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Executive Summary

Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946,¹ passed the state Legislature in 2013. It required the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to convene an English language arts (ELA) panel of experts. This panel developed a menu of best practices and strategies to help students in grades K–4 as well as low-achieving students in grades K–12 served by the state’s Learning Assistance Program (LAP), to improve their ELA performance.

In addition to ELA, the Legislature also requested that OSPI convene panels of experts to develop menus of best practices and strategies in math and behavior for low-achieving students served by LAP in grades K–12. Those menus will be released in 2015.

The ELA menu is designed to support districts as they:

- help students who struggle with reading to reach grade level by the end of fourth grade;
- improve the reading and literacy of English language learners (ELL); and
- strengthen systems to improve reading instruction for all students.

The ELA panel of experts determined that the work required for ELA in section 106 and 203 of the bill should be combined. They agreed that the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies would contain many, if not all, of the same ELA best practices and strategies for instruction of all students in grades K–4 and low-achieving students in grade K–12. Specific considerations for grades K–4 are included within appropriate best practice and strategy sections.

School districts in Washington are expected to use practices from this menu starting with the 2015–16 school year. If they don’t, they must provide data that show the practices they are using instead are effective.

This ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is organized by type, based on the currently allowed LAP service categories. The report contains a section describing promising practices—those practices identified by the ELA panel of experts as showing signs of effectiveness, but lacking sufficient research to be considered a "best practice" as of June 2014. OSPI is charged with updating the menu annually by July 1st, and will seek input from districts and the expert panel on newly identified research on both best and promising practices.

Each practice is described in more detail in the panel’s technical report: Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes: Technical Report on Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts

¹ Also see Chapter 28A.165 RCW and WAC 392-162.
Introduction

Washington’s literacy-teaching landscape is as diverse as the 1.1 million children in our 295 public school districts. Across the state, educators work diligently to provide support in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language for all children. OSPI and statewide partners work to support literacy instruction by continually revising and improving the supports and systems available for building strong literacy skills in schools.

OSPI’s vision for education is for every student in the state to be ready for careers, college, and life. To achieve this vision, the State must provide a robust system for reading and literacy support throughout K–12, starting in the early years. Washington’s Birth through 12th Grade Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP) defines literacy as an on-going cognitive process that begins at birth. It involves the integration of listening, speaking, reading, writing and critical thinking. Literacy also includes the knowledge that enables the speaker, writer, or reader to recognize and use language appropriate to a situation in an increasingly complex literate environment. Active literacy allows people to think, create, question, solve problems, and reflect in order to participate effectively in a democratic, multicultural society (p. 2, CLP 2012).

The overarching goal of the CLP is grounded in state learning standards for all students, and is based on the foundation that literacy encompasses all developmental phases. We must address the different abilities and needs of children through instruction, assessment, and intervention in each student’s primary language. The CLP and its associated resources recognize student diversity by incorporating strategies that are relevant to cultural and linguistic differences, as well as different learning styles.

In 2013, the Legislature directed OSPI to convene an expert panel to develop a menu of best practices and strategies for English language arts (ELA) to complement the State’s continuing efforts to improve outcomes in literacy for all students. The ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies builds on state and federal investments since the early 2000’s that have sought to increase early and adolescent literacy skills [e.g., Reading First (federal), and Washington Reading Corps (state), Striving Readers (federal)]; the State has provided supplemental funds via the Learning Assistance Program (LAP) to districts for many years to help struggling students. However, because outcomes have been uneven across the state, this 2014 menu of best practices and strategies, focused on K–12 ELA, seeks to identify proven practices that strengthen student outcomes for all students in the state. The ELA panel collaborated with the Washington Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to develop the menu. As required in separate legislation, WSIPP will provide a companion report, due August 1, 2014, which will identify research-based and evidence-based practices, strategies, and programs that are shown to improve student outcomes. Many of the best practices and strategies identified for inclusion in the panel’s menu will also be included in the WSIPP report. In addition, the WSIPP companion report will identify an average effect-size for identified interventions and perform a cost-benefit analysis.
It is important to note that the existence of an ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies is not sufficient to ensure that all students will succeed. Instruction and intervention work are complex. Not all instructional strategies work all the time with all students. The expert panel, in their deliberations, strongly voiced the importance of ensuring that each of the instructional strategies and best practices described in the menu be designed to meet the diverse needs of all students. Furthermore, the panel expressed the importance of integrating the linguistic and cultural needs of English language learners (ELL) into all instructional and professional development offerings described in this document, and that instruction be provided to ELL students in their primary language whenever feasible. Finally, the expert panel offered three significant and critical success factors that must be considered with every instructional strategy and best practice:

1. Fidelity of program implementation within a multi-tiered system of support framework that addresses core reading instruction for every student (when possible in their primary language) and that strategically targets interventions based on data for students that need additional support. Even the most proven intervention strategy can fail to achieve outcomes if it is implemented poorly.

2. Degree of improvement expected or obtained from implementing an intervention – sometimes interventions take more time than expected to show results. There are potentially many effective practices that are not on the menu. Districts that use practices not on the menu should be sure they align with the criteria used for considering the practices within the menu.

3. Support for students through initial instruction, assessment processes, and interventions be provided in their primary language, whenever possible.

Districts can continue to use other intervention strategies, but they must provide data that describes the effectiveness of interventions not on the ELA menu, starting with the 2015–16 school year.

Educators must engage in a process of observation, analysis, and take informed action in their classrooms regardless of the intervention(s) chosen. This action research helps solve problems as they arise, and can ensure that the interventions chosen by the teacher or district have a greater chance of succeeding.

**Learning to Read, Reading to Learn**

In July 2011, Washington adopted the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts (CCSS-ELA) to replace the state’s 2005 Reading, Writing, and Communication Learning Standards (Grade Level Expectations or GLEs). The CCSS-ELA are built on an intentional progression of the skills and knowledge necessary for all students to be ready for careers, college, and life when they exit high school. For kindergarten through grade four students, the CCSS-ELA provides targeted focus on learning to read and reading to learn across all grade levels. According to Jeanne Chall in
her book, *Stages of Reading Development* (1983), "children first learn to read and then read to learn".

Focus of instruction for kindergarten through fourth grade students is based upon the findings of the National Reading Panel Report, *Teaching Children to Read*. Students must be provided instruction in their early years that addresses phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary development, and comprehension. The CCSS set the Reading Standards: Foundational Skills for grades K–5 which build upon the National Reading Panel’s findings. These standards are directed at building a student’s ability to read and to comprehend what is read. The menu of best practices includes a specific focus on supporting K–4 students in meeting these standards, and is informed by scientifically supported, foundational practices for teaching reading to students in kindergarten through fourth grade. Evidence-based teaching practices for effective K–4 reading instruction include explicit instruction, modeling and scaffolding instruction, dynamic and flexible grouping, increased reading time, discussion, and oral and silent reading practice (Jones et al., 2012). Effective K–4 reading teachers must also differentiate and adapt instruction according to multiple points of formative and interim student assessment, as well as carefully monitor student progress and reteach as necessary (Denton, 2009). The ultimate goal for all K–12 students is for each student to possess the skills to “comprehend texts across a range of types and disciplines” (CCSS-ELA).

In addition to the CCSS-ELA as the state’s learning standards for ELA, OSPI adopted new English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards for Washington in December 2013 that were developed in 2012 and 2013 to address the increased rigor and language demands of these career and college ready standards and that align with the CCSS-ELA and CCSS for Mathematics. ELL students make up nine percent (9%) of the student population in Washington. That’s more than 94,000 students are in the process of learning a new language while simultaneously engaging in content to meet rigorous career and college ready standards. With both the ELL specialist and the content area teacher in mind, the 2013 ELP standards provide the language bridge to move students toward full engagement and academic success. The 2013 ELP standards make it clear that language learning and literacy encompass more than just grammar and vocabulary, and that they include refocus on receptive, productive, and interactive modalities for instruction of ELLs. With the revisions in the 2013 ELP standards, English language development goes hand in hand with our state’s 2012 expanded definition of literacy as found in Washington Comprehensive Literacy Plan (CLP), giving a greater emphasis on instruction in student’s primary language, cognitive processes, and integration of skills. Such integration will take our students beyond the classroom and into career and college ready to face the challenges of their futures.

With the adoption of the CCSS-ELA and associated ELP standards as Washington State’s K–12 Learning Standards for ELA and English Language Proficiency and the refinement of the state’s CLP, state literacy partners are poised to provide comprehensive and coherent professional learning for educators to better support improved student learning outcomes. OSPI and literacy experts (including experts in K–4 literacy) in each of the nine Educational Service Districts (ESDs) have jointly developed professional learning opportunities (common across all regions) to support strong implementation of the CCSS-ELA and early literacy instruction. ESSB 5946 provides additional targeted resources to each ESD region to improve K–4 ELA support for teachers and
students. The work of these "regional literacy coordinators" is grounded in the CCSS-ELA, the CLP, and will serve as an excellent support system for districts as they consider and integrate the best practices and strategies identified within the expert panel's ELA menu.

2013 Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill (ESSB) 5946 – Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes

Washington’s 2013 Legislature passed ESSB 5946 in the 2nd Special Legislative session in June 2013. The overall bill sets forth a vision for improving educational support systems for every student in grades K–12. The first Section of Part 1 references the importance of collaborative partnerships essential to supporting students; using research and evidence-based programs for all students, especially in the early years for grades K–4; and providing statewide models to support school district in implementing a multi-tiered system of support. Part 2 of the bill references the Learning Assistance Program’s focus on evidence-based support for students struggling in reading (with primary emphasis on grades K–4), mathematics, and behavior across grades K–12. The thread that binds together the bill is the expectation set forth that OSPI will convene “expert panels” that will develop menus of best practices and strategies for ELA (K–4 and K–12), mathematics (K–12), and behavior (K–12). As articulated in the bill, the ELA menu specifically will be designed to:

- help students who struggle with reading to reach grade level by the end of fourth grade;
- improve the reading and literacy of ELL students; and
- strengthen systems to improve reading instruction for all students.

The ELA expert panel determined that the work required for ELA in both sections 106 and 203 of the bill should be combined. They agreed that the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies would contain many, if not all, of the same ELA best practices and strategies for instruction of all students in grades K–4 and low-achieving students in grades K–12. Specific considerations for grades K–4 are included within each of the best practice sections. Portions of the bill specifically related to the ELA expert panel and menu of best practices and strategies are highlighted in Appendix A. See ESSB 5946 for the full text of the bill.

Companion Legislation

In addition to direction to OSPI per ESSB 5946, the 2013 Legislature also directed the Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) to “prepare an inventory of evidence-based and research-based effective practices, activities and programs for use by school districts in the learning assistance program” (Senate Bill 5034, Section 610). The WSIPP report will also identify an average effect-size for identified interventions and perform a cost-benefit analysis.

Both OSPI and WSIPP consider the two reports to be companion pieces, and are coordinating to ensure that the content of both reports are consistent while still adhering to the unique directives given to each agency. The WSIPP report is due to the Legislature by August 1, 2014.

WSIPP Assistant Director Annie Pennucci and Research Associate Matthew Lemon are key participants in the expert panel sessions as non-voting members. They are providing important
research references to the panel members, and soliciting panel member input regarding effective practices.

Both agencies collaborate on identifying topics for consideration for best practices. OSPI will include notation indicating whether the menu practices are evidence-based and/or research-based, as determined by WSIPP.

**Conclusion**

This work is significant because it has the potential to improve student outcomes across the state. Historically, even with similar funding levels, student outcomes by district have been uneven. The Legislature, with ESSB 5946, directs districts to use proven ELA practices to help struggling students. Even with proven practices, it is critically important to ensure they are implemented with fidelity because the best practices, when implemented poorly, can fail to raise student outcomes.

All districts are required to focus first on K–4 reading, because this is a fundamental skill that predicts success not only in other academic pursuits, but throughout life. In the 2015–16 school year, every school in which 40 percent or more students scored at basic or below basic on the third grade state ELA assessment, and/or for any student who received a score of basic or below basic on the third grade statewide student assessment in ELA in the previous school year and every year following—must integrate best practices and strategies proven to increase ELA literacy across grades K–4. The interventions must be selected from the list of best practices and strategies included in the ELA menu.

This menu of best practices will be refreshed annually, no later than July 1 each calendar year. Interested stakeholders are invited to submit recommendations for intervention practices, along with related research references, for consideration by the expert panel and possible inclusion in subsequent menus. It is important to note that if new research emerges that disproves the effectiveness of a practice that has historically been included in this report, the practice may be removed and no longer be allowed under LAP guidelines. Public comment forms are available on the project web page on the OSPI website, at [http://www.k12.wa.us/TitleI/LAP/ELA_Panel.aspx](http://www.k12.wa.us/TitleI/LAP/ELA_Panel.aspx).

**Next Steps**

The ELA panel of experts recognizes that there are a number of next steps to ensure that the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies are implemented across the state. Following are a list of activities that will be carried out in the 2014–15 school year.

1. The ELA Panel will continue their work which includes the following:
   a. Examine proposed best practices and strategies that the committee chose to table for future consideration for placement on the updated July 1, 2015 ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.
   b. Address public comments that suggest additional practices and strategies for inclusion in the July 1, 2015 ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies.
c. Vet potential ELA best practices and strategies recommended by districts and others.

2. Distribute the ELA Menu of Best Practices and Strategies to stakeholders through a variety of avenues including:
   a. Electronic distribution.
   b. Workshops and trainings provided in partnership with OSPI, Educational Service Districts, and districts to educators across the state.

3. Prepare and distribute data collection instruments that districts will be required to submit to meet the reporting requirements within parts 1 and 2 of ESSB 5946.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Menu of Best Practices and Strategies

Over the five sessions convened by OSPI, the expert panel worked together to develop a comprehensive menu of best practices based on the most current evidence and rigorous research available. Additional best practices will be identified during 2014–15 as the ELA panel reviews the 2013–14 ELA menu. (In some instances, it was not possible to determine whether or not a practice was evidence- or research-based by the initial report deadline.) WSIPP was charged with making that determination, which they did by carefully and systematically evaluating the quality of the aggregate work and ensuring that the studies had valid comparison groups and measure outcomes of interest, such as test scores and graduation rates. Each entry indicates whether the practice is evidence-based and/or research-based. Panelists concurred with WSIPP to use the following definitions for evidence-based and research-based studies.

Evidence-based:

- Multiple randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluations, or one large multiple-site randomized and/or statistically controlled evaluation;

- Where the weight of the evidence from a systematic review demonstrates sustained improvements in outcomes: ELA test scores;

- When possible, had been determined to be cost-beneficial.

Research-based:

- Tested with a single randomized and/or statistically-controlled evaluation demonstrating sustained desirable outcomes.

The ELA menu lists evidence-based practices and strategies that have been shown to support reading/literacy improvement for struggling learners. Many of these strategies and practices are used in commercially available supplemental programs that districts can acquire and use. It is important to note that the work of the expert panel was to identify proven general practices and strategies, not specifically branded programs that might employ those practices. Districts that are contemplating acquisition or use of one or more branded programs are encouraged to determine if the strategies and practices included in the menu are utilized by the branded programs. The table below shows a quick summary of the practices that are proven to be effective in strengthening student educational outcomes, as determined by the expert panel. Each practice is described in more detail in the panel’s technical report: Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes: Technical Report on Best Practices and Strategies for English Language Arts.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice/ Strategies</th>
<th>Evidence-Based</th>
<th>Research-Based</th>
<th>Panel Opinion</th>
<th>K–4</th>
<th>K–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tutoring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Tutoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Tutoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Learning Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Day – Out of School Time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Year² - Academics (Summer Programs)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Professional Development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coaches³</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outreach Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement Outside School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Involvement at School</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Student Mentoring</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Models</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Instruction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services under RCW 28A.320.190 — Extended Learning Opportunities Program</strong></td>
<td>(Shown in Promising Practices Section)</td>
<td>(Shown in Promising Practices Section)</td>
<td>(Shown in Promising Practices Section)</td>
<td>(Shown in Promising Practices Section)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Extended Year includes Summer Programs, Saturdays, use of school breaks, and an extension of the standard school year.
³ Instructional Coaches also includes Literacy Coaches and English Language Development Coaches.
Appendix B: Promising Practices and Strategies

Promising practices are defined as those practices that do not have research or evidence to show they are best practices, but still show potential for improving student outcomes. The practices defined in this section are considered part of the menu and can be used by districts. They are selected and described based upon the professional opinions of the expert panel members.

Districts who choose to use any of the promising practices in this section or any other strategies not on the menu must provide evidence of effective outcomes, starting with the 2016-17 school year.

It is important to note that this is not a comprehensive list of all emerging or promising practices, but rather a sample of practices that have the potential to be effective.

Table 2: Menu of Promising Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promising Practice</th>
<th>Panel Opinion</th>
<th>K–4</th>
<th>K–12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Learning Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Instruction Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Book Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services under RCW 28A.320.190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Retrieval</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition-Based Family Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Tiered Systems of Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Promising Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development for ELLs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Acceleration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Expert Panel

Panel members were appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Panel applicants were solicited through several professional channels. Candidates were nominated from OSPI, Educational Service Districts, school districts, and state educational associations. Educators were drawn from existing OSPI advisory groups, such as Curriculum Advisory and Review Committee, the Bilingual Education Advisory Council, and the Special Education Advisory Committee. Nominations were collected and reviewed by OSPI’s Strengthening Student Educational Outcomes Team. OSPI sought leaders nationally and within Washington possessing expertise and experience with multi-tiered systems of support, response to intervention, Common Core State Standards, and assessments.

Candidates were nominated and selected based on evidence of their expertise in one or more of the following criteria:

- ELA classroom and/or district leadership experience;
- Classroom and system expertise in supporting struggling readers K–4;
- Classroom and system expertise in supporting struggling readers 5–12;
- Educational research expertise and experience in implementing new strategies;
- Knowledge of research-based best practices and strategies in working with diverse student populations, including ELL students and students with disabilities;
- Representatives from high poverty school districts that range in size from urban to rural with large populations of struggling ELA students; and
- Representatives who reflect the diversity of the state’s student population.

After a review of all candidates, OSPI's team recommended panel candidates to the state superintendent for his consideration.

The cross-disciplinary panel reflects a wide range of experience and professional expertise within the K–20 environment. The state Legislature has charged the panel to “assist in the development of a menu of best practices and strategies that will provide guidance to districts as they work to impact student ELA academic achievement.”
<p>| Name               | Organization                                      | Title                                                                 | Role                      |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------|                                                                     |                          |
| Chaplin, Erin      | Yakima School District                           | P–12 Instruction Director                                           | Expert Panel Member      |
| Chow, Roger        | Tacoma School District                            | Curriculum and Instruction Director                                | Expert Panel Member      |
| Duffey, Nancy      | Wenatchee School District                         | Director of State and Federal Programs                              | Expert Panel Member      |
| Fixsen, Dean       | State Implementation &amp; Scaling up of Evidenced-based Practices Center | Co-director                                                          | Advisor                  |
| Hill, Saundra      | Pasco School District                             | Superintendent                                                      | Expert Panel Member      |
| Jacobsen, Mike     | White River School District                        | Curriculum Director                                                 | Expert Panel Member      |
| Johnson, Eric      | Washington State University Tri-Cities            | Assistant Professor of Bilingual/ESL Education                      | Expert Panel Member      |
| Kamil, Michael     | Stanford University                               |                                                                      | Advisor                  |
| Kneseal, Debra     | Central Avenue Elementary                         | Principal                                                            | Expert Panel Member      |
| Lemon, Matthew     | Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) | Research Associate                                                  | Expert Panel Member      |
| Mitchell, John     | Oakwood Elementary                                | Principal                                                            | Expert Panel Member      |
| Murner, Alice      | Neah Bay Elementary                               | Principal                                                            | Expert Panel Member      |
| Pennucci, Annie    | Washington State Institute for Public Policy (WSIPP) | Associate Director                                                  | Expert Panel Member      |
| Pottle, Pamela     | Bellingham School District                        | ELA Coach                                                            | Expert Panel Member      |
| Sederstrom, Glenda | Northeast Washington ESD 101                      | Coordinator for the Center for Special Education Services            | Expert Panel Member      |
| Shoop, Kathy       | Northwest ESD 189                                 | Assistant Superintendent                                             | Expert Panel Member      |
| Tudor, David       | Washougal School District                         | Curriculum Director                                                  | Expert Panel Member      |
| Vance, Cheryl      | ESD 113                                           | Regional Literacy Coordinator                                        | Expert Panel Member      |
| Ward, Caryn        | State Implementation &amp; Scaling up of Evidenced-based Practices Center | Senior Implementation Specialist                                     | Advisor                  |
| Wert, Linda        | Spokane School District                           | Coordinator of Special Programs                                      | Expert Panel Member      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baunsgard-Heusser, Amy</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>P12 Literacy Specialist</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bresko, John</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, Special Education</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came, Deb</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Student Information</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb, Andrea</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Policy and Research Analyst and State Transformation Specialist</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everson, Porsche</td>
<td>Relevant Strategies</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Report Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flores, Maria</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Accountability and Research Program Manager</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher, Anne</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Teaching and Learning Mathematics</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Jordyn</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Data Analyst</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwaszuk, Wendy</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor and State Transformation Specialist</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Jess</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Supervisor, Behavior and Discipline</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malagon, Helen</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Migrant and Bilingual Education</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mendoza, Gil</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Special Programs and Federal Accountability</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moilanen Potts, Liisa</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Teaching and Learning ELA</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosby, Judith</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Student and School Success, Reading Instruction, Assessment and Implementation</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munson, Robin</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauley, Gayle</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Title I/LAP and Consolidated Program Review</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterson, Jami</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, LaWonda</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Manager, Title I/LAP and Consolidated Program Reviews</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaughn, Amy</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Manager, LAP Mathematics and Research</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vavrus, Jessica</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent, Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Project Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamson, Greg</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Director, Student Support</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young, Justin</td>
<td>OSPI</td>
<td>Program Manager, Title I/LAP ELA and Research</td>
<td>Project Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Panel Review Process

There were five work sessions held over a five-month period in 2014. Three were face to face sessions held in the SeaTac area. The other two sessions were interactive webinars, typically lasting four or more hours. Significant research, writing, and collaboration happened outside the formal panel meetings. OSPI provided a project SharePoint site and discussion group to help facilitate collaboration and access to information.

Figure 1: High-Level Work Plan for the Expert Panel

The work sessions were organized around the framework of the currently allowed LAP service categories, with one key addition of identifying emerging or promising practices that might not fit into the currently allowed categories. The following work plan outlines the work of the expert panel over the five scheduled sessions. Panelists were asked to find and/or review research literature in advance of each session and to share that research with the whole group. The panelists received selected articles before each session. WSIPP maintained a folder of selected research articles on the OSPI SharePoint site related to effective practices and strategies within the allowable LAP service categories.

Panelists provided written descriptions of the proposed practices, citing evidence of effectiveness. See Appendix E for articles reviewed and used by the expert panel in the course of their work.
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