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The most important Reading First goals:

1. **Increase** the percentage of students reading “at grade level” each year at each grade level from kindergarten through third grade

2. **Decrease** the percentage of students with serious reading difficulties each year at each grade level

Our most important measures of success in doing this assess student performance on reading comprehension measures at the end of the year—particularly at end of third grade
Whether or not we achieve these goals depends on the strength of our instruction to accomplish two things during the year:

All students who begin the year meeting grade level expectations continue to meet grade level expectations at the end of the year—they make expected yearly growth.

All students who begin the year reading below grade level accelerate their development so they make expected yearly growth plus catch-up growth.
Whether or not we achieve these goals depends on the strength of our instruction to do two things during the year:

- Insuring all students make expected yearly growth.

  Strong core reading instruction for all students.
  
  Enough time spent to meet the needs of many students who do not typically receive powerful support at home.
  
  Enough quality so that the increased instructional time is spent effectively.

\[
\text{Time} \times \text{quality} = \text{yearly growth}
\]
Whether or not we achieve these goals depends on the strength of our instruction to do two things during the year:

- Insuring students who are behind make expected yearly growth plus catch-up growth.
- Effective differentiated instruction by classroom teacher.
- Effective school-level systems and resources to provide additional intensive intervention in small enough groups for enough time, and with enough skill.

Time $\times$ quality = yearly growth + catch-up growth.
In order to effectively prevent early reading difficulties, we need to apply two kinds of knowledge.

From the “science of reading”:
Information about the *individual* components of instruction and assessment that are most effective in raising literacy levels.

From effective schools:
Information about leadership, organizational, and classroom practices that are most effective in raising literacy levels.

Understanding, and Motivation to Apply
Lessons learned from the Kennewick, Washington school district:

Located in southeastern Washington

Has about 15,000 students – 13 elementary schools, four middle schools, and 3 high schools

25% of students are ethnic minorities, and 48% elementary school students qualify for free or reduced price lunch
Lessons learned from the Kennewick, Washington school district:

In 1995, the school board in Kennewick challenged the elementary schools to have 90% of their students at grade level in reading by the end of third grade – within 3 years.

The primary responsibility for accomplishing this was assigned to the school principals.
Lessons learned from the Kennewick, Washington school district:

From David Montague, a principal:

“We thought the board and the superintendent were crazy... I saw in the White Paper that elementary principals were responsible, and said ‘Why don’t they come down to our building and see the kids that come to our school?’ I mean, our kindergarten kids seem to enter school every year with lower skills...”
Lessons learned from the Kennewick, Washington school district:

From David Montague, a principal:

“After that, the whining died down. The goal started to grow legs….Principals are messengers. When you’re in the message business, it doesn’t help to criticize the message. It drives a wedge. It empowers those who don’t want to change. Since we’re responsible for implementation, it makes no sense to send a mixed message. Principals cannot play ‘loyal opposition’ harping against accountability and at the same time provide effective leadership for growth”
Lessons learned from the Kennewick, Washington school district:

The District passed a bond that provided a district reading teacher for each school, and began to hold public meetings at a different elementary school every two weeks.

At the schools…
“We began to have serious staff meetings…we began going through the district White Paper and looking at the test data to see how far behind some of our kids were. It was the first time Washington had ever had such precise data. In the fall of 1995, 23% of our 3rd graders were reading at second grade level and 41% of our 3rd graders were reading at a kindergarten or 1st grade level.
“In the United States, public schools deliver 85% or more of their curriculum by reading textbooks, whiteboards, worksheets, and computer screens. Students must read well to do well. It matters little what else they learn in elementary school if they do not learn to read at grade level. Even math depends on reading. There are far more words than numbers in math books. As the math concepts become more complicated, the verbal descriptions become more involved as well. As Kennewick has focused on reading, our math scores have improved at a rate similar to our reading scores. The reading problem becomes more obvious in middle school where students who cannot read well struggle to absorb content in all other subjects.” P. 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge View</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon View</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset View</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amistad</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Year</td>
<td>Percent at Grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 96 97 98 99 00 01 02 03 04 05 06</td>
<td>57 72 72 68 78 94 96 99 94 98 99 98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working harder and more effectively at 3rd grade

Baseline year
From the Principal:

“By the 3rd year, we had exhausted our work-harder-at-third-grade strategy...More of the catch-up gain had to be made at second and first grade. Our first-and second-grade teachers realized that they had to become more accountable for their students’ learning. Even our kindergarten teachers, who had spent most of their class time on social activities, began the transition to teaching phonemic awareness along with letter and sound recognition.”
Washington Elementary School

Growth in % of 3rd grade students meeting grade level standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>96</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>98</th>
<th>99</th>
<th>00</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent at Grade level</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Began testing in 2nd grade and focusing on earlier improvement.
- Began providing intensive interventions in the afternoon to many students.
- Result of improvement at both 2nd and 3rd Grade.
- Working harder and more effectively at 3rd grade.
- Baseline year.
Washington Elementary School

School Characteristics
55% Free/reduced lunch
28% Minority
85% Stability

Teaching Staff
2 half-day kindergarten teachers
3 classroom teachers each in 1-5
1 District Reading Specialist
3 Title I Teachers
1.5 Resource room/special ed teachers
1 PE teacher
1 librarian, 1 Librarian secretary
3 Specials teachers
9 paraprofessionals
How they get additional instructional power in first grade

During the Morning Reading Block
Small group reading during 1st hour of the day
It puts 13 adults with 75 students during the first hour in first grade
Struggling students get 1:3 with most skilled instructor
Advanced students get 1:7 ratios with paras and others

In the afternoon
Many students get additional small group or 1:1 instruction time as interventions
The reading block for 3 first grade classrooms

1st hour (8:45-9:45)
- Small group instruction
- 3 classroom teachers
- 1 District Reading Teacher
- 2 Title I teachers
- Specials teacher
- PE teacher
- 6 paraprofessionals

2nd hour (9:45-10:45)
- Whole group instruction
- Also, during the second hour, paras, Title 1, and others work in small groups with 2nd-5th grades

In the afternoon, many students are provided an additional 40-90 minutes of intervention
From David Motague

”By the fifth year, I was convinced high performance reading was about more time and better use of that time. Students who were behind needed more direct instruction. Some of them started getting 60 to 90 minutes extra each day for a total of 180 to 210 minutes a day. We spent that time on the sub-skills they hadn’t mastered.”

“For most of Kennewick’s high performance elementary schools, increasing the amount of time spent on direct reading instruction was an intuitive decision. They tried more time. It worked, and they kept on doing it. It was merely an extension of what remediation was about. Principals and many teachers at these schools saw the direct connection between increasing instructional time and increasing reading growth. Students who were a little behind needed a little more instructional time. Students who were a lot behind needed a lot more time.” P. 38.
“Growth is directly proportionate to the quality and quantity of instructional time. When we looked at our data student by student, we saw a painful fact with painful clarity. Most students who start behind stay behind. Time-starved reading programs that rely on sudden growth bursts from extraordinary instruction rarely move students from the 5th-30th percentiles up to grade level.” P. 48

“Catch-up growth is driven primarily by proportional increases in direct instructional time. Catch-up growth is so difficult to achieve that it can be the product only of quality instruction in great quantity.”
Teacher quality $\times$ time = growth

“Quantity of instructional time can be doubled or tripled in a semester. Quality of instructional time cannot. Improving quality occurs over extended periods of time, at different rates for different teachers in the same school, as a constant process of arduous, intelligent labor.

Teacher quality (1) $\times$ time (1) = growth (1)
Teacher quality (1) $\times$ time (2) = growth (2)
Teacher quality (1) $\times$ time (3) = growth (3)
Teacher quality x time = growth

“This is why the primary and immediate strategy for catch-up growth is proportional increase in direct instructional time.

Catch-up growth rarely occurs unless principals and teachers have good data, know each student’s learning needs, and schedule proportional increases in direct instructional time.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% FR Lunch</th>
<th>% at Grade Level, 2003</th>
<th>1st Grade Reading Block</th>
<th>1st Grade Interventions</th>
<th>2nd Grade Reading Block</th>
<th>2nd Grade Interventions</th>
<th>3rd Grade Reading Block</th>
<th>3rd Grade Interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon V.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westgate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amistad</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge View</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset View</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two indices from progress monitoring measures that provide data about effectiveness of core instruction and interventions

Effectiveness of Core Instruction (ECI) measures the percentage of students who began the school year (Assessment 1) on grade level (in green zone) and remained on grade level in the assessment period being reported (middle or end of year) – make expected yearly gain.
The ECI in one classroom

9 of 13 students who were at grade level continue at grade level

ECI = .69
Green Students

STAY

Green Students

From

Assessment 1 to Assessment 2

Assessment 1 to Assessment 3
Two indices from progress monitoring measures that provide data about effectiveness of core instruction and interventions

**Effectiveness of Interventions (EI)** shows the percentage of students who began the year at some level of risk for reading difficulties (reading below grade level) but who grew rapidly enough to advance to a lower level of risk, or to grade level, by the end of the year.
The EI in one classroom

One academic year

3 of 7 students who were at “at risk” moved to a lower risk level

EI = .43
Red or Yellow Students

IMPROVE TO

Yellow or Green Students

From

Assessment 1 to Assessment 2
Assessment 1 to Assessment 3
The EI index can be broken into two more specific indicators.

EI-I shows the percentage of students who began the year at the “intensive” or highest level of risk (red) but who grew rapidly enough to advance to strategic (yellow) or grade level (green) by the end of the year.

EI-S shows the percentage of students who began the year at the “strategic” or moderate level of risk (yellow) but who grew rapidly enough to advance to grade level (green) by the end of the year.
The EI in one classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>screening</th>
<th>outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One academic year

1 of 3 students who were at “high risk” moved to a lower risk level

\[ EI-I = .33 \]

2 of 4 students who were at “moderate” risk moved to grade level

\[ EI-I = .50 \]
Red Students

IMPROVE TO

Yellow or Green Students

From

Assessment 1 to Assessment 2
Assessment 1 to Assessment 3
Yellow Students

IMPROVE TO

Green Students

From

Assessment 1 to Assessment 2
Assessment 1 to Assessment 3
What They Are

ECI and EI are two measures, based on the Recommended Instructional Level (RIL) for students, that can be used to monitor the performance of the core reading program and the intensive intervention program(s) in schools.

Splits the reading program into two separate parts—core instruction and interventions—more analytic.
What They Are Not

ECI and EI should not be considered as the primary measure in evaluating schoolwide performance in reading. These are formative assessment—meant to help focus professional development, resources, school level planning. They are not the same as outcome measures.
Cautions

- **Population Sensitive**
  - Based on students that remain in the same school for each assessment
  - Small populations have volatile measures
  - Can lose all students = have no measure
  - Kindergarten and 1\textsuperscript{st} grade Assessment 1 measures are different than assessment 3

- **Data requirements**
  - Must have within year, longitudinally identifiable data
Cautions

What should we expect?

- With a new measure, we often don’t know what to expect, or what is “good performance”

Goal for ECI should be 100%

Goal for EI should be around 50%
Looking at trends in outcome data over time as a way of thinking about needed changes or improvements
Using School, or District, or State Level Reading outcome data to make decisions about allocation of resources and activities to improve school performance

Two kinds of analysis

1. Examining trends across measures for purposes of planning professional development, support and guidance

2. Examining differences in performance across schools for purposes of planning and implementing differentiated support and oversight
Using School, or District, or State Level Reading outcome data to make decisions about allocation of resources and activities to improve school performance

Two kinds of analysis

1. Examining trends across measures for purposes of planning professional development, support and guidance

2. Examining differences in performance across schools for purposes of planning and implementing differentiated support and oversight
Year to Year changes in performance on a combined measure of PA, Letter knowledge, and decoding

Kindergarten End of year

Year to Year changes in measure of oral vocabulary
Year to Year improvement in % of students at “grade level” in oral vocabulary in grades Kindergarten through Third
Other patterns that might be observed, and that would have clear implications for focus and professional development

1\textsuperscript{st} Grade growth in decoding $\Rightarrow$ growth in Fluency

2\textsuperscript{nd} Grade growth in fluency $\Rightarrow$ growth in Reading Comprehension

3\textsuperscript{rd} grade -- 60% of students are at grade level in reading fluency, but only 45% are at grade level in reading comprehension
Year to Year changes in performance on the PSF, NWF, and ORF tests on DIBELS at the end of First Grade

Are they really doing that much better in phonemic awareness and phonemic decoding than in reading fluency?
When comparing performance across measures, it is very important to know that you are using equivalent standards for “grade level” performance on each measure - setting bar at the same height

Percentile ranks derived from DIBELS norms for end of year targets in PSF, NWF, and ORF at end of first grade

PSF = 13\textsuperscript{th} percentile
NWF = 29\textsuperscript{th} percentile
ORF = 35\textsuperscript{th} percentile

1. Examining state level trends across measures for purposes of planning state wide professional development and support

Looking at year to year improvements on different measures as well as relative levels of performance on different measures

Examining performance on different measures across grade levels

If progress monitoring measures are available, examining growth within a year at different grade levels – looking for grade level weaknesses
Percent of Students at “grade level” in Reading Comprehension, Oral Reading Fluency, and Oral Vocabulary in grades 1-3, 584 schools from 3 cohorts—1st through 3rd year schools
Percent of Students at “grade level” in Reading Comprehension, Oral Reading Fluency, and Oral Vocabulary in grades 1-3 – 318 schools after three years
There are two possible measurement problems associated with this comparison.

The DIBELS end of year targets, because of the way they were developed, correspond to different percentile ranks across grades:

- 1\text{st} grade = 35\text{th} percentile
- 2\text{nd} grade = 39\text{th} percentile
- 3\text{rd} grade = 40\text{th} percentile
The DIBELS norms seem to set a higher standard at the 40th percentile than other norms—particularly at 2nd and 3rd grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>DIBELS norms</th>
<th>H&amp;T norms</th>
<th>Aimsweb norms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>45wpm</td>
<td>43wpm</td>
<td>45wpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>91wpm</td>
<td>79wpm</td>
<td>85wpm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>110wpm</td>
<td>96wpm</td>
<td>102wpm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent of Students at “grade level” in RC, ORF, and Vocab in grades 1-3 using Hasbrook and Tindal ORF norms and 40th percentile as goal
1. Examining state level trends across measures for purposes of planning state wide professional development and support

Looking at year to year improvements on different measures as well as relative levels of performance on different measures

Examining performance on different measures across grade levels

If progress monitoring measures are available, examining growth within a year at different grade levels – looking for grade level weaknesses
## Summary of Instructional Effects in Grades K-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>% “Intensive”</th>
<th>% “on grade level”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>reduced 4.3</td>
<td>increased 26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Grade</td>
<td>increased 6.0</td>
<td>decreased 20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Grade</td>
<td>increased 17.4</td>
<td>decreased 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade</td>
<td>decreased 7.1</td>
<td>increased 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some outcomes in first grade that led us to be worried about the quality and power of our “differentiated instruction”
Progress Monitoring & Reporting Network: Reports

State Progress Report

District: RF Only
School: RF Only
Class: All
Grade: 1st Grade
Probe: Nonsense Word Fluency
Student: All
Assessment: 4
School Year: 2005-2006
Date/Time: 8/19/2006 2:01 PM

Correct Letters Sounds in a Minute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>1st Quartile</th>
<th>3rd Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58895</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>58898</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59059</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>58923</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select a District: [Select]

Show Grade Summary Report
Looking at growth in phonemic decoding in 20 RF schools that had different success in meeting targets for Oral Reading Fluency.

10 high performing schools
10 low performing schools

Similar scores on NWF at beginning of the year
Percentage of students meeting benchmarks in 1st Grade NWF for High ECI and Low ECI Reading First Schools
Download at:

Or, just go to the FCRR website (www.fcrr.org) and its listed on the home page under the new stuff
Using Reading outcome data to make decisions about district and state focus to improve school performance

Two kinds of analysis

1. Examining trends across measures for purposes of planning professional development and support

2. Examining differences in performance across schools for purposes of planning and implementing differentiated support
There are at least three important ways to examine school performance in RF schools:

1. Year to year changes in % of students at “grade level” and % of students at “high risk”
2. Absolute levels of performance, in terms of % of students at grade level and % of students at “high risk”
3. “Value added” analysis that takes into consideration the “degree of difficulty” as indexed by student demographics
## Identifying “Focus Schools” in Cohorts 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>YYGL-13</th>
<th>YYHR-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compares % at grade level in Year 1 with % at Grade Level in Year 3 – positive numbers mean improvement</td>
<td>Compares % at High Risk in Year 1 with % at High Risk in Year 3 – positive numbers mean improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Identifying “Focus Schools” in Cohorts 1

## Cohort 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Code</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Number with 0 or less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YYGL-13-K</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYGL-13-1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYGL-13-2</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYGL-13-3</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYGL-13-C</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYHR-13-K</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYHR-13-1</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYHR-13-2</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYHR-13-3</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YYHR-13-C</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of schools with scores greater than zero on both indices = 239, or 75% - 79 “focus schools”


Relationship of “school challenge” to student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of School Challenge based on % of students qualifying for FR lunch</th>
<th>% of 1-3 Students Performing At Grade Level at the End of Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

587 RF schools in Florida

Average % at GL

Increasing Challenge

Decreasing Performance
The Adult Learning and Performance Gap

% of 1-3 Students Performing At Grade Level at the End of Year

Level of School Challenge based on % of students qualifying for FR lunch

Approx. 27%

Approx. 20%
One possible way to identify schools as candidates for extra support

Not making adequate year to improvements in % of students at “grade level” and reductions in % of students at “High risk”

Seriously underperforming when student demographics are taken into account
Questions/Discussion