UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

FLORIDA IMPLEMENTATION OF READING FIRST 2006 - 2007

Patricia Linder and Marilyn Kline
Senior Research Associates

David C. Anchin Center
College of Education
4202 E. Fowler Avenue, PED214
Tampa, FL 33620

(813) 974-7794

USF UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH FLORIDA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Florida was awarded $300,000,000 by the United States Department of Education to implement *Reading First* over a six year period. On July 1, 2006, the state launched implementation of year five of the initiative under the direction of a leadership triangle consisting of three entities: the Office of Just Read, Florida! at the Florida Department of Education; the Florida Center for Reading Research at Florida State University; and *Reading First* Professional Development at the University of Central Florida. During 2006-2007, this Leadership Triangle provided guidance and support to 45 of 67 Florida school districts comprised of over 300 elementary schools entering their fourth year of program participation, approximately 70 schools entering the third year, and nearly 200 schools moving into year two. These three cohorts of *Reading First* schools served over 200,000 students in kindergarten through third grade while focusing on two primary goals: to increase the percentage of students reading "at grade level" and decrease the percentage of students with serious reading difficulties.

The external evaluation of Florida's progress in the fifth year of *Reading First* Implementation relied on both quantitative and qualitative methods to address three evaluation questions:

1. Do the three entities (The Leadership Triangle: Just Read, Florida!; the Florida Center for Reading Research; *Reading First* Professional Development) that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* Initiative demonstrate efficacy individually and collaboratively?
2. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the classroom practice of Florida teachers in *Reading First* schools?
3. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the reading achievement of Florida students in *Reading First* schools?

Examination of data collected in surveys, interviews, focus groups, and observation provided ample evidence of the success of Florida's implementation of *Reading First*

during 2006-2007. The mechanism and procedures used by Florida's *Reading First* Leadership Triangle have clearly provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to RF efforts in Florida. Local stakeholders described *Reading First* personnel as accessible for questions and responding promptly to the specific needs of individual districts. Communication and support were ongoing, and took the form of phone calls, email, and technical assistance papers.

Just Read, Florida! served as the executive arm of this initiative and oversaw the implementation of *Reading First* efforts across the state through its maintenance and/or modification of the organization, goals, priorities, and communication protocols for this 5th year of implementation. Responsibilities of this oversight role have included the establishment of a state level application process, technical assistance processes, and strategies for professional preparation to ensure that all programs, strategies, and activities proposed and implemented in the state of Florida met the criteria for scientifically based reading research.

When questioned about limitations in the leadership and guidance offered by Just Read, Florida!, stakeholders had little to share; however, a change in the deadline for the *Reading First* Continuation Grant caused some anxiety. The issue of time was also the predominant concern among *Reading First* Professional Development Coordinators. They referenced both required deadlines for projects and essential communication to district and school personnel.

Another key member of Florida's *Reading First* Leadership Triangle was the Florida Center for Reading Research at Florida State University. The Florida Center for Reading Research was charged with designing, developing, and managing the data collection and assessment system in Florida, analyzing that data to determine areas in need of special support, and evaluating instructional programs and materials available for classroom use. Their analyses also led to the development of materials and tools to further assist *Reading First* teachers.

The web-based data management system developed and maintained by the Florida Center for Reading Research was a source of primary support for the implementation of *Reading First* in Florida. Survey and focus group data confirm that the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN) provided useful and timely Progress Monitoring Reports of student reading achievement. Comments repeatedly sited the ease of use of the reports and mentioned the accessibility to key stakeholders, the relevancy of the reports, and the value of trend and comparative data. Local stakeholders also appreciated the variety of reports and formats, and the ability to examine data on multiple levels: school, classroom, and individual student. They identified these reports as not only serving a valuable role in monitoring student progress, but also in impacting the differentiating of instruction based on student need.

In regards to limitations of the Progress Monitoring and Outcome Reports, the dominant issues that surfaced involved time and the use of the technology. Many professionals addressed the issue of time, and comments ranged from the amount of time needed to complete the assessments, to the close or simultaneous scheduling of multiple assessments, to the turn around time for receiving some of the reports. Some shared concerns regarding some software limitations, however, it became apparent that among the local practitioners there were varying levels of technological proficiency. This became obvious as some individuals expressed a desire for the different levels of reports that many others had identified as a particular strength of the Progress Monitoring and Outcome Reports.

Reading First Professional Development at the University of Central Florida completes the state Leadership Triangle. This entity is charged with the creation and implementation of a comprehensive, systemic organizational design for statewide professional development in reading based upon scientifically-based reading research (content), and principles of effective professional development (process) to assure continuous, high quality implementation of methods and strategies for all K-3 educators in Florida.

A key factor in the demonstrated success of *Reading First* Professional Development is the highly qualified cadre of professional development coordinators who assist in the delivery of *Reading First* professional development, both large scale and site based. The Regional Coordinators, in concert with other personnel from *Reading First* Professional Development, Just Read, Florida!, and the Florida Center for Reading Research, developed and facilitated sessions at statewide conferences, regional trainings, and school-level professional development to support *Reading First* efforts. Local educators offered a plethora of comments concerning the value of the site-based support that they received, and stressed the visits of their Regional Coordinator as a highly effective aspect of the training and support provided by *Reading First* Professional Development. Some of the topics identified as being of particular value during those visits were effective observations, walk-through protocols, and the interpretation and use of data resources.

Evidence of powerful collaboration between the Florida's *Reading First* Leadership Triangle that resulted in effective and timely guidance and leadership to *Reading First* efforts across Florida was pervasive throughout the data. Nearly every new product, resource, or training developed during the year was the result of open and regular communication among the Triangle agencies to share information, examine data, establish goals, and set priorities based on the needs of leadership, educators, and students in *Reading First* districts and schools.

The success of the 5th year implementation of *Reading First* in Florida was also evidenced in student performance data. *Reading First* students in kindergarten were assessed using the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) for both progress monitoring and outcome reporting. During 2006-2007, kindergarten students showed increases in the number of students on or above grade level. They demonstrated decreases in the number of students with serious reading difficulties.

Performance on the SAT10 was reported as outcome data for Florida's *Reading First* students in grade one. Although the trend data shows that performance improved across time, the 2006-2007 performance varied across cohorts with two groups recording increases in the number of students on or above grade level, while one cohort dropped

very slightly since last year. Likewise, cohorts did not perform consistently in the 2006-2007 efforts to decrease the number of students with serious reading difficulties. Cohort Three showed a small reduction in the number of first graders with serious reading difficulties, however, the percentage of Cohort One first graders with serious reading difficulties remained constant while the percentage of Cohort Two students increased.

Survey respondents agreed that the reading fluency of first graders had improved. One survey group agreed that reading comprehension has improved as well, while others were slightly more inclined to disagree.

Second grade students at *Reading First* schools participated in the SAT10 as an outcome measure. Trend data show that the number of students reading on grade level did increase over time in second grade classrooms, but reducing the number of students with reading difficulties proved more challenging this year. In 2006-2007, all three cohorts showed small increases in the number of students on or above grade level, but success varied on the goal of reducing the number of students with reading difficulties. While Cohort One did decrease the number slightly, both Cohort Two and Three showed marginal increases in the number of students with reading difficulties.

The perceptions of local *Reading First* educators suggest less confidence in the improvement of the reading fluency at the second grade level. Some appear to have more confidence in reading comprehension improvement than others.

The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) served as the outcome measure for third graders in *Reading First* schools. While Florida third grade *Reading First* classrooms were successful in increasing the number of students reading on grade level and decreasing the number with reading difficulties from 2003-2006, the data for 2006-2007 suggest a different picture. Across all three cohorts, the percentage of students on reading on grade level decreased noticeably while the number of third graders with reading difficulties increased by a similar margin. Despite this dip in the 2006-2007 FCAT outcomes for third graders, other measures showed sustained growth over time. For example, Cohort One students in grades one through three demonstrated

considerable growth between the first and fourth year of *Reading First* implementation in measures of oral reading fluency measures. The number of students reading on grade level increased and the number of students with reading difficulties decreased in all three grades. Similarly, all three cohorts show gains across their years of *Reading First* implementation, in all levels from kindergarten to third grade, in oral vocabulary as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Clearly the use of multiple measures, as opposed to reliance on a single assessment measure, creates a more comprehensive view of student achievement.

In 2006-2007, the Leadership Triangle entities communicated an approach to the sustainability of *Reading First* across Florida for the future. The leadership encouraged local professionals to adopt the premise that *Reading First* not be viewed as just a funding stream, but rather "as a different way of thinking about teaching and learning." Local *Reading First* agencies were charged with the task of continuing to build local capacity through shared leadership and collaboration to "put a system in place that brings new teachers up to speed, reviews/renews what is known about scientifically based reading research and instruction, and prevents regression in student reading achievement."

Thorough and complete evidence supports the positive impact of *Reading First* at every level from state leadership to student achievement. Field notes revealed additional evidence of Leadership Triangle support for capacity building at the local level to sustain *Reading First* efforts into the future. Through collaborative efforts and strategic planning, Florida is building a solid foundation to support effect reading instruction for all students.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Florida was awarded $300,000,000 by the United States Department of Education to implement *Reading First* over a six year period. On July 1, 2006, the state launched implementation of year five of the initiative under the direction of a leadership triangle consisting of three entities: the Office of Just Read, Florida! at the Florida Department of Education; the Florida Center for Reading Research at Florida State University; and *Reading First* Professional Development at the University of Central Florida. During 2006-2007, this Leadership Triangle provided guidance and support to 45 of 67 Florida school districts comprised of over 300 elementary schools entering their fourth year of program participation, approximately 70 schools entering the third year, and nearly 200 schools moving into year two. These three cohorts of *Reading First* schools served over 200,000 students in kindergarten through third grade while focusing on two primary goals: to increase the percentage of students reading "at grade level" and decrease the percentage of students with serious reading difficulties.

An external evaluation of Florida's progress in the fifth year of *Reading First* Implementation took place over 2006 – 2007. The evaluation team from the University of South Florida employed well-established practices from the field of educational evaluation and the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation (Sanders, 1994) in all phases of the evaluation process including planning, conducting, and reporting. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in the external evaluation to address three questions:

4. Do the three entities (The Leadership Triangle: Just Read, Florida!; the Florida Center for Reading Research; *Reading First* Professional Development) that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* Initiative demonstrate efficacy individually and collaboratively?

5. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the classroom practice of Florida teachers in *Reading First* schools?

6. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the reading achievement of Florida students in *Reading First* schools?

This report summarizes the evaluation methodology used to address these questions and presents the findings and conclusions.

EVALUATION DESIGN

The external evaluation was organized around components of two theoretical approaches: objectives- and expertise-oriented evaluation (Fiztpatrick, Sanders, & Worthen, 2004). The objectives-oriented approach suggested processes for determining the extent to which the goals and objectives of a program are actually being met. To operationalize this approach, the evaluators used multiple information sources to provide a framework of measurable objectives and then relied on empirical methods of collecting both quantitative and qualitative data in order to determine alignment between the objectives and actual *Reading First* performance. The expertise-oriented approach, which centers on professional expertise to provide quality judgments, was strengthened in this evaluation by the use of an evaluation team to provide collegial dialogue and shared decision-making, thereby enhancing reliability. Blending these two approaches, the evaluators tailored processes and procedures to provide a robust evaluation.

Because the three evaluation questions were comprehensive in nature, a series of fourteen subordinate questions was developed and data sources identified, for the purpose of collecting specific information related to each question. Both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were selected to align with each of the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The quantitative data included responses to four surveys administered by the evaluation team and student achievement data that

were analyzed and reported by the Florida Center for Reading Research. The four surveys also provided qualitative data in the form of open response items. Additional qualitative data included seven interviews with key administrative personnel from the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle agencies of Just Read, Florida!, the Florida Center for Reading Research, and *Reading First* Professional Development; one focus group of *Reading First* local program contacts, and two focus groups of *Reading First* school principals. Observation data was collected during one *Reading First* Professional Development monthly staff meeting, two regional quarterly professional development workshops, one regional institute, one statewide conference, and site visits to 14 *Reading First* elementary schools in eight counties. Each of these qualitative data sources is discussed individually in the section that follows.

Qualitative Data Sources

➢ **Surveys**

In order to more fully address the three comprehensive evaluation questions, four online surveys were developed and administered by the external evaluation team. Each survey contained quantitative items that provided four response options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree; and qualitative items that provided open essay boxes for participants to type in an elaborated response.

Table One describes the nature and frequency of items in evaluation surveys.

TABLE 1: Survey Design				
Survey Group	**Number of Survey Items**	**Number of Quantitative Items**	**Number of Qualitative Items**	**Number of Demographic Items**
RF Principals	26	16	7	3
RF Reading Coaches	25	14	5	6
RF Local Program Contacts	22	12	9	1
RFPD Regional Coordinators	26	18	7	1

Table Reads: The RF Principals survey consisted of 26 items: 16 quantitative, 7 qualitative, and 3 demographic.

Contact information for survey participants was supplied by Just Read, Florida! and survey data were collected from 144 *Reading First* principals, 436 coaches, 36 local program contacts, and 21 *Reading First* Professional Development Regional Coordinators using the survey instruments found in Appendix A.

Surveys of the two largest population groups, *Reading First* principals and reading coaches, were designed and field tested in May 2007. Based on analysis of the field tests, revisions were made and the surveys were administered as follows:

- **Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey**
    - o **Survey invitations were emailed on 5-2-07, 5-25-07, 6-14-07, and 6-18-07 to a total of 730 *Reading First* coaches in four attempts to reach all coaches.**
    - o **Twenty-four *Reading First* coaches responded by selecting the Opt-out option.**
    - o **Thirteen *Reading First* coaches asked to be deleted from the list due to job changes or incorrect identification in the role of coach.**
    - o **Twenty-eight emails were undeliverable. Follow-up attempts were made to reach individuals; however, all remained undeliverable.**
    - o **Four hundred thirty-six *Reading First* coaches (60% of total invited) began and completed the survey.**
    - o **Data from 431 respondents (99% of those who responded) were used for analysis.**
- **Florida *Reading First* Principals Survey**
    - o **Survey invitations were emailed on 7-27-07 and 7-30-07 to a total of 517 *Reading First* school principals in two attempts to reach all principals.**
    - o **Twenty-seven *Reading First* principals responded by selecting the Opt-out option.**

- o Twenty-five emails were undeliverable. Follow up attempts were made to reach all individuals with contact information revised, allowing the survey invitation to be resent to 10 principals.
- o One hundred forty-four *Reading First* principals (28% of total invited) began and completed the survey.
- o Data from 142 respondents (99% of those who responded) were used for analysis.

Survey designs for the two smallest population groups, *Reading First* local program contacts and *Reading First* Professional Development coordinators were based on the field tests of the previous surveys and administered as follows:

- Florida *Reading First* Program Contacts Survey
  - o Survey invitations were emailed on 6-18-07 and 7-23-07 to a total of 64 *Reading First* local program contacts in two attempts to reach all contacts.
  - o Three *Reading First* local program contacts responded by selecting the Opt-out option.
  - o Four emails were undeliverable. Follow up attempts were made to reach individuals, however, all remained undeliverable.
  - o Thirty-six *Reading First* local program contacts (56% of total invited) began and completed the survey.
  - o Data from 36 respondents (100% of those who responded) were used for analysis.
- *Reading First* Professional Development Coordinator Survey
  - o Survey invitations were emailed on 10-12-07 to a total of 25 *Reading First* Professional Development regional coordinators.

- o Twenty-one *Reading First* Professional Development regional coordinators (84% of the total invited) began and completed the survey.
- o Data from 21 respondents (100% of respondents) were used for analysis.

In each of the four surveys, demographic data were collected. The *Reading First* principals were asked to identify their location from eight designated areas of the state, years as principal of a *Reading First* school, and years of experience as a principal. The eight areas for the state were based on the following 2006-2007 assignments of *Reading First* Professional Development Regional Coordinators:

Area 1 – Counties of Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington

Area 2 – Counties of Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor

Area 3 – Counties of Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia

Area 4 – Counties of Hillsborough, Pinellas

Area 5 – Counties of Highlands, Polk

Area 6 – Counties of DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie

Area 7 – Counties of Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee

Area 8 – Counties of Miami-Dade, Monroe

The reading coaches were also asked to identify their location from the eight designated areas of the state listed above; however, their survey requested years of teaching experience, years of professional coaching experience, and whether or not they held reading certification and/or a Florida reading endorsement. *Reading First* Professional Development regional coordinators and local program contacts were asked to identify

their location from the eight designated areas of the state, however, due to small sample size, the areas were collapsed for data analysis into two divisions:

North – Counties of Alachua, Bradford, Brevard, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, Gadsden, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Lake, Leon, Madison, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Seminole, Suwannee, Taylor, Volusia, Washington

South – Counties of Broward, Charlotte, Collier, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Hillsborough, Lee, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, St. Lucie

➢ **Interviews**

In order to more fully address the three comprehensive evaluation questions, seven interviews with key administrative personnel from the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle agencies were conducted by the external evaluators. Interview data were collected from three persons at Just Read, Florida!, one person at the Florida Center for Reading Research, and three persons at *Reading First* Professional Development using the protocols found in Appendix B. Face-to-face interviews were conducted and digitally recorded, with verbal permission of all interviewees, to ensure accuracy. The interviews took place as follows:

- February 8, 2007
  - Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, FL
    - Barbara Elsie, Deputy Director, Just Read, Florida!
    - Cari Miller, Director, Florida *Reading First*
    - Hope Colle, *Reading First* Technical Assistance Coordinator
  - Florida Center for Reading Research, Tallahassee, FL
    - Dr. Joseph Torgesen, Director

- March 8, 2007
  - University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL
    - Dr. Sandra Robinson, Dean, College of Education; Principal Investigator, *Reading First* Professional Development
    - Karen Ladinsky, Resource Coordinator, *Reading First* Professional Development
- June 11, 2007
  - University of Central Florida, Orlando, FL
    - Luanne Nelson, Director, *Reading First* Professional Development

➢ Focus Groups

Information to assist in addressing the three broad evaluation questions included data collected in three focus groups held on August 7, 2007, during the Just Read, Florida! 6th Annual K-12 Leadership Conference in Orlando, Florida. Data were collected during one focus group of *Reading First* local program contacts and two focus groups of *Reading First* school principals using the protocols found in Appendix C. With written permission of all participants, the proceedings were digitally recorded to ensure accuracy. Each focus group met for approximately one hour 15 minutes.

Reading First principals were randomly selected from a list of those principals registered for the Leadership Conference to receive an invitation to participate in one of two separate focus groups. To make the selection, an online table of random numbers was applied to a list of names from *Reading First* schools located in the northern or southern region of Florida after a mid-state division of counties. Attempting to keep the focus group size manageable, a small percentage of eligible participants was invited. This proved to weaken the reliability of the focus group data, as very few of those who had accepted the invitation actually participated.

- *Reading First* principals from the northern Florida counties
  - o Focus group invitations were emailed to 15 of 159 *Reading First* principals representing Escambia, Gadsden, Columbia, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Volusia, Hillsborough, and Pinellas counties at the Leadership Conference.
  - o Four *Reading First* principals (27% of those invited) declined the invitation
  - o Four *Reading First* principals (27% of those invited) accepted the invitation
  - o Two *Reading First* principals (50% of those accepting the invitation) participated in the focus group on August 7, 2007.
- *Reading First* principals from the southern Florida counties
  - o Focus group invitations were emailed to 15 of 167 *Reading First* principals representing Polk, Glades, Hendry, Palm Beach, Broward, Lee, and Miami-Dade counties at the Leadership Conference.
  - o One *Reading First* principal (<1% of those invited) declined the invitation
  - o Five *Reading First* principals (33% of those invited) accepted the invitation
  - o Two *Reading First* principals participated in the focus group on August 7, 2007. One represented 20% of those accepting the invitation, and one represented 11% of the nine principals who did not respond to the email invitation prior to the focus group.

One group of *Reading First* local program contacts was invited to participate in a statewide focus group based on a stratified - random sample selected from a list of those registered for the Leadership Conference. To make the selection, an online table of random numbers was applied to a list of names that had been stratified by a division of the state into eight areas.

- *Reading First* local program contacts
  - Focus group invitations were emailed to 16 of 130 *Reading First* local program contacts representing Escambia, Bradford, Dixie, Duval, Brevard, Orange, Volusia, Pinellas, Polk, Glades, Hendry, Palm Beach, St. Lucie, Broward, Dade, and Monroe counties at the Leadership Conference.
  - One *Reading First* local program contact (<1% of those invited) declined the invitation
  - Nine *Reading First* local program contacts (56% of those invited) accepted the invitation
  - Seven *Reading First* local program contacts participated in the focus group on August 7, 2007. Six represented 67% of those accepting the invitation, and one represented 17% of the six *Reading First* local program contacts who did not respond to the email invitation prior to the focus group.

➢ **Observations**

The external evaluators collected observation data to inform the analysis of the three comprehensive evaluation questions. The observation data were distributed across all three agencies in the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle and were collected during one *Reading First* Professional Development monthly staff meeting; two regional quarterly professional development workshops; one regional Just Read, Florida! Summer 2007 Reading Leadership Team Institute; one statewide conference, the Just Read, Florida! 6th Annual K-12 Leadership Conference; and site visits to 14 *Reading First* elementary schools in eight counties. Each of these opportunities for data collection is discussed below.

<u>*Reading First* Professional Development Staff Meeting</u>

The *Reading First* Professional Development (RFPD) staff come together for a monthly, two-day meeting to collaborate with the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle agencies,

sharing pertinent information that may impact the delivery of technical assistance and professional development services to regional and local *Reading First* constituents. Typically, personnel from Just Read, Florida! and the Florida Center for Reading Research attend the meetings to provide leadership and ongoing support through activities such as the presentation of policy and procedural updates, discussion of trends in *Reading First* student assessment data, consideration of information reported by RFPD Regional Coordinators, and organization of plans for *Reading First* professional development opportunities across the state. The external evaluators attended the morning portion of the staff meeting held on March 8, 2007 and collected field notes on the

- general procedures and management of the meeting,

- sharing of RFPD data led by the project director,

- presentation of a review of third quarter *Reading First* data by the director of the Florida Center for Reading Research,

- updates from the Office of Just Read, Florida! offered by the director of *Reading First*, and

- interaction among the RFPD staff and *Reading First* Leadership Triangle representatives.

Regional Quarterly Professional Development

In August 2006, the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle came together for a strategic planning meeting. This multi-day retreat provided an opportunity to collaboratively review state *Reading First* data, discuss trends and implications, begin the process of designing new resources based on student needs, and determine a focus for quarterly professional development (QPD) to be delivered to *Reading First* coaches regionally. Following the retreat, the RFPD Resource Coordinator guided a team of regional coordinators in the development of QPD content that was founded on scientifically based reading research. The RFPD Regional Coordinators scheduled and delivered the

QPD to regional groups of *Reading First* coaches with the expectation that the coaches would transfer the skills and knowledge gained to the teachers at individual *Reading First* schools. The external evaluators collected observation data during two regional Quarterly Professional Development workshops as follows:

- QPD for *Reading First* reading coaches in Hillsborough County
    - April 26, 2007, Tampa
    - Three RFPD *R*egional Coordinators delivered training to more than 100 reading coaches from both *Reading First* and non − *Reading First* schools.
- QPD for *Reading First* reading coaches in Escambia County
    - May 11, 2007, Pensacola
    - One RFPD Regional Coordinator delivered training to approximately 30 coaches from both *Reading First* and non − *Reading First* schools.

Just Read, Florida! Summer 2007 Reading Leadership Team Institute

Florida *Reading First* schools established a Reading Leadership Team of six to eight members including site administrators, the reading coach, and other staff representatives. The Reading Leadership Team serves as a management tool for enhancing the literacy environment; supporting the learning and teaching of students, teachers, and educational leaders; and determining, implementing, and evaluating a course of action focused on the achievement of established literacy goals. In order to provide guidance and support for these site-based teams, Just Read, Florida! hosted eleven Reading Leadership Team Institutes across the state during Summer 2007. Teams from elementary, middle, and high schools attended the two-day Summer Institutes facilitated collaboratively by *Reading First* Professional Development (RFPD) and the Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence (FLaRE) Center.

Florida *Reading First* external evaluators attended the Reading Leadership Team Institute in Jacksonville, Florida, on June 21-22, 2007. Participating schools included 13 *Reading First* schools (34%) and 25 non-*Reading First* schools (66%). Observation data were collected during:

- **One General Session:** *Building and Sustaining an Active Literacy Leadership Team through High Visibility Initiatives*
- **Six breakout sessions**
  - *Utilizing the Reading Coach* – **presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator**
  - *Interpreting and Using Data* - **presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator** *Developing Observation Classrooms* – **presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator and 1 FLaRE coordinator**
  - *Increasing Parental Support and Involvement* - **presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator**
  - *Creating and Information-Intensive Environment* - **presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator and 1 FLaRE coordinator**
  - *Teaching for Comprehending* - **presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator and 1 FLaRE coordinator**

Just Read, Florida! 6th Annual K-12 Leadership Conference

The 6th Annual K-12 Leadership Conference hosted by Just Read, Florida! was held August 5-8, 2007, in Orlando, Florida. The opportunity to increase knowledge, build skills, and network with colleagues was provided for more than 4,000 principals, assistant principals, reading coaches, and district administrators from across the state. Sixteen keynote or featured speaker presentations and over 300 breakout sessions were offered. Personnel from the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle agencies presented approximately 89 breakout sessions including 26 that were presented collaboratively by

RFPD Regional Coordinators and practitioners from the *Reading First* schools they serve.

The external evaluators were present during the Conference on August 6th and 7th, and collected field notes in regards to:

- general procedures and management of the conference,
- the Opening General Session, and
- four breakout sessions presented by *Reading First* Leadership Triangle personnel
    - *Coaching: More Peoplework, Less Paperwork* – presented by 1 RFPD Regional Coordinator and 1 *Reading First* elementary reading coach
    - *Reading First Update* – presented by the Director of Florida *Reading First*
    - *Instructional Leadership: Teaching All Children to Read* – presented by the Deputy Director Eastern Regional *Reading First* Technical Assistance Center (ERRFTAC)
    - *PMRN for New Elementary School Users* – presented by the Director of Technical Projects, Florida Center for Reading Research.

Reading First School Site Visits

In October 2007, the external evaluators made fourteen site visits to *Reading First* schools in eight Florida counties.

Table Two describes the date and location of evaluator site visits.

TABLE 2: External Evaluator Site Visits		
County	***Reading First* Site**	**Site Visit Date**
Polk	Garner Elementary	October 15
	Auburndale Central Elementary	October 15
Pinellas	Skyview Elementary	October 16
	Clearview Avenue Elementary	October 23
	Woodlawn Elementary	October 23
Marion	Belleview Santos Elementary	October 17
Lake	Fruitland Park Elementary	October 17
Orange	Hiawassee Elementary	October 18
	Winegard Elementary	October 18
Broward	C. Robert Markham Elementary	October 23
Miami-Dade	Paul Laurence Dunbar Elementary	October 23
	Orchard Villa Elementary	October 23
	Barbara Hawkins Elementary	October 24
Lee	Dr. Carrie D. Robinson Littleton Elementary	October 24

The purpose of the site visits was to collect evidence of school-level support and technical assistance offered by RFPD. On each site visit, an RFPD Regional Coordinator accompanied the evaluators. The observation data collected during school site visits were qualitative in nature (no scoring or rating of Coordinators or services), in the form of written field notes, and based on RFPD's proposed scope of work for *Reading First* schools.

The criteria for evidence collected in the field notes included, but was not limited to, evidence of job-embedded professional development and technical assistance to *Reading First* reading coaches, K-3 teachers, and instructional leaders; school site

support of *Reading First* goals and expectations; and priority support for Focus Schools based on specific school-based action plans and district-negotiated levels of support.

The data included, but was not limited to: a positive rapport between RFPD and school-based personnel; planning in order to provide ongoing, coordinated services; side-by-side coaching with coach and/or teacher; effective modeling of reading strategies based on SBRR; and support for the use of data to inform instruction.

➢ **Document Review**

Documentation pertinent to the external evaluation of the 2006 – 2007 implementation of *Reading First* in Florida was collected during observations and interviews, provided electronically by the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle, and accessed online by the evaluation team. The reviewed documents included, but were not limited to

- *Reading First* Leadership Triangle grant applications
- Communication among the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle and local stakeholders
    - FL *Reading First* Guidance to Districts (LEAs), 2006-07 Impact Study Letters, DIBELS Teacher Administer 2006 Guidance, QPD letters, Principal Implementation Questionnaire (PIQ)
- Resources
    - ABC's of Coaching, FAQs About Reading Instruction document, Small Group Alternative Lesson Structures, Teaching All Students to Read Summary, FAQs About *Reading First* PMRN, Florida Center for Reading Research Intervention Newsletter, Florida Center for Reading Research K-1 Center Activities, Florida Center for Reading Research 2-3 Center Activities
- PowerPoint Presentations

    - *Reading First* Professional Development Staff Meeting Presentations, Conference and Institute Presentations

EVALUATION PROJECT METHODOLOGY

Three comprehensive evaluation questions provided the framework for the external evaluation of the 2007 implementation of *Reading First* in Florida.

1. Do the three entities (The Leadership Triangle: Just Read, Florida!; the Florida Center for Reading Research; *Reading First* Professional Development) that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* initiative demonstrate efficacy individually and collaboratively?

2. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the classroom practice of Florida teachers in *Reading First* schools?

3. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the reading achievement of Florida students in *Reading First* schools?

Efforts to address the three evaluation questions were strengthened by a series of fourteen subordinate questions to which both quantitative and qualitative data sources were aligned. The quantitative data included responses to four surveys administered by the evaluation team and student achievement data that were analyzed and reported by the Florida Center for Reading Research. The four surveys also provided qualitative data in the form of open response items. Additional qualitative data included seven interviews with key administrative personnel from the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle agencies of Just Read, Florida! (JRF), the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR), and *Reading First* Professional Development (RFPD); one focus group of *Reading First* local program contacts and two focus groups of *Reading First* school principals; and observation data collected during one RFPD monthly staff meeting, two regional quarterly professional development workshops, one regional institute, one statewide conference, and site visits to 14 *Reading First* elementary schools in eight

counties. The following sections describe the alignment of the evaluation questions and collected data.

<center>Evaluation Question One</center>

1. Do the three entities (The Leadership Triangle: JRF; FCRR; RFPD) that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* initiative demonstrate efficacy individually and collaboratively?

Data used to address Evaluation Question One were both quantitative and qualitative in nature and included interviews with administrators in the offices of the Leadership Triangle; surveys of RFPD Regional Coordinators, school-based reading coaches, local *Reading First* program contacts and school principals; and focus groups with local *Reading First* program contacts, and school principals.

Eight subordinate questions were posed by the evaluators to identify individual components of Evaluation Question One. A description of each subordinate question and the data sources follow.

- To what extent have the mechanisms and procedures used by JRF provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to *Reading First* efforts in Florida?

Evidence of guidance and leadership by JRF was the product of interviews with the administrators of the Leadership Triangle, a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators, a survey of and focus group participation by local program contacts, and an examination of pertinent documentation.

- To what extent do data collection procedures used by FCRR to evaluate and monitor progress in *Reading First* schools meet reasonable standards of scientific integrity?

An interview with leadership of the FCRR, examination of pertinent documentation provided by the Leadership Triangle, and examination of the FCRR website were completed in the review of evaluation and monitoring procedures.

- How useful and timely are the progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by FCRR to *Reading First* school districts, school principals, and classroom teachers?

The review of progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by FCRR consisted of an examination of pertinent documentation accessed on the FCRR website, survey and focus group participation by local *Reading First* program contacts, and surveys of *Reading First* principals and reading coaches.

- How adequately do the measures of teacher knowledge and classroom performance used by FCRR reflect the content and principles of effective reading instruction established by scientifically based reading research?

The reliability and validity of measures used by the FCRR were reviewed through an interview with the Center director and examination of pertinent documentation accessed on the FCRR website.

- To what extent has the training and support provided by RFPD to reading coaches to assist them in the fulfillment of their responsibilities been effective and timely?

Evidence of the RFPD support of reading coaches was gained through interviews with Triangle Leadership; surveys of RFPD Regional Coordinators and *Reading First* reading coaches; survey and focus group participation of local *Reading First* program contacts; and field observation.

- What are the qualifications and level of experience of individuals employed as RFPD Coordinators during the 2006-2007 evaluation period?

Interviews of RFPD leadership and examination of pertinent documentation provided by RFPD were used to review the qualifications and level of experience of RFPD Regional Coordinators.

- How adequately and consistently does the professional development provided by RFPD to coaches in *Reading First* schools reflect the best principles of professional development as outlined in *Every Child Reading: A Professional Development Guide* and the *National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development?*

The content of *Reading First* professional development for coaches was reviewed through an examination of pertinent documents and websites; interviews of RFPD leadership; and surveys of RFPD Regional Coordinators and *Reading First* reading coaches.

- To what extent have the collaborative mechanisms and procedures used by the Triangle provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to *Reading First* efforts in Florida?

Evidence of Triangle collaboration was gained through interviews with the leadership of JRF, RFPD, and FCRR; a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators; and an examination of pertinent documentation and websites.

2. **How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the classroom practice of Florida teachers in *Reading First* schools?**

Data used to address Evaluation Question Two included surveys of *Reading First* principals, reading coaches, and local *Reading First* program contacts; focus groups with local *Reading First* program contacts and school principals; and interviews with the leaders of JRF, RFPD, and FCRR.

Four subordinate questions were used to probe for deeper understanding of Evaluation Question Two. These secondary questions and descriptions of the data sources are included at this point.

- From the perspective of the LEAs that receive *Reading First* grants, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the training, support, and assistance provided by the Triangle?

LEA perceptions of Triangle support, assistance, and training for *Reading First* programs was acquired through survey and focus group participation of local *Reading First* program contacts.

- What is the nature, frequency, and duration of professional development efforts afforded K-3 *Reading First* teachers and K-12 ESE teachers, including both district- and state-sponsored events and processes?

Interviews with the Triangle Leadership, surveys of RFPD Regional Coordinators and *Reading First* principals, survey and focus group participation of local *Reading First* program contacts, and schedules of professional development opportunities provided data for review.

- **What are the qualifications and levels of experience of individuals hired as reading coaches in *Reading First* schools?**

Survey and focus group participation of local *Reading First* program contacts and *Reading First* principals, and surveys of reading coaches were used to review the qualifications and level of experience of *Reading First* reading coaches.

- **How adequately does the content of professional development provided in Teacher Academies reflect the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading?**

The content of *Reading First* Teacher Academies was explored during interviews with the FCRR leadership, an examination of pertinent documents accessed on the websites of RFPD and FCRR.

Evaluation Question Three

3. **How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the reading achievement of Florida students in *Reading First* schools?**

Investigations of Evaluation Question Three were primarily based on quantitative assessment data analyzed and reported by FCRR, and included outcome data for students in kindergarten through third grade during the 2006-2007 school year. Additional data included surveys of *Reading First* principals, and both survey and focus group data from local *Reading First* program contacts.

- To what extent has the reading achievement of students in grades one through three improved as measured by *Reading First* outcomes of fluency in *Reading First* schools?

The reading fluency achievement of *Reading First* students in grades one through three was reviewed via an examination of fluency data provided by Florida Center for Reading Research, and surveys and focus groups of local *Reading First* program contacts and *Reading First* principals.

- To what extent has reading achievement of students in grades one through three improved on measures of reading comprehension in *Reading First* schools?

The reading comprehension achievement of *Reading First* students in grades one through three was reviewed via an examination of outcome data provided by Florida Center for Reading Research, and surveys and focus groups of local *Reading First* program contacts and *Reading First* principals.

➢ **Data Analysis**

Collected data were analyzed with the support of statistical analysis software for quantitative data and qualitative data. Due to variation in survey group size, the initial analysis was limited to the descriptive statistics including the frequency distribution of responses and mean for each item. Means and frequencies are reported in Appendix D.

The Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey was analyzed to examine the frequency distribution and mean of quantitative item responses based on four response options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. These descriptive data from 14 items across six reporting groups included: statewide (all responses), area of the state,

years of teaching experience, years of professional coaching experience, reading certification (yes/no), and Florida reading endorsement (yes/no).

The Florida *Reading First* Principals Survey was analyzed to examine the frequency distribution and mean of quantitative item responses based on four response options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. These descriptive data from 16 items across four reporting groups included: statewide (all responses), area of the state, years as principal at a *Reading First* school, and years as a principal.

The Florida *Reading First* Program Contact and Florida *Reading First* Professional Development Coordinator Surveys were analyzed to examine the frequency distribution and mean of responses for quantitative item responses based on four response options: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. This descriptive data from 12 and 18 items, respectively, across two reporting groups included: statewide (all responses) and area of the state.

To delve deeper into the data, additional statistical measures were applied. To describe the relationship between items in each survey group, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated. To examine whether survey group members were equally likely to respond to items regardless of their subgroup categories, i.e., area of state, years of experience, etc.; a series of Chi-Square goodness-of-fit tests were administered.

Results were triangulated to strengthen the reliability of interpretations and conclusions. Although limited to a single year, this evaluation serves in both formative and summative capacities. The findings will stand alone as a summative evaluation of the 2006-2007 implementation of *Reading First* in Florida. However, they may also be used as formative information in the analysis of trend data in the overall evaluation of the *Reading First* grant implementation project in Florida.

FINDINGS

FINDINGS

The external evaluation of Florida's progress in the 5th year of implementing the *Reading First* initiative took place during 2006 – 2007. The evaluation team from the University of South Florida employed well-established practices from the field of educational evaluation and the Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation in all phases of the evaluation process including planning, conducting, and reporting. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in the external evaluation to address three questions:

1. Do the three entities (The Leadership Triangle: Just Read, Florida!; the Florida Center for Reading Research; Reading First Professional Development) that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* Initiative demonstrate efficacy individually and collaboratively?

2. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the classroom practice of Florida teachers in *Reading First* schools?

3. How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the reading achievement of Florida students in *Reading First* schools?

The findings here presented represent a synthesis of rigorous examination and statistical analysis of multiple data sources, and triangulation of the results from each individual analysis. The three evaluation questions serve as a framework for reporting the findings.

Findings in Regard to Evaluation Question One

➢ Do the three entities (The Leadership Triangle: Just Read, Florida!; the Florida Center for Reading Research; Reading First Professional Development) that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* Initiative demonstrate efficacy individually and collaboratively?

In the 2006-2007 implementation of *Reading First* (RF), the State of Florida's efforts demonstrate both the individual and collaborative efficacy of three entities that comprise the foundational triad for Florida's *Reading First* Initiative. The success of each RF Triangle Leadership agency will be discussed individually in regards to Evaluation Question One. The section will then conclude with the findings related to their collaborative efficacy.

➢ **Just Read, Florida!**

Just Read, Florida! (JRF) served as the executive arm of this initiative and oversaw the implementation of *Reading First* (RF) efforts across the state through its maintenance and/or modification of the organization, goals, priorities, and communication protocols for this 5th year of implementation. Responsibilities of this oversight role have included the establishment of a state level application process, technical assistance processes, and strategies for professional preparation to ensure that all programs, strategies, and activities proposed and implemented in the state of Florida met the criteria for scientifically based reading research.

Table Three provides the results from surveys of RF Local Program Contacts, Principals, and RFPD Regional Coordinators when asked to respond to statements concerning guidance and leadership provided by Just Read, Florida!

TABLE 3: Perceptions of Effective and Timely Guidance and Support Provided by Just Read, Florida!

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group		
	RF Local Program Contacts	RF Principals	RFPD Regional Coordinators
Just Read, Florida! provided **effective** guidance and leadership to district Reading First efforts.	3.64	3.45	3.52
Just Read, Florida! provided **timely** guidance and leadership to district Reading First efforts.	3.64	3.39	3.19

Table reads: Local Program Contacts than Principals or Regional Coordinators agreed that the guidance and leadership provided to district RF efforts by JRF was effective and timely.

Note - Survey Response Options: Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Perceived Strengths of the Guidance and Leadership from Just Read, Florida!

The mechanism and procedures used by JRF have clearly provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to RF efforts in Florida. Local RF Program Contacts described *Reading First* personnel as accessible for questions and responding promptly to the specific needs of individual districts. Communication and support were ongoing, and took the form of phone calls, email, and technical assistance papers. One local program contact indicated that the "clear and consistent guidance and support" received led to the implementation of a more comprehensive reading program. Timely communication through both email and telephone were well documented, and survey results indicated a high level of satisfaction. Another local Program Contact expressed, "Having had the opportunity to be involved in Reading First grant implementation...over the past 3 years has been very rewarding. I have certainly witnessed a change in the focus of

professional development. Again, I cannot thank the Tallahassee office enough for the assistance they have provided."

Reading First Professional Development Regional Coordinators concurred with previous statements concerning the positive perception of the guidance and support offered by JRF. Respondents identified communication and collaboration as the key elements in the effective leadership. There were multiple references to the value of having the Director of Reading First attend their monthly staff meetings to provide updates, as well as to seek feedback from the field. In describing communication from the JRF office, one coordinator stated, "The Just Read, Florida office always provides prompt response and support. There is a 'genuine' [sic] concern for those supporting reading instruction across the state."

This genuine concern was evident in interviews with JRF leadership, especially in regard to Focus Schools - schools with three or more years of RF implementation that are in jeopardy of loosing RF funding due to a lack of progress toward the RF goals of increasing the number of students reading on grade level and decreasing the number of students with serious reading difficulties. One comment from JRF leadership expressed the desire to see Focus Schools succeed: "We want to find out what's wrong and help them get back on track instead of just going in there and discontinuing Reading First."

Under the guidance of JRF, the RF Leadership Triangle demonstrated their commitment to providing additional support to Focus Schools in 2006-2007. During the second year of work with the Focus Schools, the collaborative efforts led to the earlier identification of the schools and a quicker start to the delivery of services. Triangle Leadership stated, "That is the whole point of all this...to support those schools who are struggling with RF. We are able to see more schools, monitor more schools, get reports out quicker so they can move forward with recommendations or requirements."

In their discussions of the effective guidance and support provided by Just Read, Florida!, RF Principals expressed appreciation for the professional development to

assist with the implementation the Reading First Initiative. One principal stated, "How to utilize Reading First Coaches and Just Read Coordinators, and How to gain the most from Professional Development for Administrators were very helpful sessions."

Regular, consistent, and timely communication was also cited by principals as effective. "The information shared with us at our leadership meeting held in conjunction with State representatives from Reading First were [sic] very informative." In terms of timeliness, another principal said, "We were kept abreast of initiatives from the Reading First office."

Perceived Limitations of the Guidance and Leadership from Just Read, Florida!

When questioned about the least effective aspects of the leadership and guidance offered by JRF, local Program Contacts had little to share; however, a change in the deadline for the *Reading First* Continuation Grant caused some anxiety.

The issue of time was also the predominant concern among *Reading First* Professional Development Coordinators in their comments concerning what they viewed as least effective. They referenced both required deadlines for projects and essential communication to district and school personnel. One Coordinator stated, "My main concern is that we get the ECI/EI letters to the districts and schools as quickly as possible so that administrators, coaches, and teachers have the information on a timely basis." On the topic of the Principal Walk-Through Training, another Coordinator indicated that the impact may have been lessened because "These trainings and drafts were released when many others were as well, and they were lost in the shuffle."

When asked to comment on the least effective aspects of the leadership and guidance, RF Principals were more apt to address topics concerning other Triangle Leaders. A few did express concerns about the scheduling of the Just Read, Florida! Leadership Conference in relation to district calendars. "In several districts, school will begin for teachers the day after principals return from Orlando....very distracting!"

➢ **Florida Center for Reading Research**

Another key member of the Reading First Leadership Triangle was the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) at Florida State University. FCRR was charged with designing, developing, and managing the data collection and assessment system in Florida, analyzing that data to determine areas in need of special support, and evaluating instructional programs and materials available for classroom use. Their analyses also led to the development of materials and tools to further assist RF teachers.

The web-based data management system developed and maintained by FCRR is a source of primary support for the implementation of *Reading First* in Florida. The Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN), as stated by FCRR, "allows schools to enter data from their *Reading First* progress monitoring and outcome assessments directly into a state level data base, and then receive timely and informative reports of student progress in reading at the individual child, classroom, school, district, region, and state level."

The PMRN Reports play an integral role in the effective implementation of *Reading First* at the school level. Educational practitioners must be able to use the reports to create meaning that can guide instructional practice. FCRR continued through the 2006-2007 year to enhance reporting of student achievement by updating PMRN training manuals and making them accessible online, providing multiple opportunities for face-to-face training, and continually reviewing and expanding their website to include ample resources for administrators, reading coaches, and teachers. For example, a new resource was the Intervention News, an online newsletter emailed to RF principals and reading coaches, and posted on the FCRR website five times during the 2006-2007 school year. The newsletters included four regular sections: 1) Research Corner, providing updates on reading research for interventions with struggling readers; 2) School Profile, recognition of RF schools with successful intervention programs; 3)

Instructional Tips, strategies for use with struggling readers; and 4) What's New, highlights of JRF, FCRR, and RFPD *Reading First* projects and links to other resources.

Broadening the scope of Progress Monitoring Reports was also achieved in 2006-2007. For example, one tool enhancing the reports are indices of the effectiveness of instruction Indices used for strategic analysis of the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). Preceding the evaluation period represented in this report, FCRR developed two indices, the Effectiveness of Core Instruction (ECI) Index and the Effectiveness of Interventions (EI) Index. During the 2006-2007 evaluation period, FCRR developed two additional indices to enhance the Effectiveness of Interventions Index by allowing for disaggregation of the DIBELS data on the reading performance of those students receiving intensive or strategic interventions. The new indices are: the Effectiveness of Interventions for Intensive students (EI-I), designed to show the percentage of students who improved reading performance by moving from the "intensive" risk category to higher performing categories of "strategic" or "on grade level"; and the Effectiveness of Interventions for Strategic Students (EI-S), which is designed to show the percentage of students moving from the "strategic" risk category to the higher performing "on grade level" grouping.

Table Four provides the results from surveys of RF Local Program Contacts, Principals, RFPD Regional Coordinators, and Reading Coaches when asked to respond to statements concerning the progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2" style="background-color:#d3d3d3">TABLE 4: Perceptions of Useful and Timely Progress Monitoring and Outcome Reports Provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research</td></tr>
</table>

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group			
	RF Local Program Contacts	RF Principals	RFPD Regional Coordinators	RF Reading Coaches
The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were **useful.**	3.75	3.65	3.67	3.78
The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were **timely.**	3.69	3.54	3.52	3.69

Table reads: The perception of all survey groups was that the progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by FCRR were slightly more useful than timely.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Perceived Strengths of Progress Monitoring & Outcome Reports

When questioned about the usefulness and timeliness of the Progress Monitoring Reports provided by FCRR, local RF Program Contacts repeatedly sited the ease of use. Other aspects mentioned were the accessibility to key stakeholders, the relevancy of the reports, and the value of trend and comparative data. The Contacts also appreciated the variety of reports and formats, and the ability to examine data on multiple levels: school, classroom, and individual student. They identified these reports as not only serving a valuable role in monitoring student progress, but also in impacting the differentiating of

instruction based on student need. One local RF Program Contact alluded to the value of these reports in determining the effective allocation of district resources.

RFPD Coordinators' comments regarding the usefulness of the Progress Monitoring Reports were made in relation to the reports' use at the instructional level. They viewed them as extremely valuable to their efforts to support schools and facilitate "focused conversations." One Coordinator stated that the reports provided, "specific insight into school, student performance, and needs to guide coordinator support/planning." In addition, the reports were described as a "hands-on tool for teacher use." In explaining the effective use of the reports at the school level, a Coordinator reported, "More explicit, more customized instruction ensued. Children moved forward faster--time was saved in using outcome measures to target students at risk early in the year."

Reading First reading coaches indicated that they found the Progress Monitoring Reports to be both useful and timely. They viewed them as a valuable tool for comparing data within and among schools, as well as for identifying areas of focus for instruction. One coach reported, "The reports gave teachers, coaches and administrators a clear picture of the students' strengths and weaknesses in a user-friendly fashion." Another described it as an essential tool, especially for planning and for intensive instruction. "Teachers are able throughout the year to make data based decisions for classroom instruction. The outcome reports give the teachers indications of the abilities of new students before they have time to work with them and allows [sic] for no lost time in knowing the student needs." Coaches also identified the color coded reports as very handy for teachers since they were "easy to access and easy for teachers to understand. The help desk personnel were extremely helpful whenever I called (which was often!) I love the quick turn around of the data."

According to reading coaches, the reports are being used to monitor students' growth and progress so that extra support can be provided as needed. "Teachers are using the information, tracking student progress and their own. As the years have increased [sic], the progress is important to note. There is so much information available on classes, school, and student." Another coach reiterated this, stating, "The progress monitoring

gives teachers a strong indicator of student success in acquiring the skills necessary to read, and the outcome reports provide excellent data to assist teachers with identifying students who are at risk. In using the data they can adjust their instruction and provide that intensive instruction that those at risk students need."

Concurring with the views of local Program Contacts and Regional Coordinators, coaches appreciated the impact of the Progress Monitoring Reports on differentiated instruction and professional development. One coach shared observed changes in practice. "The strengths of the Progress monitoring and Outcome reports have allowed teachers to group their students appropriately in order to provide differentiated instruction." Another commented on designing purposeful training. "They helped me see our school's area of weaknesses and strengths and plan staff development around it."

Coaches appreciated the array of formats available for displaying the data. "The various ways the data was [sic] presented: chart, graph, pie chart, historic reports, individual reports, parent letters, and total school reports came in very handy to teachers, reading coaches and administrators throughout the year." The format options enhanced communication within the school, and between school and home. As one coach stated, "The Cumulative Reports were very useful and effective at conferences. The parent letters served as a great tool for communicating the results and providing information on home-activities." Another coach said, "Additionally, we used the reports to set up differentiated centers; reports were used during parent conferences, and computer letters were sent home after DIBELS administrations, which helped some of the parents understand the status of their child."

Principals at *Reading First* schools saw the progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by FCRR as useful in several respects. Primarily, they viewed the reports as very valuable to their own role as instructional leader. One hands-on principal said, "I can look at data by student class as well as grade level. I can also see a history and pattern now that this has been in place a few years. This helps with showing teacher strengths and weaknesses - and gives solid data to make changes." Another discussed

application of the data, "Immediately upon release of this data, we were able to meet with our teachers and review the finding and realign the curriculum and strategies in each classroom."

A second strength of the reports as cited by principals was focused on their use in differentiated instruction. "The information assisted in individual evaluations of students. We are able to zero in on areas of deficiencies and provide the needed assistance to those iii students and mediocre students as well." As another principal stated, "The progress monitoring assisted in individualizing instruction for students and adhering to fluid flexible grouping."

Principals were also impressed with the ease of interpretation and the timeliness of the reports. "The format was easy to read and allowed teachers and me to comfortably identify trends - positive & [sic] negative - in the data. The data was very useful in driving our instructional patterns."

Perceived Limitations of Progress Monitoring & Outcome Reports

In addressing weaknesses of the Progress Monitoring and Outcome Reports, some concerns about inaccuracy in the reported data were expressed by local Program Contacts.

The most frequent comment about these reports from RFPD Regional Coordinators centered around the issue of unlimited access. Without the ability to view individual student data, coordinators felt they did not have "the specific access that we need to truly support the data analysis and work with the schools." In particular, this access was essential to their efforts to assist with the planning and implementation of Immediate Intensive Intervention (iii).

Coordinator comments echoed those of the local Program Contacts on the topic of some inaccuracies that occurred in the reporting of School Index Data, Effectiveness of Interventions/Effectiveness of Core Instruction Reports, and Focus School Data. The

gravity of the situation is summed up by this comment: "When district and schools begin to doubt the data, it is difficult to regain the trust and the desire to use that data in a supportive way for student achievement." One Coordinator also expressed a concern about the reliability of the Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) results based on inconsistencies in the way teachers conducted OPM as opposed to the way the Florida Center for Reading Research had intended.

As Reading Coaches responded to the weaknesses of the Progress Monitoring and Outcome Reports, the dominant issues that surfaced involved time and the use of the technology.

Many coaches addressed the issue of time. Their comments ranged from the amount of time needed to complete the assessments, to the close or simultaneous scheduling of multiple assessments, to the turn around time for receiving some of the reports. Some were concerned that scheduling may have skewed what could have been a more accurate picture of student growth as "the second and third DIBELS assessments were too close in time." One coach summed up the concern of many others in the following list: "The incredible amount of time it takes to administer the assessments, particularly the PPVT; the [money] and manpower needed to spend 15-20 minutes per child in a school with 600+ students; the amount of time devoted to testing and analyzing data rather than coaching and modeling in classrooms; the timing of the testing at the end of the school year when there are a plethora of end of year tests/requirements/meetings necessary for promotion criteria vs. DIBELS and PPVT."

In their concerns regarding some software limitations, it became apparent that among the coaches there were varying levels of technological proficiency. This became obvious as some coaches expressed a desire for the different levels of reports that many others had identified as a particular strength of the Progress Monitoring and Outcome Reports. However, other comments suggested the potential for useful modifications to the software. One reading coach was interested in a means to combine data from different sources for a more comprehensive picture of students' needs. "The information/data can't be downloaded into a[n] EXCEL format so that other "in house" data can be looked

at alongside to see patterns of instructional needs. I think this is a GREAT weakness."
Another would appreciate the ability to manipulate screens for easier viewing. "I would
like to have the prior year's outcome measures listed along side of the current DIBELS
data so it can all be seen at a glance instead of having to change back to another report
to see a clear picture of the child."

Many of the Reading Coaches' comments focused on the limitations of the assessments
with no measure of comprehension and on the careful use of the data collected. "The
reports for grades 3-5 only revealed FLUENCY information, but need to add a
COMPREHENSION portion in order to provide a more complete picture of the students'
abilities. FLUENCY without a COMPREHENSION component merely shows that a
student can 'call words', but does not mean that understanding has taken place and
therefore may provide a false impression to parents and teachers that a child can 'read'."
Some coaches cautioned that these data should not be the only information used as a
basis for student placement or intervention. "These are only basic indicators and should
be utilized as such. Results don't allow understanding of the complexities of reading
skills that combine during student performance, i.e., ORF [Oral Reading Fluency].
These results should only be used for progress monitoring and not used for high stakes
decisions.   This info [sic] is 'at a glance' and further diagnostics provide more
information." Another coach pointed out the potential for misinterpreting some
behaviors that could mask a reader's proficiency. "[Oral Reading Fluency] demonstrates
fluency but some students are great on comprehension which sometimes slows their
reading rate. The fluent readers have a hard time with phoneme segmentation because
they want to blend the sounds."

Although a small number of principals related finding the Progress Monitoring and
Outcome Reports confusing or difficult to use, the majority of comments focused on the
limitations of the assessments being used. One principal shared, "I, personally, wish we
had a progress monitoring piece for understanding/comprehension. There can be a
tendency to put all the eggs in the fluency hat and THAT can kill us."

Other concerns were actually focused on time and money issues rather than the reports. "No weaknesses in the reports. The only negative to the progress monitoring is that it is time and staff intensive to implement."

Additional Evidence of Effective RF Implementation

In additional to student progress monitoring data, the PMRN supports a bi-weekly log for reading coaches to report on their activities. FCRR staff reviews coaches' log entries and responds to questions in a timely manner. Additionally, they monitor the reports of time spent on coaching activities and facilitate discussion within the Triangle to provide targeted support for coaching at the school level. Summary information garnered from document reviews indicated that by mid-year, nearly 800 reading coaches had spent the largest portion of their time assessing students, conferencing with teachers, and attending meetings.

The Florida Center for Reading Research maintains reasonable standards of scientific integrity in the collection of data and monitoring of student progress through a reliability check process. At frequent intervals and during odd numbered years, the PMRN randomly selects 50 students to retake DIBELS measures with a different test administrator. The FCRR Director explained, "...the PMRN matches the scores with the reliability tests with the original one and if they are out of line, we have a formula for that and then our assessment people are alerted. If the reliabilities are too low, we call schools and say, 'What's going on?' If necessary, we retrain and recruit more people for training." The PMRN also alerts FCRR staff when test scores are out of range, so that inquiries can be made and problems solved.

Links are made between scientifically based reading research and quality of teacher instruction during FCRR site visits to RF schools. Trained observers use the Instructional Content Emphasis, Revised (ICER) instrument to collect data on two dimensions: quality of instruction, and time spent in various components of instruction. However, due to variability among the observers, there may be less confidence in the findings. Interview comments suggest that the overall quality of the instruction at

schools may not be "as high as the site visits would suggest on the numerical ratings." This hesitance to generalize results reflects one hallmark of quality researchers: caution.

- ➤ *Reading First* **Professional Development**

Reading First Professional Development (RFPD) at the University of Central Florida completes the state Leadership Triangle. In their own words, "The RFPD project is designed to ensure the creation and implementation of a comprehensive, systemic organizational design for statewide professional development in reading based upon SBRR, scientifically-based reading research (content), and principles of effective professional development (process) to assure continuous, high quality implementation of SBRR methods and strategies for all K-3 educators in Florida."

A key factor in the demonstrated success of this project is the highly qualified cadre of professional development coordinators who assist in the delivery of *Reading First* professional development, both large scale and site based. The Regional Coordinators, in concert with other personnel from RFPD, Just Read, Florida!, and the Florida Center for Reading Research, developed and facilitated sessions at statewide conferences, regional trainings, and school-level professional development to support *Reading First* efforts.

In addition to the delivery of professional development, the Coordinators served as both coach and mentor to reading coaches at *Reading First* schools across Florida during 2006-2007.   Information gleaned from interviews and site visits revealed that Coordinator services to RF schools was differentiated based on three identified levels of need. The highest priority for support (Level 1) was addressed by RFPD Regional Coordinators through a minimum of two site visits per month. Level 1 schools included Focus Schools – approximately 48 schools identified by the RF Leadership Triangle after analysis of school data determined little or no demonstrated growth in student reading achievement after three or more years of RF implementation. Level 1 also included schools targeted for additional support by special request of school district RF personnel. During one interview, a representative of the Triangle Leadership shared,

"the coordinators [at Focus Schools] do more side-by-side coaching. They actually mentor the coaches…go in and demonstrate a lesson along side a coach, with a coach, for a coach. Whatever it takes, they will do it."

RFPD Regional Coordinators provided ongoing support to Level 2 schools by traveling at least once a month to those sites making progress toward achieving the RF goals.

Assistance was provided as requested by Level 3 schools, those demonstrating success in meeting RF goals, and included quarterly site visits from a RFPD Regional Coordinator. Field notes and survey comments indicated that the Coordinators were readily accessible through email and were quick to respond to requests from school-based personnel, regardless of the school's identified level of service.

Table Five provides the results from surveys of RF Principals and Reading Coaches when asked to respond to statements concerning the on-site support provided by RFPD Regional Coordinators.

TABLE 5: Perceptions of Support Provided by *Reading First* Professional Development Regional Coordinators

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group	
	RF Principals	RF Reading Coaches
Meetings with the Reading First Professional Development Coordinator were scheduled and occurred regularly.	3.37	3.57
The Reading First Professional Development Coordinator was readily accessible and responded to questions and concerns in a timely manner.	3.45	3.73
Site visits made by the Reading First Professional Development Coordinator included observation and feedback.	3.45	3.63
The focus of meetings with the Reading First Professional Development Coordinator included support and follow-up for state and regional events.	NA	3.51

Table reads: Reading Coaches perceived RFPD Coordinators as more readily accessible and responsive to questions and concerns in a timely manner than principals did.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Perceived Strengths of RFPD Regional Coordinator Site Visits

Reading First coaches stressed the visits of their Regional Coordinator as a highly effective aspect of the training and support provided by RFPD. Some of the topics identified as being of particular value during those visits were effective observations, walk-through protocols, and the interpretation and use of data resources.

The following statements represent a plethora of comments from reading coaches concerning the value of the site-based support that they received:

> "I believe the MOST effective support comes from my Reading First coordinator when she comes out to my school. This provides me with not only the information that I need but also with guidance for myself and the teachers that the implementation is on target. This is where I am able to evaluate the impact on the students most...which is, after all, the goal we all strive for."

> "Having my regional coordinator at my school was the most beneficial because at that time it is about me, my school and my students' needs. She is most helpful in any avenue that is determined to be a need by planning and assisting in [professional development] if necessary, being an ear for the coach to talk things out and understand where she is coming from, and helping focus on the needs of the school."

> "We were finally provided with the support personnel we have needed. [Regional Coordinator] has been a tremendous support and encourager. This is the first year in which I believe we have had focus and direction. I attribute much of our success with our Action Research plans and our outcome measurements due to her support. When we had questions, she found answers."

> "[Regional Coordinator] was available for conferences, modeling and coaching. She has been an ear and a clarifier for me when I've been confused. She has been an extra eye for me when I've done walk-throughs. She has also made me think about what I'm doing and why."

Principals at *Reading First* schools identified the regular site visits as an effective element of the training and support provided by *Reading First* Professional Development. In one of the comments about specific coordinators, a principal said, "[Our Regional] Coordinator has been a great support to my Reading Coach and staff. She has provided staff development, coaching cycles and assisted with analyzing data for school improvement. Also, training was provided to my reading coach to train teachers with implementing new materials."

<u>Perceived Limitations of RFPD Regional Coordinator Site Visits</u>

Although many principals had identified the site visits of the Regional Coordinators as being effective, some saw them as not sufficient. One expressed a need for more "time for Principal to meet with the Reading First representative and internal coach regarding data." In several instances it was not clear whether the issue was the schedule of visits or the principal's schedule.

Table Six provides the results from surveys of RF Local Program Contacts, Principals, and Reading Coaches when asked to respond to statements concerning the training and support provided by RFPD.

TABLE 6: Perceptions of the Effectiveness and Timeliness of Training and Support Provided by Reading First Professional Development		

	Mean by Survey Group		
Survey Item	RF Local Program Contacts	RF Principals	RF Reading Coaches
The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was **effective**.	3.57	3.45	3.55
The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was **timely**.	3.56	3.40	3.47

Table reads: The perception of all survey groups was that the training and support provided by RFPD to reading coaches was slightly more effective than timely.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Table Seven provides the results from a survey of RF Reading Coaches when asked to respond to statements concerning state and regional professional development.

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group
	RF Reading Coaches
The state and regional Reading First Professional Development events were based on related topics that reflected an on-going, long range plan for professional development.	3.46
Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included discussion of pertinent research and theory.	3.52
Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included opportunities to observe models of coaching in action.	3.17
Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included opportunities to practice coaching techniques.	3.14
Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included opportunities for feedback on coaching techniques.	3.26

TABLE 7: Perceptions of State and Regional Training and Support to Reading Coaches

Table reads: Reading Coaches agreed that professional development was more likely to include discussion of pertinent research and theory than opportunities to practice coaching techniques.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Perceived Strengths of RFPD Training Provided to Reading Coaches

Reading First Program Contacts responding to items regarding the effectiveness of the training and support provided by RFPD repeatedly identified the ongoing nature of the services and the follow-up provided by the *Reading First* Coordinators through the QPD trainings, the monthly Coaching Meetings, and school site visits. Contacts described the content of the trainings as "data driven and relevant" to the needs of reading coaches. They appreciated the accessibility and interpersonal skills of the Coordinators, as well as the opportunity to partner with them on school site visits. Other comments referred to the value of the trainings to the support of new or developing coaches.

The coaches also had scores of comments regarding the benefits of the various trainings: Leadership Academies, Coaching Academies, Quarterly Professional Development, and Monthly Coaches' Meetings. "The Professional Development component of the Reading First Quarterly Meetings is solid, research based, and full of good information delivered in a meaningful way."

The following coach's comment depicts the ongoing, systematic nature of the training offered by the Regional Coordinators: "Our training provided by our RFPD folks was excellent in every respect. They provided training frequently throughout the year, not just their quarterly meetings. They also had follow-up in the schools after our trainings to help the coaches implement ideas presented in their trainings."

Evidence was collected to confirm that the school level work of RFPD Regional Coordinators was clearly aligned with the Florida Professional Development Protocol, and the National Staff Development Council Standards as they provided "support...to ensure appropriate application of the knowledge and skills in the classroom" and ongoing assistance to reading coaches and teachers in "implementing the new knowledge and skills correctly."

RFPD planned for systemic delivery of professional development by implementing Quarterly Professional Development (QPD) sessions, participating in monthly district coaching meetings, and following up with ongoing school-level support. QPD's were structured around state trend data, but also included time for school-level action planning. Each Quarterly Professional Development included an afternoon session focused on the development of school action plans based upon the specific needs of each school. This allowed for a differentiated approach to follow-up support from the coordinators as they made future site visits.

Field notes from the QPD delivered in April and May 2007 to reading coaches from both *Reading First* and non – *Reading First* schools, reveal evidence of high levels of

professional expertise among the RFPD Regional Coordinators. They demonstrated flexibility in working with the local RF Program Contacts to adjust the agendas; facilitated creative and thought provoking warm-up activities for participants, requiring them to reflect on previous professional development content; and presented a well-planned balance of new information, time for group interaction, and participant sharing.

Collaborating with local *Reading* First program contacts, RFPD Regional Coordinators participated in monthly coaches meetings to incorporate book studies on *Powerful Designs for Professional Learning* (NSDC) and *Making Sense of Phonics* (Beck). Differentiation occurred as the coordinators mentored the coaches and provided side-by-side coaching. They demonstrated lessons for a coach or with a coach. The coordinators also assisted coaches in planning, creating, and delivering professional development at individual schools, such as workshops and book studies.

Perceived Limitations of RFPD Training Provided to Reading Coaches

The *Reading First* coaches overwhelmingly stressed the need for differentiated professional development, especially during the Quarterly Professional Development sessions. They recognized the varied levels of expertise among their colleagues and felt that trainings were geared toward the less experienced coach and often redundant for the veteran coach, especially on such topics as the Coaching Continuum and the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network. "Quarterly Professional Development Sessions were great for newer coaches, but the content wasn't as timely and relevant for coaches that had been doing this for a long time." They suggested strategies for improving the training such as, "Quarterly regional meetings should be diversified to meet the varying levels of coaching. It would be beneficial to meet in small, varied level groups to collect and share strategies that coaches from each district utilize."

Coaches also indicated that one of the least effective aspects of the training they received was the timing, either because of conflicts with other scheduled obligations or because the topic was no longer timely. "Holding training sessions during the testing windows is ineffective. No matter how useful the training is, it is extremely difficult to concentrate when all you can think about are the 500+ students that need DIBELS by the end of the testing window. The training we received concerning core reading curriculum was, to me, the least effective; not because of the content, but because of the timing. I gained much useful information from the training; however, it was provided at the END of the school year and a year before we are to adopt our new series. How valuable the training would have been if it had only been done several years ago."

Two other areas of concern to the coaches were the Book Study and the ratio of schools to Regional Coordinators. While several questioned the Book Study selections, others were concerned about the time element and the structure of the activity. "I believe that the least effective was taking us out of our schools to read a book together. If we were given the book, we should then convene together to share its most important points and then discuss key elements of best practices that can be helpful to our teachers." In describing limited access to a Coordinator, one coach stated, "They are spread so thin you don't have enough opportunities to meet with them. As I am a coach at a focus school, I feel that we should receive a lot more assistance. I don't feel that their timeliness [sic] is their problem as much as how many coaches they have to assist and the distance that they have to travel."

Table Eight provides the results from a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators in regard to their self-assessment of the trainings delivered to Reading Coaches.

TABLE 8: Self-Assessment of Effective and Timely Training and Support Provided by *Reading First* Professional Development Regional Coordinators

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group
	RFPD Regional Coordinators
The training I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective.	3.62
The training I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely.	3.24
The support I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective	3.62
The support I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely.	3.29

Table reads: RFPD Regional Coordinators perceive the training and support they provided to reading coaches as more effective than timely.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Perceived Success of RFPD Training Provided to Reading Coaches

In the self-assessment of the training and support they provided, RFPD Coordinators overwhelmingly identified the work they did at the school level as having had the most impact. "On-site support was most powerful as it allowed for personal attention and differentiation of services based upon school/coach needs." They indicated that working at a level that allowed for such differentiation has led to sustainable change.

As RFPD Coordinators addressed the success they experienced in providing support for the implementation of *Reading First* in Florida, they focused on the topics of systemic

change, nurturing the professional growth of colleagues, collaboration, and the use of data.

One coordinator described the feeling of "being a key player in creating a school wide change [through] working with the Leadership team, Reading Coach, and teachers to create an environment that is Literacy Rich." Another described a change in school culture as "teachers who are no longer isolated, classrooms [that] are now learning communities, and students [who] are engaged and involved in their own learning."

Coordinators saw the professional growth of the coaches and teachers with whom they worked as another index of success. One coordinator discussed this growth as a result of "supporting reading coaches and working more with teachers in the day-to-day aspects of teaching primary reading skills and strategies…assisting them with gaining ownership and becoming reflective learners of their craft." Another coordinator expressed confidence in the true nature of the growth: "It is my belief that if Reading First ended tomorrow some of these coaches would easily be able to sustain the effort of Reading First at their school site."

Collaboration with district and school personnel in the implementation of *Reading First* was another indicator of Coordinators' success. One Coordinator commented, "Working with coaches side by side and then seeing them transfer that work into individual classrooms has been an awesome experience. My district has also included me in all trainings and allowed me to attend and deliver [professional development] to not only [sic] coaches but principals as well. I am seen as an integral part of the team!"

Finally, several Coordinators referred to the use of data to inform decisions related to both instruction and professional development. They expressed the belief that "schools have a much better understanding and working knowledge of what data can do to drive reading instruction for ALL students!"

Coordinators also identified specific professional development opportunities that were effective. Those mentioned were in the areas of coaching and the use of data to inform instructional decisions.

Perceived Limitations of RFPD Training Provided to Reading Coaches

Concerns expressed by *Reading First* Program Contacts regarding the least effective aspects of the training and support they received from *Reading First* Professional Development were limited. They focused on a need to differentiate the professional development based on coaching experience and prior trainings offered by the districts. One comment addressed the need to release the schedule of training events in a more timely manner and to ensure that event titles clearly described the content and purpose.

In discussing the challenges they faced in providing support for the implementation of *Reading First*, Professional Development Coordinators pointed to lack of support at district or school level, the ratio of schools to coordinator, and mobility rates. One described the need for "breaking through the barriers...districts, administrators, and teachers who refuse to support the implementation." Another coordinator pointed out that even some who did not actually resist implementation posed a challenge. "School administrations' lack of training and understanding of reading as a process sometimes inhibit gains that could otherwise be met in struggling students."

The number of schools assigned to each Coordinator was a topic that surfaced earlier in the survey. Several felt constrained by the "time and ability to provide the depth of support that schools and reading coaches are asking for given the number of schools that I service." When they were able to provide the necessary depth, it may not have occurred in a timely manner. Again, comments focused on the impact the number of assigned schools had on their ability to deliver quality professional development and technical assistance in a timely manner. There is "not enough time to truly support the schools in the depth and manner that I would like to... along with being able to truly

support and develop the role of the coach so that they are able to be the catalyst for change at the school site."

The last common area of challenge addressed by Coordinators was school staff mobility. "The greatest challenge to providing support for Reading First is the ever changing coaches, administrators, and teachers at school sites. Each time there is a change, it is like beginning anew. The schools that I serve that reflect the greatest growth are those that have maintained stable administration, coach, and had relatively limited teacher turnover."

Other comments addressed a lack of alignment with district or school leadership initiatives, insufficient follow-up, and challenges in differentiating larger scale professional development. As the follow-up responsibilities often rested with the Reading Coaches, Coordinators pointed out how essential the support of the leadership was. "Often, [coaches] were pulled in too many directions by the administration and were unable to get in classrooms and provide professional development regularly." Regarding the differentiation of professional development, Coordinators' comments echoed those of the Program Contacts discussed above.

Table Nine provides the results from surveys of RF Principals and Reading Coaches when asked to respond to statements concerning the time allocated for professional development.

TABLE 9: Perceptions of Sufficiency of Time Allocated for the Professional Development of Reading Coaches		
Survey Item	**Mean by Survey Group**	
	RF Principals	RF Reading Coaches
During the school year, sufficient time was allocated for professional development to allow for the reading coach's growth in knowledge and skills.	3.45	3.26

Table reads: Principals were more inclined than Reading Coaches to perceive that the time allocated for the professional development of reading coaches was sufficient.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

<u>Perceived Concerns About the Time Allotted for Professional Development of Coaches</u>

Reading First principals expressed concern about the amount of time their coaches were off campus for training events and meetings. One principal stated, "Reading Coaches need to receive extra training, but they are pulled out of the building too often. Another highlighted the need for communication regarding the events the coach attended. "It would be most helpful to receive a SUMMARY of what was covered at their monthly meetings."

<u>Additional Evidence of Effective RF Implementation</u>

Due to the inclusion of Cohort 2 RF schools, the number of Focus Schools increased in 2006-2007 and, as a result, the need for additional Regional Coordinators grew. The *Reading First* Leadership Triangle demonstrated confidence in the ability of RFPD to provide effective school-level services by continuing to provide resources to expand the group of Regional Coordinators from 25 to approximately 31 during 2006-2007. Applicants were carefully screened and required to hold a master's degree, preferably in reading. RF Leadership interviewers examined the teaching and coaching experience of each candidate. In the words of one member of the Triangle, "Have they coached? They have to be able to walk the walk and talk the talk when they go out into the schools." Interviews suggested that at least five years of classroom experience was desirable, but, as the state prepared to enter a sixth year of *Reading First* implementation, a workable knowledge of the *RF* Initiative was of primary importance.

During 2006-2007, RFPD Coordinators worked to sharpen their skills and fine tune their knowledge of current reading research by attending national and regional conferences and meetings, such as events sponsored by the Eastern Regional Reading First Technical Assistance Center, for opportunities to interact and network with the researchers, and receive information on latest studies. In some cases, Coordinators supported the transfer of learning to reading coaches by facilitating book studies using current published works that address areas of focus identified through the student monitoring and outcome data.

The Director of *Reading First* Professional Development monitored the work of the Regional Coordinators through review of three types of monthly reports:

- School Visits Report to chart site visits monthly and across the year;
- Activity Report allocating time for contact with individual coaches, teachers, and administrators; support and technical assistance at school and district levels; professional activities such as staff meetings, professional development planning, data collection, and professional reading; and
- Narrative Report of Site Visits describing the purpose, action taken, and next steps.

The reports provided evidence of the scope of work for each RFPD Regional Coordinator, as well as details about how time was spent. For example, a report of the kinds of activities observed during evaluator site visits might include: performed classroom walkthroughs focused on effective literacy environments; observed instruction during the 90-minute reading block and provided feedback to teachers; interpreted FCRR progress monitoring reports for school Reading Leadership Team; assisted reading coach with grade level data meetings; modeled effective reading instruction for teachers; developed action plans with district RF contacts, reading coach, and school administrators for implementation of individual student learning centers in K-3 classrooms; co-presented with reading coach to provide professional development for teachers on using FCRR Learning Centers binders to differentiate according to individual student need; and planned next steps with reading coach and scheduled a follow-up visit.

Through analysis of the monthly reports, RFPD leaders determined the percentage of time spent on activity categories. For example, in April 2007, a total of 31 RFPD Regional Coordinators spent approximately 2,235 hours (an average of 55% of activity time) providing professional development, site-based support, and technical assistance to RF school and/or district efforts. The activities most reported were Needs

Assessment/Action Planning (433 hours), Technical Assistance (368 hours), Quarterly Professional Development (286 hours), and Data Analysis (244 hours). Additionally, approximately 1716 hours (an average of 45% of activity time) were devoted to professional activities such as staff meetings and professional reading. The most common activities were RFPD staff meetings required of all Coordinators (496 hours), Data Collection/Reporting (408 hours), Professional Development Planning (334 hours), and Professional Reading (207 hours). Activity summaries for individual Coordinators were used to inform quarterly discussions and yearly performance reviews with the RFPD Director. The reports provided guidance, as evidenced in the following excerpt from interviews with RFPD leadership. "It tells me who is working way over. So many coordinators are working on Saturdays. My goal is to use this [activity report summary] as a tool. They can see the average compared to their own and see what is going on."

The monthly Coordinator activity reports also served to represent voices from the field, informing collaborative efforts between RFPD and the other RF Triangle entities. Interview data referred to the practice of highlighting reported situations or issues needing immediate attention and communicating the information to the RF Triangle for follow-up action when necessary.

➢ *Reading First* Leadership Triangle Collaboration

Evidence of powerful collaboration between the RF Leadership Triangle that resulted in effective and timely guidance and leadership to *Reading First* efforts across Florida was pervasive throughout the data. Nearly every new product, resource, or training developed during the year was the result of open and regular communication among the Triangle agencies to share information, examine data, establish goals, and set priorities based on the needs of leadership, educators, and students in RF districts and schools. For example, prior to the start of the 2006-2007 school year, JRF organized an annual retreat to bring key personnel from the RF Leadership Triangle together. The retreat provided the opportunity for face-to-face collaboration for the purposes of examining

data and establishing long range plans based on that data. In one session, personnel from FCRR led a review of current student achievement data and trends over time, while RFPD regional coordinators provided observation data from their role in the field. Rich discussion and cooperative decision making was facilitated in this collaborative environment.

As a result of this retreat, each entity took on specific tasks and determined how best to collaborate on joint projects. A protocol established follow-up communication among the Triangle entities that occurred quarterly through face-to-face meetings, video conferencing, or conference calls. These occurred in addition to more frequent phone and email communication that represented ongoing consultation and problem solving. These methods of communication promoted flexibility and led to adjustments to planning based on progress monitoring data collected and analyzed by FCRR, as well as field data from the district and school level gleaned from RFPD Regional Coordinators.

Based on the state-wide trends uncovered in the data reviewed during the August 2006 retreat, projects were planned to address specific needs. For example, the leadership group determined a need to focus on alphabetic decoding in first grade, fluency in second grade, and the ability of the reading coach to transfer his/her content knowledge in those areas. These topics were addressed by RFPD through quarterly regional professional development (QPD) sessions, monthly coaching meetings, book studies, and school-level training. In another case, information from the field revealed that teachers were struggling to use their student data to guide instruction. To address this need, FCRR designed *Empowering Teachers* as a web-based support tool to help teachers improve the quality of differentiated instruction.

Some of the strongest evidence of collaboration among the Triangle entities is centered on the needs of Focus Schools - schools who have been implementing *Reading First* for three years without demonstrating adequate student growth. The local school districts must create a support plan for a Focus School to submit to JRF. FCRR then schedules monitoring visits to the school. Finally, RFPD uses the information from the support plan, monitoring reports, and school PMRN data to plan professional development that

meets the specific needs of the school. During 2006-2007, FCRR and JRF coordinated site visits to more than half of the Focus Schools in the fall to uncover and address any issues that might be interfering with the implementation of *Reading First*. RFPD Coordinators adjusted their schedules to provide additional support for Focus Schools and strategic professional development. During Spring 2007, a random sample of 25 schools was visited. A full report of the Focus Schools site visits is available on the FCRR website.

Highly effective collaboration also resulted in well-organized RFPD staff meetings. Not only are personnel from the Leadership Triangle represented at the monthly meetings in Orlando, field notes revealed that participation of the Directors of RF at JRF and FCRR provided opportunities for meaningful interaction and exchange of information between RFPD Regional Coordinators and Triangle Leadership. Specific challenges and issues from the field were discussed with professionalism in the collegial atmosphere. The staff meetings also provided an opportunity for on-going professional development and guidance for the Regional Coordinators.

Table Ten provides the results from a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators in regard to professional development and guidance provided by FCRR.

TABLE 10: Perceptions of Effective and Timely Professional Development and Support Provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group
	RFPD Regional Coordinators
The professional development and guidance provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research to Reading First Professional Development Coordinators were **effective**.	3.62
The professional development and guidance provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research to Reading First Professional Development Coordinators were **timely**.	3.29

Table reads: RFPD Regional Coordinators perceive that the professional development and guidance provided by FCRR was slightly more effective than timely.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Table Eleven provides the results from a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators in regard to Leadership Triangle collaboration.

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group
	RFPD Regional Coordinators
The collaborative mechanisms and procedures used by the Leadership Triangle (JRF, RFPD, FCRR) provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to Reading First efforts in Florida.	3.48

TABLE 11: Perceptions of *Reading First* Leadership Triangle Collaboration

Table reads: RFPD Regional Coordinators perceive the collaborative efforts of the RF Leadership Triangle to provide guidance and leadership as effective and timely.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Survey data demonstrated the perception of RFPD Regional Coordinators that collaboration among the RF Triangle Leadership was both effective and timely. Comments from local RF Program Contacts and Principals suggested they viewed the separate members of the RF Triangle as one leadership entity.

Additional Evidence of Effective RF Implementation

The collaborative efforts of the RF Leadership Triangle were evident in the organization of approximately 50 reading academies for K-3 teachers. FCRR and RFPD worked together to make revisions to the content of the K-3 academies that involved a more explicit articulation of the correlation between the reading content and the Sunshine State Standards. Also, the assessment section was updated to reflect the change in Florida's progress monitoring from four to three times per year. Instead of sponsoring a face-to-face training for the Academy developers/trainers, an online module was created so that they could officially go through the training and take a quiz at the end to ensure understanding. This was cost effective and it met the needs of sponsors and participants. Additionally, instead of asking Academy conveners to travel for regional planning meetings, the RFPD set up conference calls with each convener and local RF Program

Contacts. As a result, Triangle Leadership reported that "all the academies were scheduled by the time the phone was hung up."

During 2006-2007, collaboration extended beyond the RF Leadership Triangle to include projects that shared responsibilities with the Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence Center (FLaRE) and the Eastern Regional *Reading First* Technical Assistance Center (ERRFTAC). For example, when RFPD Coordinators reported that many new coaches had been hired prior to the start of the 2006-2007 school year and were in need of support, RFPD worked in partnership with FLaRE and responded by delivering regional two-day trainings, the ABCs of Coaching, to provide the bare essentials for beginning coaches. This duo also combined forces to facilitate eleven regional Reading Leadership Team Institutes designed to provide professional development, and time for goal setting and action planning for school Leadership Teams of six to eight members including site administrators, the reading coach, and other staff representatives.

Field notes revealed that the cooperative efforts of RFPD Regional Coordinators and FLaRE Coordinators resulted in a successful Reading Leadership Team Institute in Jacksonville, Florida on June 21-22, 2007. Participating schools included 13 *Reading First* schools (34%) and 25 non-*Reading First* schools (66%). Responsibilities appeared to be well distributed between the agencies, with much of the professional development presented in partnerships. Although most of the content of the breakout sessions was developed by FLaRE, in most cases, the RFPD Coordinators appeared well-prepared and comfortable presenting the professional development. However, observation did suggest that at times, RFPD Coordinators may have been less secure in the presentation of training that they had not created.

In July 2007, JRF, RFPD, and FLaRE organized the JRF K-12 Summer Literacy Institute, offering four strands of professional development to practitioners statewide, including Content Area Reading Professional Development (CAR-PD), coaching strands, and a reading literacy academy for teachers of students in grades four and five.

The 6th Annual K-12 Leadership Conference hosted by Just Read, Florida! on August 5-8, 2007, in Orlando, Florida provided evidence of another collaborative success. The opportunity to increase knowledge, build skills, and network with colleagues was provided for more than 4,000 principals, assistant principals, reading coaches, and district administrators from across the state. Sixteen keynote or featured speaker presentations and over 300 breakout sessions were offered. Personnel from the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle agencies presented approximately 89 breakout sessions including 26 that were presented collaboratively by RFPD Regional Coordinators and practitioners from the *Reading First* schools they serve.

Field notes confirmed that despite the large number of participants, the conference was extremely well organized with programs, signs, and hallway monitors/assistants available to guide those in attendance to sessions. Observations revealed pertinent information and updates were presented in multiple sessions by representatives of each of the three RF Triangle entities. Of particular interest was the 26 "What Works" sessions co-presented as partnerships between RFPD Regional Coordinators and local practitioners, including reading coaches, school administrators, and RF program contacts.

Findings in Regard to Evaluation Question Two

➢ How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the classroom practice of Florida teachers in *Reading First* schools?

The impact of guidance and leadership provided by the RF Leadership Triangle to improve classroom practice in *Reading First* schools was well documented in 2006-2007. More than 15, 000 teachers at more than 550 schools in 45 Florida counties were given opportunities to benefit from high-quality professional development and guidance provided by RF Leadership. In addition to the site-based support offered by RFPD Regional Coordinators and reading coaches, teachers had unlimited access to online tools accessible on the RF Leadership Triangle websites, including support in the areas

of curriculum and instruction, assessment programs, professional development, presentations and publications, and interventions for struggling readers.

Review of pertinent documents and interview data revealed the following resources development primarily during 2006-2007:

- Differentiated Reading Instruction: Small Group Alternative Lesson Structures for *All* Students
- Empowering Teachers: making sound decisions to improve reading outcomes
- LEaRN (Literacy Essentials and Reading Network), a website focused on implementing research-based reading instruction
- Intervention News, a bi-monthly newsletter of information and ideas for support of struggling readers
- A Principal's Guide to Intensive Interventions for Struggling Readers in RF Schools
- K-5 Student Center Activities, for independent student learning
- Program Specific Professional Development (PSPD), Professional development to provide better use of the Comprehensive Core Reading Programs (CCRP's) in Reading First schools.
- Principal K-5 Reading Walkthrough (RWT) - A tool intended to assist principals with collecting reading observation data to ultimately improve teacher practice and positively impact student achievement.

Additionally, the Office of Just Read, Florida! and the Florida Center for Reading Research were easily accessible and very responsive to inquiries by phone and email, answering questions, suggesting resources, and offering technical assistance and guidance to principals, coaches, and other school personnel.

The federal *Reading First* Initiative was founded on the premise that effective reading instruction as determined by scientifically based reading research would guide students in kindergarten through third grade to succeed as readers. It is therefore noteworthy to

report that the content of professional development provided by entities in the *Reading First* Leadership Triangle reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading. The Triangle consistently referenced appropriate research in print materials, web-based resources, and during face-to-face delivery of professional development and technical assistance. Analysis of the evaluator site visit field notes revealed that RFPD Regional Coordinators were frequently observed translating research findings into specific examples of instructional practice to help bridge understanding for reading coaches and school leadership. It was evident that, in most cases, the Coordinators understood the implications of scientifically based reading research for effective classroom practice. Their survey responses provide additional evidence of the perception that research on best practices and reading instruction provide a foundation for and are imbedded in *Reading First* professional development opportunities.

Table Twelve provides the results from a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators in regard to the *Reading First* professional development based on reading research.

TABLE 12: RFPD Regional Coordinators Perceptions of Professional Development in Regard to Scientifically Based Reading Research	

Survey Item	**Mean by Survey Group**
	RFPD Regional Coordinators
The professional development provided by Reading First Professional Development to coaches in Reading First schools reflects the best principles of professional development as outlined in Every Child Reading: A Professional Development Guide and the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development.	3.52
The content of the professional development provided in Teacher Reading Academies reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading.	3.71
The content of the professional development provided in Quarterly Professional Development and Monthly Book Studies reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading.	3.52

Table reads: A high level of agreement exists among RFPD Regional Coordinators in regard to the inclusion of scientifically based reading research in professional development activities.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Contributing to the ongoing nature of high quality professional development, districts and schools sponsored follow up support for professional growth through learning communities, study groups, summer RF academies, monthly coaches meetings, and in-service activities. Local program contacts supplemented the RFPD support provided by regional coordinators with that of private educational consultants and groups such as the Eastern Regional *Reading First* Technical Assistance Center (ERRFTAC), the North East Florida Educational Consortium (NEFEC), and Florida Diagnostic and Learning Resources System (FDLRS). In addition, local program contacts reported local trainings on topics such as using DIBELS data to improve instruction, the use of FCRR center binders for independent activities, content area reading strategies, and training for para-professionals in strategies for small group reading instruction.

Site visits provided ample evidence of teachers and reading coaches working in concert with RFPD Regional Coordinators to review student assessment data, plan targeted instructional strategies for teachers, organize independent learning activities for students, and strengthen the effectiveness of literacy focused classroom environments. RFPD Regional Coordinators were also observed providing guidance and support by modeling effective instruction, co-presenting professional development, facilitating goal setting, and participating in discussions of pertinent issues between school reading coaches, district RF support personnel, and school- and district-based administrators. Although Coordinators consistently demonstrated positive rapport, evidence of collaborative planning with each school, coaching and mentoring skills, and effective use of data, leadership and implementation of RF varied from school to school.

Florida *Reading First* districts set requirements for the hiring of reading coaches. Some district plans allow for a reading coach at every RF school, while others ask two schools to share a reading coach. Because the RFPD Regional Coordinators provide support based on a 3-tier hierarchy of services, visiting those with the greatest need (Focus Schools) more often than those making good progress, districts may supplement school level support by hiring district reading coaches/RF support personnel too. Evaluator field notes indicate that the RFPD Regional Coordinators were most often able to establish a collegial working relationship with district reading coaches/RF support

personnel as evidenced in collaborative planning and unified effort to guide school level implementation of RF.

Table Thirteen explains the self-reported experience of RF Reading Coaches.

TABLE 13: Self-Reported Experience of Reading Coaches at *Reading First* Schools

Survey Item	Number	Percent of Respondents	Group
	431	100%	Statewide Total
Years of Teaching Experience	135	31%	1-2 Years
	192	45%	3-5 Years
	77	18%	6-10 Years
	25	6%	10 + Years
	2	<1%	No Response
Years of Professional Coaching Experience	135	31%	1-2 Years
	190	44%	3-5 Years
	77	18%	6-10 Years
	24	6%	10 + Years
	2	<1%	No Response
Reading Certification	198	46%	Yes
	229	53%	No
	4	<1%	No Response
FL Reading Endorsement	109	25%	Yes
	313	73%	No
	9	2%	No Response

Table reads: The self-reported experience of RF reading coaches indicates that most have three or more years of both teaching and professional coaching experience.

Data show that local school districts established guidelines for hiring highly qualified RF reading coaches. The survey of local RF program contacts indicated that a valid elementary teaching certificate; reading certification or Florida Reading Endorsement or work towards attaining the reading certification or endorsement, and three to five years of successful teaching experience served as basic requirements in hiring a reading

coach in most cases. Additionally, several local RF program contact survey respondents included an advanced degree, good communication and presentation skills, or a three-year commitment to serve as reading coach as desirable qualifications.

Data indicate that one of these basic district requirements is clearly supported by the hiring practices at the school level, where nearly 70% of the RF reading coaches self-reported having three or more years teaching experience. However, the fact that only 46% reported holding reading certification and 25% held the Florida Reading Endorsement does not necessarily mean less school level support. In some cases, the coaches explained in the comment section of the survey that they were in the process of acquiring reading certification or endorsement.

Findings in Regard to Evaluation Question Three

➢ How have the efforts of the Triangle impacted the reading achievement
   of Florida students in *Reading First* schools?

Two primary goals remain the focus of *Reading* First in Florida: 1) increase the percentage of students reading at grade level in kindergarten through third grade each year, and 2) decrease the percentage of students with serious reading difficulties in kindergarten through third grade each year. According to outcome measure data supplied by the Florida Center for Reading Research, students in Reading First schools have shown progress in attaining those two goals. A full record of student achievement in RF schools is available from FCRR; what follows in this report is limited summary information based on that data.

In 2006-2007, FCRR monitored and reported data according to three groups of RF schools: Cohort One schools - those completing their fourth year of implementation; Cohort Two schools – those completing their third year of implementation; and Cohort Three schools – those completing their second year of implementation. Data were

reported by grade level within each Cohort to show annual progress as well as trend data across the years of implementation.

Students in kindergarten were assessed using the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) for both progress monitoring and outcome reporting. During 2006-2007, kindergarten students in all three cohort groups showed increases ranging from 1 to 5% in the number of students on or above grade level. They demonstrated decreases ranging from 1 to 3% in the number of students with serious reading difficulties.   Trend data across four years indicates that RF schools in all three cohorts consistently increased the number of students reading on grade level and decreased the number with reading difficulties each year. No additional data were collected by the evaluators on the achievement of kindergarten students during 2006-2007.

Table Fourteen provides the results from surveys of RF Local Program Contacts and Principals when asked to respond to statements concerning the reading achievement of students in first grade.

	TABLE 14: Perceptions of Grade One Student Achievement in *Reading*		

Survey Item	**Mean by Survey Group**	
	RF Local Program Contacts	RF Principals
As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved in Reading First schools.	3.14	3.14
On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved in Reading First schools.	2.94	3.11

Table reads: Local Program Contacts and RF Principals agreed that the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved as measured by fluency outcomes.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Performance on the SAT10 was reported as outcome data for Florida's RF students in grade one. Although the trend data shows that performance improved across time, the 2006-2007 performance varied across cohorts with two groups recording increases of 1 to 3% in the number of students on or above grade level, while one cohort dropped 1% since last year. Likewise, cohorts did not perform consistently in the 2006-2007 efforts to decrease the number of students with serious reading difficulties. Cohort Three showed a small reduction of 1% in the number of first graders with serious reading difficulties, however, the percentage of Cohort One first graders with serious reading difficulties remained constant at 16% and the percentage of Cohort Two students increased 2%.

In surveys to local RF program contacts and principals, both groups agree that the reading fluency of first graders has improved. The principals agree that reading comprehension has improved as well, while the local program contacts were slightly more inclined to disagree.

Table Fifteen provides the results from surveys of RF Local Program Contacts and Principals when asked to respond to statements concerning the reading achievement of students in first grade.

TABLE 15: Perceptions of Grade Two Student Achievement in *Reading First* Schools		
Survey Item	**Mean by Survey Group**	
	RF Local Program Contacts	RF Principals
As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade Two improved in Reading First schools.	2.94	2.99
On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade Two improved in Reading First schools.	2.81	3.00

Table reads: RF Principals agreed that achievement as measured by fluency and comprehension has increased for Grade Two students.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Second grade students at RF schools participated in the SAT10 as an outcome measure. Trend data show that the number of students reading on grade level did increase over time in second grade classrooms, but reducing the number of students with reading difficulties proved more challenging this year. In 2006-2007, all three cohorts showed increases of 1 to 2% in the number of students on or above grade level, but success varied on the goal of reducing the number of students with reading difficulties. While Cohort One did decrease the number by 1%, both Cohort Two and Three showed increases of 1 to 4% in the number of students with reading difficulties.

The perceptions of both *Reading First* local program contacts and principals suggest less confidence in the improvement of the reading fluency at the second grade level. Principals appear to have more confidence in reading comprehension improvement than local program contacts.

Table Sixteen provides the results from surveys of RF Local Program Contacts and Principals when asked to respond to statements concerning the reading achievement of students in first grade.

TABLE 16: Perceptions of Grade Three Student Achievement in *Reading First* Schools		

| Survey Item | Mean by Survey Group | |
	RF Local Program Contacts	RF Principals
As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade Three improved in Reading First schools.	3.25	3.09
On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade Three improved in Reading First schools.	2.89	3.05

Table reads: Local Program Contacts and RF Principals agree that the reading achievement of Grade Three students in RF schools improved as measured by fluency outcomes.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

The Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) served as the outcome measure for third graders in RF schools. While Florida third grade RF classrooms were successful in increasing the number of students reading on grade level and decreasing the number with reading difficulties from 2003-2006, the data for 2006-2007 suggest a different picture. Across all three cohorts, the percentage of students on reading on grade level decreased by 7 to 9% while the number of third graders with reading difficulties increased by 6 to 8%.

Interestingly, the perceptions of local program contacts and principals were more optimistic. Both groups believed that reading fluency among third graders improved, while only the principals expressed confidence in the reading comprehension improvement.

Despite the FCRR reported dip in the 2006-2007 FCAT outcomes for third graders in RF schools, they reported other measures as showing sustained growth over time. For example, Cohort One students in grades one through three demonstrated considerable growth between the first and fourth year of RF implementation in measures of oral reading fluency measures. The number of students reading on grade level increased and the number of students with reading difficulties decreased in all three grades. Similarly, all three cohorts show gains across their years of RF implementation, in all levels from kindergarten to third grade, in oral vocabulary as measured by the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. Clearly the use of multiple measures, as opposed to reliance on a single assessment measure, creates a more comprehensive view of student achievement.

SUSTAINING *READING FIRST* EFFORTS ACROSS FLORIDA

In 2006-2007, the RF Leadership Triangle entities communicated an approach to the sustainability of *Reading First* across Florida for the future. Addressing participants at the Just Read, Florida! Annual K-12 Leadership Conference, Triangle leadership encouraged local RF professionals to adopt the premise that RF not be viewed as just a funding stream, but rather "as a different way of thinking about teaching and learning."

Presenters charged RF agencies to continue building local capacity through shared leadership and collaboration to "put a system in place that brings new teachers up to speed, reviews/renews what is known about scientifically based reading research and instruction, and prevents regression in student reading achievement."

Offering additional support for the necessary changes needed to move from a grant-funded initiative to a locally driven system, one presentation provided "elements of a school-wide reading model with added costs and sources of support" for consideration. Key ideas were summarized: "We must optimize the resources over which we have control and align them with our missions – shared leadership, strong reading culture, smart use of time, aligning allocation of recurring resources with priorities, and use of data for continuous improvement."

Field notes revealed additional evidence of Leadership Triangle support for capacity building at the local level to sustain RF efforts into the future. Evidence included:

- Encouragement to teachers to serve as test/assessment administrators for their students
- Presentations, publications, and professional development focused on increasing the skills and knowledge of RF principals and leadership
- Support and guidance provided by RFPD Regional Coordinators to school level RF staff, such as coaching, mentoring, collaborating to create professional development, and co-presenting with coaches and local school leadership at conferences
- Overall expectation of districts and schools to provide follow-up to state-sponsored professional development

Table Seventeen provides the results from a survey of RFPD Regional Coordinators in regard to their perception of local entities to provide follow-up to RF training and support.

TABLE 17: Perceptions of Local Follow-up To *Reading First* Training and Support	

Survey Item	Mean by Survey Group
	RFPD Regional Coordinators
The district(s) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was effective.	2.71
The district(s) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was timely.	2.62
The reading coach(es) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was effective.	2.90
The reading coach(es) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was timely.	2.67

Table reads: RFPD Regional Coordinators did not agree that districts and coaches provided effective and timely professional development.

Note: Survey response options were Strongly Agree = 4, Agree = 3, Disagree = 2, Strongly Disagree = 1

Despite the perceptions of Regional Coordinators, RF Program Contacts and Principals reported far-reaching professional development offered as follow-up for RFPD trainings. Contacts described monthly coaching meetings in which professional development was embedded. Many also identified trainings for differentiated instruction and reading endorsement.

Reading First Principals provided an extensive list of mostly site-based trainings offered by reading coaches on a regular basis. These data supported the topics listed above as prevalent, with data analysis as an addition. The principals also were very specific in

describing the frequency of these trainings. Though some schools provided weekly professional development and others focused on quarterly, most used a monthly schedule of trainings for their teachers. The respondents also stressed the ongoing professional development that is part of the day-to-day responsibility of the reading coach.

CONCLUSION

Examination of data collected in surveys, interviews, focus groups, and observation provided ample evidence of the success of Florida's implementation of *Reading First* during 2006-2007. The mechanism and procedures used by Florida's *Reading First* Leadership Triangle have clearly provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to RF efforts in Florida.

Evidence of powerful collaboration between the Florida's *Reading First* Leadership Triangle that resulted in effective and timely guidance and leadership to *Reading First* efforts across Florida was pervasive throughout the data. Nearly every new product, resource, or training developed during the year was the result of open and regular communication among the Triangle agencies to share information, examine data, establish goals, and set priorities based on the needs of leadership, educators, and students in *Reading First* districts and schools.

Thorough and complete evidence supports the positive impact of *Reading First* at every level from state leadership to student achievement. Field notes revealed additional evidence of Leadership Triangle support for capacity building at the local level to sustain *Reading First* efforts into the future. Through collaborative efforts and strategic planning, Florida is building a solid foundation to support effect reading instruction for all students.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

_____

Survey Instruments

Florida Reading First Coaches
2006 - 2007 Florida Reading First Evaluation

The purpose of this survey is to inform the 2006 - 2007 external evaluation of the implementation of Reading First across Florida. Responses are anonymous and will not be tracked to individual respondents.

From your perspective as a reading coach at a Reading First school, please respond to the following items as they pertain to the 2006-2007 school year.

1. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) were USEFUL.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

2. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the FCRR were TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

3. What were the STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the FCRR?

4. What were the WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the FCRR?

5. The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development (RFPD) to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS EFFECTIVE.

6. The training and support provided by RFPD to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

7. What aspect(s) of the training and support provided by RFPD to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was MOST EFFECTIVE?

8. What aspect(s) of the training and support provided by RFPD to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was LEAST EFFECTIVE?

9. The state and regional RFPD events were based on related topics that reflected an ON-GOING, LONG RANGE PLAN for professional development.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

10. Each state and regional RFPD event included discussion of pertinent RESEARCH AND THEORY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

11. Each state and regional RFPD event included OPPORTUNITIES TO OBSERVE MODELS of coaching in action.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

12. Each state and regional RFPD event included OPPORTUNITIES TO PRACTICE coaching techniques.

13. Each state and regional RFPD event included OPPORTUNITIES FOR FEEDBACK on coaching techniques.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

14. During this school year, SUFFICIENT TIME WAS ALLOCATED FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT to allow for personal growth in knowledge and skills in your role as a reading coach.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

15. Meetings with the RFPD Coordinator were SCHEDULED AND OCCURRED REGULARLY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

16. The RFPD Coordinator was readily ACCESSIBLE AND RESPONDED to questions and concerns IN A TIMELY MANNER.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

17. Site visits made by the RFPD Coordinator included OBSERVATION AND FEEDBACK.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

18. The focus of meetings with the RFPD Coordinator included SUPPORT AND FOLLOW-UP FOR STATE AND REGIONAL EVENTS.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

19. Additional comments

20. How many years of teaching experience do you have?

        1-2   3-5   6-10   10 or more

21. How many years of coaching experience do you have?

        1-2   3-5   6-10   10 or more

22. Do you currently hold reading certification?

        Yes   No

23. Do you currently hold the Florida Reading Endorsement?

        Yes   No

24. What is your gender?

        Female   Male

25. In what area is your school?

        AREA 1 (Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington)

AREA 2 (Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam,
Suwannee, Taylor)
AREA 3 (Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia)
AREA 4 (Hillsborough, Pinellas)
AREA 5 (Highlands, Polk)
AREA 6 (DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie)
AREA 7 (Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee)
AREA 8 (Miami-Dade, Monroe)

Thank you!

Your responses have been submitted. We appreciate the time and effort you took to complete this survey.

Thank you!

Florida Reading First Program Contacts
2006 - 2007 Florida Reading First Evaluation

The purpose of this survey is to inform the 2006 - 2007 external evaluation of the implementation of Reading First across Florida. Responses are anonymous and will not be tracked to individual respondents.

From your perspective as a Reading First program contact, please respond to the following items as they pertain to the 2006-2007 school year.

1. Just Read, Florida! provided EFFECTIVE GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP to district Reading First efforts.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

2. Just Read, Florida! provided TIMELY GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP to district Reading First efforts.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

3. What aspect(s) of the guidance and leadership that your Reading First program received was the MOST EFFECTIVE?

4. What aspect(s) of the guidance and leadership that your Reading First program received was the LEAST EFFECTIVE?

5. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) were USEFUL.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

6. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the FCRR were TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

7. What were the STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research?

8. What were the WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research?

9. The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

10. The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

11. What aspect(s) of the TRAINING AND SUPPORT provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was MOST EFFECTIVE?

12. What aspect(s) of the TRAINING AND SUPPORT provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was LEAST EFFECTIVE?

13. What qualifications for the position of reading coach were established by your program/district (i.e., certification, experience, etc.)?

14. As measured by FLUENCY OUTCOMES, the reading achievement of students in GRADE ONE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

15. As measured by FLUENCY OUTCOMES, the reading achievement of students in GRADE TWO improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

16. As measured by FLUENCY OUTCOMES, the reading achievement of students in GRADE THREE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

17. On measures of READING COMPREHENSION, the reading achievement of students in GRADE ONE improved in Reading First schools.

18. On measures of READING COMPREHENSION, the reading achievement of students in GRADE TWO improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

19. On measures of READING COMPREHENSION, the reading achievement of students in GRADE THREE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

20. During the 2006-2007 school year, what was the nature, frequency, and duration of PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SPONSORED BY YOUR PROGRAM/DISTRICT to complement state sponsored professional development for K-3 Reading First teachers and K-12 ESE teachers?

21. In what area is your Reading First program?

> AREA 1 (Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington)
> AREA 2 (Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor)
> AREA 3 (Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia)
> AREA 4 (Hillsborough, Pinellas)
> AREA 5 (Highlands, Polk)
> AREA 6 (DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie)
> AREA 7 (Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee)
> AREA 8 (Miami-Dade, Monroe)

22. Additional comments

Florida Reading First Principals
2006 - 2007 Florida Reading First Evaluation

The purpose of this survey is to inform the 2006 - 2007 external evaluation of the implementation of Reading First across Florida. Responses are anonymous and will not be tracked to individual respondents.

From your perspective as a principal at a Reading First school, please respond to the following items as they pertain to the 2006-2007 school year.

1. Just Read, Florida! provided EFFECTIVE GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP to district Reading First efforts.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

2. Just Read, Florida! provided TIMELY GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP to district Reading First efforts.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

3. What aspect(s) of the guidance and leadership that the district received was the MOST EFFECTIVE?

4. What aspect(s) of the guidance and leadership that the district received was the LEAST EFFECTIVE?

5. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) were USEFUL.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

6. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the FCRR were TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

7. What were the STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the FCRR?

8. What were the WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the FCRR?

9. The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development (RFPD) to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

10. The training and support provided by RFPD to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

11. Sites visits made by the RFPD Coordinator were SCHEDULED AND OCCURRED REGULARLY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

12. The RFPD Coordinator was readily ACCESSIBLE AND RESPONDED to questions and concerns IN A TIMELY MANNER.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

13. Site visits made by the RFPD Coordinator included OBSERVATION AND FEEDBACK.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

14. During this school year, SUFFICIENT TIME WAS ALLOCATED FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT to allow for the reading coach's growth in knowledge and skills.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

15. What qualifications did you consider in hiring for the position of reading coach (i.e., certification, experience, etc.)?

16. As measured by FLUENCY OUTCOMES, the reading achievement of students in GRADE ONE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

17. As measured by FLUENCY OUTCOMES, the reading achievement of students in GRADE TWO improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

18. As measured by FLUENCY OUTCOMES, the reading achievement of students in GRADE THREE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

19. On measures of READING COMPREHENSION, the reading achievement of students in GRADE ONE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

20. On measures of READING COMPREHENSION, the reading achievement of students in GRADE TWO improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

21. On measures of READING COMPREHENSION, the reading achievement of students in GRADE THREE improved in Reading First schools.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

22. During the 2006-2007 school year, what was the nature, frequency, and duration of SCHOOL-SPONSORED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT provided to complement district- and state-sponsored professional development for K-3 Reading First teachers and K-5 ESE teachers?

23. How many years of experience do you have as a principal at a Reading First school?

          1   2   3   4   5

24. How many years of experience do you have as a principal?

     1-2   3-5   6-10   10 or more

25. In what area is your school?

AREA 1 (Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington)
AREA 2 (Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor)
AREA 3 (Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia)
AREA 4 (Hillsborough, Pinellas)
AREA 5 (Highlands, Polk)
AREA 6 (DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie)
AREA 7 (Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee)
AREA 8 (Miami-Dade, Monroe)

26. Additional comments

Your responses have been submitted. We appreciate the time and effort you took to complete this survey.

Thank you!

Florida Reading First Professional Development Coordinator
2006 - 2007 Florida Reading First Evaluation

The purpose of this survey is to inform the 2006 - 2007 external evaluation of the implementation of Reading First across Florida. Responses are anonymous and will not be tracked to individual respondents.

From your perspective as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator, please respond to the following items as they pertain to the 2006-2007 school year.

1. Just Read, Florida! provided EFFECTIVE GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP to statewide Reading First efforts.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

2. Just Read, Florida! provided TIMELY GUIDANCE AND LEADERSHIP to statewide Reading First efforts.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

3. What aspect(s) of the guidance and leadership received was the MOST EFFECTIVE?

4. What aspect(s) of the guidance and leadership received was the LEAST EFFECTIVE?

5. The professional development and guidance provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research to RFPD Coordinators WERE EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

6. The professional development and guidance provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research to RFPD Coordinators WERE TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

7. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were USEFUL for RFPD Coordinator work at the school level.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

8. The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the FCRR were TIMELY for RFPD Coordinator work at the school level.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

9. What were the STRENGTHS OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the FCRR?

10. What were the WEAKNESSES OF THE PROGRESS MONITORING AND OUTCOME REPORTS provided by the FCRR?

11. The training I provided as an RFPD Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

12. The training I provided as an RFPD Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

13. The support I provided as an RFPD Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

14. The support I provided as an RFPD Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

15. What aspect(s) of the TRAINING AND SUPPORT you provided to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was MOST EFFECTIVE?

16. What aspect(s) of the TRAINING AND SUPPORT you provided to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was LEAST EFFECTIVE?

17. The district(s) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for RFPD trainings that WAS EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

18. The district(s) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for RFPD trainings that WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

19. The reading coach(es) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for RFPD training that WAS EFFECTIVE.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

20. The reading coach(es) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for RFPD training that WAS TIMELY.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

21. The professional development provided by RFPD to coaches in Reading First schools reflects the best principals of professional development as outlined in Every Child Reading: A Professional Development Guide and the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

22. The content of the professional development provided in Teacher Reading Academies reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

23. The content of the professional development provided in Quarterly Professional Development and Monthly Book Studies reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

24. Describe your greatest success in providing support for the implementation of Reading First in Florida.

25. Describe your biggest challenge in providing support for the implementation of Reading First in Florida.

26. The collaborative mechanisms and procedures used by the Leadership Triangle (JRF, RFPD, FCRR) provided EFFECTIVE AND TIMELY guidance and leadership to Reading First efforts in Florida.

a. Strongly Agree   b. Agree   c. Disagree   d. Strongly Disagree

27. Additional comments

Your responses have been submitted. We appreciate the time and effort you took to complete this survey.

Thank you!

APPENDIX B

Interview Protocols

Reading First Leadership Triangle Interview

Just Read, Florida! Protocol

Date_____ Begin Time_____End Time_____   Telephone or Face to Face

Person interviewed_____ Title _____

Introduction		Thank you for your time today. We anticipate needing approximately 30 minutes for this interview and want to be sure this is a convenient time for you. Shall we proceed?
		To ensure accuracy in our reporting, we would like your permission to record this interview. Permission granted _____ Permission denied _____
		As you know, we have been charged with the external evaluation of the 2006-07 implementation of the Reading First initiative in Florida, so you will find that our questions focus primarily on the current year. While most questions address JRF as an individual entity, some questions refer to the collaborative role with FCRR and RFPD as the RF Leadership Triangle.
		Do you have any questions before we begin?
Opening	1.	On July 1, 2006, Reading First began its 5th year in Florida. Thinking about collaboration among the Triangle entities, please briefly
(IA,IH)		describe how the *leadership* role of JRF has evolved over time.
Transition	2.	What, if any, changes were made in JRF's role in the Reading
(IA,IH)		First Leadership Triangle for the 2006-07 year?
Key IA,IH	3.	How does JRF determine what guidance is necessary to support Reading First?
Probe		- What procedures are used to schedule the delivery of guidance?
		- How does JRF determine the best format for the guidance?
Key IIB	4.	How does JRF influence what state-wide professional development is needed to support RF?
Key IIB	5.	Please describe some of the considerations when establishing the frequency and length of state-wide RF professional development opportunities?
Ending		
(IH)	6.	How would you describe the 2006-07 collaboration between JRF and RFPD? Between JRF and FCRR?
Ending	7.	Is there anything else you wish to add that we didn't ask you about?
		Thank you for your time.

Reading First Leadership Triangle Interview

Florida Center for Reading Research Protocol

Date_____ Begin Time_____End Time_____   Telephone or Face to Face

Person interviewed_____ Title _____

Introduction		Thank you for your time today. We anticipate needing approximately 45 minutes for this interview and want to be sure this is a convenient time for you. Shall we proceed?
		To ensure accuracy in our reporting, we would like your permission to record this interview. Permission granted _____ Permission denied _____
		As you know, we have been charged with the external evaluation of the 2006-07 implementation of the Reading First initiative in Florida, so you will find that our questions focus primarily on the current year. While most questions address FCRR as an individual entity, some questions refer to the collaborative role with JRF and RFPD as the RF Leadership Triangle.
		Do you have any questions before we begin?
Opening *(IA,IH)*	1.	On July 1, 2006, Reading First began its 5th year in Florida. Thinking about collaboration among the Triangle entities, please briefly describe how the *leadership* role of FCRR has evolved over time.
Transition *(IA,IH)*	2.	What, if any, changes were made in FCRR's role in the Reading First Leadership Triangle for the 2006-07 year?
Key IA,IH *Probe*	3.	How does FCRR determine what guidance is necessary to support Reading First? - What procedures are used to schedule the delivery of guidance? - How does FCRR determine the best format for the guidance?
Key IB *Probe*	4.	How does FCRR maintain standards of scientific integrity in the collection of data that are used to monitor student progress? - What types of safeguards are in place? - Where can we locate documents that provide evidence of procedures?
Key IB *Probe*	5.	In the collection of data used to monitor student progress, what procedural changes have been implemented for the 2006-07 year? -How are the changes documented? -Where can we access the documents?
Key ID *Probe*	6.	How does FCRR establish a link between scientifically based reading research and the measures of teacher knowledge? -Where can we locate supporting documents?
Key ID	7.	What changes, if any, have been implemented in the teacher knowledge test for

---

		this year?
Probe		-Where can we locate supporting documents?

Key ID   **8.**   **How does FCRR establish a link between scientifically based reading research and teacher behaviors found in effective instruction?**

         Probe   **-Please describe processes for the collection of data.**
                             -Where can we locate supporting documents?

Key IIB   **9.**   **How does FCRR influence what state-wide professional development is needed to support RF?**

Key IID   **10.**   **How has FCRR been able to keep the training aligned with an every-growing knowledge base in reading research?**

Key IID   **11.**   **What types of revisions in training content were deemed necessary for this year?**

         Probe   **-What data supported the need for these revisions or the decision not to revise?**

Key IIIA & B   **12.**   **Where will we find data that show the extent to which the reading fluency and comprehension of Florida students in grades 1-3 have been impacted by Reading First?**

         Probe   **- What 2006 -07 data is currently available?**
                             - Where can we access it?
                             - When will complete 2006-7 data be available?

Ending   **13.**   **Please describe the 2006-07 collaborative efforts between FCRR and JRF?**
(IH)   **Between FCRR and RFPD?**

Ending   **14.**   **Is there anything else you wish to add that we didn't ask you about?**

                           Thank you for your time.

Reading First Leadership Triangle Interview

Reading First Professional Development Protocol

Date_____ Begin Time_____ End Time_____   Telephone or Face to Face

Person interviewed_____ Title _____

Introduction		Thank you for your time today. We anticipate needing approximately 45 minutes for this interview and want to be sure this is a convenient time for you. Shall we proceed?

To ensure accuracy in our reporting, we would like your permission to record this interview.   Permission granted _____   Permission denied _____

As you know, we have been charged with the external evaluation of the 2006-07 implementation of the Reading First initiative in Florida, so you will find that our questions focus primarily on the current year. While most questions address RFPD as an individual entity, some questions refer to the collaborative role with JRF and FCRR as the RF Leadership Triangle.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Opening   1.   On July 1, 2006, Reading First began its 5th year in Florida. Thinking about
(IA,IH)   collaboration among the Triangle entities, please briefly describe how the
                      leadership role of RFPD has evolved over time.

Transition   2.   What, if any, changes were made in RFPD's role in the Reading
(IA,IH)   First Leadership Triangle for the 2006-07 year?

Key IA,IH   3.   How does RFPD determine what guidance is necessary to support Reading First?

    Probe   - What procedures are used to schedule the delivery of guidance?
                      -    How does RFPD determine the best format for the guidance?

Key IE   4.   How does RFPD determine the training needs of reading coaches?

Key IE   5.   How does RFPD support coaches with differing/varying degrees of knowledge
                      and experience?

Key IF   6.   What are the qualifications and level of experience you looked for in RFPD
                      Coordinators hired this year (since July 1, 2006)?

    Probe   -How were decisions made concerning which candidates to hire?

Key IF   7.   To what extent do you envision continued growth and need for hiring additional
                      coordinators?

Key IG   8.   How does RFPD maintain a link between research-based best practices of
                      professional development and state-wide trainings for reading coaches?

Key IIB   9.   How does RFPD influence what state-wide professional development is needed to
                      support RF?

Key IIB	10.	Please describe some of the considerations when establishing the frequency and length of state-wide RF professional development opportunities?
Key IID	11.	How has RFPD been able to keep the training aligned with an every-growing knowledge base in reading research?
Key IID	12.	What types of revisions in delivery and content of RF teacher trainings and RF coach trainings were deemed necessary for this year?

Probe   -What data supported the need for these revisions?
-What data supported the decision not to revise?

| *Ending (IH)* | 13. | Please describe the 2006-07 collaborative efforts between RFPD and JRF? Between RFPD and FCRR? |
| *Ending* | 14. | Is there anything else you wish to add that we didn't ask you about? |

Thank you for your time.

APPENDIX C

Focus Group Protocols

Reading First **Focus Groups**
Tuesday, August 7, 2007

<u>Agenda</u>

I. **Introduction/Background**
    a. **Welcome and overview**

    b. **Evaluation Project Background**
- i. **RF Local Program Contacts Online Survey at**
  http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=1OL_2fJZwcpXmntjsRAY4roA_3d_3d

- ii. **RF Principal Online Survey at**
  http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.aspx?sm=JfSqFb2nuKpCDmtO3cEzww_3d_3d

    c. **Purpose of the Focus Group**
- i. *Reading First* **Leadership Triangle**
  1. **Just Read, Florida! (JRF)**
  2. **Reading First Professional Development (RFPD)**
  3. **Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR)**

    d. **Introductions**

    e. **Participant Selection**
- i. **Area 1 (Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington)**
- ii. **Area 2 (Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor)**
- iii. **Area 3 (Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia)**
- iv. **Area 4 (Hillsborough, Pinellas)**
- v. **Area 5 (Highlands, Polk)**
- vi. **Area 6 (Desoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie)**
- vii. **Area 7 (Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee)**
- viii. **Area 8 (Miami-Dade, Monroe)**

    f. **Confidentiality**

    g. **Timing**

II. **Discussion**
    a. **Site Visits**

    b. **Timeliness of guidance and support**

    c. **Monitoring Student Progress**

    d. **Professional Development**

III. **Closing**

FOCUS GROUP PROTOCOL

I. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

➢ **Welcome and overview of session**

Hello everybody. My name is Patricia Linder and this is Marilyn Kline. We are from the University of South Florida and we are the external evaluators for the federal Reading First grant received by Florida. We will be leading today's discussion of your perceptions concerning the implementation of Reading First in your district/school this past year (2006-2007).

➢ **Project Background**

We would like to start by briefly talking about the Evaluation Project. As you probably know, external evaluators are often hired to review grant implementation for reports as part of accountability to the funding source. As such, we have been asked to focus our evaluation on a single year of the Reading First grant implementation – last school year.

The evaluation project requires us to review the full spectrum of the implementation plan across the state, from the state level leadership Triangle to the school level. We have already conducted interviews with those in leadership roles at JRF, FCRR, and RFPD and collected documents provided by those triangle organizations for review. We have also collected survey data from over 400 Reading coaches, 100 RF Principals, and nearly ½ the district contacts across the state. By the way, the surveys will remain open through August if you'd like to offer your responses online using the web-link on the agenda.

➢ **Purpose of the Focus Group**

The intent of this focus group is to gain an understanding how Reading First was implemented last year from the perspective of the district level program contacts/principals. We would like to identify how the process transitioned from the state to the district and the district to the schools. Also we would like to hear from you about strengths and/or possible future improvements to the implementation process. In particular, we will be talking about:

A. Site Visits
B. Timeliness of guidance and support
C. Student Progress Reporting
D. Professional Development

Information from this focus group will be combined with information from surveys, interviews, and other sources, to evaluate the 2006-2007 year of Florida's Reading First statewide implementation.

➢ **Focus group participant introductions**
Before we continue, we would like to find out who you are. If you would, please tell us your name and the district you represent.

➢ **Participant Selection**
I imagine that you are interested in knowing how you were invited to join today's session. We were given a list of Reading First district program contacts/RF principals who had registered for this K-12 Leadership Conference. The list was sorted into the eight groups based on the area of the state served by RFPD coordinators as shown on your agenda. A total of 15 invitations were sent to randomly selected names representing each area. To be sure that we sampled names correctly, I want to make sure everyone here belongs in this group. Is there anyone here who was not a Reading First district-level program contact/principal during the last school year?

➢ **Confidentiality**
Any information you share with us today will be held confidential. We also ask that anything said in this group remains in this room. We want everyone to feel comfortable about talking, which means that we have to agree not to discuss what was said here today. Is everyone comfortable with that?

➢ **Consent to Participate**
At this time we'd like you to review the consent form and provide your signature if you wish to continue for the rest of the discussion. If you have changed your mind, we thank you for considering participation and ask that you slip out quietly.

➢ **Timing**
Today's focus group will last approximately 1 hour. Are there any questions before we get started?

II. DISCUSSION
1. One of the aspects of the guidance and leadership that was identified as most effective was site visits. How would you describe the nature and duration of those site visits?
2. How would you describe the timeliness of guidance and support from the state?
3. What enhancements to the guidance and leadership offered by JRF, FCRR, and RFPD would best meet your needs?
4. How are your districts professional needs identified/addressed?
5. We are outsiders – help us understand - reports show individual student data but others report frustration because they can't get classroom level data? Huh?
   a. Let's talk about the FCRR Reports on progress monitoring
   b. How has the change from 4 to 3 DIBELS assessments impacted your schools?
6. Is student learning measured sufficiently or is there testing overkill?
7. Talk about Triangle support for interpreting data.
8. How does RFPD go about finding out what your professional development needs are?

9. Describe communication between you and the RFPD Coordinator – Who initiates? Is contact regular?
10. How do you monitor and follow-up on professional development at the classroom level?
11. What have you observed in terms of the transition of professional development from RFPD to coaches to classroom? For example, Learning Communities, book studies – What have you seen? How would you describe? What does it look like?
12. How does RF fit with your district reading plan?

III. CLOSING
In closing, we want to again mention that your comments will be held confidential. We will be combining information that we gather in the focus groups with information gathered from the survey and interviews. We will then prepare our evaluation report and will submit it to the Office of Just Read, Florida this fall.

Thank you for participating in today's session. We appreciate your taking the time and sharing your ideas with us.

APPENDIX D

Mean and Frequency Tables

Florida *Reading FIrst* Program Contact Survey 2007

Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

	Number	Just Read, Florida! provided effective guidance and leadership to district Reading First efforts.								Just Read, Florida! provided timely guidance and leadership to district Reading First efforts.								The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were useful.							
		*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	36	23	64	13	36	0	0	0	0	23	64	13	26	0	0	0	0	27	75	9	25	0	0	0	0
		Mean = 3.64								Mean = 3.64								Mean = 3.75							
Area of State **North**	20	14	70	6	30	0	0	0	0	15	75	5	25	0	0	0	0	14	70	6	30	0	0	0	0
***South**	16	9	56	7	44	0	0	0	0	8	50	8	50	0	0	0	0	13	81	3	19	0	0	0	0

	Number	The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were timely.								The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective.								The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely.							
		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	36	25	69	11	31	0	0	0	0	21	60	13	37	1	3	0	0	20	56	16	44	0	0	0	0
		Mean = 3.69								Mean = 3.57								Mean = 3.56							
Area of State North	20	12	60	8	40	0	0	0	0	14	74	4	21	1	5	0	0	14	70	6	30	0	0	0	0
South	16	13	81	3	19	0	0	0	0	7	44	9	56	0	0	0	0	6	38	10	63	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

* North = Alachua, Bradford, Brevard, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, Gadsden, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Lake, Leon, Madison, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Seminole, Suwannee, Taylor, Volusia, Washington

** South = Broward, Charlotte, Collier, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Hillsborough, Lee, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, St. Lucie

Florida *Reading FIrst* Program Contact Survey 2007

Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved in Reading First schools.									As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade Two improved in Reading First schools.									As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade Three improved in Reading First schools.							
		*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	36	7	19	27	75	2	6	0	0		5	15	22	65	7	21	0	0		9	25	27	75	0	0	0	0
					Mean = 3.14									Mean = 2.94									Mean = 3.25				
Area of State **North**	20	7	35	12	60	1	5	0	0		5	28	11	61	2	11	0	0		7	35	13	65	0	0	0	0
***South**	16	0	0	15	94	1	6	0	0		0	0	11	69	5	31	0	0		2	13	14	88	0	0	0	0

		On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved in Reading First schools.									On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade Two improved in Reading First schools.									On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade Three improved in Reading First schools.							
		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	36	3	9	27	77	5	14	0	0		2	6	25	69	9	25	0	0		2	6	28	80	4	11	1	3
					Mean = 2.94									Mean = 2.81									Mean = 2.89				
Area of State North	20	2	10	17	85	1	5	0	0		1	5	16	80	3	15	0	0		2	10	18	90	0	0	0	0
South	16	1	7	10	67	4	27	0	0		1	6	9	56	6	38	0	0				10	67	4	27	1	7	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

**North = Alachua, Bradford, Brevard, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, Gadsden, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Lake, Leon, Madison, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Seminole, Suwannee, Taylor, Volusia, Washington

*** South = Broward, Charlotte, Collier, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Hillsborough, Lee, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, St. Lucie

Florida Reading FIrst Principals Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		Number	Just Read, Florida! provided effective guidance and leadership to district Reading First efforts.								Just Read, Florida! provided timely guidance and leadership to district Reading First efforts.								The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were useful.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		**142**	**66**	**47**	**71**	**51**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**59**	**42**	**76**	**54**	**5**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**93**	**65**	**49**	**35**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
					Mean = 3.45								Mean = 3.39								Mean = 3.65					
Area of State	**Area 1	6	4	67	2	33	0	0	0	0	3	50	2	33	1	17	0	0	4	67	2	33	0	0	0	0
	Area 2	26	6	24	18	72	1	4	0	0	6	24	18	72	1	4	0	0	18	69	8	31	0	0	0	0
	Area 3	5	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Area 4	19	6	32	13	68	0	0	0	0	5	26	14	74	0	0	0	0	8	42	11	58	0	0	0	0
	Area 5	16	7	44	8	50	1	6	0	0	7	44	8	50	1	6	0	0	9	56	7	44	0	0	0	0
	Area 6	20	6	32	12	63	1	5	0	0	5	26	13	68	1	5	0	0	13	65	7	35	0	0	0	0
	Area 7	28	18	64	10	36	0	0	0	0	17	61	10	36	1	4	0	0	18	64	10	36	0	0	0	0
	Area 8	22	16	73	6	27	0	0	0	0	14	64	8	36	0	0	0	0	18	82	4	18	0	0	0	0
Years as Principal at a Reading First School	1 Year	13	7	54	5	38	1	8	0	0	7	54	5	38	1	8	0	0	12	92	1	8	0	0	0	0
	2 Years	33	15	47	16	50	1	3	0	0	14	44	18	56	0	0	0	0	21	64	12	36	0	0	0	0
	3 Years	35	17	50	17	50	0	0	0	0	15	44	16	47	3	9	0	0	23	66	12	34	0	0	0	0
	4 Years	30	11	37	18	60	1	3	0	0	11	37	18	60	1	3	0	0	16	53	14	47	0	0	0	0
	5 Years	29	14	48	15	52	0	0	0	0	12	41	17	59	0	0	0	0	19	66	10	34	0	0	0	0
	No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years as a Principal	1-2 Years	30	15	52	13	45	1	3	0	0	14	48	14	48	1	3	0	0	24	80	6	20	0	0	0	0
	3-5 Years	40	22	56	17	44	0	0	0	0	22	56	16	41	1	3	0	0	29	73	11	28	0	0	0	0
	6-10 Years	32	13	41	19	59	0	0	0	0	11	34	20	63	1	3	0	0	21	66	11	34	0	0	0	0
	10 + Years	38	15	39	21	55	2	5	0	0	12	32	24	63	2	5	0	0	18	47	20	53	0	0	0	0
	No Response	2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2 – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida Reading FIrst Principals Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

| | | The progress monitoring and outcome reports proviced by the Florida Center for Reading Research were timely. | | | | | | | | The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective. | | | | | | | | The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely. | | | | | | | |
| | | *Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | | Strongly Agree | | Agree | | Disagree | | Strongly Disagree | |
	Number	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	142	80	56	59	42	3	2	0	0	66	46	74	52	2	1	0	0	58	41	81	57	2	1	0	0
		Mean = 3.54								Mean = 3.45								Mean = 3.40							
Area of State — **Area 1	6	3	50	3	50	0	0	0	0	4	67	2	33	0	0	0	0	4	67	2	33	0	0	0	0
Area 2	26	15	58	10	38	1	4	0	0	7	27	17	65	2	8	0	0	5	19	20	77	1	4	0	0
Area 3	5	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0
Area 4	19	6	32	12	63	1	5	0	0	7	37	12	63	0	0	0	0	5	26	14	74	0	0	0	0
Area 5	16	9	56	7	44	0	0	0	0	9	56	7	44	0	0	0	0	8	53	7	47	0	0	0	0
Area 6	20	14	70	6	30	0	0	0	0	10	50	10	50	0	0	0	0	9	45	11	55	0	0	0	0
Area 7	28	16	57	11	39	1	4	0	0	16	57	12	43	0	0	0	0	15	54	13	46	0	0	0	0
Area 8	22	14	64	8	36	0	0	0	0	11	50	11	50	0	0	0	0	11	50	11	50	0	0	0	0
Years as Principal at a Reading First School — 1 Year	13	9	69	4	31	0	0	0	0	7	54	5	38	1	8	0	0	6	46	6	46	1	8	0	0
2 Years	33	18	55	15	45	0	0	0	0	18	55	15	45	0	0	0	0	17	52	16	48	0	0	0	0
3 Years	35	20	57	13	37	2	6	0	0	19	54	14	43	1	3	0	0	15	44	19	56	0	0	0	0
4 Years	30	15	50	14	47	1	3	0	0	12	40	18	60	0	0	0	0	12	40	18	60	0	0	0	0
5 Years	29	17	59	12	41	0	0	0	0	10	34	19	66	0	0	0	0	8	28	20	69	1	3	0	0
No Response	2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
Years as a Principal — 1-2 Years	30	19	63	11	37	0	0	0	0	16	53	13	43	1	3	0	0	15	50	14	47	1	3	0	0
3-5 Years	40	22	55	17	43	1	3	0	0	17	43	22	55	1	3	0	0	16	40	24	60	0	0	0	0
6-10 Years	32	18	56	13	41	1	3	0	0	15	47	17	53	0	0	0	0	13	41	19	59	0	0	0	0
10 + Years	38	20	53	17	45	2	3	0	0	18	47	20	53	0	0	0	0	14	38	22	59	1	3	0	0
No Response	2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida Reading FIrst Principals Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		Number	Site visits made by the Reading First Professional Development coordinator were scheduled and occurred regularly.								The Reading First Professional Development coordinatorwas readily accessible and responded toquestions and concerns in a timely manner.								Site visits made by the Reading First Professional Development coordinator included observation and feedback.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		142	58	41	79	56	5	4	0	0	67	48	68	49	4	3	0	0	70	50	65	46	6	4	0	0
			Mean = 3.37								Mean = 3.45								Mean = 3.45							
Area of State	**Area 1	6	4	67	2	33	0	0	0	0	5	83	1	17	0	0	0	0	4	67	2	33	0	0	0	0
	Area 2	26	10	38	16	62	0	0	0	0	11	42	14	54	1	4	0	0	14	56	11	44	0	0	0	0
	Area 3	5	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0
	Area 4	19	6	32	12	63	1	5	0	0	7	37	12	63	0	0	0	0	7	37	11	58	1	5	0	0
	Area 5	16	8	50	8	50	0	0	0	0	9	56	7	44	0	0	0	0	8	50	8	50	0	0	0	0
	Area 6	20	8	40	11	55	1	5	0	0	9	47	9	47	1	5	0	0	11	55	6	30	3	15	0	0
	Area 7	28	9	32	18	64	1	4	0	0	14	52	12	44	1	4	0	0	13	46	14	50	1	4	0	0
	Area 8	22	11	50	10	45	1	5	0	0	10	48	11	42	0	0	0	0	11	50	11	50	0	0	0	0
Years as Principal at a Reading First School	1 Year	13	7	54	5	38	1	8	0	0	7	58	4	33	1	8	0	0	9	69	4	31	0	0	0	0
	2 Years	33	15	45	17	52	1	3	0	0	15	48	15	48	1	3	0	0	15	45	17	52	1	3	0	0
	3 Years	35	15	43	2	57	0	0	0	0	18	51	17	49	0	0	0	0	21	60	13	37	1	3	0	0
	4 Years	30	11	37	19	63	0	0	0	0	14	47	16	53	0	0	0	0	14	47	15	50	1	3	0	0
	5 Years	29	9	31	17	59	3	10	0	0	12	41	15	52	2	7	0	0	11	39	14	50	3	11	0	0
	No Response	2	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
Years as a Principal	1-2 Years	30	14	47	14	47	2	7	0	0	14	50	12	43	2	7	0	0	16	53	13	43	1	3	0	0
	3-5 Years	40	14	35	25	63	1	3	0	0	15	38	24	60	1	3	0	0	16	40	22	55	2	5	0	0
	6-10 Years	32	15	47	17	53	0	0	0	0	18	58	13	42	0	0	0	0	20	63	12	38	0	0	0	0
	10 + Years	38	15	39	21	55	2	5	0	0	20	53	17	45	1	3	0	0	18	47	17	45	3	8	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

****Area 1** – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida Reading FIrst Principals Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		Number	During the school year, sufficient time was allocated for professional development to allow for the reading coach'e growth in knowledge and skills.								As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved in Reading First schools.								As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade Two improved in Reading First schools.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		142	65	46	73	52	2	1	0	0	29	22	95	71	10	7	0	0	17	13	98	74	18	14	0	0
			Mean = 3.45								Mean = 3.14								Mean = 2.99							
Area of State	**Area 1	6	3	50	3	50	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0
	Area 2	26	9	36	15	60	1	4	0	0	3	13	19	79	2	8	0	0	2	9	16	70	5	22	0	0
	Area 3	5	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0
	Area 4	19	7	37	12	63	0	0	0	0	3	16	13	68	3	16	0	0	2	11	15	79	2	11	0	0
	Area 5	16	6	40	9	60	0	0	0	0	4	25	9	56	3	19	0	0	2	13	12	75	2	13	0	0
	Area 6	20	12	60	8	40	0	0	0	0	2	12	14	82	1	6	0	0	1	6	15	88	1	6	0	0
	Area 7	28	16	57	12	43	0	0	0	0	8	30	18	67	1	4	0	0	4	15	20	74	3	11	0	0
	Area 8	22	9	41	13	59	0	0	0	0	6	29	15	71	0	0	0	0	4	19	13	62	4	19	0	0
Years as Principal at a Reading First School	1 Year	13	7	54	6	46	0	0	0	0	3	27	8	73	0	0	0	0	2	18	9	82	0	0	0	0
	2 Years	33	15	47	17	53	0	0	0	0	6	19	21	68	4	13	0	0	2	6	23	74	6	19	0	0
	3 Years	35	17	50	16	47	1	3	0	0	7	22	21	66	4	13	0	0	5	16	2	65	6	19	0	0
	4 Years	30	16	53	14	47	0	0	0	0	5	17	25	83	0	0	0	0	3	10	23	77	4	13	0	0
	5 Years	29	10	34	18	62	1	3	0	0	8	29	18	64	2	7	0	0	5	18	21	75	2	7	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
Years as a Principal	1-2 Years	30	13	43	17	57	0	0	0	0	6	22	18	67	3	11	0	0	4	15	20	74	3	11	0	0
	3-5 Years	40	19	49	18	46	2	5	0	0	7	18	29	74	3	8	0	0	6	16	28	74	4	11	0	0
	6-10 Years	32	15	47	17	53	0	0	0	0	7	24	21	72	1	3	0	0	4	14	19	66	6	20	0	0
	10 + Years	38	18	49	19	51	0	0	0	0	9	24	25	68	3	8	0	0	3	8	29	78	5	14	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida Reading FIrst Principals Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		Number	As measured by fluency outcomes, the reading achievement of students in Grade Three improved in Reading First schools.								On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade One improved in Reading First schools.								On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade Two improved in Reading First schools.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		142	24	18	99	74	10	7	1	1	24	18	98	75	9	7	0	0	16	12	101	76	16	12	0	0
			Mean = 3.09								Mean = 3.11								Mean = 3.00							
Area of State	**Area 1	6	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0
	Area 2	26	3	12	21	84	1	4	0	0	2	8	22	92	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	79	3	13	0	0
	Area 3	5	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0
	Area 4	19	2	11	13	68	4	21	0	0	3	16	13	68	3	16	0	0	1	5	16	84	2	11	0	0
	Area 5	16	4	25	12	75	0	0	0	0	4	27	8	53	3	20	0	0	2	13	12	75	2	13	0	0
	Area 6	20	2	12	12	71	2	12	1	6	1	6	16	89	1	6	0	0	1	6	15	88	1	6	0	0
	Area 7	28	4	15	21	78	2	8	0	0	6	24	17	68	2	8	0	0	3	12	20	77	3	12	0	0
	Area 8	22	6	30	16	65	1	5	0	0	5	25	15	75	0	0	0	0	5	24	11	52	5	24	0	0
Years as Principal at a Reading First School	1 Year	13	1	8	11	92	0	0	0	0	1	9	10	91	0	0	0	0	1	10	8	80	1	10	0	0
	2 Years	33	3	10	24	80	2	7	1	3	5	17	22	73	3	10	0	0	2	6	24	77	5	16	0	0
	3 Years	35	9	28	19	59	4	13	0	0	6	19	23	72	3	9	0	0	6	18	22	67	5	15	0	0
	4 Years	30	4	13	25	83	1	3	0	0	5	17	25	83	0	0	0	0	3	10	25	83	2	7	0	0
	5 Years	29	7	25	18	64	3	11	0	0	7	26	17	63	3	11	0	0	4	14	21	75	3	11	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Years as a Principal	1-2 Years	30	4	14	23	82	1	4	0	0	4	15	21	78	2	7	0	0	3	12	21	81	2	8	0	0
	3-5 Years	40	7	18	27	71	4	11	0	0	5	13	33	83	2	5	0	0	6	15	28	70	6	15	0	0
	6-10 Years	32	5	17	21	72	3	10	0	0	7	24	21	72	1	3	0	0	5	17	21	72	3	10	0	0
	10 + Years	38	8	22	26	70	2	5	1	3	8	24	22	65	4	12	0	0	2	5	30	81	5	14	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida Reading FIrst Principals Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

			On measures of reading comprehension, the reading achievement of students in Grade Three improved in Reading First schools.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		Number	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		142	23	18	91	70	16	12	0	0
					Mean = 3.05					
Area of State	**Area 1	6	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0
	Area 2	26	3	13	21	88	0	0	0	0
	Area 3	5	4	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Area 4	19	3	17	11	61	4	22	0	0
	Area 5	16	5	33	10	67	0	0	0	0
	Area 6	20	1	6	14	74	4	21	0	0
	Area 7	28	5	19	17	65	4	15	0	0
	Area 8	22	5	25	11	55	4	20	0	0
Years as Principal at a Reading First School	1 Year	13	2	17	9	75	1	8	0	0
	2 Years	33	3	10	23	74	5	16	0	0
	3 Years	35	8	25	19	59	5	16	0	0
	4 Years	30	4	14	23	82	1	4	0	0
	5 Years	29	6	22	17	63	4	15	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years as a Principal	1-2 Years	30	5	18	20	71	3	11	0	0
	3-5 Years	40	6	16	25	68	6	16	0	0
	6-10 Years	32	5	18	20	71	3	11	0	0
	10 + Years	38	7	19	25	69	4	11	0	0
	No Response	2	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida *Reading First* Professional Development Coordinator Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

Block 1

	Number	Just Read, Florida! provided effective guidance and leadership to Reading First efforts statewide.								Just Read, Florida! provided timely guidance and leadership to Reading First efforts statewide.								The professional development and guidance provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research to Reading First Professional Development Coordinators were effective.							
		*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	21	11	52	10	48	0	0	0	0	5	24	15	71	1	5	0	0	13	62	5	38	0	0	0	0
					Mean = 3.52									Mean = 3.19								Mean = 3.62			
Area of State **North	8	5	63	3	38	0	0	0	0	3	38	5	63	0	0	0	0	3	38	5	63	0	0	0	0
***South	13	6	46	7	54	0	0	0	0	2	15	10	77	1	8	0	0	10	77	3	23	0	0	0	0

Block 2

	Number	The professional development and guidance provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research to Reading First Professional Development Coordinators were timely.								The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were useful for Reading First Professional Develoment Coordinator work the school level.								The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were timely for Reading First Professional Develoment Coordinator work the school level.							
		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	21	8	38	11	52	2	10	0	0	15	71	5	24	1	5	0	0	12	57	8	38	1	5	0	0
					Mean = 3.29									Mean = 3.67								Mean = 3.52			
Area of State North	8	2	25	5	63	1	13	0	0	5	63	2	25	1	13	0	0	5	63	3	38	0	0	0	0
South	13	6	46	6	46	1	8	0	0	10	77	3	23	0	0	0	0	7	54	5	38	1	8	0	0

Block 3

	Number	The training I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective.								The training I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely.								The support I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective.							
		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	21	13	62	8	38	0	0	0	0	8	38	10	48	3	14	0	0	13	62	8	38	0	0	0	0
					Mean = 3.62									Mean = 3.24								Mean = 3.62			
Area of State North	8	6	75	2	25	0	0	0	0	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0
South	13	7	54	6	46	0	0	0	0	4	31	6	46	3	23	0	0	9	69	4	31	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

* North = Alachua, Bradford, Brevard, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, Gadsden, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Lake, Leon, Madison, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Seminole, Suwannee, Taylor, Volusia, Washington

** South = Broward, Charlotte, Collier, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Hillsborough, Lee, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, St. Lucie

Florida *Reading FIrst* Professional Development Coordinator Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

Block 1

	Number	The support I provided as a Reading First Professional Development Coordinator to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely.								The district(s) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was effective.								The district(s) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was timely.							
		*Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	21	9	46	9	43	3	14	0	0	2	10	12	57	6	29	1	5	1	5	12	57	7	33	1	5
		Mean = 3.29								Mean = 2.71								Mean = 2.62							
Area of State **North	8	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	50	3	38	0	0	5	63	3	38	0	0	0	0
***South	13	5	38	5	38	3	23	0	0	1	8	8	62	3	23	1	8	1	8	7	54	4	31	1	8

Block 2

	Number	The reading coach(es) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was effective.								The reading coach(es) provided professional development to serve as follow-up for Reading First Professional Development trainings that was timely.								The professional development provided by Reading First Professional Development to coaches in Reading First schools reflects the best principles of professional development as outlined in Every Child Reading: A Professional Development Guide and the National Staff Development Council's Standards for Staff Development.							
		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	21	1	5	17	81	3	14	0	0	1	5	12	57	8	38	0	0	11	52	10	48	0	0	0	0
		Mean = 2.90								Mean = 2.67								Mean = 3.52							
Area of State North	8	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0
South	13	1	8	10	77	2	15	0	0	1	8	5	38	7	54	0	0	7	54	6	46	0	0	0	0

Block 3

	Number	The content of the professional development provided in Teacher Reading Academies reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading.								The content of the professional development provided in Quarterly Professional Development and Monthly Book Studies reflects the knowledge acquired from scientifically based research in reading.								The collaborative mechanisms and procedures used by the Leadership Triangle (JRF, RFPD, FCRR) provided effective and timely guidance and leadership to Reading First efforts in Florida.							
		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly		Strongly		Agree		Disagree		Strongly	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	21	15	71	6	29	0	0	0	0	11	52	10	48	0	0	0	0	10	48	11	52	0	0	0	0
		Mean = 3.71								Mean = 3.52								Mean = 3.48							
Area of State North	8	5	63	3	38	0	0	0	0	4	50	4	50	0	0	0	0	5	63	3	38	0	0	0	0
South	13	10	77	3	23	0	0	0	0	7	54	6	46	0	0	0	0	5	38	8	62	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

* North = Alachua, Bradford, Brevard, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Escambia, Flagler, Franklin, Gadsden, Hamilton, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Lake, Leon, Madison, Marion, Nassau, Orange, Putnam, Seminole, Suwannee, Taylor, Volusia, Washington

** South = Broward, Charlotte, Collier, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Hillsborough, Lee, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, St. Lucie

Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		Number	The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were useful.								The progress monitoring and outcome reports provided by the Florida Center for Reading Research were timely.								The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was effective.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		431	338	78	89	21	3	1	1	<1	307	71	116	27	6	1	1	<1	246	57	176	41	6	1	2	1
			Mean = 3.78								Mean = 3.69								Mean = 3.55							
Area of State	**Area 1	31	24	77	7	23	0	0	0	0	21	68	9	29	1	3	0	0	21	70	9	30	0	0	0	0
	Area 2	72	56	78	15	21	0	0	1	1	47	65	23	32	1	1	1	1	41	57	29	40	1	1	1	1
	Area 3	40	31	78	9	23	0	0	0	0	26	65	13	33	1	3	0	0	22	55	17	43	1	3	0	0
	Area 4	44	33	75	11	25	0	0	0	0	31	70	13	30	0	0	0	0	26	59	18	41	0	0	0	0
	Area 5	30	21	70	8	27	1	3	0	0	18	62	10	34	1	3	0	0	11	67	18	60	1	3	0	0
	Area 6	47	35	74	10	21	2	4	0	0	33	70	12	26	2	4	0	0	25	53	20	43	1	2	1	2
	Area 7	68	55	81	13	19	0	0	0	0	50	74	18	26	0	0	0	0	34	50	32	47	2	3	0	0
	Area 8	98	82	84	16	16	0	0	0	0	80	82	18	18	0	0	0	0	65	66	33	34	0	0	0	0
	No Response	1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience	1-2 Years	135	106	79	29	21	0	0	0	0	90	67	43	32	2	1	0	0	83	61	51	38	1	1	0	0
	3-5 Years	192	157	82	34	18	1	1	0	0	142	74	46	24	4	2	0	0	109	57	76	40	5	3	1	1
	6-10 Years	77	55	71	20	26	1	1	1	1	57	74	19	25	0	0	1	1	40	52	36	47	0	0	1	1
	10 + Years	25	18	72	6	24	1	4	0	0	16	67	8	33	0	0	0	0	13	52	12	48	0	0	0	0
	No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Years of Professional Coaching Experience	1-2 Years	135	106	79	29	21	0	0	0	0	90	67	43	32	2	1	0	0	83	61	51	38	1	1	0	0
	3-5 Years	190	157	82	34	18	1	1	0	0	142	74	46	24	4	2	0	0	109	57	76	40	5	3	1	1
	6-10 Years	77	55	71	20	26	1	1	1	1	57	74	19	25	0	0	1	1	40	52	36	47	0	0	1	1
	10 + Years	24	18	72	6	24	1	4	0	0	16	67	8	33	0	0	0	0	13	52	12	48	0	0	0	0
	No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Reading Certification	Yes	198	159	80	37	19	2	1	0	0	143	73	52	26	2	1	0	0	111	56	82	41	4	2	1	1
	No	229	176	77	51	22	1	<1	1	<1	163	71	61	27	4	2	1	<1	134	59	91	40	2	1	1	<1
	No Response	4	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0
FL Reading Endorsement	Yes	109	90	83	19	17	0	0	0	0	78	72	28	26	3	3	0	0	66	61	41	38	1	1	0	0
	No	313	241	77	68	22	3	1	1	<1	223	71	85	27	3	1	1	<1	177	57	131	42	4	1	1	<1
	No Response	9	7	78	2	22	0	0	0	0	6	67	3	33	0	0	0	0	3	33	4	44	1	11	1	11

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		Number	The training and support provided by Reading First Professional Development to assist reading coaches in the fulfillment of their responsibilities was timely.								The state and regional Reading First Professional Development events were based on related topics that reflected an on-going, long range plan for professional development.								Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included discussion of pertinent research and theory.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		431	220	52	191	45	14	3	2	1	205	48	213	50	6	1	1	<1	228	54	192	45	4	1	1	<1
			Mean = 3.47								Mean = 3.46								Mean = 3.52							
Area of State	**Area 1	31	21	68	9	29	1	3	0	0	17	55	13	42	1	3	0	0	18	60	11	67	1	3	0	0
	Area 2	72	34	49	31	44	3	4	2	3	31	43	40	56	0	0	1	1	36	50	35	49	0	0	1	1
	Area 3	40	19	49	18	46	2	5	0	0	15	38	24	60	1	3	0	0	18	45	21	53	1	3	0	0
	Area 4	44	23	53	19	44	1	2	0	0	22	50	22	50	0	0	0	0	23	52	21	48	0	0	0	0
	Area 5	30	10	33	20	67	0	0	0	0	9	30	18	60	3	10	0	0	10	33	19	63	1	3	0	0
	Area 6	47	24	51	23	49	0	0	0	0	23	50	23	50	0	0	0	0	24	52	21	46	1	2	0	0
	Area 7	68	30	44	32	47	6	9	0	0	31	48	33	51	1	2	0	0	34	53	30	47	0	0	0	0
	Area 8	98	58	59	39	40	1	1	0	0	56	58	40	42	0	0	0	0	64	65	34	35	0	0	0	0
	No Response	1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience	1-2 Years	135	69	51	64	47	2	1	0	0	67	50	66	50	0	0	0	0	75	57	57	43	0	0	0	0
	3-5 Years	192	100	53	83	44	5	3	1	1	88	46	99	52	3	2	0	0	98	52	88	47	3	2	0	0
	6-10 Years	77	38	50	32	42	5	7	1	1	36	48	35	47	3	4	1	1	42	55	33	43	1	1	1	1
	10 + Years	25	12	48	12	48	1	4	0	0	13	52	12	48	0	0	0	0	12	48	13	52	0	0	0	0
	No Response	2	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Years of Professional Coaching Experience	1-2 Years	135	69	51	64	47	2	1	0	0	67	50	66	50	0	0	0	0	75	57	57	43	0	0	0	0
	3-5 Years	190	100	53	83	44	5	3	1	1	88	46	99	52	3	2	0	0	96	52	88	47	3	2	0	0
	6-10 Years	77	38	50	32	42	5	7	1	1	36	48	35	47	3	4	1	1	42	55	33	43	1	1	1	1
	10 + Years	24	12	48	12	48	1	4	0	0	13	52	12	48	0	0	0	0	12	48	13	52	0	0	0	0
	No Response	2	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Reading Certification	Yes	198	97	50	94	48	4	2	0	0	90	46	103	53	1	1	0	0	101	52	91	47	1	1	0	0
	No	229	122	54	95	42	9	4	2	1	115	51	106	47	52	10	0	0	125	55	99	42	3	1	1	<1
	No Response	4	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0
FL Reading Endorsement	Yes	109	58	54	47	44	1	1	1	1	53	49	53	49	2	2	0	0	62	57	44	41	2	2	0	0
	No	313	157	50	141	45	12	4	1	<1	149	48	155	50	4	1	1	<1	163	53	142	46	2	1	1	<1
	No Response	9	5	56	3	33	1	11	0	0	3	38	5	63	0	0	0	0	3	33	6	67	0	0	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

	Number	Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included opportunities to observe models of coaching in action.								Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included opportunities to practice coaching techniques.								Each state and regional Reading First Professional Development event included opportunities for feedback on coaching techniques.							
		*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	431	129	30	242	57	52	12	3	1	119	29	239	58	55	13	2	1	151	36	230	55	40	9	1	<1
		Mean = 3.17								Mean = 3.14								Mean = 3.26							
Area of State — **Area 1	31	12	39	14	45	5	16	0	0	12	41	14	48	3	10	0	0	15	50	11	67	4	13	0	0
Area 2	72	21	29	36	50	12	17	3	4	17	24	40	56	13	18	1	1	21	30	39	55	10	14	1	1
Area 3	40	10	25	22	55	8	20	0	0	9	23	21	54	9	23	0	0	14	35	22	55	4	10	0	0
Area 4	44	13	30	28	63	3	9	0	0	13	30	29	66	2	5	0	0	15	34	25	57	4	9	0	0
Area 5	30	5	17	21	70	4	13	0	0	5	17	21	70	4	13	0	0	5	17	21	7	4	13	0	0
Area 6	47	13	28	29	63	4	9	0	0	14	30	29	63	3	7	0	0	17	39	25	57	2	5	0	0
Area 7	68	24	36	35	53	7	11	0	0	17	27	37	58	10	16	0	0	23	35	35	54	7	11	0	0
Area 8	98	31	32	56	58	9	9	0	0	32	35	47	52	11	12	1	1	41	42	51	53	5	5	0	0
No Response	1	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience — 1-2 Years	135	41	31	73	56	16	12	1	1	33	26	75	60	16	13	1	1	50	39	69	54	10	8	0	0
3-5 Years	192	58	30	108	57	24	13	1	1	54	29	110	58	25	13	0	0	67	35	103	54	20	11	0	0
6-10 Years	77	20	26	45	58	11	14	1	1	23	30	41	54	11	14	1	1	24	32	43	57	8	11	1	1
10 + Years	25	9	36	16	64	0	0	0	0	8	35	13	57	2	9	0	0	9	36	15	60	1	4	0	0
No Response	2	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0
Years of Professional Coaching Experience — 1-2 Years	135	41	31	73	56	16	12	1	1	33	26	75	60	16	13	1	1	50	39	69	53	10	8	0	0
3-5 Years	190	58	30	108	57	24	13	1	1	54	29	110	58	25	13	0	0	67	35	103	54	20	11	0	0
6-10 Years	77	20	26	45	58	11	14	1	1	23	30	41	54	11	14	1	1	24	32	43	57	8	11	1	1
10 + Years	24	9	36	16	64	0	0	0	0	8	35	13	57	2	9	0	0	9	36	15	60	1	4	0	0
No Response	2	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0	1	50	0	0
Reading Certification — Yes	198	50	26	120	62	23	12	0	0	53	28	115	62	19	10	0	0	71	37	103	54	18	9	0	0
No	229	77	34	120	52	29	13	3	1	65	29	123	55	36	16	1	<1	78	35	125	55	22	10	1	<1
No Response	4	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	0	0	1	33	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0
FL Reading Endorsement — Yes	109	35	33	55	51	16	15	1	1	30	29	58	56	16	15	0	0	42	40	53	50	11	10	0	0
No	313	94	30	281	58	33	11	2	1	89	29	175	58	36	12	2	1	109	36	170	55	27	9	1	<1
No Response	9	0	0	6	67	3	33	0	0	0	0	6	67	3	33	0	0	0	0	7	78	2	22	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

		During this school year, sufficient time was allocated for professional development to allow for personal growth in knowledge and skills in your role as a reading coach.								Meetings with the Reading First Professional Development Coordinator were scheduled and occurred regularly.								The Reading First Professional Development Coordinator was readily accessibile and responded to questions and concerns in a timely manner.							
		*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Number	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL	431	160	38	218	51	44	10	3	1	256	61	155	37	10	2	2	1	316	75	104	25	2	1	2	1
		Mean = 3.26								Mean = 3.57								Mean = 3.73							
Area of State — **Area 1	31	14	45	15	48	2	6	0	0	22	73	8	27	0	0	0	0	23	77	7	23	0	0	0	0
Area 2	72	28	39	38	53	5	7	1	1	49	70	20	29	0	0	1	1	53	75	16	23	1	1	1	1
Area 3	40	12	31	26	67	1	3	0	0	24	62	14	36	1	3	0	0	27	69	12	31	0	0	0	0
Area 4	44	23	52	13	30	8	18	0	0	29	67	13	30	1	2	0	0	38	88	5	12	0	0	0	0
Area 5	30	5	17	21	70	3	10	1	3	19	63	10	3	0	0	1	3	22	73	7	23	1	3	0	0
Area 6	47	14	30	28	60	5	11	0	0	27	59	18	39	1	2	0	0	39	83	8	17	0	0	0	0
Area 7	68	24	36	34	51	9	13	0	0	31	46	32	48	4	6	0	0	40	60	26	39	0	0	1	1
Area 8	98	39	41	43	46	11	12	1	1	54	56	40	41	3	3	0	0	73	76	23	24	0	0	0	0
No Response	1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience — 1-2 Years	135	53	40	62	46	18	13	1	1	69	52	57	43	6	5	0	0	102	77	31	23	0	0	0	0
3-5 Years	192	68	36	102	54	18	10	0	0	123	65	62	33	3	2	0	0	140	74	46	24	1	1	1	1
6-10 Years	77	24	31	45	58	7	9	1	1	47	62	27	36	0	0	2	3	50	66	24	32	1	1	1	1
10 + Years	25	13	54	9	38	1	4	1	4	16	64	8	32	1	4	0	0	22	88	3	12	0	0	0	0
No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Professional Coaching Experience — 1-2 Years	135	53	40	62	46	18	13	1	1	69	52	57	43	6	5	0	0	102	77	31	23	0	0	0	0
3-5 Years	190	68	36	102	54	18	10	0	0	123	65	62	33	3	2	0	0	140	74	46	24	1	1	1	1
6-10 Years	77	24	31	45	58	7	9	1	1	47	62	27	36	0	0	2	3	50	66	24	32	1	1	1	1
10 + Years	24	13	54	9	38	1	4	1	4	16	64	8	32	1	4	0	0	22	88	3	12	0	0	0	0
No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reading Certification — Yes	198	70	36	102	52	23	12	0	0	112	58	76	39	4	2	1	1	144	73	49	25	2	1	1	1
No	229	89	39	114	50	20	9	3	1	143	63	77	34	6	3	1	<1	170	76	53	24	0	0	1	<1
No Response	4	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0
FL Reading Endorsement — Yes	109	43	40	56	52	8	8	0	0	69	65	33	31	4	4	0	0	79	74	28	26	0	0	0	0
No	313	116	37	159	51	32	10	3	1	182	59	118	38	6	2	2	1	231	75	74	24	2	1	1	<1
No Response	9	1	13	3	38	4	50	0	0	5	56	4	44	0	0	0	0	6	67	2	22	0	0	1	11

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

Florida *Reading First* Coaching Survey 2007
Frequency of Responses to Survey Items and Percentage of Group Represented

			Site visits made by the Reading First Professional Development Coordinator included observation and feedback.								The focus of meetings with the Reading First Professional Development Coordinator included support and follow-up for state and regional events.							
			*Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
		Number	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
STATEWIDE TOTAL		431	283	67	122	29	13	3	3	1	234	55	174	41	14	3	1	<1
Area of State	**Area 1	31	23	77	7	23	0	0	0	0	22	73	8	27	0	0	0	0
	Area 2	72	52	72	17	24	2	3	1	1	36	50	34	47	1	1	1	1
	Area 3	40	25	64	13	33	1	3	0	0	22	56	14	36	3	8	0	0
	Area 4	44	34	77	9	20	1	2	0	0	25	58	17	40	1	2	0	0
	Area 5	30	18	60	11	37	1	3	0	0	12	40	17	57	1	3	0	0
	Area 6	47	33	75	10	23	1	2	0	0	22	49	21	47	2	4	0	0
	Area 7	68	24	37	33	51	6	9	2	3	26	39	36	55	4	6	0	0
	Area 8	98	73	76	22	23	1	1	0	0	68	70	27	28	2	2	0	0
	No Response	1	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Years of Teaching Experience	1-2 Years	135	94	71	34	26	5	4	0	0	78	59	52	39	3	2	0	0
	3-5 Years	192	127	68	54	29	4	2	2	1	101	53	83	44	5	3	0	0
	6-10 Years	77	45	60	27	36	2	3	1	1	40	53	30	40	5	7	0	0
	10 + Years	25	15	63	7	29	2	8	0	0	14	61	8	35	1	4	0	0
	No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Years of Professional Coaching Experience	1-2 Years	135	94	71	34	26	5	4	0	0	78	59	52	39	3	2	0	0
	3-5 Years	190	127	68	54	29	4	2	2	1	101	53	83	44	5	3	0	0
	6-10 Years	77	45	60	27	36	2	3	1	1	40	53	30	39	5	7	1	1
	10 + Years	24	15	63	7	29	2	8	0	0	14	61	8	35	1	4	0	0
	No Response	2	2	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	0	0	0	0
Reading Certification	Yes	198	132	58	51	26	9	5	1	1	107	55	81	42	6	3	0	0
	No	229	149	67	69	31	4	2	2	1	124	55	92	41	8	4	1	<1
	No Response	4	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0
FL Reading Endorsement	Yes	109	77	73	28	26	1	1	0	0	61	57	43	40	3	3	0	0
	No	313	202	66	90	29	12	4	2	1	170	55	127	41	10	3	1	<1
	No Response	9	4	44	4	44	0	0	1	11	3	38	4	50	1	13	0	0

*Response Options: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree

Area 1 – Escambia, Franklin, Gadsden, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Leon, Madison, Washington; **Area 2** – Alachua, Bradford, Clay, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hamilton, Lafayette, Lake, Marion, Nassau, Putnam, Suwannee, Taylor; **Area 3** – Brevard, Orange, Seminole, Volusia; **Area 4** – Hillsborough, Pinellas; **Area 5** – Highlands, Polk; **Area 6** – DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, St. Lucie; **Area 7** – Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Lee; **Area 8** – Miami-Dade, Monroe

APPENDIX E

References

Narrative References

Beck, I.L. 2006. Making sense of phonics: The hows and whys. New York: The Guilford Press.

Easton, L.B. (Ed.) 2004. Powerful designs for professional learning. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council

Fitzpatrick, J.L., Sanders, J.R., and Worthen, B.R. 2004. Program Evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines, 3rd ed. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Learning First Alliance. 2003. Every Child Reading: A Professional Development Guide. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from http://www.learningfirst.org/publications.

National Staff Development Council. 2001 NSDC's standards for staff development. Retrieved February 15, 2007, from www.nscd,org/standards/index.cfm

Sanders, J.R. 1994. The program evaluation standards, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

APPENDIX F

Evaluation Team

EVALUATION TEAM

Patricia L. Linder and Marilyn D. Kline are Senior Research Associates at the David C. Anchin Center in the College of Education at the University of South Florida. With a combined total of 60 years experience in public education, they currently direct a wide range of projects, including program evaluation; regional support for adult, community, and family literacy and education programs; and regional professional development. From 2004 to 2006, Linder and Kline served as program evaluators for the Just Read, Florida! statewide K-3 Reading Academy project and collaborated on works published in S*uper Learning in a Super City: NFL Youth Outreach Program* and in a National Literacy Project online publication for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Since 2004 they have written, been awarded, and administered grants in excess of $1,470,000, and the pair were most recently published in the Winter 2007 edition of ERS Spectrum: Journal of Research and Information. Linder and Kline have worked nationally as educational consultants and are currently doctoral candidates at the University of South Florida, completing the Ph.D. program in Curriculum and Instruction with an emphasis in research and measurement.