Summary of Early Results from the External Evaluation of the
i3 Scale-Up of Reading Recovery

In 2011-12, CPRE conducted approximately 100 interviews with i3 staff, university training center (UTC) directors, teacher leaders (TL), Reading Recovery teachers (RRT), and principals; administered surveys to more than 1500 members of the Reading Recovery community; and coordinated with IDEC to collect ITBS reading scores for over 1,200 students as part of a rigorous impact study. Daily activity logs were submitted by hundreds of i3-trained Reading Recovery teachers, and nine comprehensive case studies were conducted across nine UTC regions. This document summarizes the key emergent themes from these data, focusing on impacts on student performance, quality of training and implementation, and recruitment of new schools and teachers.

Impacts on Student reading Performance

- **Results from a rigorous randomized experiment reveal significant positive effects on student reading and comprehension ITBS scores**

    o **Baseline balance tests confirmed pre-intervention equivalence of treatment and control groups in terms of gender, race, ELL status, and initial text reading level.**

    o **The average impact on ITBS Reading raw scores was .55 standard deviations.**

    o **The average impact on ITBS Comprehension raw scores was .63 standard deviations.**

    o **There is substantial variability in impacts across schools, with the majority of schools showing medium to large positive impacts.**

Quality of RR Training and Supports

- RR teachers report that RR training was transformative in terms of their own instruction and understanding about literacy. Their new skills in assessment and observation, as well as new instructional strategies, are useful not only for their RR lessons but also for their other instructional roles.
- RR teachers view TLs as important and accessible sources of information about literacy instruction and as supports for their own professional growth.

- Reading Recovery teachers report great satisfaction with their decision to become RRTs. Even teachers who face challenges generally express excitement about their impact on student achievement and value their roles as RRTs.

Consortium for Policy Research in Education
University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education
3440 Market Street, Suite 560, Philadelphia, PA 19104

Implementation

- Overwhelmingly, RR teachers report faithful implementation of the RR intervention.

- Staffing models vary across i3 RR schools. Reading Recovery teachers play a range of roles in their schools, from full-day RRTs; to half RRT/half-kindergarten classroom teacher; to ESL teacher, SPED teacher, or interventionist.

- RR teachers report meaningful communication with other teachers in their schools, primarily first-grade teachers. Much of this communication takes the form of informal discussions about RR strategies that can be used in the classroom.

Data utilization

- Many Reading Recovery teachers report that their progress data is utilized during the referral process for students who do not discontinue successfully.

- RRTs most frequently report that they monitor the progress of discontinued students one to three times per month.

- Ninety-eight percent of Reading Recovery teachers report using progress monitoring data to inform parents of student progress.

Recruitment

- Each UTC has developed a distinct staffing model and recruitment approach that seeks to leverage local opportunities for recruitment, while addressing unique obstacles to recruitment.

- Recruitment efforts vary in the degree to which they reflect long-range strategic thinking, and in the degree to which UTC staff leverage pre-existing social, political, and fiscal resources.

- Many UTCs' initial focus has been on reviving previously active RR sites and expanding existing implementations.

- Some UTCs have improved recruiting by deviating from common practice. Creative strategies have been used to remove obstacles to participation in i3 for schools and districts.