### The Impact of OG on Kindergarten Foundational Literacy Skills...Packing One Powerful Punch

Angela Crousore, Jennifer McNamara, and Shelli Champion Early Learning Center at Mary Castle

### Background That Led To Our Inquiry

### The Context

Our Kindergarten Team feels providing our students with a guaranteed and viable curriculum is of utmost importance. We believe this to be especially true in the teaching and learning of foundational literacy skills...decoding, encoding, phonological awareness, print concepts, and automatic word recognition.

#### The Issue

Our Team has used a variety of instructional strategies over the years to teach foundational literacy skills...Heggerty, Augusta Mann, etc. During this time, foundational literacy skills were not being taught in a consistent and systematic way across our building, thus preventing us from providing a guaranteed and viable curriculum to ALL of our students.

# The Purpose of Our Inquiry

Therefore, the purpose of our action inquiry was to create a literacy block that included a systematic approach to teaching foundational literacy skills across all of our Kindergarten classrooms.

# Statement of Our Wondering

With this purpose, we wondered. . .how can implementing OG (Orton Gillingham) into our Tier I Foundations impact student achievement and student growth for ALL students in addition to overall foundational literacy skills?

### To Gain Insight...

## Take Action

### OG at the ELCMC

To gain insights into our wondering, our entire Kindergarten Team chose to be OG trained and committed to implementing OG with fidelity into our Tier I Foundations (Literacy) Block. In addition, the ELCMC partnered with the Rooney Foundation to receive additional professional development, coaching, and mentoring opportunities.

Our plan included tracking the following:

- Short Term Data...Weekly Data
- Long Term Data...BOY, MOY, EOY Data
- Overall School Growth
- Subgroup Growth

## To Gain Insight...

# Collect Data

### **Data Strategies**

To gain the best insights into our wondering, we utilized the following to collect data.

- OG SRS (Student Response Sheet)
  - Letters/Sounds
  - New Phonogram
  - Words to Spell
  - New/Review Memory Words
  - Dictation
- Weekly Data Dump
  - Letter ID
  - Letter Sounds
  - Sight Words
- FastBridge
  - Letter ID
  - Onset Sounds
  - Segmenting
  - Nonsense Words

# **ELCMC Student Response Sheet**



# ELCMC Weekly Data Dump

<u>K - Data 2021-2022</u>

### **ELCMC BOY Data**

		Overall	1		Black			Hispani	ic	(	White	<u> </u>		Multirac	ial		SpEd			F/R Lund	ch		ELL	-
	Fall	ll 2021	Fall 2020	Fall	ll 2021	Fall 2020	Fall	l 2021	Fall 2020	Fal	ll 2021	Fall 2020	Fall	l 2021	Fall 2020	Fal	ll 2021	Fall 2020	Fall	ll 2021	Fall 2020	Fall	2021	Fall 2020
	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark
K	176	50.0%	47.8%	74	46.1%	36.5%	34	22.9%	22.9%	53	71.7%	72.1%	14	53.3%	64.0%	13	84.6%	100%	58	42.4%	39.6%	<b>(</b> '	1′	27.8%

### **ELCMC MOY Data**

		2		Over	all Reading by	y SubGroup		2 2		
Total T	esters		Onset Sounds	5		Non-Sense			Segmenting	
BOY	MOX	On Grade	On Grade	On Grade	On Grade	GOAL	Combined	On Grade	GOAL	Combined
1	2									0.00%
74	77	5.41%	61.04%	55.63%	29.87%	9.09%			36.36%	51.95%
33	34	0.00%	67.65%	67.65%	38.24%	11.76%	50.00%	35.29%	35.29%	70.59%
15	16	6.67%	62.50%	55.83%	37.50%	25.00%	62.50%	37.50%	50.00%	87.50%
48	52	18.75%	96.15%	77.40%	57.69%	28.85%	86.54%	11.54%	78.85%	90.38%
1	2	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%
15	15	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	40.00%	13.33%	53.33%	20.00%	46.67%	66.67%
93	95	2.15%	64.21%	62.06%	37.89%	9.47%	47.37%	24.21%	36.84%	61.05%
27	27	0.00%	59.26%	59.26%	33.33%	7.41%	40.74%	40.74%	14.81%	55.56%
172	183	8.14%	72.68%	64.54%	39.34%	16.39%	55.74%	20.22%	48.63%	68.85%
	BOY 1 74 33 15 48 1 1 5 93 27	1 2   74 77   33 34   15 16   48 52   1 2   15 15   93 95   27 27	BOY On Grade BOY   MOY BOY   1 2 0.00%   74 77 5.41%   33 34 0.00%   15 16 6.67%   48 52 18.75%   15 15 0.00%   93 95 2.15%   27 27 0.00%	BOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade BOY   1 2 0.00% 50.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04%   33 34 0.00% 67.65%   15 16 6.67% 62.50%   48 52 18.75% 96.15%   15 15 0.00% 100.00%   93 95 2.15% 64.21%   27 27 0.00% 59.26%	Total Testers On Grade Growth <t< td=""><td>Total Testers On Grade On Grade</td><td>BOY On Grade BOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade GOAL   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00% 0.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04% 55.63% 29.87% 9.09%   33 34 0.00% 67.65% 67.65% 38.24% 11.76%   15 16 6.67% 62.50% 55.83% 37.50% 25.00%   48 52 18.75% 96.15% 77.40% 57.69% 28.85%   1 2 0.00% 80.00% 80.00% 40.00% 13.33%   93 95 2.15% 64.21% 62.06% 37.89% 9.47%   27 27 0.00% 59.26% 59.26% 33.33% 7.41%</td><td>Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense   BOY MOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04% 55.63% 29.87% 9.09% 38.96%   33 34 0.00% 67.65% 67.65% 38.24% 11.76% 50.00%   15 16 6.67% 62.50% 55.83% 37.50% 25.00% 62.50%   48 52 18.75% 96.15% 77.40% 57.69% 28.85% 86.54%   1 2 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%   15 15 0.00% 80.00% 80.00% 40.00% 13.33% 53.33%   93 95 2.15% 64.21% 62.06% 37.89% 9.47% 47.37%   27 27 0.00%</td><td>Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense   BOY On Grade BOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined On Grade   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04% 55.63% 29.87% 9.09% 38.96% 15.58%   33 34 0.00% 67.65% 67.65% 38.24% 11.76% 50.00% 35.29%   15 16 6.67% 62.50% 55.83% 37.50% 25.00% 62.50% 37.50%   48 52 18.75% 96.15% 77.40% 57.69% 28.85% 86.54% 11.54%   1 2 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 50.00% 50.00%   15 15 0.00% 80.00% 80.00% 40.00% 13.33% 53.33% 20.00%   15 15 0.00% 59.26% <td< td=""><td>Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense Segmenting   BOY MOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined On Grade On Grade GOAL   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00%</td></td<></td></t<>	Total Testers On Grade	BOY On Grade BOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade GOAL   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00% 0.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04% 55.63% 29.87% 9.09%   33 34 0.00% 67.65% 67.65% 38.24% 11.76%   15 16 6.67% 62.50% 55.83% 37.50% 25.00%   48 52 18.75% 96.15% 77.40% 57.69% 28.85%   1 2 0.00% 80.00% 80.00% 40.00% 13.33%   93 95 2.15% 64.21% 62.06% 37.89% 9.47%   27 27 0.00% 59.26% 59.26% 33.33% 7.41%	Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense   BOY MOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04% 55.63% 29.87% 9.09% 38.96%   33 34 0.00% 67.65% 67.65% 38.24% 11.76% 50.00%   15 16 6.67% 62.50% 55.83% 37.50% 25.00% 62.50%   48 52 18.75% 96.15% 77.40% 57.69% 28.85% 86.54%   1 2 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%   15 15 0.00% 80.00% 80.00% 40.00% 13.33% 53.33%   93 95 2.15% 64.21% 62.06% 37.89% 9.47% 47.37%   27 27 0.00%	Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense   BOY On Grade BOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined On Grade   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%   74 77 5.41% 61.04% 55.63% 29.87% 9.09% 38.96% 15.58%   33 34 0.00% 67.65% 67.65% 38.24% 11.76% 50.00% 35.29%   15 16 6.67% 62.50% 55.83% 37.50% 25.00% 62.50% 37.50%   48 52 18.75% 96.15% 77.40% 57.69% 28.85% 86.54% 11.54%   1 2 0.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0.00% 50.00% 50.00%   15 15 0.00% 80.00% 80.00% 40.00% 13.33% 53.33% 20.00%   15 15 0.00% 59.26% <td< td=""><td>Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense Segmenting   BOY MOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined On Grade On Grade GOAL   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00%</td></td<>	Total Testers Onset Sounds Non-Sense Segmenting   BOY MOY On Grade BOY On Grade MOY On Grade Growth On Grade Growth On Grade On Grade On Grade GOAL Combined On Grade On Grade GOAL   1 2 0.00% 50.00% 50.00% 0.00%

# **ELCMC BOY Comparison Data**

#### District

			Overall					Black					Hispani	C				White				1	Multirac	ial	
		Fall	2021	ş	Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021	c	Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fal	2021		Fall 2020
	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark
К	978	NA	48.6%	48.6%	41%	373	NA	54.3%	54.3%	45%	313	NA	21.7%	21.7%	22%	221	NA	75.2%	75.2%	55%	62	NA	55.6%	55.6%	54%

# **ELCMC BOY District Comparison Data**

			SpEd				1	F/R Lunc	h				ELL					Dual		
		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021	_	Fall 2020
	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark
К	72	NA	55.0%	55.0%	15%	313	NA	40.9%	40.9%	38%		NA	2		23%	265	NA	34.5%	34.5%	NA
	• •	(																		

### **ELCMC MOY District Comparison Data**

					Overa	ll Reading by	SubGroup				5
	Total T	esters	(	Onset Sounds		and the	Non-Sense	2		Segmenting	
	воу	ΜΟΥ	On Grade BOY	On Grade MOY	On Grade Growth	On Grade	GOAL	Combined	On Grade	GOAL	Combined
American Indian or Alaska Na	1	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Asian	5	5	0.00%	60.00%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%
Blank	369	394	9.49%	43.91%	34.42%	25.32%	7.59%	32.91%	23.10%	18.27%	41.37%
Hispanic	314	336	3.82%	24.70%	20.88%	14.71%	5.71%	20.42%	13.17%	12.87%	26.05%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pag	1	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Multiracial	62	68	8.06%	41.18%	33.11%	23.88%	13.43%	37.31%	23.53%	20.59%	44.12%
White	216	229	25.93%	72.93%	47.00%	35.24%	26.43%	61.67%	21.93%	49.56%	71.49%
(blank)	2	4	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%
SpEd	92	90	6.52%	32.22%	25.70%	18.68%	8.79%	27.47%	11.11%	15.56%	9000.00%
F/R	577	605	5.37%	36.20%	30.83%	21.32%	6.28%	27.60%	18.51%	15.37%	60500.00%
ELL	272	293	1.47%	18.09%	16.62%	12.07%	3.45%	15.52%	13.06%	7.22%	29100.00%
Grand Total	970	1038	11.13%	43.93%	32.80%	23.91%	11.42%	35.33%	19.71%	23.38%	43.09%

## **ELCMC** Teacher Thoughts

- All eight Kindergarten Teachers have agreed with to utilize OG for Foundations for the the 2022–2023 school year.
- "When done with fidelity, I see a difference in the students learning, ability to identify letters and sounds, and becoming readers. OG is a great addition to the Mann work that we do."
- "I really love the engagement. It has definitely helped my students improve their Reading and Writing skills."
- "I have been happy to see so much even growth. This is the first year in the second quarter that it is hard to identify English Language Learners from English-only students based on their letter sounds and identification knowledge scores."

### Our Discoveries

Learning Statements

Can implementing OG (Orton Gillingham) into Tier I Foundations impact student achievement and growth for ALL students in addition to overall foundational literacy skills?

YES

### Our Discoveries

#### Learning Statements

Implementing OG (Orton Gillingham) into our Tier I Foundations has impacted student growth and overall Foundational Literacy Skills. Professional development, coaching, and instructional integrity has allowed us to provide our students with a guaranteed and viable curriculum that has resulted in equitable outcomes for our students.

- Overall student achievement increased.
- Student growth was exhibited in all subgroups.
- Overall foundational literacy skills were developed within a guaranteed and viable literacy curriculum.

### What's Next

#### **Reflection and Direction**

This Action Inquiry Team Project has had a positive impact on our team and our school as a whole. We have successfully implemented OG into our Literacy Block as the foundational skills piece. This required a professional commitment from all team members to be trained, implement the approach with fidelity, and take advantage of professional development, mentoring, and coaching.

Our commitment has been proven to impact overall student achievement and growth for ALL students. The data collection has encouraged, motivated, and inspired us to continue to make OG implementation part of our regular PLC discussions. Our commitment has also sparked district level conversations on the impact of OG on K-2 literacy foundations.

# Bibliography

Marzano. R.J., Warrick, P.B., Rains. C.L., & Dufour, R. (2018). *Leading A High Reliability School*. Bloomington, Indiana: Solution Tree Press.

Peavler, J., & Rooney, T (2019). Orton Gillingham "Join the Journey in support of reading" Kindergarten Teacher Manual. Retrieved from <a href="http://marooneyfoundation.org">http://marooneyfoundation.org</a>

Wexler, N. (2019). The Knowledge GAP, The Hidden Cause of America's Broken Education System-And How to Fix It. New York: Penguin Random House.



### The Impact of OG on Kindergarten Foundational Literacy Skills...Packing One Powerful Punch

Principal Name: Angela Crousore Team Members: Shelli Champion and Jennifer McNamara School Name: Early Learning Center at Mary Castle Principal's Email Contact: angelacrousore@msdlt.k12.in.us

#### **Background Leading to Our Inquiry**

Our Kindergarten Team feels providing our students with a guaranteed and viable curriculum is of utmost importance. We believe this to be especially true in the teaching and learning of foundational literacy skills...decoding, encoding, phonological awareness, print concepts, and automatic word recognition.

Our Team has used a variety of instructional strategies over the years to teach foundational literacy skills...Heggerty, Augusta Mann, etc. During this time, foundational literacy skills were not being taught in a consistent and systematic way across our building, thus preventing us from providing a guaranteed and viable curriculum to ALL of our students.

#### The Purpose of Our Inquiry

The purpose of our action inquiry was to create a literacy block that included a systematic approach to teaching foundational literacy skills across all of our Kindergarten classrooms.

#### **Our Wondering**

How can implementing OG (Orton Gillingham) into our Tier I Foundations impact student achievement and student growth for ALL students in addition to overall foundational literacy skills?

#### **Our Actions**

To gain insights into our wondering, our entire Kindergarten Team chose to be OG trained and committed to implementing OG with fidelity into our Tier I Foundations (Literacy) Block. In addition, the ELCMC partnered with the Rooney Foundation to receive additional professional development, coaching, and mentoring opportunities.

Our plan included tracking the following:

- Short Term Data...Weekly Data
- Long Term Data...BOY, MOY, EOY Data
- Overall School Growth
- Subgroup Growth

#### Data Collection

To gain the best insights into our wondering, we utilized the following to collect data.

- OG SRS (Student Response Sheet)
  - Letters/Sounds
  - New Phonogram
  - Words to Spell
  - New/Review Memory Words
  - Dictation
- Weekly Data Dump
  - o Letter ID
  - Letter Sounds
  - Sight Words
- FastBridge
  - Letter ID
  - Onset Sounds
  - Segmenting
  - Nonsense Words

#### Our Data

#### ELCMC BOY Data

		Overal	I		Black			Hispani	ic		White			Multirac	ial		SpEd			F/R Lun	ch		ELL	
	Fall	2021	Fall 2020	Fall	2021	Fall 2020	Fall	2021	Fall 2020	Fal	2021	Fall 2020	Fal	2021	Fall 2020	Fal	l 2021	Fall 2020	Fall	2021	Fall 2020	Fall	2021	Fall 2020
	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% Benchmark	% Benchmark
K	176	50.0%	47.8%	74	46.1%	36.5%	34	22.9%	22.9%	53	71.7%	72.1%	14	53.3%	64.0%	13	84.6%	100%	58	42.4%	39.6%			27.8%

#### ELCMC MOY Data

					Over	all Reading by	y SubGroup				
	Total T	esters		Onset Sounds	6		Non-Sense			Segmenting	
			On Grade	On Grade	On Grade						
	BOY	MOY	BOY	MOY	Growth	On Grade	GOAL	Combined	On Grade	GOAL	Combined
Asian	1	2	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Black	74	77	5.41%	61.04%	55.63%	29.87%	9.09%	38.96%	15.58%	36.36%	51.95%
Hispanic	33	34	0.00%	67.65%	67.65%	38.24%	11.76%	50.00%	35.29%	35.29%	70.59%
Multiracial	15	16	6.67%	62.50%	55.83%	37.50%	25.00%	62.50%	37.50%	50.00%	87.50%
White	48	52	18.75%	96.15%	77.40%	57.69%	28.85%	86.54%	11.54%	78.85%	90.38%
(blank)	1	2	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	50.00%
SpEd	15	15	0.00%	80.00%	80.00%	40.00%	13.33%	53.33%	20.00%	46.67%	66.67%
F/R	93	95	2.15%	64.21%	62.06%	37.89%	9.47%	47.37%	24.21%	36.84%	61.05%
ELL	27	27	0.00%	59.26%	59.26%	33.33%	7.41%	40.74%	40.74%	14.81%	55.56%
Overall	172	183	8.14%	72.68%	64.54%	39.34%	16.39%	55.74%	20.22%	48.63%	68.85%

#### BOY Comparison Data

			Overall					Black					Hispanie	:				White				P	Multiracia	al	
		Fall	2021		Fall 2020	2020 Fall 2021				Fal 202															
	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	%
ĸ	978	NA	48.6%	48.6%	41%	373	NA	54.3%	54.3%	45%	313	NA	21.7%	21.7%	22%	221	NA	75.2%	75.2%	55%	62	NA	55.6%	55.6%	54

			SpEd					F/R Lunc	h				ELL					Dual		
		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020		Fall	2021		Fall 2020
	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark	# Testers	% PR Benchmark	% Low Risk Benchmark	% Combined Benchmark	% Benchmark
К	72	NA	55.0%	55.0%	15%	313	NA	40.9%	40.9%	38%		NA			23%	265 NA 34.5% 34.5%			34.5%	NA

#### MOY District Comparison Data

					Over	ll Reading by	SubCrown				
						ii keaung by					
	Total 1	esters	(	Onset Sounds	5		Non-Sense			Segmenting	
			On Grade	On Grade	On Grade						
	BOY	MOY	BOY	MOY	Growth	On Grade	GOAL	Combined	On Grade	GOAL	Combined
American Indian or Alaska Na	1	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
Asian	5	5	0.00%	60.00%	60.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%	20.00%	0.00%	20.00%
Blank	369	394	9.49%	43.91%	34.42%	25.32%	7.59%	32.91%	23.10%	18.27%	41.37%
Hispanic	314	336	3.82%	24.70%	20.88%	14.71%	5.71%	20.42%	13.17%	12.87%	26.05%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pag	1	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Multiracial	62	68	8.06%	41.18%	33.11%	23.88%	13.43%	37.31%	23.53%	20.59%	44.12%
White	216	229	25.93%	72.93%	47.00%	35.24%	26.43%	61.67%	21.93%	49.56%	71.49%
(blank)	2	4	0.00%	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	25.00%	0.00%	25.00%
SpEd	92	90	6.52%	32.22%	25.70%	18.68%	8.79%	27.47%	11.11%	15.56%	9000.00%
F/R	577	605	5.37%	36.20%	30.83%	21.32%	6.28%	27.60%	18.51%	15.37%	60500.00%
ELL	272	293	1.47%	18.09%	16.62%	12.07%	3.45%	15.52%	13.06%	7.22%	29100.00%
Grand Total	970	1038	11.13%	43.93%	32.80%	23.91%	11.42%	35.33%	19.71%	23.38%	43.09%

#### **Our Discoveries**

Implementing OG (Orton Gillingham) into our Tier I Foundations has impacted student growth and overall Foundational Literacy Skills. Professional development, coaching, and instructional integrity has allowed us to provide our students with a guaranteed and viable curriculum that has resulted in equitable outcomes for our students.

- Overall student achievement increased.
- Student growth was exhibited in all subgroups.
- Overall foundational literacy skills were developed within a guaranteed and viable literacy curriculum.

#### Where We Are Heading Next

This Action Inquiry Team Project has had a positive impact on our team and our school as a whole. We have successfully implemented OG into our Literacy Block as the foundational skills piece. This required a professional commitment from all team members to be trained, implement the approach with fidelity, and take advantage of professional development, mentoring, and coaching.

Our commitment has been proven to impact overall student achievement and growth for ALL students. The data collection has encouraged, motivated, and inspired us to continue to make OG implementation part of our regular PLC discussions. Our commitment has also sparked district level conversations on the impact of OG on K-2 literacy foundations.

#### **Bibliography**

Marzano. R.J., Warrick, P.B., Rains. C.L., & Dufour, R. (2018). *Leading A High Reliability School.* Bloomington, Indiana: Solution Tree Press.

Peavler, J., & Rooney, T (2019). Orton Gillingham "Join the Journey in support of reading" Kindergarten Teacher Manual. Retrieved from <u>http://marooneyfoundation.org</u>

Wexler, N. (2019). The Knowledge GAP, The Hidden Cause of America's Broken Education System-And How to Fix It. New York: Penguin Random House.