



Partnering with Iowa's Local Schools



# Early Literacy Implementation – Intervention List

December 2014

# Agenda - Outcomes

---

- ▶ Outcomes for today are to understand the---
  1. Purpose of the Early Literacy Intervention List
  2. Process of developing criteria
  3. Process of applying criteria
  4. Results of review
  5. Next steps in this work

# Purpose of Early Literacy Intervention List

---

To identify evidence-based interventions at the classwide, targeted and intensive levels of support.

# Process of developing criteria

---

February 2014 – April 2014

- ▶ Established Task & Vetting Groups
- ▶ Identified National Expert(s)
- ▶ Developed and vetted criteria
- ▶ Developed and released RFI/RFP

# Process of developing criteria

## TASK & VETTING GROUPS:

TASK GROUP	VETTING GROUP
<p>To establish criteria, review rubric, and process to review universal, targeted and intensive programs and interventions as outlined in 279.68.</p>	<p>To provide feedback, guidance and input on products and processes developed by the task group.</p>
<p>Jennifer Adkins, Isbelia Arzola, Sarah Brown, Sue Daker, Michelle Hosp, <u>Laura Justice</u>, Sandy Nelson, Brad Niebling, Barbara Ohlund, <u>Andy Porter</u>, Wendy Robinson, <b>Jeanne Wanzek</b></p>	<p>Jennifer Adkins , Colleen Anderson, Isbelia Arzola , Sarah Brown, Michael Bunde, Kim Buryanek, Sue Daker, Lea Davidson, Kris Donnelly, Mark Draper, Lindsay Grow, Lou Ann Gvist, Deb Hindman, Michelle Hosp, <u>Laura Justice</u>, Becky Miles-Polka, Sandy Nelson, Brad Niebling, Barbara Ohlund, Doug Penno, <u>Andy Porter</u>, Claudia Reyes-Fry, Wendy Robinson, Kim Rost, Melissa Schnurr, Terri Schofield, Dana Schon, Christopher Schulz, Judith Spitzli, Denise Terry, <b>Jeanne Wanzek</b></p>

# Process of developing criteria

---

## NATIONAL EXPERT(S)

- ❑ People put names forward for K-6 Criteria, Early Childhood Criteria, and standards alignment
  - ▶ Task group and IRRC Advisory Council
- ❑ Gathered Vita for all experts
- ❑ Ranked them, discussed, made contact
- ❑ Jeannie Wanzek from Florida State University and the Florida Center for Reading Research
- ❑ Laura Justice from The Ohio State University
- ❑ Andy Porter from University of Pennsylvania

# Process of developing criteria

---

## THE CRITERIA

- ❑ INTERVENTION REVIEW
  - ▶ General Information
  - ▶ Teacher Usability
- ❑ TECHNICAL REVIEW
  - ▶ Internal Validity
  - ▶ External Validity
  - ▶ Findings
- ❑ ALIGNMENT REVIEW

# Process of developing criteria

---

## INTERVENTION: General Information

- ❑ Intended Grade Levels
- ❑ Reading Domains Covered
- ❑ Recommended Dosage of Program
- ❑ Number of Lessons Available
- ❑ Placement Assessment Included
- ❑ Intended Population of Students
- ❑ Recommended Implementers
- ❑ Recommended Grouping Formats
- ❑ Parent/Home Connection Strategies/Materials Included
- ❑ Number of Studies Submitted
- ❑ Number of Peer-Reviewed Studies Submitted
- ❑ Costs of Materials, Training, Hours of Training and any Additional Costs

# Process of developing criteria

---

## INTERVENTION: Teacher Usability

- ❑ Accessibility
- ❑ Credibility
- ❑ Content
- ❑ Bias
- ❑ Rater Use/Grade

# Process of developing criteria

---

## TECHNICAL: Internal Validity

- ❑ Study Design
- ❑ Group/Person Conducting the Study
- ❑ Developer of Assessment
- ❑ Technical Adequacy of measures to determine effect size or evidence of improvement
- ❑ Data Collection
- ❑ Data Analysis
- ❑ Evidence of Confounding Factors

# Process of developing criteria

---

## TECHNICAL: External Validity

- ❑ Group/Person Implementing Intervention/Program
- ❑ Dosage: Session Time and Frequency
- ❑ Fidelity of Implementation
- ❑ Reading Domains Addressed
- ❑ Grouping Format
- ❑ Student Outcomes Measured
- ❑ Treatment Acceptability

# Process of developing criteria

---

## TECHNICAL: Findings and Summary of Evidence

- ❑ Overall Findings
- ❑ Long Term Findings
- ❑ Participants
- ❑ Extent of Evidence

# Process of developing criteria

---

## ALIGNMENT

- ❑ Criterion A: Standard Identification
- ❑ Criterion B: Amount of Alignment
- ❑ Criterion C: Replicability
- ❑ Criterion D: Content Definition & Specificity
- ❑ Criterion E: Inter-rater Reliability
- ❑ Criterion F: Conductor of Alignment
- ❑ Criterion G: Misalignments

# Process of developing criteria

---

## RFI/RFP SUBMISSION:

- ❑ Criteria incorporated into RFI/RFP released mid-April
- ❑ Request for Information
  - ▶ Interventions submitted for review to be part of a published list
- ❑ Request for Proposal
  - ▶ Interventions submitted for review to be part of a published list + proposal submitted to provide the state with services
  
- ❑ In this case, the services were:
  - ▶ Professional Learning and Coaching based on an established scaling model to provide state capacity to continue the intervention.

# Process of developing criteria

---

- ▶ RFI/RFP posted
- ▶ Information about the RFI/RFP was sent to:
  - ❑ Iowa Reading Research Center
  - ❑ IRRC Advisory
  - ❑ C4K Oversight
  - ❑ C4K
  - ❑ AEA/DE leadership
  - ❑ And a courtesy email to interventions/vendors indicated on the published 2012 report from IRRC.....

# Process of developing criteria

---

## RFI/RFP SUBMISSION:

- ❑ All materials submitted by vendors, and required to be submitted online
- ❑ All online submitted materials were downloaded and sent to the Project Issuing Officer
- ❑ All hardcopy materials received in response to RFP BO107-01 were stored in a locked cabinet, pending review results.

# Process of applying criteria

---

June – October 2014

- ▶ Identified and trained reviewers across intervention, technical and alignment
- ▶ Reviewed Interventions
- ▶ Established thresholds
- ▶ Finalized results

# Process of applying criteria

---

## ▶ IDENTIFIED AND TRAINED REVIEWERS

- ❑ All call across the system for reviewers
- ❑ Reviewers signed Confidentiality Statement and Conflict of Interest Statement
- ❑ Reviewers were trained on how to apply a Quality Review Rubric, and a Teacher Usability Rubric

# Process of applying criteria

---

## ▶ IDENTIFIED AND TRAINED REVIEWERS

- ❑ To apply the criteria to review universal, targeted and intensive programs and interventions as outlined in 279.68.
  - ▶ Intervention Specialists
    - Review general information [intended grade levels, reading domains covered, number of lessons available, cost of materials/training]
  - ▶ Technical Specialists
    - Review studies submitted that establish evidence of effect to determine the quality of internal validity [e.g., study design, technical adequacy of measures to determine effect size or evidence of improvement, data collection/analysis], the quality of external validity [e.g., session time/frequency, fidelity of implementation, student outcomes measured], and overall and long-term findings.
  - ▶ Alignment Specialists
    - Review studies submitted in the area of standards alignment to determine the quality of such items as standard identification, amount of alignment to standards, inter-rater reliability.

# Process of applying criteria

---

## ▶ REVIEWED INTERVENTIONS

- ❑ Materials submitted using the online submission system were reviewed by trained reviewers using the Quality Review Rubric and/or the Teacher Usability Rubric.
  - ▶ Two reviewers were assigned the same information to review, independently;
  - ▶ Discrepancies were identified by a third party;
  - ▶ The third party alerted reviewers about discrepancies;
  - ▶ Reviewers reconciled discrepancies, recording rationale and final scores.
- ❑ Final scores were submitted.

# Process of applying criteria

---

## ▶ ESTABLISHED THRESHOLDS

- ❑ Final review team across intervention, technical and alignment established to review all results to set thresholds.
- ❑ Purpose:
  - ▶ To make final recommendations for a reviewed list of interventions to publish on the DE website.

# Process of applying criteria

---

## ▶ ESTABLISHED THRESHOLDS

### □ Project Officer

- ▶ Online submission system
- ▶ Match to Letter of Intent

### □ Final review team, national expert and Project Officer

- ▶ Interventions must have alignment materials for review.
- ▶ Studies submitted must have completed study form(s) using the online submission system.
- ▶ Vendor evidence submitted must meet the acceptable range score across Internal Validity, External Validity and Overall Findings to establish evidence of positive effects for students across studies.

# Process of applying criteria

---

## ▶ Vendor Submissions

- ❑ 32 interventions submitted
- ❑ 23 were able to be reviewed and placed on the reviewed list

## ▶ What happened to 9 interventions:

- ❑ 4 vendors completed the first page of online submission and didn't continue
- ❑ 1 vendor submitted evidence – but it wasn't evidence it was a plan for establishing evidence
- ❑ 2 vendors did not submit via the online system
- ❑ 2 vendors did not match submitted materials with the letter of intent

TABLE 1. REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS SUMMARY

Intervention Name	Vendor	Grade	Instructional Tier	Internal Validity	External Validity	Overall Findings	Alignment Materials	Teacher Usability
Lexia Reading Core5	Lexia Learning Systems	PK4-5	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Fast ForWord	Scientific Learning Corporation	K-12	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reading Recovery	University			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Path to Literacy	University			✓	✓	✓	✓	
Story Friends	University of South Florida	PK4	Targeted, Intensive					
REWARDS	Voyager Sopris Learning	4-12	Targeted					
Multisyllable Routine Cards with Phonics Screener for Intervention	95% Group Inc	2-6	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive				✓	✓
Phonics Chip Kits and Phonics Screener for Intervention	95% Group Inc	2-6	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive		✓		✓	✓
Phonics Lesson Library and Phonics Screener for Intervention	95% Group Inc	2-6	Targeted, Intensive	✓	✓		✓	✓
Phonological Awareness and Phonological Awareness Screener for Intervention	95% Group Inc	K-1	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive				✓	✓
Achieve Intervention	Achieve 3000	2-12	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive					
Access Code	Foundations in Learning	1-6	Targeted					✓
Reading Horizons Discovery	HEC Reading Horizons	PK4-3	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive					✓
Reading Horizons Elevate	HEC Reading Horizons	4-12	Targeted, Intensive					✓
Eaerobics	Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing	PK3-3	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive		✓	✓	✓	✓
Imagine Learning	Imagine Learning Inc	PK4-6	Intensive		✓	✓	✓	✓
SPELL-Links to Reading and Writing Word Study Curriculum	Learning by Design	K-12	Classwide, Targeted, Intensive		✓	✓	✓	✓
PRESS Partner Reading with Paragraph Shrinking	Minnesota Center for Reading Research	2-6	Classwide	✓	✓	✓		✓
PRESS Tier 2 (Standard Treatment Protocol) Interventions	Minnesota Center for Reading Research	K-6	Targeted		✓	✓	✓	✓
READ 180 Next Generation	Scholastic Inc	4-12	Intensive	✓	✓		✓	✓
System 44 Next Generation	Scholastic Inc	3-12	Intensive		✓		✓	✓
LANGUAGE! Live	Voyager Sopris Learning	4-12	Intensive		✓		✓	✓
Step Up to Writing	Voyager Sopris Learning	K-12	Targeted			✓	✓	✓

This list is alphabetized by vendor and does not reflect any rank-order.

\*\*Established EV in elementary studies only.

# In the end.....

---

- ▶ Out of the six interventions listed:
  - ❑ 3 are listed as interventions that are used in Iowa in the IRRC study.
  - ❑ 3 submitted for an RFP
- ▶ All 3 RFPs were reviewed that made criteria
  - ❑ Only one intervention was listed as an intervention used in Iowa AND submitted for an RFP
  - ❑ All 3 were either above the costs reserved – between 6-9x more money and/or did not include the age span needed
- ▶ No RFP was awarded

# Next Steps

---

## ▶ Webinars:

- ❑ The Criteria & Rubric
- ❑ The Process
- ❑ The Results – other areas of interest
- ❑ How to submit interventions for review

## ▶ Continued identification of evidence-based interventions for the state of Iowa

- ❑ We have changed this from a vendor-selected submission to active-selection of interventions for review.