* Balanced Literacy instruction (reading, writing, and work work) they provide every day. **Seventy-one percent of principals indicated that their school schedule allows for a 145 minute literacy block, however, the majority (68%) of teachers indicated that they have between 80 to 139 minutes of continuous literacy instruction daily.** When asked about support needed to implement Balanced Literacy and Benchmark, many teachers stated they found it challenging to fit all of the Balanced Literacy and Benchmark components into the constraints of the school day. Several teachers requested guidance around this process.

Teacher
Quotes

“We don't have enough time to do the "required" amount of Benchmark work and all the other stuff we're expected to do (math, SEL, transitions, specialist classes, recess, lunch, structured play, IB, Spanish, morning meeting, closing circle, morning work, dismissal, assemblies, celebrations, etc.).”

“There are so many pieces to Benchmark—there is too much for any one teacher to implement so you have to decide what is going to work best for your students and take into account what your students need the most. All of the staff development has focused on different aspects of the curriculum (writing, word work, technology, comprehension, assessment, cultural relevance), it would be helpful to see a list of ‘must do’ and ‘implement when you have time’.”

“Having clear expectations that also fit in with time we have allotted for language arts would be a good start [for support]. I feel that we are asked to do way too much in the time we have provided. It feels like we are in a ‘gotcha’ mode where we are expected to do it all, but we don't have the time and then when we don't get everything done it is on the teachers because it was set out as an expectation.”

Table 1: PRINCIPAL SURVEY: Length of Literacy Block

Our school schedule allows for at least a 145 minute literacy block.	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents	Total Respondents
Yes	25	71.4%	35
No	10	28.6%	35

Table 2: TEACHER SURVEY: Number of Minutes of Continuous Balanced Literacy Instruction Provided Daily

	Percent of Respondents
Less than 60 minutes	10.8%
60-79 minutes	11.4%
80-99 minutes	25.4%
100-119 minutes	10.8%
120-139 minutes	32.0%
140 minutes or more	9.6%
<i>Total Respondents</i>	334

Principal Expectations and Teacher Perception of Expectations Varies

Principals were asked about the expectations they have set for Balanced Literacy implementation and the use of Benchmark. Teachers were asked about the support they received around implementing Balanced Literacy using Benchmark in Grades K-5. **While most principals and teachers would agree or strongly agree that clear expectations have been set for Balanced Literacy and Benchmark implementation, over 25% of teachers still disagree or strongly disagree.**

Table 3: PRINCIPAL SURVEY: Schoolwide Implementation of Balanced Literacy using Benchmark

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I have set the expectation that teachers in my school implement the district's balanced literacy framework.	0.0%	2.9%	47.1%	50.0%	34
I have set the expectation that teachers in my school use the Benchmark Advance/Adelante curriculum.	0.0%	2.9%	50.0%	44.1%	34

Table 4: TEACHER SURVEY: Support around Implementing Balanced Literacy using Benchmark

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
There are clear expectations about how to implement Balanced Literacy at my school.	4.9%	20.0%	47.5%	27.5%	385
There are clear expectations about how to use the Benchmark Advance/Adelante curriculum in my school.	6.1%	20.7%	49.1%	24.1%	377

Teachers Want Support with Implementation of Writing Practice

Teachers were asked to indicate the frequency with which they implement the following Writing Practice Benchmark components (see Table 5). When asked which of the five implementation components (foundational skills, planning and preparation, core instruction, reading practice, and writing practice) teachers felt they needed more PD on, **55% of respondents stated a need for PD on writing practice.**

Teacher Quote

"Writing practice [is a need]. I find teaching writing is really hard when so many kids are so far below grade level. We end up spending a lot more time on phonics as well as the mini lessons and whole group lessons in Benchmark. Those often take more time than expected."

Table 5: TEACHER SURVEY: Frequency of Implementation of Differentiation and Scaffolding Writing Practice Benchmark Components

Writing Practice Components	Never (0 days)	Some Days (1-2 days)	Most Days (3-4 days)	Every Day (5 days)	Total Respondents
Mini-Lessons	9.5%	33.8%	36.8%	19.9%	337
Guided Writing	8.3%	44.0%	34.5%	13.1%	336
Independent Writing	7.4%	32.3%	34.7%	25.5%	337
Conferring	13.4%	56.1%	24.3%	6.2%	337

Majority of Teachers are Implementing Foundational Skills

Teachers were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the statements about foundational skills and phonics in the context of reading practice. **Overall, 82% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they have built in time for phonics and 81% agreed or strongly agreed that they have built in time for phonological awareness. Sixty-nine percent of teachers indicated that they implement phonics (K-2 teachers) or word study and vocabulary (3-5 teachers) most or every day of the week within their implementation of the reading practice component.**

Table 6: TEACHER SURVEY: Implementation of Foundational Skills

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I have built in time for phonics.	2.0%	15.9%	32.2%	49.9%	345
I have built in time for phonological awareness.	3.5%	15.0%	37.8%	43.7%	341

Table 7: TEACHER SURVEY: Frequency of Implementation of Differentiation and Scaffolding Reading Practice Benchmark Components

Reading Practice Components	Never (0 days)	Some Days (1-2 days)	Most Days (3-4 days)	Every Day (5 days)	Total Respondents
Phonics/Word Study and Vocabulary	6.1%	24.6%	28.7%	40.6%	345

Teachers who use Benchmark Phonics Resources Find Them Useful

Teachers were asked to identify the Benchmark resources they use. Sixty-eight percent of respondents teaching K-2 students stated they used the Phonics resources. Teachers were then asked to indicate the frequency with which they used those resources and the extent to which they found those resources useful to their literacy instruction. **Overall, of the K-2 teachers who indicated they used the Benchmark phonics resources, 98% stated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the resources were useful.**

Table 8: TEACHER SURVEY: Frequency of Use of Benchmark Resources

	Never (0 days)	Some Days (1-2 days)	Most Days (3-4 days)	Every Day (5 days)	Total Respondents
Phonics (e.g. high frequency word cards, picture cards, workmats, alphabet charts, decodable readers) (K-2 only)	1.4%	22.7%	34.8%	41.1%	141

Table 9: TEACHER SURVEY: Usefulness of Benchmark Resources

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
Phonics (e.g. high frequency word cards, picture cards, workmats, alphabet charts, decodable readers) (K-2 only)	0.7%	1.5%	55.6%	42.2%	135

Teachers Agree that Culturally Relevant Teaching is Present in their Instruction

Teachers were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about Culturally Relevant Teaching (CRT). **Most teachers agree that CRT is part of their literacy instruction, however a larger number of teachers tended to disagree that they were implementing CRT in the following areas: engaging students in literary discussion that examines how power works in text (24%) and engaging in dialogue with students about how literacy can be a vehicle for social change (18%).**

Table 10: TEACHER SURVEY: Culturally Relevant Teaching in Literacy Instruction

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I encourage students to voice their perspectives about justice (e.g., fairness, unfairness) in the texts they read.	0.3%	5.9%	46.2%	47.6%	338
I encourage students to voice their perspectives about representation in the texts they read.	0.3%	8.7%	50.0%	41.0%	334
My students engage in literary discussion that examines how power works in text. (e.g., whose voices hold the most influence, whose voices are marginalized, why certain voices hold more power)	1.6%	24.1%	50.0%	24.4%	320
I intentionally select texts and resources authored by people from marginalized groups (e.g., women of color, people with disabilities, trans authors, immigrants, poor & working class authors).	0.3%	6.2%	48.1%	45.5%	341
I give students opportunities to build meaning and understanding of the learning target through discussion in a wide variety of social groups (across gender, first language culture, perceived ability).	0.3%	6.8%	58.9%	34.0%	338
I engage in dialogue with my students about how literacy can be a vehicle for social change.	0.3%	17.7%	56.6%	25.4%	334
Within literacy, I provide opportunities for language development that supports students' academic language growth in the language of instruction (language of instruction could be Spanish, Hmong, or English).	0.9%	7.1%	51.0%	40.9%	337

Teachers' Use of Benchmark Resources Varies

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they used each of the Benchmark resources in their classroom. Items are ordered from most frequently selected to least frequently selected. **The percent of respondents using each Benchmark resource varies considerably. More than 70% of respondents indicated that they use the Leveled Readers (88%), Teacher's Resource System (85%) and the Online Resources (72%), however, on the other hand, many fewer teachers indicated that they use the Read Aloud Handbook (33%), Text Evidence Comprehension Card (33%), ELD Materials (25%), and Steps to Advance (6.5%).**

Table 11: TEACHER SURVEY: Use of Benchmark Resources

	Percent of Respondents	Total Respondents
Leveled Readers	88.2%	340
Benchmark Advance/Adelante Teacher's Resource System	85.0%	340
Online Resources (Benchmark Universe)	72.6%	340
Big Book	69.4%	144 (K-1 only)
Phonics (e.g. high frequency word cards, picture cards, workmats, alphabet charts, decodable readers)	67.7%	192 (K-2 only)
Text for Close Reading Student Books	63.6%	187 (2-5 only)
Scope and Sequence of Units	63.5%	340
My Share Readings Student Books	60.4%	144 (K-1 only)
MPS Pacing Calendar	60.3%	340
Benchmark Assessments	60.3%	340
Multi-Leveled Reader's Theater	50.6%	340
Intervention Materials	46.2%	340
Read Aloud Handbook	33.2%	340
Text Evidence Comprehension Card	33.2%	340
English Language Development (ELD) Materials	24.7%	340
Steps to Advance	6.5%	340

Respondents were then asked to indicate frequency of use for the Benchmark resources they indicated they used in their classroom. **Frequency of use varies considerably by resource.**

Table 12: Frequency of Use of Benchmark Resources

	Never (0 days)	Some Days (1-2 days)	Most Days (3-4 days)	Every Day (5 days)	Total Respondents
Benchmark Advance/Adelante Teacher's Resource System	1.1%	15.8%	30.8%	52.4%	273
Read Aloud Handbook	2.8%	39.3%	41.1%	16.8%	107
Leveled Readers	0.7%	19.1%	44.2%	36.0%	283
Text Evidence Comprehension Card	1.9%	43.7%	35.9%	18.4%	103
MPS Pacing Calendar	3.1%	44.6%	23.3%	29.0%	193
Multi-Leveled Reader's Theater	2.5%	86.5%	8.6%	2.5%	163
Intervention Materials	2.0%	52.4%	38.1%	7.5%	147

English Language Development (ELD) Materials	2.5%	41.2%	35.0%	21.2%	80
Online Resources (Benchmark Universe)	0.0%	32.5%	28.3%	39.2%	237
Steps to Advance	0.0%	50.0%	40.9%	9.1%	22
Scope and Sequence of Units	2.4%	47.8%	25.9%	23.9%	205
Benchmark Assessments	3.6%	87.3%	5.6%	3.6%	197
My Share Readings Student Books (K-1 only)	2.3%	46.5%	33.7%	17.4%	86
Big Book (K-1 only)	0.0%	31.6%	39.8%	28.6%	98
Phonics (e.g. high frequency word cards, picture cards, workmats, alphabet charts, decodable readers) (K-2 only)	1.6%	22.4%	34.4%	41.6%	125
Text for Close Reading Student Books (2-5 only)	0.0%	15.8%	47.4%	36.8%	114

Lastly, respondents were asked to indicate usefulness of the Benchmark resources they indicated they used in their classroom. **In general, if a teacher indicated they used a resource, they did tend to agree that it was useful.**

Table 13: Usefulness of Benchmark Resources

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
Benchmark Advance/Adelante Teacher's Resource System	1.9%	7.2%	55.1%	35.8%	265
Read Aloud Handbook	2.0%	7.9%	72.3%	17.8%	101
Leveled Readers	1.8%	6.6%	52.6%	39.0%	272
Text Evidence Comprehension Card	1.0%	3.0%	60.4%	35.6%	101
MPS Pacing Calendar	1.1%	5.3%	70.4%	23.3%	189
Multi-Leveled Reader's Theater	0.0%	3.9%	65.2%	31.0%	155
Intervention Materials	1.4%	7.6%	64.6%	26.4%	144
English Language Development (ELD) Materials	0.0%	6.4%	73.1%	20.5%	78
Online Resources (Benchmark Universe)	1.3%	4.8%	55.7%	38.3%	230
Steps to Advance	0.0%	0.0%	72.7%	27.3%	22
Scope and Sequence of Units	0.5%	4.0%	67.3%	28.1%	199
Benchmark Assessments	5.7%	20.8%	57.3%	16.1%	192
My Share Readings Student Books (K-1 only)	1.2%	7.4%	61.7%	29.6%	81
Big Book (K-1 only)	1.1%	3.2%	53.8%	41.9%	93

Phonics (e.g. high frequency word cards, picture cards, workmats, alphabet charts, decodable readers) (K-2 only)	0.8%	1.7%	55.5%	42.0%	119
Text for Close Reading Student Books (2-5 only)	3.5%	7.1%	50.4%	38.9%	113

Teachers Frequently Replace Benchmark Texts

Teachers were asked to indicate the frequency with which they replace Benchmark texts (see Table 14). If a teacher indicated they did replace Benchmark texts, they were asked to explain why they replace texts and specifically which texts they replace. **Overall, teachers are replacing Benchmark texts because they feel many fiction texts are not engaging (33%), not culturally relevant or representative of their students (32%), and/or do not match students' reading levels (20%).**

Teacher
Quotes

"I try to reflect the student voices in my classroom, so I choose texts that include characters or real people who reflect my students. I choose texts I find more engaging to my students."

"Sometimes I need texts that better represent my students and their interests. For example, 3rd grade's technology unit has no African American or female inventors. This is a unit my students really enjoy, but as the majority of my students are students of color, I feel it is important for them to see the great contributions of men and women who look like them."

"I like Benchmark, however, some materials are not at the level of the students. The current materials in Spanish are good for below and grade level students, but not enough for advanced levels."

Table 14: TEACHER SURVEY: Frequency of Replacement of Benchmark Texts

	Never (0 days)	Some Days (1-2 days)	Most Days (3-4 days)	Every Day (5 days)	Total Respondents
I use other texts in place of Benchmark Advance/Adelante texts. (This refers to the replacement of texts, not supplementing)	21.6%	45.3%	21.9%	11.1%	333

Conflating Balanced Literacy and Benchmark

When asked to comment on Balanced Literacy, it was clear that some teachers are conflating the use of the Benchmark curriculum with Balanced Literacy. Instead of commenting on Balanced Literacy implementation, they commented on the use of the Benchmark. Many teachers identified a need for training around how to incorporate Benchmark into Balanced Literacy instruction.

Teacher
Quotes

"I've been in the district for 4 years. I've been a full-time teacher for 2 of those years. I still could not explain what the phrase 'Balanced Literacy' means. Before I can understand how to implement Balanced Literacy, I need to gain an understanding of what it is exactly. This seems like a topic that should have been presented at new teacher orientation, but this was not part of those 2 days of workshops."

Implementation Support Needs Identified

Principals were asked about the district support they received and their schoolwide implementation around implementing Balanced Literacy using Benchmark in Grades K-5. Teachers were asked about the support they needed to feel prepared to implement Balanced Literacy and Benchmark, as well as the support that has been most helpful in making them feel prepared to implement.

LITERACY SPECIALISTS AND TIME ARE NEEDED TO SUPPORT BALANCED LITERACY IMPLEMENTATION

Principals overwhelmingly identified the **need for a literacy specialist** to support literacy instruction in their building. Teachers identified support from literacy/instructional specialists and coaches as being critical to their ability to successfully implement Balanced Literacy.

Principal
Quote

“As one of the district's 4 priorities and with such an incredible financial investment in Benchmark, it is a mismatch to not have Literacy Specialists at each building per predictable staffing.”

Teacher
Quote

“Our literacy coach we had many years ago was the person who laid the groundwork with training and modeling and co-teaching. We have not had that kind of true ‘expert’ in the field at our school since [they] left.”

Principals also identified **limited time as a challenge** around incorporating more professional development in their buildings.

Principal
Quote

“There is always a tension for time for PD. We have two SIP goals that need professional development...One principal convened meeting is not enough time to adequately develop the needed skills.”

Teachers consistently identified **time to plan and collaborate with their peers as the support that has been most helpful** in making them feel prepared to implement Balanced Literacy.

Teacher
Quotes

“The most helpful support in implementing Balanced Literacy is providing time to plan. Most teachers believe in and know the data behind balanced literacy. PD around balanced literacy is helpful when it acknowledges that and provides ideas/examples that are pertinent to the classroom and then gives time to plan around those ideas. It is only possible to provide balanced, high-quality instruction when there is ample time to discuss and plan each component with colleagues.”

“Having time with other teachers to discuss the curriculum and how they are using it [has been helpful in making me feel prepared to implement Balanced Literacy]. Seeing it in action in other teachers’ classrooms was helpful as well.”

SPECIFIC TRAINING AND MORE ENGAGING RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS NEEDED TO SUPPORT BENCHMARK IMPLEMENTATION

When asked about support needed to implement Benchmark, teachers identified **more specific training/PD and more engaging resources for students** as needs. Many teachers did not find the Benchmark-led trainings helpful and requested more trainings/PD on specific Balanced Literacy and Benchmark components.

Teacher
Quote

“I need clear expectations about what materials to use. I find the whole program just overwhelming. There are materials for everyone and everything, but it's hard to figure out how to create a manageable system. It's also hard to juggle Benchmark and Reading/Writing workshop. I just feel I need more practice. Furthermore, it's hard to choose Benchmark text resources when there

is such good children's literature out there. A lot of the Benchmark text pieces are just not engaging to the students."

Teacher Quote

"The Benchmark-led trainings have always been 'let me sell you an overview of the curriculum.' They have not been to the level that lets us learn new strategies or best practices. Nor do they give time to really dive into the materials to make connections between content (important given the limited time for language arts instruction)."

Table 15: PRINCIPAL SURVEY: District Support around Implementing Balanced Literacy using Benchmark

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
The District has provided clear guidance on expected implementation of the Balanced Literacy framework.	0.0%	11.8%	67.6%	20.6%	34
The District has provided clear guidance on expected use of the Benchmark Advance/Adelante curriculum.	0.0%	14.7%	55.9%	29.4%	34
The District has provided the tools needed to successfully implement the Balanced Literacy framework.	0.0%	21.2%	75.8%	3.0%	33
The District has provided the financial resources (including staff allocations) needed to successfully implement the Balanced Literacy framework.	17.6%	52.9%	26.5%	2.9%	34

Table 16: PRINCIPAL SURVEY: Schoolwide Implementation of Balanced Literacy using Benchmark

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
Our school has the staff needed to successfully implement the Balanced Literacy framework.	2.9%	50.0%	41.2%	5.9%	34
Our school is able to provide the building-level professional development needed to successfully implement the Balanced Literacy framework.	8.8%	41.2%	44.1%	2.9%	34

Table 17: TEACHER SURVEY: Support around Implementing Balanced Literacy using Benchmark

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I feel prepared to implement Balanced Literacy in my classroom.	2.7%	13.4%	47.7%	36.2%	373
I feel prepared to use the Benchmark Advance/Adelante curriculum during Balanced Literacy instruction.	4.5%	13.5%	50.8%	31.2%	378

APPENDIX

Principal Survey | Teacher Implementation

In Table 6 below, respondents were asked about their general perception of teacher implementation of Balanced Literacy using Benchmark Advance/Adelante in grades K-5.

Table 1a: Teacher Implementation of Balanced Literacy using Benchmark Advance/Adelante

	None of the Teachers	Some of the Teachers	Most of the Teachers	All of the Teachers	Total Respondents
About how many teachers in your school implement the district's Balanced Literacy framework with fidelity in their classrooms?	2.9%	22.9%	65.7%	8.6%	35
About how many teachers in your school use the Benchmark Advance/Adelante curriculum during literacy instruction?	2.9%	11.4%	34.3%	51.4%	35

Teacher Survey | Implementation of Balanced Literacy

Planning and Preparation: Scheduling and Pacing and Long-Term Planning: Unit Plans

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Scheduling and Pacing**.

Table 2a: Implementation of Scheduling and Pacing

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I plan small group activities or independent work ahead of time.	1.1%	0.8%	27.5%	70.6%	367
I have materials readily available for students.	1.4%	0.8%	31.1%	66.8%	367
I have scheduled mini-lessons aligned with Benchmark Advance/Adelante.	2.3%	7.9%	42.3%	47.6%	355

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Long-Term Planning: Unit Plans**.

Table 3a: Implementation of Long-Term Planning: Unit Plans

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I use summative assessments to backward plan the unit.	3.9%	20.2%	45.5%	30.3%	356
I identify grade level standards when planning the unit.	0.5%	3.8%	42.3%	53.3%	364
I create formative assessments with success criteria when planning the unit.	1.1%	15.0%	48.8%	35.2%	361

Core Instruction: Foundational Skills, Rituals and Routines, Differentiation and Scaffolding, Reading Practice, and Writing Practice

Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which they implement the following **Reading Practice** Benchmark Advance/Adelante components.

Table 4a: Frequency of Implementation of Differentiation and Scaffolding Reading Practice Benchmark Advance/Adelante Components

Reading Practice Components	Never (0 days)	Some Days (1-2 days)	Most Days (3-4 days)	Every Day (5 days)	Total Respondents
Mini-Lessons	3.5%	9.6%	33.3%	53.5%	342
Read Aloud	6.0%	20.8%	24.7%	48.5%	336
Guided Reading	2.3%	7.6%	38.9%	51.2%	342
Independent Reading	5.4%	6.0%	25.0%	63.7%	336
Conferring	8.9%	59.5%	23.4%	8.3%	338
Shared Reading	8.7%	34.0%	35.5%	21.8%	335
Phonics/Word Study and Vocabulary	6.1%	24.6%	28.7%	40.6%	345

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Rituals and Routines**.

Table 5a: Implementation of Rituals and Routines

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I have established student-led systems and structures.	0.6%	10.8%	40.1%	48.6%	352
I have established teacher-led systems and structures.	0.3%	1.7%	36.8%	61.3%	359

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Differentiation and Scaffolding**.

Table 6a: Implementation of Differentiation and Scaffolding

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I provide intentional scaffolds while students work towards their grade level standards.	0.3%	1.4%	40.7%	57.6%	361
I use a variety of instructional strategies. (e.g., small groups may be using different texts based on levels)	0.6%	0.8%	29.4%	69.2%	360
I collaborate with EL/SPED teachers to plan scaffolds and differentiation to meet the needs of all students.	2.9%	11.0%	40.5%	45.7%	346

Assessment and Grouping: Use of Data to Determine Groups, Progress Monitoring, and Academic Feedback

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Use of Data to Determine Groups**.

Table 7a: Implementation of Use of Data to Determine Groups

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I form groups based on instructional data.	0.0%	0.6%	27.4%	72.0%	354
I set learning targets for differentiated groups.	0.3%	4.0%	41.9%	53.8%	353

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Progress Monitoring**.

Table 8a: Implementation of Progress Monitoring

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I document student progress towards learning goals.	0.0%	4.0%	50.6%	45.5%	352
I help my students use data to understand their own progress toward proficiency.	1.4%	19.9%	49.4%	29.2%	346

Respondents were asked about the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the following statements about **Academic Feedback**.

Table 9a: Implementation of Academic Feedback

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I give academic feedback to students.	0.0%	0.8%	45.5%	53.7%	354
I make "real-time" formative assessment decisions.	0.0%	2.3%	42.6%	55.1%	352

Teacher Survey | Benchmark Advance/Adelante Use

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed about their usage of Benchmark Universe.

Table 10a: Use of Benchmark Universe

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Respondents
I use Benchmark Universe to assign materials for students to complete online.	28.4%	35.9%	29.4%	6.2%	320

Teacher Survey | Demographics

In order to more fully understand who responded to the survey, respondents were asked to indicate the school they work at, which version of the curriculum they use, their role, number of years teaching in MPS, and grade levels taught.

Table 11a: Number of Respondents from each School

	Number of Respondents
Andersen United	21
Anishinabe Academy	5
Bancroft	5
Barton Open	5
Bethune Community	9
Bryn Mawr Community	7
Burroughs Community	14
Cityview Community	5
Dowling Urban Environmental	6
Emerson Spanish Dual Immersion	8
Folwell Performing Arts Magnet	14
Hale Community	10
Hall International	6
Hmong International Academy	13
Jefferson Community	8
Jenny Lind Elementary	10
Kenny Community	6
Kenwood Community	8
Lake Harriet Community—Lower	12
Loring Community	9
Lucy Craft Laney at Cleveland Park	5
Lyndale Elementary	9
Marcy Open	7
Nellie Stone Johnson Community	18
Northrop Community	9
Pillsbury Community	11
Sheridan Arts Spanish Dual Immersion	5
Sullivan Community	6
Waite Park Community	9
Webster Elementary	9
Whittier International	11
Windom Spanish Dual Immersion	8
<i>Total Respondents who Indicated a School</i>	<i>311</i>

Note: Schools with less than five respondents were omitted from this table in order to maintain data privacy.

Table 12a: Use of Benchmark Advance or Benchmark Adelante

	Percent of Respondents
Benchmark Advance	92.8%
Benchmark Adelante	7.2%
<i>Total Respondents</i>	<i>307</i>

Table 13a: Role in Building

	Percent of Respondents
Classroom teacher	86.3%
English learner teacher	5.3%
Special education teacher	6.3%
TOSA	1.3%
Other	2.8%
<i>Total Respondents</i>	<i>320</i>

Table 14a: Years Teaching in MPS

	Percent of Respondents
0-1 years	9.6%
2-3 years	9.0%
4-5 years	12.7%
5-10 years	21.4%
10+ years	47.2%
<i>Total Respondents</i>	<i>322</i>

Table 15a: Grade Levels Taught

	Percent of Respondents
Kindergarten	28.2%
1st	29.2%
2nd	24.0%
3rd	26.6%
4th	22.1%
5th	16.0%
<i>Total Respondents</i>	<i>312</i>