Wisconsin Reading Corps is based on the successful Minnesota Reading Corps, the largest AmeriCorps tutoring program in the country. A rigorous study conducted by the University of Chicago confirms that Reading Corps is a proven model that significantly accelerates literacy achievement for children age 3 to grade 3. By combining the people power of AmeriCorps with evidence-based practices, Reading Corps tutors in Wisconsin are part of a multi-state effort helping more than 40,000 struggling students learn to read each year. ServeMinnesota provides the evaluation, training, and technical support to ensure fidelity of Reading Corps implementation across the country.
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Executive Summary

Reading Corps is an AmeriCorps program that provides trained literacy tutors to support reading development for students in PreKindergarten through grade 3. In the 2015-16 school year, Wisconsin Reading Corps worked with students in Kindergarten through grade 3. Reading Corps tutors are trained to implement evidence-based literacy instruction and assessment protocols. Tutors are supported by a multi-level coaching model that includes site-based (“Internal”) and external (“Master”) coaches.

Tutors at the Kindergarten through grade 3 level work with approximately 15-18 at-risk students for 20 minutes each day. The research-based tutoring interventions are supplemental to the core reading instruction provided at each school. The goal of the tutoring is to accelerate student growth so that they catch up to their grade level targets.

The Reading Corps evaluation addresses four broad questions with data collected during the 2015-16 school year.

1. What is the scope of the Reading Corps program in Wisconsin?

Nineteen Reading Corps tutors served 338 students at eight sites. On average, students received 20 weeks of tutoring with an average of 72 minutes per week.

2. How accurately is the Reading Corps program implemented in Wisconsin?

Reading Corps Master Coaches and Internal Coaches observed tutors administering assessments and delivering interventions throughout the school year. These observations allow for coaches to build on the tutor’s formal training and to help tutors improve their implementation of the Reading Corps model. The results of the observations show that the majority of the assessments and interventions were conducted with high levels of mean fidelity (>90% accuracy), indicating the program was implemented as intended.

3. What are the primary outcomes of Reading Corps in Wisconsin?

Weekly progress monitoring scores for participating students demonstrated that 70% of students had a weekly growth rate exceeding the target growth, which means these students were closing their individual achievement gap and catching up to their grade level targets.

4. What do key stakeholders and implementers report regarding how participation in Reading Corps has affected their beliefs, opinions, and/or professional practices?

Internal Coaches, administrators, teachers, and tutors reported that participation in Reading Corps had a positive impact on both their students and their site. Teachers responded that tutors are a valuable component of their school’s reading resources, and administrators reported that they would recommend Reading Corps to others in their network.
Background of Reading Corps

Reading Corps is an AmeriCorps program that provides trained literacy tutors to support reading development for students in PreKindergarten through grade 3. In the 2015-2016 school year, Reading Corps worked with students in Kindergarten through grade 3 in Wisconsin. Reading Corps tutors are trained to implement evidence-based literacy instruction and assessment protocols. Tutors are supported by a multi-level coaching model that includes site-based ("Internal") and external ("Master") coaches.

The vision of Reading Corps is to broadly impact literacy outcomes for children, with the following primary goals:

- All children, age 3 to grade 3, who qualify for Reading Corps, will have access to Reading Corps and will meet reading standards by third grade.
- AmeriCorps tutors, through the training, development, and service opportunity provided by Reading Corps, will pursue education related careers and/or continue to be ambassadors for children’s literacy throughout their lives.
- Schools and community institutions/organizations, through their experiences with Reading Corps, will understand and incorporate the Reading Corps methods for increasing literacy; those institutions will, in turn, build awareness of Reading Corps literacy interventions with their colleagues.

Evidence

Over two school years, external researchers from the University of Chicago independently evaluated Reading Corps and found meaningful, significant effects across ages. Students who participated in Reading Corps accelerated their literacy skills and performed better than comparable students who did not. Moreover, students of color, students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch, and English Language Learners made noteworthy gains toward closing their learning gap. Reading Corps is an effective model for improving student literacy outcomes.

Research-based Service Delivery

The Reading Corps model aligns with Response-to-Intervention (RTI) or Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS), which are two descriptions of a framework for delivering educational services effectively and efficiently. The key aspects of that alignment include the following:

- Clear literacy targets at each level from PreKindergarten through grade 3

• Benchmark assessment three times a year to identify students eligible for individualized interventions

• Evidence-based interventions

• Frequent progress monitoring during intervention delivery

• High-quality training in program procedures, coaching, and observations to support fidelity of implementation

In the RTI, or MTSS framework, data play the key roles of screening student eligibility for additional services and monitoring student progress towards achieving academic goals (i.e., benchmarks). Reading Corps screens students for program eligibility three times a year (i.e., fall, winter, spring) using empirically-derived grade- and content-specific performance benchmarks. Eligible students (defined as students scoring below target scores) are determined potential candidates to receive supplemental Reading Corps support.

Reading Corps is focused on intervention in the “Big Five Ideas in Literacy” as identified by the National Reading Panel, including phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Full-time tutors in Kindergarten through grade 3 work with approximately 15-18 at-risk students for 20 minutes each day. The tutoring interventions align with the Big Five literacy targets\(^3\) and are supplemental to the core reading instruction provided at each school. The goal of the tutoring is to raise individual students’ literacy levels so that they are on track to meet or exceed the next program-specified literacy benchmark.

**Coaching and Support**

As mentioned above, Reading Corps provides multiple layers of supervision to ensure integrity of program implementation. Site-specific Internal Coaches, who are typically staff literacy specialists, teachers, or curriculum directors, serve as immediate on-site supervisors, mentors, and advocates for tutors. The Internal Coach’s role is to monitor tutors and provide guidance in the implementation of Reading Corps’s assessments and interventions. As the front-line supervisor, the Internal Coach is a critical component of the supervisory structure.

The external, or Master Coach, is a literacy expert who provides site staff (i.e., Internal Coaches and AmeriCorps tutors) with expert consultation on literacy instruction and ensures implementation integrity of Reading Corps program elements. In addition to these two coaching layers, a third layer consisting of AmeriCorps program support helps ensure a

---


successful year of AmeriCorps service. Program support staff are Reading Corps employees who provide administrative oversight for program implementation to sites participating in Reading Corps.

Training

Prior to the start of each school year, Reading Corps hosts a three-day Institute to train returning and new Master Coaches, Internal Coaches, and AmeriCorps tutors. This intensive, information-filled training provides foundational training in the research-based literacy interventions employed by Reading Corps. During several sessions at the Institute, tutors learn the skills, knowledge, and tools needed to serve as literacy interventionists. Tutors are provided with detailed literacy manuals as well as online resources that mirror and supplement the contents of the manual (e.g., videos of model interventions and best practices). Both the manuals and online resources are intended to provide tutors with just-in-time support and opportunities for continued professional development and skill refinement. Additional training and coaching sessions are provided throughout the tutors' year of service.
Overview of the Evaluation

The Reading Corps evaluation addresses four broad questions with data collected during the school year. The evaluation report is organized around each of these questions. Data for the evaluation are collected and recorded by the implementers of Reading Corps. Program administrators collect data about tutors and sites, including survey responses. Tutors collect data about student dosage and literacy outcomes. Coaches collect specific details about tutor implementation of interventions and assessments. These data are used to answer the following questions:

1. **What is the scope of the Reading Corps program in Wisconsin?**

2. **How accurately is the Reading Corps program implemented in Wisconsin?**

3. **What are the primary outcomes of Reading Corps in Wisconsin?**

4. **What do key stakeholders and implementers report regarding how participation in Reading Corps has affected their beliefs, opinions, and/or professional practices?**

Appendices to the report provide additional details regarding the Reading Corps Assessments and Interventions.

   - Appendix A: K-3 Assessment Measures and Procedures
   - Appendix B: Assessment Research Base
   - Appendix C: Intervention Research Base
1. What is the scope of the Reading Corps program in Wisconsin?

Tutors and Students

2015-16 was the first year Reading Corps tutors served in Wisconsin. As summarized in Table 1, 19 tutors served at 8 different sites.

Table 1: Number of Sites, Coaches, and Tutors Serving During the 2015-16 School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Internal Coaches</th>
<th>Master Coaches</th>
<th>Number of Tutors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Defined as having entered tutoring minutes for at least one student in the Reading Corps data management system.

Table 2 displays the number of students tutored in 2015-16. Reading Corps sites appeared to focus on tutoring students in grades 1-3, as Kindergarten had the least number of students tutored.

Table 2: Number of Students Tutored

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade K</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reading Corps tutors record the demographic information of students they tutor. Table 3 shows that 98% were students of color and about one in twenty were identified as English Language Learners.

Table 3: Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Background</th>
<th>English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52.1% Female 47.9% Male</td>
<td>81.7% Black or African American 8.9% Hispanic/Latino 3.6% Asian 3.3% Multi-Racial 2.4% White 0.3% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5.6% Yes 93.8% No 0.6% Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutoring Dosage

Tutors work with students every day for 20 minutes. Table 4 shows that students were tutored for an average of 72 minutes per week. Kindergarten students averaged less tutoring sessions and weeks of tutoring than the older grades, potentially due to faster growth and subsequent exit from tutoring.

*Table 4: Tutoring Dosage by Grade*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Students Tutored</th>
<th>Average Tutoring Sessions</th>
<th>Average Tutoring Weeks</th>
<th>Average Tutoring Minutes Per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade K</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How accurately is the Reading Corps program implemented in Wisconsin?

Ensuring accurate, effective implementation is a core principle of Reading Corps. In addition to formal training sessions, ongoing coaching is provided throughout the school year. In coaching sessions, Reading Corps Master Coaches and Internal Coaches observe tutors administering assessments and delivering interventions. These observations allow for coaches to build on the tutor’s formal training and to help tutors improve their implementation of the Reading Corps model.

Coaches are required to observe tutors administering each assessment at least three times per year, prior to collecting seasonal benchmark data. If tutors do not properly administer the assessment, coaches will provide targeted training and observe the tutor delivering the assessment again. Ongoing observation and coaching continues until the tutor achieves over 90% accuracy. This process helps to ensure assessment data are properly collected and that the results accurately measure each student’s literacy skills.

Coaches are also expected to observe tutors administering interventions. These observations provide an opportunity for coaches to provide ongoing tutor training and to ensure the interventions are delivered effectively and in accordance with their evidence base.

Coaching Sessions

Table 5 displays the total number of assessment and intervention coaching sessions conducted by Master Coaches and Internal Coaches during the 2015-16 school year and the average number of coaching sessions each tutor received. The average number of assessment observation sessions is right around the expectation of three sessions per tutor, showing that tutors are being observed before each benchmark window.

The number of intervention observation sessions shows that tutors are being observed at least once per month, implying that most tutors are receiving consistent coaching and support.

Table 5: Observation Sessions by Internal and Master Coaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th></th>
<th>Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Observation Sessions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average Observations per Tutor</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Observation Sessions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tutor Fidelity

After completing each assessment and intervention fidelity observation, coaches enter the number of checklist items that the tutor delivered correctly into an online data system. The percent fidelity is then calculated by dividing the number of items delivered correctly by the total number of items.

Table 6 displays the range and average fidelity for each assessment. High levels of average fidelity were noted for all measures (at least 94%), meaning 94% or more of the steps involved in administering the assessments were completed accurately. These high levels of fidelity imply the assessment data collected by Reading Corps tutors accurately reflect the literacy skills the assessments were designed to measure.

Table 6: Fidelity of Assessment Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Total Checks Collected</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test of Letter Names</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77-100%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Letter Sounds</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62-100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Nonsense Words (Eng.)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69-100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBMReading</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85-100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from Table 7 show that four of the ten interventions had high levels of fidelity (at least 90%), meaning they were regularly implemented as intended. Given that each intervention has an extensive evidence-base (see Appendix C), this indicates the interventions were implemented in accordance with their established evidence base. The other six interventions had average fidelity below 90%, suggesting a need for improved training and coaching for these interventions. It should be noted that some interventions were used infrequently, as indicated by few completed fidelity checks.
Table 7: Fidelity of Intervention Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Total Checks Completed</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blending Words</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56-100%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duet Reading</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>45-100%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Leaps</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>67-100%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter/Sound Correspondence</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newscaster Reading</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50-100%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pencil Tap</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42-100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoneme Blending</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78-100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoneme Segmenting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70-100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated Reading with Comprehension Strategy Practice</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48-100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop/Go</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83-85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What are the primary outcomes of Reading Corps in Wisconsin?

**Measures of Early Literacy**

Data for literacy outcomes are reported from student performance on measures of early literacy that are designed for students in Kindergarten through grade 3. The measures assess phonics skills (i.e., knowing letter names, sounds, and simple word-level phonetic relationships) and reading fluency skills (i.e., how well the student reads connected text). The specific measures are listed below (see Appendix B for the research base):

- Test of Letter Names
- Test of Letter Sounds
- Test of Nonsense Words (English)
- CBMReading (measure of oral reading fluency)

The measures are administered by Reading Corps tutors at each screening period or “benchmark window” (fall, winter, and spring). Tutors assess students who were previously tutored by Reading Corps and students identified by classroom teachers as potential candidates for tutoring. Benchmark scores are compared to seasonal grade level targets that predict future reading success. Students who score below target are eligible to receive Reading Corps tutoring (see Appendix A for more information).

The literacy assessments are also used to measure the progress of students while they are receiving tutoring. Tutors “progress monitor” each student they are tutoring one time per week and track their progress toward the proficiency targets. Students’ weekly scores are used by coaches to determine if students have made enough progress to “exit” the program and no longer receive tutoring.

**Student Performance**

A student’s weekly progress monitoring score allows the program to measure their growth while receiving tutoring. This growth can be compared to the measures “target growth” which is the amount of weekly growth a student who is on target in the fall would need to maintain throughout the year to remain on target in the spring.

A basic premise of Reading Corps in K-3 is that students are below their grade level target, and thus need growth rates above target growth if they are going to meet future grade level targets. In other words, these students need to make more than a year’s worth of growth if they are going to “catch up” and close their individual achievement gap.

Table 8 displays the average weekly growth rate for students receiving at least three weeks of Reading Corps tutoring compared to the target growth rate. For all measures, the
average growth rate exceeded the target growth, meaning the average student was closing their individual achievement gap and on pace to make more than a year’s worth of growth.

The last row of Table 8 shows the percentage of students who had an above target growth rate. About 70% of all students tutored were catching up to their grade level targets, with Kindergarten and Grade 3 having the highest percentage of students above target growth. Slightly less than half of Grade 1 students had above target growth for CBMReading, reflecting the potential for further improvement in accelerating reading growth for students in this grade.

**Table 8: Participant Average Growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade K</th>
<th>Grade 1</th>
<th>Grade 1*</th>
<th>Grade 2</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test of Letter Sounds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Growth per Week</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Growth per Week</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students**</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Above Target Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Above Target Growth</td>
<td>85.07%</td>
<td>70.45%</td>
<td>48.48%</td>
<td>58.14%</td>
<td>82.52%</td>
<td>69.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students in this group may have also participated in Grade 1 Test of Nonsense Words (Eng.).
**Students must have at least 3 progress monitoring data points to be included in the growth rate calculations.

Figures 1-5 visually represent the average student growth rate (blue line) compared to the target growth (yellow line). The figures show that the average student started below target in the fall and in some cases, well below target. They also show that for all five measures, the average student achieved above target growth and was closer to the grade level target in the fall than they were in the spring. In Kindergarten Letter Sounds and Grade 1 Nonsense Words (English), the average student achieved enough growth to be above target by the spring.
**Figure 1: Kindergarten Letter Sound Growth**

- **Student on Target**: Words Read Correct per Minute
- **Average Growth**: Words Read Correct per Minute

- **Week**: 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30, 33
- **Words Read Correct per Minute**: 0, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100

- **Target Growth per Week**: 2.37 average growth per week
- **Average Growth per Week**: 1.21 target growth per week

**Figure 2: Grade 1 Nonsense Word (English) Growth**

- **Student on Target**: Words Read Correct per Minute
- **Average Growth**: Words Read Correct per Minute

- **Week (Fall to Winter)**: 0, 3, 6, 9, 12, 15
- **Words Read Correct per Minute**: 0, 20, 40, 60, 80

- **Target Growth per Week**: 1.59 target growth per week
- **Average Growth per Week**: 2.62 average growth per week
Figure 3: Grade 1 CBMReading Growth

![Grade 1 CBMReading Growth Graph]

- 1.88 target growth per week
- 1.91 average growth per week

Figure 4: Grade 2 CBMReading Growth

![Grade 2 CBMReading Growth Graph]

- 1.61 target growth per week
- 1.79 average growth per week
Table 9 provides information about the percentage of students who successfully exit the Reading Corps program by meeting grade level targets who then later meet the spring benchmark near the end of the school year (see Appendix A for more information on the Reading Corps targets). This is an important measure on students’ maintenance of the reading skills they developed during tutoring. In total, 53% of students who exited the program also met or exceeded the spring benchmark target score.

Table 9: Percentage of Students Who Exit and Also Meet the Spring Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Number Exited*</th>
<th>Exited and Have a Spring Benchmark</th>
<th>Exited and Met Spring Benchmark</th>
<th>Percent Exited and Met Spring Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.01%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*“Exited” indicates student progress was at or above expected grade-level trajectories for skill improvement. Practically, Reading Corps determines at or above grade-level trajectory as having 3-5 consecutive weekly points above a target growth line plus 2 points above an upcoming seasonal benchmark target score.
4. What do key stakeholders and implementers report regarding how participation in Reading Corps has affected their beliefs, opinions, and/or professional practices?

In the spring of each program year, Reading Corps staff distribute an online survey to tutors, Internal Coaches, site administrators, and classroom teachers of participating students.

The survey – tailored to each role within Reading Corps – asks a wide-range of questions regarding the implementation and impact of Reading Corps during the past year. Each question asks the respondent to rate their agreement with various statements by selecting if they “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, “Disagree”, or “Strongly Disagree” or have “No Opinion”.

For the 2015-16 school year, Reading Corps received complete survey responses from the following stakeholders and implementers:

- 14 tutors – 100% response rate
- 7 Internal Coach – 55% response rate
- 1 administrator – 13% response rate
- 11 teachers – 18% response rate

**Reading Corps Impact**

Two of the most important questions on the survey are each respondent’s opinion of the impact Reading Corps had on their students and on their site. Figure 6 displays the percent of each type of respondent who agrees or strongly agrees that Reading Corps had a positive impact on students. Figure 7 displays the percent of each type of respondent who agrees or strongly agrees that Reading Corps had a positive impact on sites.

Nearly all respondents agree that Reading Corps is having a positive impact on students and sites. Tutors were the only role that was not in 100% agreement, though the results were still strong with 93% of respondents agreeing that Reading Corps had a positive impact on their students and site.
Figure 6: Survey Respondents Opinion Regarding the Impact on their Students

Participation in Reading Corps had a positive impact on our students.
Percent Strongly Agree or Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Internal Coach</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Survey Respondents Opinion Regarding the Impact on their Site

Participation in Reading Corps had a positive impact on our sites.
Percent Strongly Agree or Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Internal Coach</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Systems and Tutor Impact

In addition to looking at the broad impact on students and sites, the survey questions also address whether Reading Corps achieved its primary goals:

- All children, age 3 to grade 3, who qualify for Reading Corps, will have access to Reading Corps and will meet reading standards by third grade.
- AmeriCorps tutors, through the training, development, and service opportunity provided by Reading Corps, will pursue education related careers and/or continue to be ambassadors for children's literacy throughout their lives.
- Schools and community institutions/organizations, through their experiences with Reading Corps, will understand and incorporate the Reading Corps methods for increasing literacy; those institutions will, in turn, build awareness of Reading Corps literacy interventions with their colleagues.

Table 10 and Table 11 show that the all of Internal Coaches and administrators respondents agree that Reading Corps is having a positive impact on sites in the areas of literacy interventions and assessments, the use of data to drive instruction, and the use of research-based strategies. In perhaps the strongest endorsement, nearly all Internal Coach and administrator respondents would recommend the Reading Corps program to others.

**Table 10: Additional Internal Coach Survey Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps supports our site in implementing a rigorous, aligned, and developmentally appropriate system of literacy interventions and assessments.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps participation has accelerated our strategic use of data to drive literacy instruction and intervention.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps fosters successful schools through the use of research-based strategies.</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps training and experience provides meaningful preparation for tutors interested in entering the field of education.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend the Reading Corps program to others in my network.</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Additional Building Administrator Systems Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps supports our site in implementing a rigorous, aligned, and developmentally appropriate system of literacy interventions and assessments.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps participation has accelerated our strategic use of data to drive literacy instruction and intervention.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps fosters successful schools through the use of research-based strategies.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps training and experience provides meaningful preparation for tutors interested in entering the field of education.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend the Reading Corps program to others in my network.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that 100% of teachers feel positive about having their students participate in Reading Corps. This is an important outcome as teachers are an essential component of student selection and the scheduling of interventions. The teachers also reported that Reading Corps has a positive impact on both participating students’ confidence in reading and love of reading.
Table 12: Additional Teacher Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel positive about having students in my classroom participate in interventions through Reading Corps.</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Corps tutors are a valuable component of our school’s reading resources.</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Reading Corps increased students’ confidence in reading.</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Reading Corps increased students’ love of reading.</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the positive outcomes reported for students and sites, Table 13 shows Reading Corps also benefits tutors. 100% of tutors reported that participation in Reading Corps had a positive impact on them personally. After their service, many tutors are considering a career in teaching or education and nearly all tutors are dedicated to the ongoing promotion of childhood literacy.

Table 13: Additional Tutor Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Reading Corps had a positive impact on me this school year.</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Reading Corps increased students’ confidence in reading.</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Reading Corps increased students’ love of reading.</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am considering a career in teaching or education.</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am dedicated to ongoing promotion of childhood literacy.</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Kindergarten through Grade 3 Assessment Measures and Procedures

The following table depicts which measures are used at each grade across the school year. **BOLDED** measures are used to progress monitor (Grade 1 students are monitored for progress with two measures during part of the winter).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Names</td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Names</td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Sounds</td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Sounds</td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Test of Nonsense Words (English)</td>
<td>▪ Test of Nonsense Words (English)</td>
<td>▪ Test of Nonsense Words (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>▪ Test of Letter Sounds</td>
<td>▪ Test of Nonsense Words (English)</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Test of Nonsense Words (English)</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
<td>▪ CBMReading (3 passages)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each eligibility assessment, a target score was identified as the goal for the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. The original Reading Corps target scores using AIMSweb brand passages were based on research conducted at the St. Croix River Education District in Minnesota, which documented the predictive and concurrent validity of these measures with the state reading proficiency assessment. As a result of the strong correlations between performance on the selected AIMSweb fluency measures and the statewide reading assessment, a series of cut scores were originally identified. These original benchmark scores, or target scores, defined levels of performance on the fluency measures that strongly predict future success on the grade 3 statewide reading assessment.

In the 2013-2014 school year, Reading Corps starting using FAST brand passages. With increased performance expectations for 3rd grade students on state accountability tests across the country, the target scores were updated in 2014-2015 to reflect performance that predicts proficient state test performance.

The table below specifies assessments given at each grade level and the FAST benchmark scores for each assessment during several points throughout the school year that maintain their predictive nature with the state reading proficiency assessment targets.
The target scores for each assessment grow across years from Kindergarten to Grade 3, which results in benchmarks for reading performance that students should maintain in order to predict future reading success. Within a single year, these benchmarks are used to establish the rates of growth at which a student should grow to maintain that likelihood of success. For example, the fall Grade 2 target score is 63 on CBM-Reading. The spring Grade 2 target score on this measure is 116. To grow from 63 to 116 in one academic year, a student would need to gain 1.61 words correct per minute per week on the CBM-Reading assessment. Thus, 1.61 words growth per week becomes the expectation for Grade 2 growth rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Fall September 8-25</th>
<th>Winter January 4-22</th>
<th>Spring April 25-May 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>Test of Letter Sounds</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>Test of Nonsense Words (Eng.)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>CBMReading</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>CBMReading</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>CBMReading</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Assessment Research Base

Assessment tools were selected for use in Reading Corps because of their well-established statistical reliability and validity for screening and progress monitoring purposes. The Test of Letter Names, Test of Letter Sounds, Test of Nonsense Words, and Curriculum-based Measures for Reading (CBMReading) are measures of early literacy skills that have been supported by decades of thorough research, most recently as part of the Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST). Reading Corps uses measures from FAST, which are some of the strongest available measures for assessing the skills targeted by Reading Corps. CBMReading provides an assessment of connected text reading. Early and ongoing research on this measure has also been conducted at the University of Minnesota. All these measures fit under the umbrella of "Curriculum-Based Measurement (CBM) and are fluency based assessments, meaning that students respond to an unlimited number of items within a fixed amount of time and the number of correct responses is counted.

The information that follows summarizes empirical findings related to the statistical reliability and validity of the measures used in Reading Corps.

**Test of Letter Names:**
- \( r = .94 \) inter rater reliability
- \( r = .90 \) 2 week test retest reliability
- \( r = .88 \) 1 month alternate reliability
- \( r = .93 \) alternate forms reliability
- \( r = .70 \) with WJ-R Readiness Cluster
- \( r = .70 \) with WJ Psychoeducational Battery
- \( r = .53 \) to \( .58 \) with CTOPP Composite
- Predictive \( r = .65 \) with WJ Total Reading Cluster
- Predictive \( r = .71 \) with R-CBM
- ELL Predictive \( r = .67 \) with a composite of DIBELS NWF and R-CBM

**Sources:**

Haager, D. & Gersten, R (April, 2004). Predictive Validity of DIBELS for English Learners in Urban Schools. DIBELS Summit conference presentation, Albuquerque, NM.


Test of Letter Sounds:
- $r = .83$ 2-week test-retest reliability
- $r = .80$ alternate form reliability
- $r = .79$ with Letter Naming Fluency
- Predictive $r = .72$ with R-CBM

Sources:


Test of Nonsense Words:

- $r = 0.83$ one month alternate form reliability
- $r = 0.36$ to $0.59$ with WJ-R Readiness Cluster
- Predictive $r = 0.82$ with Spring R-CBM in Spring of grade 1
- Predictive $r = 0.65$ with oral reading and $0.54$ with maze in grade 3
- Ell Predictive $r = 0.63$ with a composite of DIBELS NWF and R-CBM

Sources:


- Haager, D. & Gersten, R (April, 2004). Predictive Validity of DIBELS for English Learners in Urban Schools. DIBELS Summit conference presentation, Albuquerque, NM.


Curriculum Based Measurement – Reading (CBMReading):

- r = .92 to .97 test retest reliability
- r = .89 to .94 alternate form reliability
- r = .82 to .86 with Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test
- r = .83 to Iowa Test of Basic Skills
- r = .88 to Stanford Achievement Test
- r = .73 to .80 to Colorado Student Assessment Program
- r = .67 to Michigan Student Assessment Program
- r = .73 to North Carolina Student Assessment Program
- r = .74 to Arizona Student Assessment Program
- r = .61 to .65 to Ohio Proficiency Test, Reading Portion
- r = .58 to .82 with Oregon Student Assessment Program (SAT 10)

Sources:


Appendix C: Intervention Research Base

The interventions used in the Reading Corps program are designed to provide additional practice that is supplemental to the core reading instructional program offered by the local school site. The interventions target automaticity and fluency of important reading skills that have been introduced by local classroom teachers. It is important to note that Reading Corps participation is in addition to, not in replacement of, a comprehensive core reading instructional program, and that the Reading Corps program should in no way be viewed as a substitute for high quality core instruction.

A unique feature of Reading Corps is the consistent use of research-based intervention protocols with participating students to provide this additional support. School-based Internal Coaches select from a menu of research-based supplemental reading interventions for use with participating students as listed below. For each intervention protocol sources of empirical evidence for intervention effectiveness are listed.

Repeated Reading with Comprehension Strategy Practice


• Therrien, W.J. (2004). Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of repeated reading: A meta-analysis. Remedial and Special Education. 25(4) 252-261.


**Duet Reading**


**Newscaster Reading**


Stop Go


Pencil Tap


Great Leaps

• Mercer, Cecil D., Campbell, Kenneth U., Miller, W. David, Mercer, Kenneth D., and Lane, Holly B. Effects of a Reading Fluency Intervention for Middle Schoolers with


Word Blending


Letter Sound Identification


Phonological Awareness Interventions


Phoneme Blending

Wisconsin Reading Corps End-of-Year Evaluation
2015-16


Phoneme Segmentation


