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Background

Oregon Reading First Participant Districts and Schools

- Cohort A: 14 districts and 33 schools
  - Three full years of implementation
- Cohort B: 8 districts and 16 schools
  - One full year of implementation
Impact Analyses

- Cohort A: Improvement over time
  - Year 1 to Year 2 to Year 3
- Cohort A and Cohort B
  - 3 years of implementation compared to 1 year of implementation
Cohort A
Improvement Over Time

- Percent of children at grade level or meeting benchmark performance goals
  - Evidence of impact would be higher rates for year 3 vs. year 2 vs. year 1

- Percent of children at high risk for reading difficulties
  - Evidence of impact would be lower rates for year 3 vs. year 2 vs. year 1
Comparability in Kindergarten at Beginning of Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Letter Naming Fluency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent Reaching Benchmark Goals on DIBELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade K NWF</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1 ORF</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2 ORF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 ORF</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent Reaching Grade Level on High Stakes Measures

Year 1  | Year 2  | Year 3
---------|---------|---------
G K SAT10 | 58      | 60      | 68
G 1 SAT10 | 47      | 53      | 58
G 2 SAT10 | 47      | 50      | 55
G 3 OSA  | 47      | 51      | 53
Percent at High Risk on DIBELS
Percent At High Risk on High Stakes Measures

- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G K SAT-10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1 SAT-10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2 SAT-10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3 OSA</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect Sizes for Large Scale Reading Interventions
(Borman et al., 2003; Borman & D’Agostino (1996, 2001)

![Bar chart showing adjusted effect sizes for Title I, 1 Year, 2 Year, and 3 Years of interventions. The effect sizes are 0.15 for Title I, 0.17 for 1 Year, 0.14 for 2 Year, and 0.15 for 3 Years.](chart.png)
Cohort A Effect Sizes
(Year 3 – Year 1)

Oregon Reading First
Cohort A and Cohort B

- Percent of children at grade level or meeting benchmark performance goals
  - Evidence of impact would be higher rates for greater years of implementation (Cohort A)

- Percent of children at high risk for reading difficulties
  - Evidence of impact would be lower rates for greater years of implementation (Cohort A)
Comparability in Kindergarten at Beginning of Implementation Year 1

Percent At High Risk

Cohort B: 42.5
Cohort A: 41.5
Performance on DIBELS After Year 1 of Implementation

Cohort B  Cohort A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Cohort B</th>
<th>Cohort A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade K NWF</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1 ORF</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2 ORF</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 ORF</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Y3 (Cohort A) and Y1 (Cohort B) on DIBELS

Cohort B Year 1 | Cohort A Year 3

Grade K NWF: 55 78
Grade 1 ORF: 47 59
Grade 2 ORF: 42 55
Grade 3 ORF: 35 50
Percent at High Risk Y3 (Cohort A) and Y1 (Cohort B) on DIBELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Cohort B Year 1</th>
<th>Cohort A Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade K NWF</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1 ORF</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2 ORF</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 ORF</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance on High Stakes Measure After Y1 of Implementation

Cohort B Year 1

Cohort A Year 1

Percent at Grade Level

G K SAT-10

G 1 SAT-10

G 2 SAT-10

G 3 OSA

54 51 46 41

58 47 47 47
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Performance Y3 (Cohort A) and Y1 (Cohort B) on High Stakes Measure

- Cohort B Year 1:
  - G K SAT10: 54
  - G 1 SAT10: 51
  - G 2 SAT10: 46
  - G 3 OSA: 41

- Cohort A Year 3:
  - G K SAT10: 68
  - G 1 SAT10: 58
  - G 2 SAT10: 55
  - G 3 OSA: 53

Percent at Grade Level
Percent at High Risk Y3 (Cohort A) and Y1 (Cohort B) on High Stakes Measures

Cohort B Year 1  Cohort A Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cohort B Y1</th>
<th>Cohort A Y3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G K SAT10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 1 SAT10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 2 SAT10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 3 OSA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effect Sizes
(Cohort A Year 3 – Cohort B Year 1)

Oregon Reading First
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Summary of Preliminary Evidence

- Evidence of increased achievement over years (Cohort A)
- Evidence of improvement for longer implementation duration (three years vs. one year)
- Improvement in performance on multiple reading achievement measures
- Improvement in increasing the percent of children reaching grade level and benchmark goals
- Improvement in reducing the percent of children at high risk for reading difficulties
Effect Sizes for Large Scale Longitudinal Interventions (Borman et al., 2003)

Years of Implementation

1 Year: 0.17
2 Year: 0.14
3 Years: 0.15
4 Years: 0.13
5 Years: 0.25
6 Years: 0.23
7 Years: 0.39
8-14 Years: 0.50
Policy Considerations

1. What role should the Oregon Reading First model play in beginning reading instruction throughout the state?

2. What role should ODE – or the LLSSC – play in directing decisions of districts and schools to build effective, strong beginning reading programs?
Policy Considerations

3. Should the focus on beginning reading programs be on K-3?

4. Should the major goal of beginning reading programs be grade level reading achievement at the end of grade 3?

5. Should outcomes determine school effectiveness in building a strong beginning reading program?
Policy Considerations

6. Should high quality data be used to determine how well students are reading in each grade of K-2?

7. What implications does an Oregon Reading First model have for in-service PD for teachers, coaches, specialists, and school, district, and state leaders?
Policy Considerations

8. What implications does an Oregon Reading First model have for preservice PD for teachers, coaches, specialists, and school, district, and state leaders?

9. What role and responsibilities do institutions of higher education have in helping build the capacity to implement a model of beginning reading instruction based on Oregon Reading First?