



ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Each reading program will be scored using a rubric. A response must meet **all** the criteria in each scored area to be included on the K-3 MOWR vetted reading program list. Peer Review will be noted but does not disqualify overall approval.

Study: Mixed Methods Evaluation of Scholastic Literacy in a South Carolina Public School District Date of Study: August 2023 Grade Levels of Study: 2-5 Core Program's Marketed Name: Scholastic Literacy		
	Rating or Measure Select: Y or N	Rationale
ESSA Evidence Tier	Y	Tier 3- due to p values for clustering students.
Independent Researchers (Y/N)	Y	Johns Hopkins School of Education Center for Research and Reform in Education (CRRE)
Established Measure (Y/N)	Y	This study analyzed reading progress monitoring assessments from the 2022-23 school year in the South Carolina school district. Specifically, Reading RIT Growth scores from NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment were analyzed in these quantitative achievement analyses. Quantitative achievement data included NWEA MAP reading scores and demographic data from the school district, as well as reading achievement scores from a virtual control group (VCG), as provided by a NWEA Similar Schools Report (SSR).
Sample Size	Y	2,665 Grades 2-5 students from across 12 elementary schools located in South Carolina. The student population consisted mainly of Black (34%) and Hispanic (32%) students, with a slightly smaller percentage of White (26%) students.

		<p>2nd (n=663)</p> <p>3rd (n=681)</p> <p>4th (n=689)</p> <p>5th (n=632)</p> <p>Treatment sample includes students with 2022 Fall BOY MAP data and 2023 Spring EOY MAP data.</p>
Research Design	Y	<p>A quasi-experimental design (QED) was used to compare reading achievement of Scholastic Literacy students to matched comparison student data obtained from a Similar Schools Report provided by NWEA, through district leaders. Mixed-methods study- The qualitative study portion broadly focused on the implementation of, and instructional practices used with Scholastic Literacy in a public school district in South Carolina, as well as teacher and student attitudes towards Scholastic Literacy, perceived impact on student engagement and achievement, and program support and professional development.</p>
Outcome	Y	<p><u>Average MAP Reading Scores</u></p> <p>Fall-to-spring gains for Scholastic Literacy students were generally comparable to or slightly larger than gains for virtual comparison students. Scholastic Literacy students outgained comparison students by slightly less than 1 point in Grades 3 and 4, while Grade 5 Scholastic students outgained comparison students by approximately one-half point. Virtual comparison students slightly outgained Scholastic students in Grade 2, but only by about one-tenth of a point.</p> <p>A small positive impact of Scholastic Literacy on student reading achievement was observed across the entire sample. The magnitude of this impact was 0.55 points but did not quite reach statistical significance ($p = .085$). Significant positive impacts were observed for Grades 3 and 4 students, with Scholastic Literacy students in these grades outgaining their virtual comparison counterparts by nearly 1 point at each grade level. No other significant program impacts were observed. It is important to note that, when school-level clustering was not taken into account, the main Scholastic Literacy impact on MAP Reading score gains was statistically significant ($p < .001$).</p>

		<p><u>MAP Reading Gains</u></p> <p>Across all students, Scholastic students averaged slightly more than 0.5 points larger score gains on the MAP Reading assessment than did virtual comparison students. This overall difference was significant at $p < .10$ but not at $p < .05$. after taking school-level clustering into account¹. When breaking down by grade level, Scholastic Literacy students in Grades 3 and 4 significantly outgained virtual comparison students, with slightly smaller than 1-point larger gains evidenced for Scholastic Literacy students at both grade levels. Grade 5 students outgained virtual comparison students by slightly more than 0.5 points, and virtual comparison students slightly outgained Scholastic Literacy students in Grade 2; however, neither of these differences reached statistical significance. All p values are adjusted for school-level clustering.</p> <p><u>MAP Reading Gain by Subgroup</u></p> <p>A significant positive impact of Scholastic Literacy was evidenced by White students, with an advantage of 2.5 points for Scholastic Literacy students in this subgroup. A significant negative impact was also found for special education students, although the sample size was fairly small, relative to the entire sample. No other significant program impacts were evidenced across student subgroups of interest in Scholastic Literacy students. White $n=697$ $P < .001$, SPED $n=398$ $P < .001$. When school-level clustering is not taken into account, this impact is statistically significant ($p = .001$).</p> <p><u>MAP Reading Gain by Prior Achievement</u></p> <p>Significant positive program impacts were observed for students with high prior reading achievement, with high prior achievement students outscoring virtual comparison students by nearly 1.4 points. High $n=496$ $P < .001$.</p>
Effect Size	Y (If student clustering is taken away then the p value is less than .001).	Scholastic Literacy students slightly outgained comparison students identified by NWEA's Similar Schools Report, by 0.55 points. This advantage approached, but did not reach, statistical significance ($p = .085$). When school-level clustering was not considered in analyses, this advantage was statistically significant ($p = .001$).

*Peer Review (Y/N)	Y	
--------------------	---	--

MOWR Committee completed review.

MOWR Committee findings:

- Meets ESSA Evidence Tier 3.
- Must note that the research included student clustering data below required p value but also included non-student clustering data that had p value below .001.
- Will be added to the MOWR Core Program Vetted List.