

From: Alison Procopio [aprocopio@americanreading.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 23, 2007 7:30 PM
To: What Works
Subject: RE: WWC inquiry about 100 Book Challenge
[Thank you for your response.](#)

We are concerned as a company because studies were "reviewed" but we were never contacted. Many of the "research studies" that were named in the WWC report are not ones we, as a company, would consider "studies" ourselves. Plus, the one study that we are proud of and would like the WWC to review was not even in the group of studies reviewed. This report, by Robert Offenburg, would have been the report we would have sent you and it is on our website. So, we were confused as to why the two DuCette studies were reviewed because they were on our website, but the Offenburg study was not.

[Is it possible for this report to be considered by WWC?](#)

[Thank you,](#)
[Alison](#)

From: What Works [<mailto:whatworks@mathematica-mpr.com>]
Sent: Saturday, September 22, 2007 3:15 PM
To: Alison Procopio; anathan@americanreading.com
Cc: Harps, Shauna N'; info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov
Subject: RE: WWC inquiry about 100 Book Challenge

The WWC can respond only to written questions or inquiries about intervention reports. You can send your questions to this e-mail address and we will do our best to answer them. Responses to previous questions were provided by Jill Constantine.

Thanks for your interest.

The What Works Clearinghouse

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Procopio [<mailto:aprocopio@americanreading.com>]
Sent: Thu 9/20/2007 4:28 PM
To: What Works; anathan@americanreading.com
Cc: 'Harps, Shauna N'; info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov
Subject: RE: WWC inquiry about 100 Book Challenge

Thank you for your response. Is there someone that I could speak to in person about this, I have a few more questions? I tried to contact Jill Constantine but have not heard back from her yet.

Thank you very much for your help with this.
Alison Procopio

-----Original Message-----

From: What Works [<mailto:whatworks@mathematica-mpr.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2007 4:24 PM
To: anathan@americanreading.com

Cc: Harps, Shauna N; info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov
Subject: WWC inquiry about 100 Book Challenge

The protocol for how the WWC assessed research on reading interventions, including 100 Book Challenge, can be reviewed at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/beginning_reading/. The protocol lays out the guidelines under which research was identified for the review and how it was incorporated into the WWC's reports.

For 100 Book Challenge, the WWC reviewed 12 publicly available documents, all which indicated that they were studies of 100 Book Challenge. All studies are listed in Appendix A5 of the Beginning Reading Topic Report. These included reports from school districts, as well as two studies by Ducette that are posted on the 100 Book Challenge website. Upon review, none of these studies met WWC evidence standards.

We are having technical difficulties with a few of the HTML files on the WWC website. Please use the following link to a pdf file view the appendix to the Beginning Reading Topic report.

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/BR_APP_08_13_07.pdf

Thanks for your interest in the WWC.

The What Works Clearinghouse

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Procopio
Sent: Wed, September 12, 2007 4:57 pm
To: info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov
Subject: RE: Your email to the What Works Clearinghouse

Dear David,
I have still not received word from What Works Clearinghouse about my request. Is there someone I can call and speak to about this. We, as a company, are very confused and upset about recent WWC findings and would like to speak to someone as soon as possible.

Thank you,
Alison Nathan
Director of Academic Credibility
American Reading Company

From: info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov [<mailto:info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2007 2:40 PM
To: Alison Nathan
Subject: Your email to the What Works Clearinghouse

Dear Alison,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse Help Desk (www.whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov). We received your request for information regarding materials submitted to the WWC on 100 Book Challenge.

I have brought your request to the attention of a WWC specialist, and she will follow up with you shortly under separate cover.

I hope this is helpful,

David Anderson
Moderator, What Works Help Desk
1-866-WWC-9799
<http://whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov>

-----Original Message-----

From: Alison Nathan
Sent: Wed, August 29, 2007 4:20 pm
To: info@whatworkshelpdesk.ed.gov
Subject: 100 Book Challenge

Hello,

I am interested in finding out what was submitted for review by WWC, when, and by whom on behalf of our product 100 Book Challenge.

Thank you so much,
Alison

100 Book Challenge

Pilot Program Evaluation and Data Report 2006-2007



**Baltimore County Public Schools
Office of Equity & Assurance**

**Dr. Barbara Dezmon
Ms. Cheryl Brooks
Ms. Maggie Kennedy, Consultant**

February 2008

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	3
Executive Summary	4
Introduction	8
Alignment to Standards.....	15
• Blueprint for Progress	
• Maryland State Curriculum	
• No Child Left Behind	
100 Book Challenge Daily Instructional Framework	24
Professional Development Component	27
Parent and Family Involvement Component	32
Evaluation Findings and Outcomes	36
• Evaluation of Implementation Process	
• Evaluation of Pilot Schools Implementation	
Student Outcomes Data Analysis	43
• Analysis of Independent Reading Levels by Subgroups	
Summary and Implications.....	54
Appendices.....	58
Appendix A: Mars Estates – Beginning Pilot 2004-2006	
Appendix B: The Effects of 100 Book Challenge on Standardized Test Scores of Urban Elementary Pupils in Philadelphia, PA	
Appendix C: Leveling of Students’ Reading Proficiency	
Appendix D: Self-scoring Implementation Rubrics for Individual Schools, 2006-2007	
Appendix E: Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between Special Ed and Non-Special Ed Students by Grade	

Acknowledgments

Sincere gratitude is expressed to the following individuals for their contributions to this report: Ms. Vicki Sappe, Mr. Shakeel Mohammed, and Ms. Carol Morgan. The authors also recognize Dr. Joe A. Hairston for his leadership and constant encouragement of initiatives to address the academic needs of all students. Most important, a special note of thanks is extended to students, parents, faculties, staff, and administrators, Mses. Jill Carter, Linda Chapin, Lisa Dingle, Marcel Hall, Edith Howard, Maureen Partilla, Iris Steele, and Sharon Whitlock, at the pilot schools for their participation in and contributions to this important effort.

Executive Summary

Research attests that, as part of a balanced literacy approach, school systems should designate an independent reading time in the Language Arts/Reading block to accompany the instructional components. However, Baltimore County Public Schools' implementation of this valuable literacy component has been inconsistent. To fulfill this requirement, 100 Book Challenge provides students with books that they can read independently with successful decoding and full comprehension. 100 Book Challenge supports students towards the ultimate goal of independent application of comprehension, skills, and strategies.

100 Book Challenge is an independent reading system that includes a professional development initiative and a parent support framework resulting in unprecedented success in 256 school districts in more than 1400 schools across the United States. This reading program is a scientifically research-based program that connects independent reading practice to local, state, and national standards. The 100 Book Challenge program provides opportunities for students to become high-achieving readers, writers, and thinkers. It helps teachers provide exemplary literacy programs reflecting the diverse talents and interests of children and their communities. In addition, the program assists parents in adopting successful home support routines to enhance their children's reading.

100 Book Challenge offers a wealth of multicultural authentic literature books, both fiction and non-fiction, and appropriate practice at the "just right" level for all children. The students are leveled in a "reading zone" of "just right," easier, and easiest to promote fluency, word recognition, literary word acquisition, and comprehension. Embedded continuous assessment and differentiation provide students, parents, and teachers with the information needed to monitor and support improvement. 100 Book Challenge provides benchmarks in the

following areas: wide reading and motivation, decoding and word solving strategies, fluency, vocabulary and background knowledge, and comprehension of informational and literary text. Students also benefit from the differentiation of targeted coaching and developmentally appropriate independent reading selections.

The 100 Book Challenge pilot project featured in this report was conducted in 6 schools and involves 1,409 students. After the October 2006 6-hour professional development for all participating teachers and administration from Chase Elementary, Deer Park Elementary, Mars Estates Elementary, Pleasant Plains Elementary, and Winfield Elementary, data was collected and monitored for 6 months. Randallstown's 3.5 hour professional development and several hours of on-site support occurred in November 2006, and data was collected for 4.5 months. Data collected included individual student independent reading grade level equivalence, amount of time reading in school, and amount of time reading at home with parental/family support. Data were disaggregated to monitor all NCLB subgroups. Overall, individual student reading levels improved, families/parents supported home reading, and teachers provided 15 minutes of independent reading on a daily basis in class.

There were 99 classes participating within the 6 schools across Baltimore County Public Schools. The number of classrooms and grade levels varied somewhat from school to school. Mars Estates' pilot included all kindergarten through 3rd grade classrooms. Two self-contained special education classrooms were also included in the pilot. The Winfield Elementary pilot included all kindergarten through 5th grade classrooms, including all self-contained special education classes. Chase, Deer Park, Pleasant Plains, and Randallstown's implementation included all 3rd - 5th grade classrooms. Mars Estates implemented the program in kindergarten through 3rd grade.

Overall, there was a significant increase in family and community involvement. The 100 Book Challenge structure provided home reading materials and coaching skills cards to guide students and parents. Consistently over 50% of parents read with their child or monitored their student's independent reading level 3 or more nights a week. In addition, at least one parent training was held in each pilot school. All schools held more than one parent training. School-wide celebrations often included parents as partners. For example, schools partnered with local libraries for sneaks night, introduced summer reading initiatives, parent and student reading celebrations, as well as family award nights. The data show marked improvement in meaningful student and parent participation regarding reading.

During 100 Book Challenge, students can experience a rate of growth of up to 2.6 years improvement, given students read independently for 60 minutes per day, for the full school year with targeted instruction, coaching, and proper home support. Students across all schools experienced a mean growth of 8 months over 4.5 to 6 months time. It is worth mentioning, several subgroups and schools outperformed the mean. For instance, at Deer Park Elementary FARM students experienced 1 year of growth in 6 months of implementation. Also making advances were gifted and talented students at Pleasant Plains, Deer Park, Mars Estates, and Chase, all of whom experienced more than 1 year of growth over 6 months. Deer Park GT students experienced more than 2 years' reading growth in the same time frame. Some individual Special Education students at Randallstown and Chase also made significant gains with growth of 1 year or more during the implementation.

As stated above, the data show that students made 8 months of progress on their independent reading levels over a range of 4.5 to 6 months. However, when examining the school data, beyond the mean, the rate of advancement of student independent reading levels

ranged from 5 months upwards of 1 year 2 months of progress attained. While data shows there was progress, the school implementation rubrics as well as the individual teacher rubrics reflect a direct correlation to student achievement. The advancement in independent reading levels correlates with the time allotted for reading and the quality of implementation in classrooms and schools. Another factor that impacted the results was the attrition of teachers during the expansion and implementation of the program. 100 Book Challenge helps provide a solid base on which to grow. As teachers improve their levels of quality implementation, student achievement should also improve. The more successful experience students, teachers, and families have with this reading program, there should be an even greater acceleration of student achievement.

Introduction

Introduction

A fully implemented independent reading program will make the difference in student achievement. This is primarily based upon how well the classroom teacher implements the components of the 100 Book Challenge program in the classroom on a daily basis. A fully implemented instructional program consists of direct instruction that is based on state standards, independent and coached reading practice for every student, conferencing with students based on state standards and student needs, and an ongoing assessment framework and resources. In addition to direct instruction, students require independent and coached reading practice where students apply the skill or strategy taught by the teacher to their independent reading. The teacher reminds the students about the skill or strategy and supervises their independent reading to see that they have transferred their new learning to real reading in authentic books. The teacher is coaching and instructing students on the adoption of the kind of reading lifestyle we know is essential for school success. This is a crucial instructional component, which very often has been left up to parents that schools can address through this program.

When providing direct instruction, the teacher directly teaches a skill or strategy to the whole class, small group, or individual student. This skill or strategy is usually the regular instructional component of the school's core reading program or it is a skill or strategy taken from the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum that the class, group, or student has demonstrated needs improvement. 100 Book Challenge provides a scope and sequence for reading instruction, and many teachers find it very helpful in planning their small group work. The 100 Book Challenge does not provide a new curriculum. The program helps teachers use their existing instructional curriculum more effectively. It helps teachers organize their instruction so that all

the students learn, regardless of their current reading level, and provides for differentiation of instruction for all students.

Through the 100 Book Challenge Program, differentiation of instruction and one-on-one feedback is provided by teachers during conferencing using an assessment framework referred to as the 100 Book Challenge Independent Reading Level Assessment, which is based on state standards. During conferencing, teachers circulate, working with individuals or small groups, sampling their ability to apply the skills and strategies taught in the core program. Teachers provide intensive one-on-one instructional support where necessary and use what they learn about their students' reading practices to inform their instructional decision making. This is an intensive instructional setting for both the students and the teacher. The 100 Book Challenge has teachers sitting, listening to them read, seeing firsthand how students handle the unpredictable demands of real books, watching to see if they are applying what they thought they taught, getting to know their students as readers, and tailoring their "core programs" to better meet the demands of both students and the reading process.

100 Book Challenge is, in many ways, the ideal reading system for use by students who are English Language Learners (ELL) or students with special needs. Although 100 Book Challenge is not as prescriptive as many programs specifically designed for special needs students, it provides almost all of the key ingredients to help these students succeed:

- Careful matching of students to texts at their own independent levels
- Immersion in success-level reading
- Specification of skills the student needs to master at each level in order to progress to the next
- One-on-one instruction

- Motivation, recognition, and reward for effort
- Student choice

The 100 Book Challenge is ideal for addressing the needs of the ELL student population as students learn to read in English, because 100 Book Challenge provides the skills and tools that all emergent readers need. 100 Book Challenge combines phonics and meaning-based learning models to guarantee student success from the very beginning and then supports student achievement through advanced levels. Instead of using stilted ELL workbooks and drill sheets, 100 Book Challenge immerses students in real books—interesting books, books the students choose to read. Hundreds of different titles are organized into color-coded collections and presented in an easy-to-understand sequence.

In November 2004, the 100 Book Challenge Program began being piloted in Baltimore County Public Schools at Mars Estates Elementary School. The impetus for this project has focused on racial/ethnic minority students and students who require Free and Reduced Meals. The 100 Book Challenge pilot was initiated and implemented in three 1st grade classrooms, one 2nd grade inclusion class, and one 3rd grade inclusion class. Considerable improvement was made over each quarter, and noted areas of strengths and areas of improvement were recognized and shared with all involved at both the school and district level. A further analysis of 100 Book Challenge levels was performed at the end of the school year for all 5 classrooms. In September, 4 out of 5 classrooms had 100% of students reading below grade level. By June, in 3 of 5 classrooms where 100% of the students were present from September to June, students increased their reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension by two or more independent reading levels. The 3 inclusion classrooms showed the most growth, with 50% or more of students present from December to June increasing their reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension by 3 or more

independent reading levels. For a detailed description of the pilot of 100 Book Challenge at Mars Estates 2004-2006, see Appendix A.

Based on the above results, in March 2006, the pilot expanded to Winfield Elementary School in kindergarten through Grade 5. In September 2006, the pilot was again expanded to include Chase Elementary, Deer Park Elementary, and Pleasant Plains Elementary in Grades 3, 4, and 5. At Mars Estates, the first site, Grade K was added with an expansion to include all 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms. Then, in late November 2006, the program was introduced to Randallstown Elementary School in Grades 3, 4, and 5. In addition, in June 2007, Chase Elementary and Mars Estates Elementary piloted a summer school component of 100 Book Challenge in Grades 3, 4, and 5. In September 2007, Halstead Academy and Woodmoor Elementary Schools, Grades 3, 4, and 5 were included, as well as completion of Grades 1 and 2 at Chase, Randallstown, Pleasant Plains, and Deer Park Elementary Schools. In October 2007, 3 kindergarten classes at Deer Park were included in 100 Book Challenge. Currently there are 135 classes involved in daily independent reading instruction.

The expected growth rate of students in schools fully implementing the program is 2.6 years growth when a student reads independently for 60 minutes per day. In BCPS, participating schools implemented the program for 2/3 of the year for 15 minutes per day; therefore, the expected growth rate became 1 month of growth per month of implementation. The optimum time allotment recommended is 15 minutes for younger students and 30 minutes for students in grades 3, 4, and 5. Despite not having the most advantageous time allotment, among all schools the average independent reading level growth was still 8 months. Newly added schools in the 2006-2007 school years with 4.5 to 6 months of implementation including Chase, Deer Park, Pleasant Plains, and Randallstown also progressed well. The average amount of independent

reading level growth among the new schools was 9 months. The average overall growth rate exceeded the expected growth rates given the duration of program implementation and the level of implementation at each school.

The data in this report was disaggregated by school, by grade, by race, by Special Education, by Free and Reduced Meals, by English Language Learners, and by Gifted and Talented. The indicators of student achievement in this report are based on progress on the independent reading level growth of students during the implementation of the program. The implementation period has not been long enough to include a discussion of the impact on MSA in this analysis. However, earlier studies cite the positive effect of full implementation of 100 Book over a period of years on student achievement based on standardized tests such as Terra Nova. One study also attests that the program had a considerable effect on closing achievement disparities between African American and majority students. See Appendix B.

This report also provides information about the implementation level in each school, and the successes of some schools at beginning, partial, and full implementation levels. Although the reading program began as an initiative to assist ethnic minority and low SES students, it provides tools to enhance the education of all students. Furthermore, the program should continue as an integral part of Baltimore County Public Schools' efforts to address achievement disparities among individual as well as various groups of students.

Finally, for all students, 100 Book Challenge offers a leveling system that makes clear what readers need to know and be able to do at each level of reading acquisition, Pre-K through 12th grade. These performance expectations are all linked to Maryland State Standards. The Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA) outlines the skills and strategies (standards) in detail for teacher, student, and parent use. Skills cards for each level make the standards clear

and go home with students each day so parents know what is expected and how to help their children practice. These skills and strategies form the basis of all good reading instruction. Once teachers, students, and parents understand how standards (objectives) clarify and simplify their work together, core programs, state testing, and state standards all make more sense.

(b)(6)



Alignment to Standards

The information contained in this section of the report will highlight the program's alignment to various standards including No Child Left Behind, the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum, and the BCPS Blueprint for Progress. The program is also designed to meet the needs of students receiving special education services as well as English language learners. 100 Book Challenge was selected for implementation in Baltimore County Public Schools based on program validity, alignment to standards, and meeting student needs by enabling all students to be successful and increase achievement rates. Alignment to the Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum (VSC) is especially critical today as BCPS strives to prepare all students to be academically successful and to pass state testing requirements.

Alignment with the BCPS Blueprint for Progress

100 Book Challenge meets the following criteria from the Blueprint for Progress.

Performance Goal 1

By 2012, all students will reach high standards, as established by the Baltimore County Public Schools and state performance level standards, in English/reading/writing, mathematics, science, and social studies.

Performance Indicators for Goal 1

1.1 All diploma-bound students in Grades 3 – 8 and students enrolled in English 10 and Algebra I will meet or exceed Maryland School Assessment (MSA) standards, and students enrolled in English 10 and Algebra I will pass the High School Assessments (HSA). (State standard)

1.8 Students in Grades 2 – 6 will achieve grade level standards on reading assessments. (BCPS standard)

Key Strategies for Goal 1

c) Provide for the consistent and systematic implementation of the Essential Curriculum in all content areas, which includes differentiated curriculum for English Language Learners, special education, gifted and talented, and honors students.

- l) Encourage reading by establishing a minimum goal of 25 books from the recommended list that will be read by/to each student during the academic school year.
- q) Provide parents, guardians, and community stakeholder groups with strategies that can be implemented with children to enhance student learning.
- r) Strengthen communications and mutual support between and among parents/guardians, teachers, administrators, and students by providing parents/guardians with concrete strategies to use at home to help their children achieve high standards.
- s) Enlist parents, guardians, and community members in reading efforts at the schools and at home.
- u) Provide staff with access to technology essential to collecting, analyzing, and reporting student achievement data.
- w) Support teachers in the implementation of reading techniques through professional development opportunities.
- x) Provide ongoing support to new and veteran teachers through professional development opportunities.
- y) Provide professional development opportunities to teachers, paraprofessionals, and principals in content areas.

Performance Goal 3

By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

Performance Indicators for Goal 3

3.2 All teachers and paraprofessionals will participate in high quality differentiated professional development, as defined by No Child Left Behind. (State standard)

Key Strategies for Goal 3

- k) Provide staff development opportunities that focus on principals' assessed needs and system priorities.

Performance Goal 6

Engage parents/guardians, business, and community members in the educational process.

Performance Indicators for Goal 6

6.1 All parents/guardians will have multiple opportunities to participate in home-school communication. (BCPS standard)

6.2 Increase students, parent/guardian, and teacher conferences to 100% in all schools. (BCPS standard)

6.3 Increase learning opportunities for parents/guardians, staff, and community members to assist in developing and refining the knowledge and skills needed to support students' academic achievement and recognize students' successes. (BCPS standard)

6.4 Increase parent/guardian attendance at school-based events and activities such as back-to-school nights and school improvement teams. (BCPS standard)

6.6 Increase communication and positive relationships with parents/guardians and community members by disseminating information about system, school, and student successes. (BCPS Standard)

Key Strategies for Goal 6

a) Provide professional development opportunities to principals/schools to assist in aligning parent/guardian and community involvement strategies with school improvement goals.

e) Expand recognition opportunities for students, parents/guardians, community, and business partners.

Alignment with Maryland Voluntary State Curriculum

100 Book Challenge is a scientifically-based research program which effectively addresses all reading standards included in the Maryland State Voluntary Curriculum: Standard 1.0 General Reading Processes, Standard 2.0 Comprehension of Informational Text, Standard 3.0 Comprehension of Literary Text, and Standard 4.0 Writing.

Maryland State Standard 1.0

Phonemic Awareness

Students develop phonemic awareness as they read as well as before they learn to read. Students, at the beginning levels of 100 Book Challenge, develop phonemic awareness through extensive oral reading to the teacher, other students, and themselves. Teachers use one-on-one conferences during 100 Book Challenge Readers' Workshop to teach phonemic awareness and to lead students in guided oral reading—another practice recommended by the National Reading Panel.

Phonics

100 Book Challenge books are leveled according to the scope and sequence of phonics skills acquisition. Students develop phonics skills through extensive reading in leveled texts, use of Skills Cards that make explicit the phonics skills to be mastered at each reading level, and targeted, timely, one-on-one instruction from the teacher, informed by the leveling system and Skills Cards.

Fluency

All 100 Book Challenge students are carefully matched to text to ensure fluency. All 100 Book Challenge books are leveled according to a state-of-the-art book-leveling system that mirrors students' developmental acquisition of reading skills. All books are color-coded to allow for consistent and easy matching of students to text of appropriate challenge by teachers and by the students themselves. Students invest the majority of their time reading books at successful fluency (independent) levels.

Vocabulary

100 Book Challenge builds vocabulary directly and effectively. Students' wide reading brings them into repeated contact with new vocabulary within a variety of meaningful contexts. Skills Cards at each reading level list key and representative vocabulary for students to master. The Readers' Workshop format provides teachers with daily opportunities to teach vocabulary directly and to reinforce students' acquisition of new vocabulary.

General Reading Comprehension

Students' comprehension is expanded through wide reading at success levels. Skills Cards for each reading level detail comprehension skills and strategies to practice and master. In Readers' Workshops, teacher's model, observe, and assess comprehension strategies daily (e.g., visualizing, predicting, summarizing). Students apply these strategies in self-selected text every day both in school and at home.

Maryland State Standard 2.0

Students will read, comprehend, interpret, analyze, and evaluate informational text. 100 Book Challenge offers a dual approach to ensuring students' success with informational text. Regular 100 Book Challenge book collections contain approximately one-third nonfiction books. All 100 Book Challenge students, therefore, have access to hundreds of informational texts at all reading levels. Daily Readers' Workshops—including teacher modeling, student independent reading, one-on-one teacher-student conferences, and small and whole group discussions—provide the structures in which teachers and students can read, comprehend, interpret, analyze, and evaluate a wide variety of informational texts.

In addition, 100 Book Challenge Research Labs™ in science and social studies are specifically designed to develop students' reading, writing, and researching skills using informational texts. In a typical Research Lab, students explore one topic (e.g., marine life, space, ancient civilizations) through extensive reading in leveled libraries containing books on that topic. Skills Cards created to guide work on each topic present students, teachers, and parents with the major questions, vocabulary, and concepts that define that field of study. As students read, write, and

discuss the topic, they compare, contrast, and categorize the information they accumulate. This dynamic interaction with informational texts culminates in a significant demonstration of student learning, often in the form of a student-authored book on a special subtopic of individual choosing.

Maryland State Standard 3.0

Students will read, comprehend, interpret, analyze, and evaluate literary texts. 100 Book Challenge offers a dual approach to ensuring students' success with literary texts. Regular 100 Book Challenge book collections contain approximately two-thirds literary texts. All 100 Book Challenge students, therefore, have access to hundreds of literary texts at all reading levels, representing the full spectrum of literary genres. Daily Readers' Workshops—including teacher modeling, student independent reading, one-on-one teacher-student conferences, and small and whole group discussions—provide the structures in which teachers and students can read, comprehend, interpret, analyze, and evaluate a wide variety of literary texts.

100 Book Challenge Research Labs™ in literature are specifically designed to develop students' reading, writing, and analyzing skills using literary texts in important genres. In a typical literary Research Lab, students explore one genre (e.g., poetry, historical fiction, biography) through extensive reading in leveled, genre-specific libraries. Skills Cards created to guide work in that area of study present students, teachers, and parents with the major questions, vocabulary, and concepts that define that field. As students read, write, and discuss the topic, they develop a deep understanding of literature. This dynamic interaction with literary texts culminates in a significant demonstration of student learning, often in the form of a student-authored text that represents the studied genre.

Maryland State Standard 4.0

Students will compose in a variety of modes by developing content, employing specific forms, and selecting language appropriate for a particular audience and purpose. 100 Book Challenge offers a dual approach to ensuring students' writing success. In daily 100 Book Challenge Readers' Workshops, students get regular opportunities to study the writing of hundreds of authors representing a full spectrum of genres. Students write in response to their reading, learn to appreciate authors' craft and purposes, and begin to read as writers.

In 100 Book Challenge Research Labs in science, social studies, and literature, students study both a specific topic and authors' methods of exploring and presenting that topic. Students and teachers compare texts and discuss the merits and effectiveness of different forms of writing. Each student's work within a Research Lab includes serious attention to the student's own writing and usually culminates in a student-authored text.

Alignment with No Child Left Behind

In the following discussion, goals associated with NCLB are in bold text, and the alignment with 100 Book Challenge is directly under the standard.

Title I · Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged

Appropriate Assessments must be in place.

100 Book Challenge provides the standards-based architecture for school or district-wide assessment, motivation, and monitoring for reading achievement, Pre-K–12th grade, in both English and Spanish. Daily and periodic classroom-based assessment of each student’s reading level and current strengths and needs informs instructional development.

Low-achievers’ needs must be met so the gap is closed between them and higher achievers.

100 Book Challenge accelerates progress for lower achievers through intensive “just right” practice and targeted, effective instruction, in tens of thousands of highly engaging trade books. Results indicate significant and rapid achievement gains for all learners—slashing, even reversing, the achievement gap between higher and lower income students.

Ensure professional development.

Initial and ongoing professional development are provided, including in-class coaching for teachers using a self-assessment rubric that makes expectations and ingredients for success explicit. Structures for teacher learning are embedded in their daily classroom practice.

Afford parents the chance to participate.

Parents become home reading coaches supported by easy-to-understand procedures and Skills Cards that explain students’ objectives at each color level. Books are sent home each day for required nightly reading. Parent workshops explain clearly what parents can do to help their children succeed.

Programs must have measurable objectives.

Objectives for reading achievement and quantity of reading practice in both school and homes are delineated, assessed, monitored, and motivated for every student, classroom, and school. Clearly designed reading benchmarks are continually measured. Tens of thousands of real books, leveled by world class standards, addressing the five key components of reading, make grade level expectations clear to all stakeholders. Scope and sequence makes clear the phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension required at each level of reading acquisition.

Academic assessments must be used to improve achievement.

Regular, in-class assessments are tied directly to instruction to improve achievement. The clear articulation of the scope and sequence of skill acquisition allows teachers to continuously and accurately assess students’ academic levels and plan instruction to improve achievement.

Teachers use what they learn from conferencing during independent reading to make better use of small and large group instruction.

Promote reading and library programs that provide access to engaging reading material, including coordination with other programs.

Engaging reading materials are the bedrock upon which the 100 Book Challenge is built. Tens of thousands of books of all levels, genres, fiction and non-fiction, reflecting all ethnicities are selected from every publisher in the industry, organized into components that move in and out of classrooms, providing a river of books for every student at every level, every day of the school year. Thematic collections in science and social studies help teachers differentiate learning in content areas.

100 Book Challenge provides independent practice for a core curriculum. Teachers use Direct Instruction and Guided Practice to teach the skills and strategies of *whatever* core curriculum is in place. Teachers then have students apply those skills and strategies in independent reading during 100 Book Challenge. Students' use of the strategies is assessed during one-on-one conferences and sharing times. Independent practice, with the teacher learning to systematically watch her students, has been the missing feedback loop in both teacher and student learning. Teachers learn to teach for transfer, not just the skills and strategies involved in learning how to read, but the lifestyle required in being a reader. 100 Book Challenge creates a seamless literacy environment partnering with any core reading program.

Enhance the early language, literacy, and pre-reading development of preschool age children.

100 Book Challenge's Early Literacy program is designed to enhance the early language, literacy, and pre-reading development of preschool age children through language stimulation and reading readiness experiences. 100 Book Challenge ensures that every child takes home a new selection of books every night and that the family is given incentives to read those books aloud to the child.

Title II · Professional Development

Provide training in how to teach and address the needs of students with different learning styles, particularly students with disabilities, students with special learning needs (including students who are gifted and talented), and students with limited English proficiency.

100 Book Challenge helps create better teachers of reading. 100 Book Challenge teaches teachers to address students' different learning styles through start-up training, in-class teacher coaching with follow-up, and advanced training sessions. Students' learning styles are constantly addressed via choice, ownership, and variety of materials they will read. The guaranteed success of 100 Book Challenge book leveling and matching students to books of appropriate challenge and interest is perfect for supporting students with special learning needs as well as gifted and talented students.

Title III · English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement

Help ensure that these children attain English proficiency, develop high levels of academic attainment in English, and meet the same challenging standards as all children. Assist them to achieve at high levels in core academic subjects so that those children can meet the same challenging standards as all children.

ELL students enrolled in 100 Book Challenge classrooms accelerate acquisition of English vocabulary, oral language, and reading skills through intensive practice in listening to, reading, and discussing engaging materials matched to their individual skill levels. This helps ELL students achieve at high levels in core academic subjects and meet the same challenging standards as all children.

Develop the proficiency of limited English proficient children and, to the extent possible, the native language skills of such children.

ELL students enrolled in 100 Book Challenge classrooms accelerate acquisition of English vocabulary, oral language, and reading skills. Books available in Spanish help affirm cultural identity and support native language literacy for Latino/Hispanic students.

Title V · Innovative Programs

Establish programs to improve the academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged elementary school and secondary school students, including activities to prevent students from dropping out of school.

100 Book Challenge is an innovative program that improves the academic achievement of educationally disadvantaged elementary and secondary school students. For example, recent experimental application of the 100 Book Challenge in Chichester, PA, found that 1st grade students in high-poverty schools using 100 Book Challenge outperformed 1st grade students in high-income schools who did not use 100 Book Challenge in reading achievement.

Establish programs for the educational needs of gifted and talented children.

100 Book Challenge is an innovative program that addresses the needs of gifted and talented students by matching students with reading materials consonant with their skill levels and interests. 100 Book Challenge thematic investigations (Stage Four) are ideally suited to project-based education shown by research to be effective with gifted and talented students.

100 Book Challenge
Daily Instructional Framework

100 Book Challenge Daily Instructional Framework

Following are details of the instructional framework and methodologies employed with students in the 100 Book challenge program.

Step #1: Direct Instruction: Teacher directly teaches a skill or strategy to the whole class, small group or individual student. This skill or strategy is usually the regular instructional component of the school's Core Reading Program or it is a skill or strategy taken from Maryland State Standards that the class, group, or student has demonstrated needs improvement. The 100 Book Challenge program provides a scope and sequence for reading instruction and many teachers find it very helpful in planning their small group work. 100 Book Challenge does not provide a new curriculum. 100 Book Challenge helps teachers use their existing instructional curriculum more effectively. This should be seen as good news for schools since the program can help schools ascertain that all of their students (and teachers) are successful with their current core programs. 100 Book Challenge helps teachers organize their instruction so that all the students learn, regardless of their current reading level.

Step #2: Independent (Coached) Reading Practice: Students apply the skill or strategy taught by the teacher to their independent reading. The teacher reminds the students about the skill or strategy and supervises their independent reading to see that they are transferring this new learning to their real reading in real books. In addition, the teacher is coaching (instructing) students on the adoption of the kind of reading lifestyle we know is essential for school success. This is a crucial instructional component which we have been leaving up to parents. Many parents need assistance in order to be supportive.

Step #3: One-on-one conferencing using an assessment framework (100 Book Challenge Independent Reading Level Assessment) based on State Standards: Teachers

circulate, working with individuals (or small groups), sampling their ability to apply the skills and strategies taught in the core program. Teachers provide intensive one-on-one instructional support where necessary and use what they learn about their students' reading practices to inform their instructional decision making. This is an intensive instructional setting for both the students and the teacher. 100 Book Challenge has teachers sitting at their students' elbows, listening to them read, seeing firsthand how students handle the unpredictable demands of real books, watching to see if they are applying what was taught, getting to know their students as readers, and tailoring their "core programs" to better meet the demands of both students and the reading process. What most teachers realize is that many students need intensive work in decoding while others struggle with background knowledge and comprehension. 100 Book Challenge provides direct support for phonics instruction, utilizing the Word Work Logbook and phonics skills cards. Comprehension is best developed through extensive reading in content areas.

Step #4: Assessment Framework: The 100 Book Challenge leveling system makes it clear what readers need to know and be able to do at each level of reading acquisition, Pre-K through 12th grade. These performance expectations are all linked to Maryland State Standards. The Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA) outlines the skills and strategies (standards) in detail for teacher, student, and parent use. Skills cards for each level make the same standards clear and go home with students each day so parents know what is expected and how to help their children practice. These skills and strategies form the basis of all good reading instruction. Once teachers, students, and parents understand how standards (objectives) clarify and simplify their work together, core programs, state testing, and state standards all make more sense.

Professional Development Component

Professional Development Component

In BCPS, professional development and support remains crucial to teachers being prepared to adequately implement the 100 Book Challenge Program at schools. The 100 Book Challenge program provides for various types and opportunities for professional development including start-up training, individualized teacher coaching visits, targeted fishbowl teacher coaching visits, leadership training for principals and site coordinators, and family workshops for parents and their children. A vital component of professional development is through family workshops. Family workshops for 100 Book Challenge parents and their children are provided for each school at a family reading night or family workshops. All participating schools in BCPS have held successful family reading nights. The following professional development scheme provided instruction and support for teachers, administrators, and parents in Baltimore County Public Schools to help maximize program implementation and success.

In 2006-2007, Baltimore County elementary teachers, principals, and support staff from Chase (Grades 3-5), Mars Estates (Grades K-3), Pleasant Plains (Grades 3-5), Winfield (Grades K-5), Randallstown (Grades 3-5), and Deer Park (Grades 3-5) participated in 6.5 hours of start-up training. Quarterly on-site support classroom coaching visits were conducted for each school, along with teacher/faculty roundtable meetings after each classroom coaching visit and principal debriefing meetings after each school visit. In addition, family workshops were presented in each schoolhouse and numerous other support visits were requested by principals, such as grade level team meetings.

In the spring of 2007, Dr. Joe A. Hairston, Dr. Barbara Dezmon, and all 100 Book Challenge principals participated in a roundtable discussion and leadership training. All site coordinators participated in a leadership meeting and training. In June 2007, seven teachers from

Mars Estates and Chase were trained to use 100 Book Challenge during summer school. An on-site support visit in July during summer school provided extra support for all new teachers. Data was collected about student progress. In September 2007, all new administrators and new teachers from the six existing pilot schools as well as elementary teachers, principals, and support staff from Woodmoor (Grades 3-5) and Halstead Academy (Grades 3-5) participated in the 6.5 hours of start-up training. In addition, grades were added in existing schools to provide a K-5 or Grade 1-5 continuum of independent reading. Principals, assistant principals, reading support staff, and teachers have participated in start-up trainings provided in November 2005, March 2006, September 2006, or September 2007.

Individual teacher coaching visits have taken place three times per year during the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. Continuous support for principals, teachers, and site coordinators was available upon request and through email and phone calls. Initial teacher coaching visits are scheduled for the 2007-2008 school year.

Start-up training is intended for all teachers, principals, coaches, and reading specialists in schools planning to implement the program. This training consists of 6.5 hours of initial professional development emphasizing the key program components and includes in-class demonstrations with teachers' own students. Teachers and administrators learn the rationale behind and research support for the 100 Book Challenge systematic approaches to creating successful, independent readers. Effective start-up implementation is made possible through clear descriptions and hands-on experience of the essentials of differentiated assessment and instruction, motivation and monitoring, and data collection and analysis. This introductory training provides all participants with a strong grounding in the multiple layers of interrelated and integrated instructional systems that compose the 100 Book Challenge program.

Individualized teacher coaching visits were conducted for all 100 Book Challenge teachers in all participating schools, 3 times during school year, with additional support upon request. During one-on-one Teacher Coaching Visits, a 100 Book Challenge master teacher consults with one classroom teacher at a time, helps the teacher self-assess her level of program implementation using a detailed rubric, and works with that teacher in real time to move toward higher levels of effective instruction. The teacher's questions are answered, instructional techniques are demonstrated right there in the teacher's own classroom, and the teacher is supported and encouraged to achieve greater and greater success with her students. All teacher coaching visits included meetings with the principal and site coordinator to review the strengths of the school's program. Some classrooms were identified to serve as models for demonstration visits. All teacher coaching visits concluded with a roundtable group discussion. All staff was invited to a summarizing discussion and was provided an opportunity to ask questions of the 100 Book Challenge teacher coach.

Targeted fishbowl teacher modeling visits were provided upon principal request. During 2006-2007, 5 schools requested this type of site visit at Chase, Deer Park, Winfield, Pleasant Plains, and Randallstown. During a fishbowl visit, a 100 Book Challenge master teacher models a 100 Book Challenge Readers' Workshop in a teacher's classroom while other teachers from the same grade or school observe them. Everyone is then provided an opportunity to debrief/discuss the demonstration lesson and ask any questions they may have. Fishbowl demonstration lessons were a tool utilized to get everyone "on the same page" in terms of 100 Book Challenge instructional practices and expectations.

Leadership training for principals and 100 Book Challenge site coordinators was provided to 100 Book Challenge schools. During the 2006-2007 year, separate site coordinator

and principal meetings were held in BCPS. Leadership training for site coordinators and principals was held on October 29, 2007, for the 2007-2008 school year. Leadership training immerses each school's leadership team of principal and program site coordinator in the essentials for effecting dramatic gains in student achievement. In-depth discussions, problem-solving, and sharing of best practices helps principals understand and plan for creation of a truly effective, fully integrated reading system in their schools.

Parent and Family Involvement Component

Parent and Family Involvement Component

100 Book Challenge Family Involvement is an important key to student achievement. Part of the success of student progress in this program was dependent upon the home reading support and encouragement that a student receives at home. The 100 Book Challenge Program embeds parental and family involvement and support and incorporates workshops for parents on how to support reading at home.

The 100 Book Challenge program fully endorses parental and family involvement and support. The program provides a format and support materials for continuous home reading and learning. Many principals indicated that the program supported and improved family involvement through reading and learning activities at home helping to expand family literary experiences.

Resources were provided for families to help parents serve as reading coaches to continue to support learning at home. Parents received skills cards which identify word attack and comprehension strategies, sight vocabulary, literary vocabulary, and appropriate reading behaviors and comprehension activities. Parents also sign a student reading log sheet to indicate that at-home independent reading is occurring. Parents are prompted to help students at home by encouraging, listening, reacting, praising, guiding, monitoring, and discussing reading.

The 100 Book Challenge program aligns with national standards of parental involvement. 100 Book Challenge through independent home reading creates opportunities for parents and families to fulfill the national parent involvement expectations. NCLB requires schools to develop strategies for involving parents in their child's education and assist in improving the overall school climate. It also stipulates that all students should have a chance to read (silently or

to self) independently and (aloud or with support) instructionally in school each day and at home every night.

Also, Goals 2000, National Education Goals, have charged every state to develop policies to assist local schools and local educational agencies to establish programs for increasing partnerships that respond to the varying needs of parents and the home, including parents of children who are disadvantaged or bilingual, or parents of children with disabilities.

Schools were encouraged to have kick-off events or assemblies to engage the community in celebrating reading and introducing the 100 Book Challenge program. For example, Mars Estates and Winfield introduced the program at back-to-school nights. Some schools began the school year with a community school-wide assembly or family reading night to reinforce the partnership of daily in-school and at-home reading and set community-wide goals of at least 400 steps or 11 steps a week for every child. As a reminder, schools posted weekly independent reading goals in central locations, such as the cafeteria, library, and the school lobby.

All schools encouraged parents and families as well as community volunteers to take on roles to support the program. Some schools received support from the PTA/PTO for the program. Schools recruited available parent and community members to volunteer in the schoolhouse to provide extra support by listening to children read and coaching students needing extra support.

Communicating with the community through newsletters about literacy and the 100 Book Challenge program was also key in spreading the word about the important role parents play in the academic success of their children. Some schools posted information on their Website for parents to become aware of reading targets and strategies for students to improve reading at home. Schools were also able to gain family and community support by celebrating students and

parents who were successful readers. Many schools had incentive programs, activities, and celebrations to commemorate student successes and parent support.

Chase Elementary and Winfield Elementary schools hosted a reading night at the local public library. At the library-based events, children and adults sign up for library cards and share information with the local library staff so they can help students find “just right” books to read. Deer Park and Randallstown Elementary hosted reading nights and fundraisers at local book stores. Chase and Mars Estates held parent and student award ceremonies to recognize parents who provide nightly signatures with a certificate. Schools acknowledge student reading progress, through the school newsletter. Some schools also held reading luncheons to celebrate students’ meeting reading benchmarks and inviting and acknowledging supportive parents. Several schools posted bulletin boards with photos of students who met various reading benchmarks. Students also had opportunities to be rewarded on televised morning announcements at Pleasant Plains, Randallstown, and Deer Park Elementary. Movie nights for students and parents, who worked together to reach reading benchmarks, were held on a semester basis at Deer Park. BCPS schools involved in the pilot have been creative in acknowledging students, parents, and volunteers in many ways.

Evaluation Findings and Outcomes


Evaluation of Implementation Process

A crucial component of the evaluation process is the assessment of implementation at the classroom and school levels. To accomplish this, self-scoring rubrics are completed by each teacher to determine their level of implementation of the 100 Book Challenge program. Using the rubric, teachers identify whether they were at negligible, beginning, partial, or full implementation. The categories range from a 0-3 point scale from negligible to full implementation. Teachers identify if they are providing adequate time, if students are on task, if folders and log sheets are kept up to date, if students have accessibility to books, if the home reading is being completed, and if students are on target with the amount of reading being done. Teachers must also identify if data is being collected regularly, if celebrations are being done, and if students are aware of their appropriate reading level. They must also indicate whether or not they are conferencing with students by using skills cards, maintaining status of the class, and taking extensive notes or running records on each student, and at which levels.

As stated above, a key factor of the self-scoring implementation rubric and the overall program involves monitoring student progress through proficiency leveling. Gaining information related to the students' levels of comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency forms the foundation of the program. Students are initially leveled to gauge their independent reading proficiency. The benchmark levels of text are indicated by letter, such as Y or BB, and color bands are placed on the books. This technique permits ready identification of level by teachers, students, and parents. Leveling is a process that continues throughout the implementation of the program as embedded assessment. As students prove proficient based on various texts, they advance to more complicated texts. See Appendix C for additional details about the leveling scheme.

For the evaluation of implementation, the total number of points that can be achieved is 33. Teachers who score 28 to 33 are at full implementation; 21-27 represents partial implementation; 12-20 represents beginning implementation; and 0-11 signifies negligible implementation. All teachers are expected to be at different ranges commensurate with the experience of the program. By the end of the third full year in each classroom, it is expected that full implementation is achieved. A sample of the teacher self-scoring rubric can be viewed in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1. 100 Book Challenge Implementation Rubric

	100 Book Challenge[®]	School:	Grade:	Room:
	Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2	District:	Date of Program Start:	
	Teacher Self-Assessment Protocol	Teacher:	Staff Developer:	
		Date:		

		3	2	1	0
Component		Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only "eye-on-the-page" reading.)	30+ minutes	15–25 minutes	5–10 minutes	Not much reading is going on.
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task.	75% are on task.	50% are on task.	Fewer than 50% are on task.
3	BOOKS: Every student regularly has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read (weekly for K-5; every two weeks for 6-12).	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded.	New titles are available for every level needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • every week (K-5) • every two weeks (6-12) 	New titles are available for every level needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • every two weeks (K-5) • every month (6-12) 	Baskets aren't rotating very often.
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time.	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time.	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students.	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student.
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night.	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night.	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night.	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night.
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target.	75% are on target.	50% are on target.	Fewer than 50% are on target.

Figure 1. Continued

		3	2	1	0
	Component	Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available).	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available).	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available).	Data collection system not yet established.
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers.	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause).	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps.	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge.
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books.	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books.	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books.	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult.
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing.	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing.	Implementation of some RW components daily.	Reading Workshop model not being used at this time.
11	CONFERENCING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records).	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class.	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system.	Teacher circulates to keep children on task.
IMPLEMENTATION TOTALS FOR STAGES 1 & 2					
Full:		28-33 (including 3 on #6)			
Partial:		21-27			
Beginning:		12-20			
Negligible:		0-11			

Evaluation of Pilot Schools Implementation

To appropriately evaluate implementation, a minimum of 3 official site visits per school were conducted by Cheryl Brooks and consultant Maggie Kennedy. During visits to each of the schools, classrooms were visited and observed; teachers were given support and feedback. In some cases, on-the-spot modeling was provided for areas of need, as requested by the teacher or identified by the coordinator and consultant and based upon the self-scoring rubric.

Data collection makes it possible to monitor the three key student metrics: amount of reading accomplished, independent reading level, and amount of home reading support. Teacher self-scoring rubrics also provide monitoring of the level of classroom implementation in each of the 11 components. It also provides a rubric score of negligible, beginning, partial, and full implementation. Data was collected four times during the school year.

Data in Table 1 below indicate the final levels at which implementation was done as of May 2007. The chart reflects a three-year implementation rubric with the beginning level as a year one expectation, the partial level as a year two goal, and full implementation which is the expectation for all teachers by the end of year three. Considerations must be made for the retention and promotion of teachers. This is a factor to consider when examining implementation levels.

Table 1. Final Implementation Levels for Pilot Schools, 2006-2007

School Name	Total # of Teachers	Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
Chase *	7	14%	86%	0%	0%
Deer Park*	12	42%	34%	24%	0%
Mars Estates***	13	38%	24%	38%	0%
Pleasant Plains*	11	36%	54%	9%	0%
Randallstown*	7	0%	44%	56%	0%
Winfield**	18	15%	55%	30%	0%

* denotes schools are within a school year of implementation

** denotes schools are beginning second year of implementation, with 7 faculty members new in 2006-2007 school year

*** denotes five teachers beginning third school year of implementation; remainder are in first year of implementation

Appendix D contains complete detailed implementation rubrics for each of the six pilot schools. When reviewing results of implementation levels, the teacher retention rate should be considered because many teachers were new at Winfield and were non-tenured resulting in a lower level of teachers at a full level of implementation. The implementation process takes 2-3 years before full implementation can be expected. Resignations, leave of absences, long-term illness, long-term substitutes may change the data quarterly.

Student Outcomes Data Analysis

Student Outcomes Data Analysis

The following section features findings related to student outcomes for 2006-2007. The section begins with information about data collection procedures and then provides details of student results based on subgroup analysis. The data in the section were collected over time. Collected data regard students' independent reading levels and progress, amount of home reading, amount of in-school reading, and a self-scoring rubric of teacher implementation of the program. When determining growth of student participation in the 100 Book Challenge program, data focus on the independent reading levels of students from November 1 to May 1. Data continued to be collected from all classroom teachers during the school year. Overall, all schools showed marked improvement over approximately 6 months implementation. The expected rate of increase would be .1 growth per month of implementation. The implementation in all schools was approximately 15 minutes of independent reading per day. In previous research-based studies, school systems have shown that with 30 minutes of reading at home and 30 minutes at school, students have demonstrated up to 2.6 years of growth in one calendar school year.

Analysis of Independent Reading Levels by Subgroups

All Students. Table 2 first shows the total enrollment of students in each school during the 2006-2007 school year in the 100 Book Challenge program. The 1,409 total represents 995 African American students, 281 white, 58 Hispanic, 40 multi-racial, 33 Asian, and 2 American Indian students involved in the program. Data in the table also show the fall and spring reading level equivalencies of these students, covering 6 months. Overall, data in the table indicate substantial growth among students during this period of time. Across all schools, students attained a mean increase of .8 independent reading levels. Deer Park and Chase Elementary

experienced the highest growth rates during this period. On average, students increased by 1.2 levels at Deer Park and 1.0 level at Chase exceeding the expected growth. Pleasant Plains, Mars Estates, and Winfield students increased their independent reading levels by .9, .8, and .6, respectively.

Randallstown students improved .5 independent reading levels. Program implementation began at Randallstown in December 2006, which denotes 4.5 months of implementation compared to all other schools in the pilot with 6 months of implementation. This could explain why these students were exhibiting the lowest level of improvement. However, the students' level of improvement still meets the expected outcomes.

Table 2. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies for All Students by School for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	170	2.3	3.3	1.0
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	191	2.4	3.6	1.2
MARS ESTATES ELEM	227	1.0	1.8	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	239	2.6	3.5	0.9
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	206	2.8	3.3	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	376	1.8	2.4	0.6
Total	1,409	2.1	2.9	0.8

English Language Learners (ELL). Table 3 shows the total enrollment of ELL students in each school during the 2006-2007 school years in the 100 Book Challenge Program. It also shows the fall and spring reading level equivalencies of students.

ELL in 100 Book Challenge schools had increases ranging between .4 and 1.1. The average level of growth for all ELL students was .6 for 6 months. The highest rate of growth occurred at Pleasant Plains Elementary at 1.1. This school also has the greatest number of ELL students of the six reported. Mars Estates students also attained outstanding average

improvement at .9. The reading equivalency for ELL students attending Randallstown Elementary remained constant.

Table 3. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies by School for ELL Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007.

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	ELL	1	1.3	1.7	0.4
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	ELL	1	2.0	2.6	0.6
MARS ESTATES ELEM	ELL	8	0.7	1.6	0.9
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	ELL	15	1.9	3.0	1.1
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	ELL	2	2.0	2.0	0.0
WINFIELD ELEM	ELL	13	0.9	1.5	0.6
Total	ELL	40	1.3	2.1	0.8

Data in Table 4 compare the differences between the fall and spring reading level equivalencies for ELL and Non-ELL students. In general, the data indicate appropriate progress among both groups of students. This fact is important considering the challenges of language proficiency that confront ELL students. In 2 instances, Mars Estates and Pleasant Plains, average growth among ELL students even exceeded that of the Non-ELL students.

Table 4. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between ELL and Non-ELL Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007.

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	ELL	1	1.3	1.7	0.4
	Non-ELL	169	2.3	3.3	1.0
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	ELL	1	2.0	2.6	0.6
	Non-ELL	190	2.4	3.6	1.2
MARS ESTATES ELEM	ELL	8	0.7	1.6	0.9
	Non-ELL	219	1.0	1.8	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	ELL	15	1.9	3.0	1.1
	Non-ELL	224	2.6	3.5	0.9
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	ELL	2	2.0	2.0	0.0
	Non-ELL	204	2.8	3.3	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	ELL	13	0.9	1.5	0.5
	Non-ELL	363	1.8	2.5	0.7
Total	ELL	40	1.3	2.1	0.8
	Non-ELL	1,369	2.1	2.9	0.8

Free and Reduced Meals (FARM). Table 5 shows differences between the fall and spring reading level equivalencies for FARM students in the 100 Book Challenge program. According to the data, students receiving free and reduced meals had an average independent reading level growth of .8. FARM students at Deer Park Elementary experienced the greatest level of improvement. Deer Park FARM students increased by 1.0, and Pleasant Plains students increased by .9. Both schools had the highest number of teachers effectively implementing the program. Chase Elementary and Mars Estates both increased the independent reading levels of students by .8. Winfield students increased their reading level by .7 and Randallstown students increased by .5. Students at Chase, Deer Park, Mars Estates, and Pleasant Plains exceeded the expected amount of growth.

Table 5. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies by School for FARM Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	FARM	86	2.3	3.1	0.8
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	FARM	83	2.2	3.2	1.0
MARS ESTATES ELEM	FARM	164	1.0	1.8	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	FARM	117	2.4	3.3	0.9
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	FARM	91	2.6	3.1	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	FARM	222	1.4	2.1	0.7
Total	FARM	763	1.8	2.6	0.8

Table 6 shows the total enrollment of FARM and Non-FARM students in each school during the 2006-2007 school year in the 100 Book Challenge Program. It also shows the fall and spring reading level equivalencies of students. (Of note, on several occasions the FARM students made more growth than Non-FARM students. FARM students' progress exceeded that of Non-FARM students at Deer Park Elementary in Grade 3, in Grade 1 at Mars Estates, and in Grade 3 at Pleasant Plains.) There was no significant disparity in rate of growth between FARM and Non-FARM students at Mars Estates, Randallstown, and Winfield.

Table 6. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between FARM and Non-FARM Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	FARM	86	2.3	3.1	0.8
	Non-FARM	84	2.3	3.5	1.2
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	FARM	83	2.2	3.2	1.0
	Non-FARM	108	2.5	3.9	1.4
MARS ESTATES ELEM	FARM	164	1.0	1.8	0.8
	Non-FARM	63	1.0	1.8	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	FARM	117	2.4	3.3	0.9
	Non-FARM	122	2.7	3.7	1.0
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	FARM	91	2.6	3.1	0.5
	Non-FARM	115	2.9	3.4	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	FARM	222	1.4	2.1	0.7
	Non-FARM	154	2.3	3.0	0.7
Total	FARM	763	1.8	2.6	0.8
	Non-FARM	646	2.4	3.3	0.9

Gifted and Talented (GT) Students. Table 7 shows differences between the fall and spring reading level equivalencies of GT students. Data indicate that students at Deer Park Elementary demonstrated outstanding improvement on their independent reading levels with an increase average of 2.1. Among the other schools, substantial progress was also made: Chase Elementary students increased by 1.6; students at Mars Estates increased by 1.4; and, students at Pleasant Plains increased by 1.1. Randallstown GT students improved by .6 and Winfield students by .2. Many of the GT students exceeded the expected rate of improvement. In total, GT students improved by 1.1 on their independent reading levels.

Table 7. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies by School for GT Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007.

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	GT	42	2.8	4.4	1.6
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	GT	27	3.2	5.3	2.1
MARS ESTATES ELEM	GT	6	2.8	4.2	1.4
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	GT	84	3.1	4.2	1.1
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	GT	34	3.7	4.3	0.6
WINFIELD ELEM	GT	46	4.0	4.2	0.2
Total	GT	239	3.3	4.4	1.1

Table 8 compares the progress of GT to Non-GT students in the 100 Book Challenge Program. Data illustrate that for all schools, progress among GT students consistently exceeded that among Non-GT students, except at Winfield Elementary. Overall, the total average growth of GT compared to Non-GT peers was a difference in progress of .3, which remains relatively close.

Table 8. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between GT and Non-GT Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	GT	42	2.8	4.4	1.6
	Non-GT	128	2.1	3.0	0.9
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	GT	27	3.2	5.3	2.1
	Non-GT	164	2.2	3.3	1.1
MARS ESTATES ELEM	GT	6	2.8	4.2	1.4
	Non-GT	221	0.9	1.7	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	GT	84	3.1	4.2	1.1
	Non-GT	155	2.3	3.1	0.8
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	GT	34	3.7	4.3	0.6
	Non-GT	172	2.6	3.1	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	GT	46	4.0	4.2	0.2
	Non-GT	330	1.5	2.2	0.7
Total	GT	239	3.3	4.4	1.1
	Non-GT	1,170	1.8	2.6	0.8

Special Education (Special Ed) . Table 9 shows differences between the fall and spring reading level equivalencies of Special Ed students. These students across all schools

participating in the 100 Book Challenge Program, except Randallstown, exceeded the expected increase in students' independent reading levels. The greatest progress among Special Ed students occurred at Chase, Deer Park, and Pleasant Plains schools with the means of 1.0, .9, and .8, respectively.

Table 9. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies by School for Special Education Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	Special Ed	43	1.8	2.8	1.0
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	Special Ed	18	2.0	2.9	0.9
MARS ESTATES ELEM	Special Ed	44	0.8	1.4	0.6
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	Special Ed	27	1.5	2.3	0.8
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	Special Ed	20	2.3	2.5	0.2
WINFIELD ELEM	Special Ed	57	1.3	2.0	0.7
Total	Special Ed	209	1.5	2.2	0.7

Table 10 compares the progress of Special Education students to that of Non-Special Education. In general, the progress among Special Ed students was comparable to that of Non-Special Education students. Chase Special Education and Non-Special Education both experienced the same rate of growth at 1.0 over 6 months of implementation.

It is also important to cite here that data included in table in Appendix E show that in several instances, Special Ed students made more progress than Non-Special Ed, as evidenced by Grade 3 Special Ed students at Chase, Kindergarten at Mars Estates, 4th graders at Pleasant Plains Elementary and Winfield Elementary, and Grades 3 and 5 students at Winfield.

Table 10. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between Special Ed and Non-Special Ed Students for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Subgroup	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	Special Ed	43	1.8	2.8	1.0
	Non-Special Ed	127	2.5	3.5	1.0
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	Special Ed	18	2.0	2.9	0.9
	Non-Special Ed	173	2.4	3.7	1.3
MARS ESTATES ELEM	Special Ed	44	0.8	1.4	0.6
	Non-Special Ed	183	1.0	1.9	0.9
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	Special Ed	27	1.5	2.3	0.8
	Non-Special Ed	212	2.7	3.6	0.9
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	Special Ed	20	2.3	2.5	0.2
	Non-Special Ed	186	2.8	3.3	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	Special Ed	57	1.3	2.0	0.7
	Non-Special Ed	319	1.9	2.5	0.6
Total	Special Ed	209	1.5	2.2	0.7
	Non-Special Ed	1,200	2.2	3.0	0.8

Race/Ethnicity. Table 11 features the differences between the fall and spring reading level equivalencies of students based on race/ethnicity. Based on duration of participation in the program, students from all races in the pilot schools met or exceeded the expected amount of growth on their independent reading levels. Asian, African American, and Hispanic students averaged .8 to 1.0 year level of growth on their independent reading. White and multi-race students had the greatest gains making .9 and 1.0 levels of progress, respectively. American Indian students improved by .6 independent reading levels, which meets the expected outcome. On average all races improved by .8 independent reading levels, exceeding the expected outcome. Of the schools with 6 months implementation, Chase, Deer Park, and Pleasant Plains, which exhibited higher levels of implementation, also demonstrated higher average progress in reading levels compared to the other schools with lower overall levels of implementation and time. Data indicate that the greatest gains were experienced by Asian and multi-race students at

Deer Park Elementary. Students at Randallstown that had 4.5 months duration, and Mars Estates .8 and Winfield .6 showed notable progress with an average increase of .7 in reading levels.

The total averages for increases among the diverse races across all schools are substantial. When comparing these figures, the differences among the races are minor.

Table 11. Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies based on Students' Race/Ethnicity by School for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Race/Ethnicity	Student Count	Fall RLE	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	American Indian	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Asian	4	2.8	3.7	0.9
	African American	37	2.3	3.2	0.9
	White	117	2.3	3.4	1.1
	Hispanic	6	1.9	2.8	0.9
	Multi-Race	6	3.1	4.0	0.9
	All Races	170	2.3	3.3	1.0
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	American Indian	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Asian	2	3.0	5.0	2.0
	African American	178	2.3	3.5	1.2
	White	4	2.1	3.3	1.2
	Hispanic	3	1.9	3.2	1.3
	Multi-Race	4	3.0	5.0	2.0
	All Races	191	2.4	3.6	1.2
MARS ESTATES ELEM	American Indian	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Asian	7	1.7	1.7	0.0
	African American	105	1.0	1.9	0.9
	White	82	0.9	1.7	0.8
	Hispanic	22	0.8	1.6	0.8
	Multi-Race	11	1.5	2.4	0.9
	All Races	227	1.0	1.8	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	American Indian	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Asian	13	2.8	3.9	1.1
	African American	146	2.5	3.4	0.9
	White	63	2.7	3.6	0.9
	Hispanic	8	2.1	3.2	1.1
	Multi-Race	9	2.9	3.9	1.0
	All Races	239	2.6	3.5	0.9
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	American Indian	2	1.7	2.3	0.6
	Asian	2	2.3	3.3	1.0
	African American	188	2.7	3.3	0.6
	White	2	3.5	3.5	0.0
	Hispanic	9	3.1	3.5	0.4
	Multi-Race	3	3.0	3.0	0.0
	All Races	206	2.8	3.3	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	American Indian	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Asian	5	1.4	2.1	0.7
	African American	341	1.8	2.5	0.7
	White	13	1.6	2.3	0.7
	Hispanic	10	1.4	2.1	0.7
	Multi-Race	7	2.1	2.9	0.8
	All Races	376	1.8	2.4	0.6
Total	American Indian	2	1.7	2.3	0.6
	Asian	33	2.4	3.2	0.8
	African American	995	2.1	2.9	0.8
	White	281	2.0	2.9	0.9
	Hispanic	58	1.6	2.4	0.8
	Multi-Race	40	2.4	3.4	1.0
	All Races	1,409	2.1	2.9	0.8

Summary and Implications

Summary and Implications

With the introduction of the 100 Book Challenge Independent Reading program in the piloted BCPS elementary schools, teachers have had the opportunity to enhance their knowledge of independent reading and the vital influence independent reading has on students' reading skills and abilities, which, in turn, affect achievement in all academic disciplines. What's more, the 100 Book Challenge helps teachers differentiate assessment and instruction, and make informed instructional decisions based on detailed information they gather about each student's reading strengths and needs. In this program, teachers have the training and tools to provide students with regular opportunities for high-success reading as well as opportunities to integrate complex skills and strategies into an automatic, independent reading process.

Generally, students involved in the 100 Book Challenge program pilot have shown substantial gains in reading achievement as measured by program-specific assessments. All classrooms that exhibited appropriate time allotment and full implementation achieved either expected or greater-than-expected average growth in reading levels. This circumstance has implications related to eventual enhancement of performance on standardized assessments such as MSAs. Fidelity and effectiveness of program implementation improved considerably during the pilot phase, aided by individualized support provided to teachers in their own classrooms. Noteworthy, gains that were attained with only partial implementation of the program suggest potential for even greater student growth with increased fidelity of program execution. Therefore, continuation and expansion of the 100 Book Challenge to other classrooms and schools may be expected to result in or exceed gains realized in the six pilot schools.

The 100 Book Challenge Independent Reading Program has also helped to promote the crucial teacher-student-parent-community link and has empowered teachers with opportunities to

recognize parents for their consistent home support. Through the home-school connection that is integral to the program, parents have an active role in enriching students' skills and their appreciation for reading. Feedback from parents across the pilot schools reflects approval and enthusiasm regarding both their and their children's involvement in the program.

Based on the information contained in this evaluation report as well as pertinent research, 100 Book Challenge should continue in each of the existing classrooms and expand into other grades and schools. Accordingly, new teachers would receive 6 hours of introductory training with in-classroom modeling sessions. All existing teachers would be encouraged to attend introductory training each year to remain updated on new findings and ideas within the realm of independent reading and the 100 Book Challenge. All existing and new teachers would be provided with on-site teacher-coaching visits each year of program implementation. In addition, existing teachers should be provided opportunities for advanced-level training sessions, including those that provide a framework for self-analysis of all essential components of the 100 Book Challenge program, those specific to coaching and conferencing, sessions focused on enhancing student comprehension of texts, and sessions focused on the utilization of new tools to enhance teacher expertise in the area of independent reading.

During the 2007-2008 school year and upcoming school years, student progress should continue to be monitored through the KidPace program for school-based and system administrators to monitor and track student reading progress on the school, system, class, and individual basis. The Cognos data cube, which was created during the summer of 2007, and 100 Book's KidPace program will also enable the school system to continue to monitor the progress of teacher/school implementation, student performance levels, MSA scores, independent reading level equivalencies, and students' amount of reading.

As 100 Book Challenge is meant to complement the reading curricula and strategies in place within the school system, it is recommended that the program should expand and be implemented in its entirety under direction of the Division of Curriculum and Instruction in elementary schools throughout the school system. Currently, funding for a 22-school expansion is planned for the 2008-2009 school year. If the expansion is fully budgeted and approved, there will be 30 elementary schools implementing the 100 Book Challenge program. That figure, while indicating positive movement, falls short of the goal of having the necessary self-selected, independent reading component included in reading instruction throughout all elementary schools in Baltimore County.

National studies point out that self-selected, independent reading is an essential part of balanced literacy instruction. 100 Book Challenge provides this element within a carefully structured, methodological instructional design, which includes consistent monitoring of program implementation and student progress as well as ongoing parental involvement and professional development. When BCPS elementary schools are able to fully implement all vital reading components within the program, 100 Book Challenge will be most effective in increasing student achievement.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Mars Estates – Beginning Pilot
2004-2006

Appendix A
Mars Estates – Beginning Pilot
2004-2006

2004-2005 Initial Pilot at Mars Estates

The 100 Book Challenge Independent Reading Program was started in November 2004 in three 1st grade classrooms, one 2nd grade classroom, and one 3rd grade classroom. One of the classrooms was an inclusion class and both the 2nd and 3rd grade classrooms were inclusion classrooms. Each classroom that implemented the 100 Book Challenge Independent Reading program immersed all students for 30 minutes each day in reading color-coded, leveled books at each student’s independent or “just right” reading level. As part of these daily Readers’ Workshops, individual students received one-on-one coaching with the classroom teacher informed by the 100 Book Challenge leveling system and Skills Cards. In each conference, teachers assessed and then helped students practice and enhance complex skills and strategies necessary to successfully read at the individual students’ levels of the reading spectrum. Students also took books home to read for another 15-30 minutes each night, during which time a home-coach listened to and “coached” the child to further develop his or her reading strategies and skills at his/her “just right” independent reading level. Mars Estates Elementary School received eight-hours of introductory training for all teachers and reading specialists who would be involved with the implementation of the 100 Book Challenge Program. Mars Estates also received 3 on-site teacher-coaching visits.

Sixty-four 1st grade students, 12 2nd grade students, and 23 3rd grade students were involved in the 100 Book Challenge from October 2004 through June 2005. Of the 64 1st grade students, 23 students were in a 1st grade inclusion class. All 12 2nd grade students were in a 2nd

grade inclusion class, and all 23 3rd grade students were in a 3rd grade inclusion class. The total number of students involved in the 100 Book Challenge Independent Reading Program for the 2004-2005 school year was 99. Fifty-eight percent of these students (or 58 of the 99) were students in inclusion classrooms.

Many teachers take up to two years, with full administrative support, or 3 without the full support, to create a fully operational 100 Book Challenge program, with successfully intertwined subsystems that support effective in-school reading routines, daily instructional best practices, home reading, record keeping and recognition of student effort. The most important measurement of a classroom's level of implementation is the percentage of students who achieve the minimum goal of reading for 100 hours during the year, measured in 15-minute increments called "Steps." A student who reads 400 Steps (100 hours) in one school year is likely to make one or more years of progress in reading. Although none of the 5 participating classrooms achieved full program implementation, considerable improvement was made over each quarter and noted areas of strengths were recognized at the school. One class had students that exceeded 400 steps of reading, and the average number of "steps" read by classes ranged from 139 to 317. When examining independent reading level growth, the average student growth in all 5 classrooms was 1.6 and exceeded this benchmark of 1 year of growth. The independent reading growth ranged from 1.3 to 1.8 average years of growth in reading per classroom. Even with partial implementation, all classes exceeded the expected growth rate. The 1st grade inclusion class experienced 1.7, while the other 1st grade classes experienced growth of 1.8 and 1.4. The 2nd grade inclusion class students made 1.3 years of growth and the 3rd grade inclusion class made 1.8 years of growth.

2005-2006 Pilot Expansion at Mars Estates

During the 2005-2006 school years, Mars Estates students who matriculated to the next grade in the program in full inclusion classrooms in 2nd and 3rd grades continued to show improvement in their independent reading levels. One hundred percent of the students enrolled in pilot classes from September to June improved 2 or more independent reading levels, while 50% of inclusion 2nd graders improved 3 or more levels, and 62% of the 3rd grade inclusion class students improved 4 or more levels. One hundred percent of all students in these pilot classes began the year reading below grade level. By June, 50 % of the 2nd grade students read on or above grade level, and 21% of students in 3rd grade read on or above grade level.

The 3 1st grade pilot classroom teachers introduced 100 Book Challenge to all incoming 1st graders in September 2005. Teachers in 2 of the 3 classrooms reported all students reading below grade level. One 1st grade class reported 66% of the students read below grade level in September. In June of 2006, 47% and 25% of students in the aforementioned classrooms (all students read below grade level in September 2005) read on or above grade level. One hundred percent of the students in the third 1st grade classroom read on or above grade level in June 2006. This translates into 32 of the 53 students enrolled in 1st grade in the 2005-06 school year were ready or exceeded standards to begin 2nd grade reading.

In conclusion, 4 out of 5 or 80% of the participating classrooms reached levels of full implementation. All classroom implementations showed growth from the previous year. Teachers reported an overall increase in student word recognition, fluency, and comprehension benchmarks. One hundred percent of all 1st grade students improved 2 or more independent reading levels, while 89% of all 1st grade students improved 3 or more independent reading levels with another 50% increasing by 4 or more levels by June 2006. There was a 32% increase

in the number of steps read in the five 2005-2006 pilot classrooms and an overall 27% increase in the parent participation measured by home coaching signatures and a general increase in the number of families (72 more) participating in 100 Book Challenge parent involvement workshops and celebration from the previous year.

Appendix B

The Effects of 100 Book Challenge on Standardized Test Scores of Urban Elementary Pupils in Philadelphia, PA

Evaluation of American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge Reading Program

**The Effects of 100 Book Challenge on Standardized Test Scores of Urban
Elementary Pupils in Philadelphia, PA**

Dr. Robert Offenberg

About the Author

Dr. Offenberg led research groups for the school district of Philadelphia for 35 years, most recently as its senior policy researcher. In addition, he has served as an independent consultant, taught experimental design and statistics, and served as a member of dissertation committees. His expertise is in applied, quantitative studies. He is especially interested in investigations using the computer-managed records maintained by most school districts.

Effects of the 100 Book Challenge Reading Program on Standardized Test Scores of Urban Elementary School Pupils

The goal of the research was to determine whether urban schools' multi-year, multi-grade use of the 100 Book Challenge reading program added value to the standardized reading test scores of children in Grades 1 through 3. If the program improved the test scores, the next goal was to identify the types of students who were the principal beneficiaries and assess the magnitude of the effects of the program on them. We hoped that findings would help schools and school districts make suitable decisions about incorporating 100 Book Challenge into their reading instruction. 100 Book Challenge, developed and owned by American Reading Company, is designed to enhance students' reading competencies through use of self-selected reading of materials that are not part of traditional, formal instruction. It includes teacher-training, parent-involvement, and student-centered components. The program gives students access to large numbers of books, leveled for difficulty and stored in libraries that rotate among the classrooms of schools and grades. Students typically read self-selected materials at their independent reading levels for 30 minutes under teacher supervision during the school day and for 30 minutes at home under parent supervision each evening. In school, teachers sign students' log sheets to confirm the amount of time students have invested in independent reading. Parents confirm that their children have engaged in the home reading component, and schools give students rewards based on the amount of time they have spent reading. The reading materials and the staff development activities were designed to address development of critical reading competencies as recommended by the National Reading Panel (2000): phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The programs of in-class, at-home, teacher-preparation and parental training are based on research and fieldwork by Allington (2001), Wiggins (1989), Vygotsky (1990), Calkins (2000), Clay (1979), Moses (1989), Glasser (1990), and Krashen (1993).

Two earlier studies (DuCette, 1999 and DuCette, 2001) assessed the effects of 100 Book Challenge on students' standardized test NCE scores. The first compared a self-selected sample of classes that implemented the program to other self-selected classes that had not. It found that classes that had implemented the program out-performed the others. The second study used a matched sample of schools. It found that, over a single school year, the program significantly improved the scores of 2nd grade students, and there was a non-significant trend in favor of the program in 3rd grade. (Results for 1st grade looked promising, but there was no 1st grade comparison group.)

Study Design

The goal in conducting this study was to measure the value added by the 100 Book Challenge program to the 1st through 3rd grade standardized reading test scores of pupils who attend urban elementary schools that used the program every school year. We used a multivariate, hierarchical experimental design to relate the pupils' 2004 TerraNova reading NCE scores to school and student-history factors. The experimental design allowed us to determine whether having the program at schools generally increased pupils' scores and whether there were some groups of pupils that benefited more from the program than others did.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of the study was the Normal Curve Equivalent Reading scores of TerraNova tests (CTB McGraw Hill, 2002) administered by the school district to its entire 1st through 3rd grade student population in April 2004. NCE scores have desirable statistical analysis and, because they have a constant meaning across test levels, they are especially useful in multi-grade studies like this one.

Sample

The study sample comprised most students who attended Grades 1 through 3 of 89 different Philadelphia neighborhood public schools—fourteen 100 Book Challenge schools that provided the program to all 1st through 3rd grade students, and 75 comparison schools that never offered the program. (Neighborhood schools that could not be assigned to 100 Book Challenge or comparison group conditions because they offered the program to some but not all of their classes during the study years were the only ones excluded from the study.) The 16,000 pupils in the study all attended one of the sampled schools continuously from the beginning of 1st grade until they were tested in spring 2004. They were near the end of 1st, 2nd, or 3rd grade when tested. At 100 Book Challenge schools, the students were in the program since the beginning of 1st grade. Depending upon their grade in 2004, they were in the program for one to three consecutive years. At comparison schools, 100 Book Challenge was never a part of reading instruction the pupils received.

Variables and Data Analysis

Hierarchical Linear Analysis or HLM (Raudenbush, S., A. Bryk, Y. F. Cheong, and R. Congdon, 2000) was used to analyze the data because it allows simultaneous analyses of school level variables, pupil level variables, and interactions between the two. In this study, the effect of two school variables on the reading test scores were examined: 100 Book Challenge versus Comparison School and Prevalence of Title 1 Eligible Pupils. The effect of five pupil-history variables were also examined: Grade Level in 2004, Ever Repeated a Grade, In Special Education, African American, Latino, and Early 1st Grade Reading Level. The design allowed us to disentangle the effects of the program from the effects of student history, so that the value that 100 Book Challenge added to the test scores of pupil subgroups was evident.

Results

Preliminary, overall results showed that pupils attending schools with the 100 Book Challenge had significantly higher test scores than comparison school students. The main HLM analysis showed that the overall results were due to 100 Book Challenge nearly eliminating the test score gap between White and African American students, and to its raising the scores of students who came to school with some early reading skills. Specifically:

- 100 Book Challenge improved the scores of African American pupils enough to overcome 71% of the gap between this group and White children that had been found at comparison schools. In comparison schools the difference between African American and White children was 4.6 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) test score points. In 100 Book Challenge schools it was only 1.3 NCEs.
- It enhanced the rate that children's early reading skills developed into the higher-order reading skills that were measured by the TerraNova tests months or years later. Children in both the 100 Book Challenge and the comparison schools who were able to read better near the beginning of 1st grade had higher TerraNova reading NCE scores. However, children attending 100 Book Challenge schools were better able to exploit their early reading proficiencies, making effect of early-proficiency on subsequent test scores 20% greater. The NCE difference between children in the two groups of schools depended upon their early reading levels: the average independent reading Grade Equivalent score on the 1st grade fall report cards of pupils in the study was 0.9; the program increased the test scores of pupils who were at this GE by 2.4 NCEs above the scores of similar comparison school students. Children with fall 1st grade reading report card marks equaling 1.6 GE or higher comprised the top 10% of pupils in the study; the program increased these pupils' test scores by 4.3 or more NCEs above the scores of similar comparison group students.
- The analysis suggested that the above effects were additive, and that the 29% of the children in the study who were both African American and reading at the beginning of 1st grade benefited from both trends.

These outcomes suggest that the 100 Book Challenge program can be an important component of reading instruction at many elementary schools. The finding that it reduced the gap between African American and White pupils suggests that it can be a valuable program component for schools that are at risk of failing to meet the African American ethnic-subgroup AYP standard of No Child Left Behind. The finding that it enhanced the achievement of children who began 1st grade having some reading skills suggests that the program could be helpful to schools serving communities where the enrichment of traditional reading instruction with high-interest materials is appropriate.

References

Allington (2001). *What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research-Based Programs*. Addison-Wesley.

Calkins, L.M. (2000). *The Art of Teaching Reading*. Pearson Education.

Clay, M. M. (1979). *The Early Detection of Reading Difficulties*. Hong Kong: Heinemann.

CTB McGraw Hill (2002). *TerraNova, The Second Edition, CAT Technical Bulletin 1*, Monterey, CA.

DuCette, J. (1999). *An Evaluation of the 100 Book Challenge Program* (monograph), Philadelphia, PA, Temple University.

DuCette, J. (2001). *An Evaluation of the 100 Book Challenge Program in the Schools Funded by the William Penn Foundation* (monograph), Philadelphia, PA, Temple University.

Glasser, William (1990). "The Quality School." *Phi Delta Kappan*, v71 n6 p424-35.

Krashen, S. (1993). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Moses, Robert P., et al (1989). "The Algebra Project: Organizing in the Spirit of Ella." *Harvard Educational Review*, v59 n4 p423-43.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (2002). (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard>)

National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. (<http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org>).

Raudenbush, S., A. Bryk, Y. F. Cheong, and R. Congdon (2000). *HLM 5 Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling*, Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.

Wiggins, G. (1989). "The Futility of Trying to Teach Everything of Importance." *Educational Leadership*, v47 n3 p44-48, 57-59.

Vygotsky, L.S.S., Vygotskii, L.S., Vera John-Steiner (Editor). (1990). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Appendix C

Leveling of Students' Reading Proficiency



100 Book Challenge® Benchmarks

		Characteristics of Text	What the Reader Needs to Know and Be Able to Do to Read Successfully at This Level	Representative Titles
K	Y	One word labeling books of familiar objects. (note: Y and YY are concurrent levels)	Finds the main idea of a picture. Uses initial consonant sounds to self-prompt. Cross checks with picture clues.	<i>Zoo Colors</i> Alphabet labeling books
	YY	One basic sentence pattern is repeated on each page. Only one word changes per page and that word is clear from the picture. (note: Y and YY are concurrent levels)	Remembers the sentence. Tracks each word with finger. Uses initial consonant sounds to self-prompt the new word on each page and cross checks with picture clues.	<i>My Mama</i> <i>Good Night, Gorilla</i>
	G	Simple sentences with picture and pattern support. Uses first 50 sight words.	Has automatic recall of first 50 sight words. Uses first letter of an unfamiliar word to self-prompt. Cross checks with picture clues.	<i>Have You Seen My Cat?</i> <i>I Love You Sun, I Love You Moon.</i>
1	GG	Simple sentences with picture and pattern support and first 100 sight words. Initial blends and digraphs may be required.	Has automatic recall of first 100 sight words. Uses first two letters of a word to self-prompt (blends, digraphs). Cross checks with picture clues.	<i>Blue Hat, Green Hat</i> <i>Bears in the Night</i>
	B	Simple sentences, first 175 sight words and basic one-syllable word family words (bat, Matt, flat; bike, Mike).	Has automatic recall of first 175 sight words. Finds the familiar word chunk inside an unfamiliar one-syllable word and uses rhyming to figure out the word.	<i>Spooky Old Tree</i> <i>Go Dog Go</i>
	BB	Basic sight vocabulary (250+ sight words). Uses simple two-syllable words (compound words, endings, basic vowel patterns).	Uses endings, compound words, and basic word families to figure out most two-syllable words. Sub-vocalizes or whisper reads and still maintains comprehension.	<i>Itchy Itchy Chicken Pox</i> <i>Clifford</i>
2	R	Regular three-syllable words, one- and two-syllable words with vowel digraphs, and three-letter consonant blends.	Uses endings, simple prefixes and suffixes, vowel digraphs, three-letter blends, and basic word families to decode simple three-syllable words. Reads silently.	<i>Little Bill</i> books <i>Hungry Hungry Sharks</i>
	RR	Picture books and first chapter books (usually with some pictures). Uses words from common speech. More advanced phonics elements (e.g., -ion, -tious, i sounds as ē in alien).	Uses rules of syllabification to decode any word familiar from everyday speech, media, classroom, etc. Sustains interest across sittings, regularly finishes first chapter books.	<i>Stories Julian Tells</i> <i>Magic Treehouse</i> <i>Junie B. Jones</i> <i>Cam Jansen</i>

		Characteristics of Text	What the Reader Needs to Know and Be Able to Do to Read Successfully at This Level	Representative Titles
3	Wt	Picture books and easy chapter books where approximately one to two out of 100 words are "literary" vocabulary (e.g., exclaimed, muttered, await).	Uses context to figure out the meaning of words that are not in our everyday speech. Is acquiring a literary vocabulary. Background knowledge includes basic third grade knowledge of home, school, and community.	<i>Bailey School</i> <i>Zack Files</i> <i>Lyle the Crocodile</i> <i>Box Car Children</i>
4	Bk	Picture books and chapter books where three to five words on a full page of text are "literary" vocabulary. Background knowledge required goes beyond home locale.	Uses context to figure out the meaning of words that are not in our everyday speech. Has a literary vocabulary of 1,000 words. Background knowledge includes basic fourth grade material: Basic US geography and beginning awareness of other continents.	<i>Goosebumps</i> <i>Babysitters Club</i> <i>Time Warp Trio</i> <i>Lator Gator</i>
5	Or	Picture books and chapter books where six to ten words out of one full page of text are "literary" vocabulary. Frequent use of compound and complex sentences. May include Europe and other major world landmarks.	Has a working literary vocabulary of approximately 2,000 words. Background knowledge includes basic fifth grade material: people, places, times (e.g., 1984, 2015), math concepts (e.g., square miles), and science concepts. Beginning of US history awareness.	<i>Maniac McGee</i> <i>My Teacher is an Alien</i> <i>Animorphs</i> <i>Bud, Not Buddy</i>
6	Pu	Picture books and chapter books with increasingly obscure vocabulary (11–15 "literary" words per full page). Complex sentence structure may have lots of embedded clauses. Geography of the whole world is fair territory.	Has a working literary vocabulary of approximately 3,000 words that allows comprehension of material at this level of complexity. Background knowledge includes basic sixth grade material: American government, countries of world, major historical events, fifth grade math (e.g., percentages, trillion, square roots, ratios), and science concepts. Beginning of world history awareness.	<i>The Egypt Game</i> <i>The Indian in the Cupboard</i> <i>Walk Two Moons</i> <i>A Wrinkle in Time</i> <i>Asterix</i> <i>Harry Potter (first four volumes)</i>
7–8	Br	Picture books and chapter books with increasingly obscure (abstract) vocabulary (16–20 "literary" words per full page). Complex sentence structure. Whole world is fair territory.	Vocabulary is no longer just descriptive, but may embody larger concepts (e.g., economy, reformation, labor union), plus basic conceptual knowledge of math, science, and history as fields of study.	<i>The Contender</i> <i>The Outsiders</i> <i>Dragon's Gate</i>

Correlations with Other Leveling Systems

This chart shows how 100 Book Challenge compares to other research-based leveling tools. These are all research-based leveling tools.

	100 Book Challenge® KidPACE™	Lexile Reader Measures*	Lexile Text Measures**	Guided Reading (Fountas and Pinnell)	DRA (Joetta Beaver)	Reading Recovery
K	Y (1 Yellow) YY (2 Yellow) G (1 Green)	-	-	A B	A - 2	A, B, 1, 2, 3
1	GG (2 Green) B (1 Blue) BB (2 Blue)	Up to 300L	200L - 400L	C - I	3 - 16	4 - 16
2	R (1 Red) RR (2 Red)	140L - 500L	300L - 500L	J - M	18 - 28	17 - 20
3	W (White)	330L - 700L	500L - 700L	N - P	30 - 38	21 - 24
4	Bk (Black)	445L - 810L	650L - 850L	Q - R	40	25 - 26
5	Or (Orange)	565L - 910L	750L - 950L	S	44	27 - 28
6	P (Purple)	665L - 1000L	850L - 1050L	-	-	29 - 30
7-8	Br (Brown)	735L - 1100L	950L - 1100L	-	-	31 - 44
9-10	Sl (Silver)	855L - 1195L	1050L - 1200L	-	-	-
11-12	Gl (Gold)	940L - 1210L	1100L - 1300L	-	-	-

* Interquartile Range, mid-year ** Lexile Framework Map

Reading Grade Level Equivalency

(Measured in tenths of a year)

Color Level	Reading Level Equivalency	Range
Y	0	0-.5
YY	.5	.6-.8
G	.6	.9-1.2
GG	.9	1.3-1.6
B	1.3	1.3-1.6
BB	1.7	1.7-1.9
R	2.0	2.0-2.5
RR	2.6	2.6-2.9
Wt	3.0	3.0-3.9
Bk	4.0	4.0-4.9
Or	5.0	5.0-5.9
Pu	6.0	6.0-6.9

Appendix D
Self-scoring Implementation Rubrics for
Individual Schools, 2006-2007

Chase Elementary



100 Book Challenge®
Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2
School Summary

School: Chase Elementary
District: Baltimore County
Grade(s): 3-5
of Classrooms Visited: 7

Date(s) of Visit: 4/2007
Date(s) of Program Start: 11/2007
Submitted By: M. Kennedy, C. Brooks

	Component	3	2	1	0
		Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only "eye-on-the-page" reading.)	30+ minutes 0%	15-25 minutes 100%	5-10 minutes 0%	Not much reading is going on. 0%
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task. 29%	75% are on task. 71%	50% are on task. 0%	Fewer than 50% are on task. 0%
3	BOOKS: Every student has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read weekly.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded. 0%	New titles are available every week for every level needed. 71%	New titles are available every two weeks for every level needed. 29%	Baskets aren't rotating very often. 0%
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time. 57%	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time. 29%	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students. 14%	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student. 0%
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 14%	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 57%	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 29%	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night. 0%
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target. 0%	75% are on target. 71%	50% are on target. 0%	Fewer than 50% are on target. 29%

7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 0%	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 29%	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 71%	Data collection system not yet established. 0%
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers. 86%	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause). 14%	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps. 0%	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge. 0%
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 57%	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 43%	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 0%	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult. 0%
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 14%	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 57%	Implementation of some RW components daily. 29%	Readers' Workshop model not being used at this time. 0%
11	CONFERRING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records). 14%	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class. 86%	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system. 0%	Teacher circulates to keep children on task. 0%
SUMMARY OF OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS FOR STAGES 1 & 2 BY CLASSROOM		CLASSROOMS AT FULL: Overall Score of 28-33	CLASSROOMS AT PARTIAL: Overall Score of 21-27	CLASSROOMS AT BEGINNING: Overall Score of 12-20	CLASSROOMS AT NEGLIGIBLE: Overall Score of 0-11
Full: 28-33 (including 3 on #6) Partial: 21-27 Beginning: 12-20 Negligible: 0-11		14%	86%	0%	0%

Deer Park Elementary



100 Book Challenge®
Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2
School Summary

School: Deer Park
District: Baltimore County
Grade(s): 3-5
of Classrooms Visited: 12

Date(s) of Visit: 5/2007
Date(s) of Program Start: 10/2006
Submitted By: M. Kennedy, C. Brooks

		3	2	1	0
	Component	Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only "eye-on-the-page" reading.)	30+ minutes 50%	15–25 minutes 50%	5–10 minutes 0%	Not much reading is going on. 0%
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task. 58%	75% are on task. 42%	50% are on task. 0%	Fewer than 50% are on task. 0%
3	BOOKS: Every student has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read weekly.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded. 0%	New titles are available every week for every level needed. 50%	New titles are available every two weeks for every level needed. 50%	Baskets aren't rotating very often. 0%
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time. 0%	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time. 58%	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students. 42%	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student. 0%
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 34%	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 34%	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 16%	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night. 16%
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target. 34%	75% are on target. 42%	50% are on target. 8%	Fewer than 50% are on target. 16%

7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 76%	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 16%	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 8%	Data collection system not yet established. 0%
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers. 76%	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause). 16%	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps. 1%	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge. 0%
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 76%	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 24%	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 0%	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult. 0%
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 34%	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 50%	Implementation of some RW components daily. 16%	Readers' Workshop model not being used at this time. 0%
11	CONFERRING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records). 34%	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class. 66%	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system. 0%	Teacher circulates to keep children on task. 0%
SUMMARY OF OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS FOR STAGES 1 & 2 BY CLASSROOM		CLASSROOMS AT FULL: Overall Score of 28-33	CLASSROOMS AT PARTIAL: Overall Score of 21-27	CLASSROOMS AT BEGINNING: Overall Score of 12-20	CLASSROOMS AT NEGLIGIBLE: Overall Score of 0–11
Full: 28-33 (including 3 on #6) Partial: 21-27 Beginning: 12-20 Negligible: 0–11		42%	34%	24%	0%

Mars Estates



100 Book Challenge®
Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2
School Summary

School: Mars Estates
District: Baltimore County
Grade(s): K-3
of Classrooms Visited: 13

Date(s) of Visit: 5/4/07
Date(s) of Program Start: 11/2005—
9/2006
Submitted By: M. Kennedy, C. Brooks

	Component	3 Full	2 Partial	1 Beginning	0 Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only "eye-on-the-page" reading.)	30+ minutes 34%	15–25 minutes 58%	5–10 minutes 85%	Not much reading is going on. 0%
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task. 68%	75% are on task. 24%	50% are on task. 8%	Fewer than 50% are on task. 0%
3	BOOKS: Every student has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read weekly.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded. 38%	New titles are available every week for every level needed. 48%	New titles are available every two weeks for every level needed. 28%	Baskets aren't rotating very often. 0%
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time. 56%	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time. 44%	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students. 0%	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student. 0%
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 28%	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 44%	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 28%	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night. 0%
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target. 14%	75% are on target. 14%	50% are on target. 42%	Fewer than 50% are on target. 30%

7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 46%	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 46%	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 8%	Data collection system not yet established. 0%
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers. 76%	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause). 16%	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps. 8%	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge. 0%
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 64%	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 26%	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 0%	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult. 0%
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 30%	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 46%	Implementation of some RW components daily. 24%	Readers' Workshop model not being used at this time. 0%
11	CONFERENCING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records). 38%	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class. 46%	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system. 16%	Teacher circulates to keep children on task. 0%
SUMMARY OF OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS FOR STAGES 1 & 2 BY CLASSROOM		CLASSROOMS AT FULL: Overall Score of 28-33	CLASSROOMS AT PARTIAL: Overall Score of 21-27	CLASSROOMS AT BEGINNING: Overall Score of 12-20	CLASSROOMS AT NEGLIGIBLE: Overall Score of 0-11
Full: 28-33 (including 3 on #6) Partial: 21-27 Beginning: 12-20 Negligible: 0-11		38%	24%	38%	0%

Pleasant Plains



100 Book Challenge®
Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2
School Summary

School: Pleasant Plains Elem
District: Baltimore County
Grade(s): 3-5
of Classrooms Visited: 11

Date(s) of Visit: 5/2007
Date(s) of Program Start: 11/2006
Submitted By: M. Kennedy, C. Brooks

	Component	3	2	1	0
		Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only "eye-on-the-page" reading.)	30+ minutes 63%	15-25 minutes 3%	5-10 minutes 9%	Not much reading is going on. 0%
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task. 63%	75% are on task. 27%	50% are on task. 9%	Fewer than 50% are on task. 0%
3	BOOKS: Every student has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read weekly.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded. 0%	New titles are available every week for every level needed. 45%	New titles are available every two weeks for every level needed. 54%	Baskets aren't rotating very often. 0%
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time. 54%	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time. 36%	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students. 9%	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student. 0%
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 18%	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 63%	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 9%	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night. 0%
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target. 45%	75% are on target. 45%	50% are on target. 9%	Fewer than 50% are on target. 0%

7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 36%	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 27%	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 36%	Data collection system not yet established. 0%
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers. 100%	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause). 0%	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps. 0%	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge. 0%
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 73%	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 27%	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 0%	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult. 0%
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 54%	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 27%	Implementation of some RW components daily. 18%	Readers' Workshop model not being used at this time. 0%
11	CONFERENCING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records). 72%	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class. 18%	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system. 9%	Teacher circulates to keep children on task. 0%
SUMMARY OF OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS FOR STAGES 1 & 2 BY CLASSROOM		CLASSROOMS AT FULL: Overall Score of 28-33	CLASSROOMS AT PARTIAL: Overall Score of 21-27	CLASSROOMS AT BEGINNING: Overall Score of 12-20	CLASSROOMS AT NEGLIGIBLE: Overall Score of 0-11
Full: 28-33 (including 3 on #6) Partial: 21-27 Beginning: 12-20 Negligible: 0-11		36%	54%	9%	0%

Randallstown



100 Book Challenge®
Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2
School Summary

School: Randallstown
District: Baltimore County
Grade(s): 3-5
of Classrooms Visited: 7

Date(s) of Visit: 5/2007
Date(s) of Program Start: 12/2006
Submitted By: M. Kennedy, C. Brooks

	Component	3	2	1	0
		Full	Partial	Beginning	Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only 'eye-on-the-page' reading.)	30+ minutes 14%	15–25 minutes 86%	5–10 minutes 0%	Not much reading is going on. 0%
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task. 43%	75% are on task. 43%	50% are on task. 14%	Fewer than 50% are on task. 0%
3	BOOKS: Every student has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read weekly.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded. 0%	New titles are available every week for every level needed. 0%	New titles are available every two weeks for every level needed. 58%	Baskets aren't rotating very often. 42%
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time. 42%	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time. 60%	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students. 0%	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student. 0%
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 0%	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 14%	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 0%	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night. 86%
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target. 14%	75% are on target. 28%	50% are on target. 14%	Fewer than 50% are on target. 44%

7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 28%	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 28%	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 44%	Data collection system not yet established. 0%
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers. 0%	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause). 28%	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps. 72%	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge. 0%
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 44%	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 66%	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 0%	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult. 0%
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 14%	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 66%	Implementation of some RW components daily. 30%	Readers' Workshop model not being used at this time. 0%
11	CONFERENCING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records). 28%	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class. 44%	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system. 28%	Teacher circulates to keep children on task. 0%
SUMMARY OF OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS FOR STAGES 1 & 2 BY CLASSROOM		CLASSROOMS AT FULL: Overall Score of 28-33	CLASSROOMS AT PARTIAL: Overall Score of 21-27	CLASSROOMS AT BEGINNING: Overall Score of 12-20	CLASSROOMS AT NEGLIGIBLE: Overall Score of 0–11
Full: 28-33 (including 3 on #6) Partial: 21-27 Beginning: 12-20 Negligible: 0–11		0%	44%	56%	0%

Winfield



100 Book Challenge®
Implementation Rubric Stages 1 & 2
School Summary

School: Winfield Elementary
District: Baltimore County
Grade(s): K-5
of Classrooms Visited: 18

Date(s) of Visit: 5/2007
Date(s) of Program Start: 11/2005—9/2006
Submitted By: M. Kennedy, C. Brooks

	Component	3 Full	2 Partial	1 Beginning	0 Negligible
1	TIME: Every student reads 100 Book Challenge color-coded books every day in school. (Count only "eye-on-the-page" reading.)	30+ minutes 20%	15–25 minutes 80%	5–10 minutes 0%	Not much reading is going on. 0%
2	ON TASK RATE: During this time, the students are on task and invested in their self-selected reading (silent reading at R and higher).	95% are on task. 25%	75% are on task. 70%	50% are on task. 5%	Fewer than 50% are on task. 0%
3	BOOKS: Every student has access to at least 30 new 100 Book Challenge color-coded books that he or she can read and wants to read weekly.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus extensive classroom collection is also color-coded. 0%	New titles are available every week for every level needed. 25%	New titles are available every two weeks for every level needed. 55%	Baskets aren't rotating very often. 20%
4	FOLDERS AND LOG SHEETS: Every student has a 100 Book Challenge two-pocket folder and keeps accurate log sheets (complete with number, title, level, date, and signature for each entry).	Log sheets are complete and accurate and have been carefully maintained over time. 30%	Log sheets have been mostly filled in and are accurate for most students across time. 50%	Log sheets are only partially filled in, are inaccurate, or have large time gaps for one or two students. 20%	Log sheets or folders are missing for more than one student. 0%
5	HOME READING: Students read every night at home and get parents' or coaches' signatures.	95% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 15%	75% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 35%	50% of students complete one or more Steps at home and get logs signed each night. 35%	Fewer than 50% complete one or more Steps each night. 15%
6	ON TARGET: Students are on target to complete 400 Steps for the year (or are at 11 X # of weeks since 100 BC started in this school). (1 Step = 15 minutes of reading.)	95% are on target. 0%	75% are on target. 55%	50% are on target. 35%	Fewer than 50% are on target. 15%

7	DATA COLLECTION: Teacher checks and/or collects key data from every student daily, e.g., while checking log sheets. Principal, teacher and students know what the weekly Steps target is and where students are in relation to the target.	Daily check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 50%	Weekly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 30%	Quarterly check/collection of: 1) # Steps Read; 2) Color Level; 3) Home Reading for every student. Data entered regularly into KidPACE (if available). 20%	Data collection system not yet established. 0%
8	CELEBRATIONS: Classroom charts, 20-Step rewards, and other incentives monitor and celebrate students' accomplishments.	Same as <i>Partial</i> , plus <u>school-wide recognition</u> of 100, 200, 300, etc. via school bulletin boards, PA announcements, etc. School is a community of readers. 80%	Same as <i>Beginning</i> , plus Teacher regularly <u>tracks and rewards home reading</u> . Accomplishments are recognized in a variety of ways (e.g., weekly grades, Student of the Week, peer applause). 0%	Large, up-to-date classroom chart recognizes every 20 Steps. 15%	No incentive systems currently dedicated to 100 Book Challenge. 5%
9	LEVELING AND FLUENCY: Students can tell you their Reading Zones (i.e., the highest independent level and anything easier). Teacher is obviously monitoring individual student progress through the levels.	95% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 75%	75% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 25%	50% of students are leveled correctly, know their Reading Zones and are reading appropriate books. 5%	Most students are leveled incorrectly or are reading books that are too difficult. 0%
10	100 BOOK CHALLENGE READERS' WORKSHOP: Workshops are used instructionally: Mini-lessons/focus-setting and sharing (whole class, small groups, or partners) are used to integrate independent reading time with the rest of the reading program.	Daily implementation of all RW components: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 40%	Implementation of all RW components at least 3 times per week: Mini-Lesson/Focus Setting; whole class independent reading time; sharing. 20%	Implementation of some RW components daily. 40%	Readers' Workshop model not being used at this time. 0%
11	CONFERENCING: Teacher conferences with individual readers during 100 Book Challenge reading time. Teacher gets to each student every few weeks and has monitoring and assessment systems established. The teacher also keeps written records that track each student's learning goals and literacy progress.	Teacher uses Skills Cards and keeps a Conference Notebook with extensive notes (e.g., Running Records). 20%	Teacher is conferencing using Skills Cards and maintaining Status of the Class. 60%	Teacher is conferencing with no systematic note-taking system. 20%	Teacher circulates to keep children on task. 0%
SUMMARY OF OVERALL IMPLEMENTATION LEVELS FOR STAGES 1 & 2 BY CLASSROOM		CLASSROOMS AT FULL: Overall Score of 28-33	CLASSROOMS AT PARTIAL: Overall Score of 21-27	CLASSROOMS AT BEGINNING: Overall Score of 12-20	CLASSROOMS AT NEGLIGIBLE: Overall Score of 0–11
Full: 28-33 (including 3 on #6) Partial: 21-27 Beginning: 12-20 Negligible: 0–11		15%	55%	30%	0%

Appendix E

Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between Special Ed and Non-Special Ed Students by Grade

Differences in Reading Level Equivalencies between Special Ed and Non-Special Ed Students by Grade for Fall and Spring 2006-2007

School	Grade Level	Special Ed Status	Student Count	Fall Reading Level Equivalency	Spring RLE	Difference
CHASE ELEMENTARY	3	Special Ed	15	1.3	2.4	1.1
CHASE ELEMENTARY	3	Non-Special Ed	38	2.1	3.1	1
CHASE ELEMENTARY	4	Special Ed	14	1.9	2.9	1
CHASE ELEMENTARY	4	Non-Special Ed	40	2.6	3.7	1.1
CHASE ELEMENTARY	5	Special Ed	14	2.5	3.3	0.8
CHASE ELEMENTARY	5	Non-Special Ed	49	2.6	3.7	1.1
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	3	Special Ed	11	1.2	2.2	1
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	3	Non-Special Ed	64	1.7	3.1	1.4
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	4	Special Ed	3	2.3	2.9	0.6
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	4	Non-Special Ed	67	2.4	3.4	1
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	5	Special Ed	4	3.9	4.7	0.8
DEER PARK ELEMENTARY	5	Non-Special Ed	42	3.3	4.9	1.6
MARS ESTATES ELEM	KG	Special Ed	8	0.1	0.8	0.7
MARS ESTATES ELEM	KG	Non-Special Ed	42	0.2	0.8	0.6
MARS ESTATES ELEM	1	Special Ed	13	0.4	0.9	0.5
MARS ESTATES ELEM	1	Non-Special Ed	51	0.8	1.5	0.7
MARS ESTATES ELEM	2	Special Ed	10	0.8	1.5	0.7
MARS ESTATES ELEM	2	Non-Special Ed	52	1.3	2.4	1.1
MARS ESTATES ELEM	3	Special Ed	13	1.6	2.3	0.7
MARS ESTATES ELEM	3	Non-Special Ed	38	2	2.9	0.9
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	3	Special Ed	12	1.4	2.2	0.8
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	3	Non-Special Ed	69	1.9	3	1.1
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	4	Special Ed	7	1.4	2.5	1.1
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	4	Non-Special Ed	67	2.6	3.6	1
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	5	Special Ed	8	1.9	2.4	0.5
PLEASANT PLAINS ELEM	5	Non-Special Ed	76	3.4	4.3	0.9
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	3	Special Ed	2	1.2	1.3	0.1
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	3	Non-Special Ed	68	2.1	2.6	0.5
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	4	Special Ed	7	1.8	2.1	0.3
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	4	Non-Special Ed	59	2.9	3.5	0.6
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	5	Special Ed	11	2.9	3	0.1
RANDALLSTOWN ELEM	5	Non-Special Ed	59	3.6	4.1	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	KG	Special Ed	9	0.1	0.6	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	KG	Non-Special Ed	59	0.1	0.6	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	1	Special Ed	6	0.3	0.7	0.4
WINFIELD ELEM	1	Non-Special Ed	58	0.5	1.3	0.8
WINFIELD ELEM	2	Special Ed	6	0.6	1.5	0.9
WINFIELD ELEM	2	Non-Special Ed	39	1.5	2.7	1.2
WINFIELD ELEM	3	Special Ed	18	1.1	1.8	0.7
WINFIELD ELEM	3	Non-Special Ed	45	2.4	2.9	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	4	Special Ed	8	2.6	3.2	0.6
WINFIELD ELEM	4	Non-Special Ed	49	3.3	3.8	0.5
WINFIELD ELEM	5	Special Ed	10	2.8	3.6	0.8
WINFIELD ELEM	5	Non-Special Ed	69	3.4	4	0.6
By System			1,409	2.1	2.9	

Evaluation of American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge Reading Program

The Effects of 100 Book Challenge on
Standardized Test Scores of Urban
Elementary Pupils in Philadelphia, PA

(b)(6)



Author: Dr. Robert Offenberg

Effects of the 100 Book Challenge Reading Program on Standardized Test Scores of Urban, Elementary School Pupils

The goal of our research was to determine whether urban schools' multi-year, multi-grade use of the 100 Book Challenge reading program added value to the standardized reading test scores of children in grades 1 through 3. If the program improved the test scores, our next goal was to identify the types of students who were the principal beneficiaries and assess the magnitude of the effects of the program on them. We hoped that our findings would help schools and school districts make suitable decisions about incorporating 100 Book Challenge into their reading instruction.

100 Book Challenge, developed and owned by American Reading Company, is designed to enhance students' reading competencies through use of self-selected reading of materials that are not part of traditional, formal instruction. It includes teacher-training, parent-involvement, and student-centered components. The program gives students access to a large numbers of books, leveled for difficulty and stored in libraries that rotate among the classrooms of schools and grades. Students typically read self-selected materials at their independent reading levels for 30 minutes under teacher supervision during the school day and for 30 minutes at home under parent supervision each evening. In school, teachers sign students' log sheets to confirm the amount of time students have invested in independent reading. Parents confirm that their children have engaged in the home reading component, and schools give students rewards based on the amount of time they have spent reading. The reading materials and the staff development activities were designed to address development of critical reading competencies as recommended by the National Reading Panel (2000): phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The programs of in-class, at-home, teacher-preparation and parental training are based on research and fieldwork by Allington (2001), Wiggins (1989), Vygotsky (1990), Calkins (2000), Clay (1979), Moses (1989), Glasser (1990), and Krashen (1993).

Two earlier studies (DuCette, 1999 and DuCette, 2001) assessed the effects of 100 Book Challenge on students' standardized-test, NCE scores. The first compared a self-selected sample of classes that implemented the program to other, self-selected classes that had not. It found that classes that had implemented the program out-performed the others. The second study used a matched sample of schools. It found that, over a single school year, the program significantly improved the scores of second grade students, and there was a non-significant trend in favor of the program in third grade. (Results for first grade looked promising, but there was no first-grade comparison group.)

Study Design

Our goal in conducting this study was to measure the value added by the 100 Book Challenge program to the 1st through 3rd grade, standardized reading test scores of pupils who attend urban elementary schools that used the program every school year. We used a multivariate, hierarchical experimental design to relate the pupils' 2004 TerraNova reading NCE scores to school and student-history factors. The experimental design allowed us to determine whether having the program at schools generally increased pupils' scores and whether there were some groups of pupils that benefited more from the program than others did.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable of the study was the Normal Curve Equivalent Reading scores of TerraNova tests (CTB McGraw Hill, 2002) administered by the school district to its entire first through third grade student population in April 2004. NCE scores have desirable statistical analysis and, because they have a constant meaning across test levels, they are especially useful in multi-grade studies like this one.

Sample

The study sample comprised most students who attended grades one through three of 89 different Philadelphia neighborhood public schools—fourteen 100 Book Challenge schools that provided the program to all first through third grade students, and seventy-five Comparison schools that never offered the program. (Neighborhood schools that could not be assigned to 100 Book Challenge or Comparison group conditions because they offered the program to some but not all of their classes during the study years were the only ones excluded from the study.)

The 16,000 pupils in the study all attended one of the sampled schools continuously from the beginning of first grade until they were tested in spring 2004. They were near the end of first, second, or third grade when tested. At 100 Book Challenge schools, the students were in the program since the beginning of first grade. Depending upon their grade in 2004, they were in the program for one to three consecutive years. At Comparison schools, 100 Book Challenge was never a part of reading instruction the pupils received.

Variables and Data Analysis

Hierarchical Linear Analysis or HLM (Raudenbush, S., A. Bryk, Y. F. Cheong, and R. Congdon, 2000) was used to analyze the data because it allows simultaneous analyses of school level variables, pupil level variables and interactions between the two. In this study, the effect of two school variables on the reading test scores were examined: 100 Book Challenge versus Comparison School and Prevalence of Title 1 Eligible Pupils. The effect of five pupil-history variables were also examined: Grade Level in 2004, Ever Repeated a Grade, In Special Education, African American, Latino, and Early 1st Grade Reading Level. The design allowed us to disentangle the effects of the program from the effects of student history, so that the value that 100 Book Challenge added to the test scores of pupil subgroups was evident.

Results

Preliminary, overall results showed that pupils attending schools with the 100 Book Challenge had significantly higher test scores than Comparison school students. The main, HLM analysis showed that the overall results were due to 100 Book Challenge nearly eliminating the test-score gap between White and African American students, and to its raising the scores of students who came to school with some early reading skills. Specifically:

- 100 Book Challenge improved the scores of African American pupils enough to overcome 71% of the gap between this group and White children that had been found at Comparison schools. In Comparison Schools the difference between African-American and White children was 4.6 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) test score points. In 100 Book Challenge schools it was only 1.3 NCEs.
- It enhanced the rate that children's early reading skills developed into the higher-order reading skills that were measured by the TerraNova tests months or years later. Children in both the 100 Book Challenge and the Comparison schools who were able to read better near the beginning of 1st grade had higher TerraNova reading NCE scores. However, children attending 100 Book Challenge schools were better able to exploit their early reading proficiencies, making effect of early-proficiency on subsequent test scores 20% greater. The NCE difference between children in the two groups of schools depended upon their early reading levels: the average independent reading Grade Equivalent score on the 1st grade fall report cards of pupils in the study was 0.9; the program increased the test scores of pupils who were at this GE by 2.4 NCEs above the scores of similar Comparison-school students. Children with fall first-grade reading report card marks equaling 1.6 GE or higher comprised the top 10% of pupils in the study; the program increased these pupils' test scores by 4.3 or more NCEs above the scores of similar Comparison-group students.
- The analysis suggested that the above effects were additive, and that the 29% of the children in the study who were both African-American and reading at the beginning of first grade benefited from both trends.

These outcomes suggest that the 100 Book Challenge program can be an important component of reading instruction at many elementary schools. The finding that it reduced the gap between African American and White pupils suggests that it can be a valuable program component for schools that are at risk of failing to meet the African-American ethnic-subgroup AYP standard of No Child Left Behind. The finding that it enhanced the achievement of children who began first grade having some reading skills suggests that the program could be helpful to schools serving communities where the enrichment of traditional reading instruction with high-interest materials is appropriate.

References

- Allington (2001). *What Really Matters for Struggling Readers: Designing Research-Based Programs*. Addison-Wesley.
- Calkins, L.M. (2000). *The Art of Teaching Reading*. Pearson Education.
- Clay, M. M. (1979). *The Early Detection of Reading Difficulties*. Hong Kong: Heinemann.
- CTB McGraw Hill (2002). *TerraNova, The Second Edition, CAT Technical Bulletin 1*, Monterey, CA.
- DuCette, J. (1999). *An Evaluation of the 100 Book Challenge Program (monograph)*, Philadelphia, PA, Temple University.
- DuCette, J. (2001). *An Evaluation of the 100 Book Challenge Program in the Schools Funded by the William Penn Foundation (monograph)*, Philadelphia, PA, Temple University.
- Glasser, William (1990). "The Quality School." *Phi Delta Kappan*, v71 n6 p424-35.
- Krashen, S. (1993). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Moses, Robert P., et al (1989). "The Algebra Project: Organizing in the Spirit of Ella." *Harvard Educational Review*, v59 n4 p423-43.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2002). (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard>)
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. (<http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org>).
- Raudenbush, S., A. Bryk, Y. F. Cheong, and R. Congdon (2000). *HLM 5 Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling*, Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International.
- Wiggins, G. (1989). "The Futility of Trying to Teach Everything of Importance." *Educational Leadership*, v47 n3 p44-48, 57-59.
- Vygotsky, L.S.S., Vygotskii, L.S., Vera John-Steiner (Editor). (1990). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

About the Author

Dr. Offenberg led research groups for the School District of Philadelphia for 35 years, most recently as its Senior Policy Researcher. In addition he has served as an independent consultant, taught experimental design and statistics, and served as a member of dissertation committees. His expertise is in applied, quantitative studies. He is especially interested in investigations using the computer-managed records maintained by most school districts.

An Evaluation of the
100 Book Challenge Program
in the Schools Funded by the
William Penn Foundation

January, 2001

Dr. Joseph DuCette
Department of Educational Psychology
Temple University

Executive Summary

This report presents a series of analyses on data collected to evaluate the “100 Book Challenge Program.” The “100 Book Challenge Program” is designed to help students in the School District of Philadelphia improve their level of proficiency in reading. An integral part of the Program is the stipulation that students read a minimum of 100 books during a designated period of time. Initially, the Program was implemented for approximately 14 months in the first, second, and third grades in twelve elementary schools in the District. The current evaluation focuses on ten schools that were added to the Program as part of a grant from the William Penn Foundation. At the time of data collection, these schools had been participating in the Program for less than one full school year.

The evaluation utilized a quasi-experimental design in which students in Program schools were compared to students in matched schools. The matching was based on four criteria: the School District’s Achievement Accountability Index; the grade range serviced in the school; the poverty level of the students; and, the racial distribution of the students within the school. The Stanford Achievement Test 9th Edition (SAT-9) was used to assess the reading level of Program and comparison students. The SAT-9 was given at the end of the 1999–2000 academic year. Data for the second and third grades were obtained as part of the District’s regular testing program. Data for first grade students were obtained through a special administration of the SAT-9.

The results of the evaluation indicated that:

- First grade students are reading at levels higher than would be expected if the Program had not been implemented.
- Program students in the second grade attained significantly higher levels of reading achievement as compared to students in non-Program schools.
- Although the difference between Program and comparison students at the third grade was not significant, the average score of Program third graders was higher than the score for students in the comparison schools.
- Program students in classes with a higher degree of Program implementation attain significantly higher reading scores than students in classes with a lower degree of implementation.
- Data from a questionnaire administered to principals and teachers in the Program schools indicated strong support for the Program.

Overall, the evaluation indicates clear support for the “100 Book Challenge Program.” Suggestions for future research on the Program are provided at the end of the Report.

An Evaluation of the “100 Book Challenge Program”: Year Two

DR. JOSEPH DUCETTE
JANUARY, 2001

A • Introduction

Presented in this report are data concerning the effectiveness of the “100 Book Challenge Program” (hereafter referred to as “the Program”). A previous evaluation of the Program was submitted in October, 1999. As described in that report, the “100 Book Challenge Program” is a motivational and instructional support system where students are asked to read a minimum of 100 books at levels appropriate to their age and reading proficiency throughout a specific period of time. Students may read more than this, and data are collected through the Program on the number of children who meet the goal of 100 books read, as well as 200 and 300 books. Both students and parents are asked to verify that the books have actually been read. Teachers who participate in the Program are provided with an array of books at various difficulty levels for their classroom. The central purpose of the Program is to improve the reading achievement of participating students.

In the previous evaluation report, data were presented which demonstrated that students in Program classes in the first, second, and third grades were reading at significantly higher levels than students in matched classrooms. Reading achievement was measured through the Stanford Achievement Test, 9th Edition (or, SAT-9 as the test is often known), which is used throughout the School District of Philadelphia. The data indicated that the Program was somewhat less effective in the second grade, although the average SAT-9 scores of the Program second graders were higher than the average score for the matched control students. The previous evaluation was conducted after the Program had been implemented in the School District for fourteen months. The current evaluation uses data collected one year later, at the end of the 1999–2000 academic year. The specific focus of this evaluation is on ten schools which are part of a new cohort of Program participants funded by the William Penn Foundation. These cohort schools have been participating in the Program for less than a year.

B • Methodology and Instrumentation

Data were collected from students in the ten elementary schools in the District which were participating in the Program as part of a grant from the William Penn Foundation. A matched sample of schools was chosen as the comparison group by the Office of Research and Evaluation of the School District. The schools were matched with the Program schools on four variables, in the following priority:

- Achievement Accountability Index Score
- Grade range serviced in the school (e.g., K–8; K–6)
- Poverty level of the students
- Racial distribution of the students

To make this comparison as valid as possible, each Program school was matched with two comparison schools, one immediately above the Program school in rank order on the Achievement Accountability Index Score and one immediately below, with the further stipulation that the grade range of the school was identical. Twenty comparison schools were chosen by this method. Consistent with the previous evaluation study, this study employs what Campbell and Stanley (1966) call a quasi-experimental design. This design is both common and acceptable in the educational evaluation literature.

The primary dependent variable for the evaluation are scores from the SAT-9. The data from the SAT-9 are expressed as Normal Curve Equivalent Scores (NCE's). NCE's are a form of derived scores which are standardized so that the average is set at 50 for each grade. NCE's are similar to, but are not identical with, percentile rank scores. NCE's are most commonly used to report aggregated statistics on school districts or schools within districts. For students in the third grade and above, the Stanford-9 produces scores in three areas for reading: a multiple choice reading comprehension score; an open-ended reading comprehension score; and a composite reading score. For students in the first and second grade, only the open-ended score is available. Moreover, since the previous report found that the composite score and the multiple choice score were redundant, it was decided not to use the multiple choice score for students in the third grade. The data presented in this study were collected at the end of the 1999–2000 school year. As in the previous study, the data for the first grade students were collected through a special administration of the SAT-9, since the SAT-9 is not normally given by the School District to students lower than second grade.

C • Differences Between the Current and Previous Evaluations

There are several differences between the two evaluations which should be noted. The most notable is that the previous evaluation design used classes within the same school as the comparison group. Since the Program has been more widely implemented in participating schools during the time between the two evaluations, it was felt that a reasonable comparison group could not be created by using the method of within-school matching. Moreover, there was some concern expressed about the prior design that there might have been uncontrolled differences between the two sets of classrooms which may have affected the results. The current design, therefore, was not only necessitated by the nature of the schools used in the Program as part of the William Penn cohort, but may also be somewhat stronger than the previous study.

A second difference between the two studies involves the collection of direct evaluation data from the principals and teachers in the Program schools. Brief questionnaires were

constructed for the principals and teachers asking them their perception of the Program. Descriptive data from these questionnaires will be presented in this report.

An additional difference between the two studies involves the unit of analysis. In the previous study, data were available only at the classroom level. Therefore, the class mean served as the unit of analysis. For the current study, data were available for individual students. This differing data set provides considerably more power in the statistical analyses. In order to make direct comparisons between the two studies possible, however, the data will be analyzed using both the student and the class mean as the unit of analysis.

A final difference between the two evaluations concerns the existence of comparison schools for the first grade. In the previous evaluation, comparison first grade classrooms were chosen and were included in the special administration of the SAT-9. This proved to be both costly and problematic. As a consequence, there were no comparison first grades chosen for this study. Rather, the comparison that will be made is between the scores of the Program schools and the population mean for the SAT-9. In addition, data from this year's evaluation will be compared to the data from the previous study.

D · Sample Description

Table 1 presents a breakdown of classes and students for the Program schools. Comparable data on the comparison schools are presented in Table 2.

Table 1: Sample Description of Program Schools

School	First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	Classes	Students	Classes	Students	Classes	Students
Adaire	3	59	2	52	3	59
Blankenburg	4	80	3	76	NA	NA
Edmonds	2	40	1	26	2	49
Elkin	3	67	1	29	3	94
Greenberg	2	47	3	64	2	61
Houston	3	78	2	57	3	70
Kelly	4	116	1	29	NA	NA
Mayfair	2	51	2	55	2	55
Steel	5	141	4	118	NA	NA
Wright	3	66	3	70	1	29
Total	31	745	22	576	16	417

Note: NA indicates that there were no classrooms in the sample for that grade in the specified school.

Table 2: Sample Description of Comparison Schools

School	Second Grade		Third Grade	
	Classes	Students	Classes	Students
H.A. Brown	3	81	3	77
J.H. Brown	3	73	4	70
Belmont	3	71	NA	NA
Bethune	6	148	8	154
Disston	2	58	4	80
Dick	2	51	2	44
Duckry	3	77	NA	NA
Fitler	2	56	NA	NA
Frank	6	119	6	97
Hancock	3	78	3	85
Jenks	2	51	2	50
Logan	3	58	NA	NA
Marin	2	62	2	55
McKinley	2	43	2	39
Pastorious	5	134	3	93
Potter-Thomas	3	79	3	63
Powel	2	56	NA	NA
Pratt	2	54	NA	NA
Prince Hall	5	118	4	112
Wister	4	98	3	87
Total	63	1565	47	1106

Note: NA indicates that there were no classrooms in the sample for that grade in the specified school.

As demonstrated in Tables 1 and 2, there were 69 classes represented in the Program sample (31 first grades, 22 second grades, and 16 third grades), with a total sample size of 1738 students. The

comparison sample consisted of 110 classes (63 second grades and 47 third grades) with a total of 2767 students.

E • SAT-9 DATA FOR STUDENTS IN THE FIRST GRADE

The means for the open-ended scores on the SAT-9 for Program first grade students are presented in Table 3, by school.

Table 3: Mean SAT-9 Scores for First Grade Program Students

School	Mean SAT-9 Score
Adaire	37.69
Blankenburg	55.93
Edmonds	54.46
Elkin	42.20
Greenberg	62.49
Houston	46.20
Kelly	45.76
Mayfaire	50.12
Steel	48.95
Wright	36.20
Total	47.33

As demonstrated in Table 3, the average scores per school range from a high of 62.49 (Greenberg) to a low of 36.20 (Wright). The average across all of the first grade students tested was 47.23. Two statistical analyses were conducted to provide additional perspective on these data. First, the mean of each school, as well as the total mean, were compared to the population mean for the SAT-9 through a one-sample z test. A one-sample z test answers the question: what is the probability that a specific sample is taken from a population, when the mean and the standard deviation of the population are known? This translates in this case into the question: are the students in each school scoring at a level significantly different (either higher or lower) than the national average on the SAT-9. Assuming that the population mean of the SAT-9, expressed as NCE's, is 50, and that the population standard deviation is 21.06, this test can be used to ascertain if the average score in each school is significantly different from the population mean. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of One-Sample Z tests Comparing Program Schools to the National Average on the SAT-9

School	Deviation From Population Mean	Z score	Level of Significance
Adaire	-12.31	4.71	.000
Blankenburg	5.93	2.64	.008
Edmonds	4.46	1.41	NS
Elkin	-7.80	3.18	.001
Greenberg	12.49	4.26	.000
Houston	- 3.80	1.67	NS
Kelly	-4.24	2.99	.002
Mayfair	.12	.42	NS
Steel	-1.15	.68	NS
Wright	-13.8	5.58	.000
Total	-2.67	3.83	.000

As demonstrated in Table 4, two of the Program schools are significantly higher than the national average (Blankenburg and Greenberg), four are not significantly different from the national average (Edmonds, Houston, Mayfair and Steel), and four are significantly lower than the national average (Adaire, Elkin, Kelly and Wright). Since all of these schools are urban, it should be viewed as positive that the students in the first grade in six of the ten schools are scoring at levels at or above the national average.

As an additional comparison, the results from the first grade testing for the current evaluation were compared to the data collected last year on the Program and comparison students. These data are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: First Grade Results from Previous and Current Evaluations

Group	Mean SAT-9 Scores
1998–1999 Program Students	43.72
1998–1999 Comparison Students	33.16
1999–2000 Program Students	47.33

Separate sample t-tests were computed on the data in Table 5 which indicated that the current first grade Program students are scoring at a level significantly higher than both last year's Program and comparison students.

As another assessment of how well the first grade students in the William Penn cohort are reading, an analysis was performed using level of performance as the metric. The School District of Philadelphia uses a four-level system to classify performance on the SAT-9: Below Basic; Basic; Proficient; and, Advanced. The percentages of first grade Program students in the William Penn cohort, as well as data from the previous Program and comparison first graders, are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Percentages of First Grade Students at Four Levels of Performance for the Current and Previous Evaluations

	Current First Grade Cohort Students	Previous Program Students	Previous Comparison Students
Below Basic	22.4%	34.94%	51.53%
Basic	39.9%	26.69%	31.31%
Proficient	30.8%	29.28%	14.91%
Advanced	6.9%	6.08%	2.21%

These percentages were compared to ascertain if they differed from each other. These results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Comparison of Percentages for Current Program, Previous Program and Previous Comparison Students

	Current Program vs. Previous Program	Current Program vs Previous Comparison	Previous Program vs. Previous Comparison
Below Basic	.013	.000	.024
Basic	.016	.041	NS
Proficient	NS	.000	.007
Advanced	NS	NS	NS

It is evident from the data in Table 6 that the current Program students are performing less at the Below Basic level and more at the Basic and Proficient levels as compared to students in the previous Program classes.

F · Analysis of the SAT-9 Data for Second and Third Grade Students Using the Student as the Unit of Analysis

The means for the open-ended and composite scores of the SAT-9 are presented in Table 8 by grade level for the Program and comparison students. As mentioned above, only the open-ended sub-scale is available for the second graders. The results of separate sample t-tests are also reported in this table.

Table 8: SAT-9 Data for Program and Comparison Students Using the Student as the Unit of Analysis

	Program Mean	Comparison Mean	t-test	Significance
Grade 2:				
Open-Ended	47.63	44.70	2.55	.009
Grade 3:				
Open-Ended	43.39	42.46	.83	NS
Composite	43.27	41.92	1.36	NS

It is evident from Table 8 that there is a significant difference between the Program and comparison students in the second grade in favor of the Program students. The difference between Program and comparison students is not significant in the third grade, although the means for both the open-ended and the composite scales are higher for Program students than for comparison students.

G · Analysis of the SAT-9 Data For Second and Third Grade Students Using the Class Mean as the Unit of Analysis

As mentioned previously, the prior study used the class mean as the unit of analysis. To allow direct comparisons between the two evaluations, this analysis was replicated for the current study. Consistent with the previous study, means for each class were computed which contained a minimum of 10 students. The data from this analysis are contained in Table 9.

Table 9: SAT-9 Data for Program and Comparison Students Using the Class Mean as the Unit of Analysis

	Program Mean	Comparison Mean	t-test	Significance
Grade 2:				
Open-Ended	46.63	44.76	2.03	.03
Grade 3:				
Open-Ended	44.91	43.45	.48	NS
Composite	43.97	42.71	.44	NS

It is evident from Table 9 that the results of this analysis using the class mean as the unit of analysis are identical to the analysis using individual student data. As before, there is a significant difference in favor of the Program classes in the second grade, but not a significant difference in the third grade.

H · Analysis of the Performance Level of Program and Comparison Students

As mentioned previously, the School District categorizes performance on the SAT-9 into four levels. To ascertain if the Program and comparison schools at the second and third grade levels differed on this metric, an analysis was performed on these data. The data for second grade students are presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Percentages of Second Grade Students at Four Levels of Performance for the Program and Comparison Students

	Second Grade Program Students	Second Grade Comparison Students
Below Basic	14.6%	19.8%
Basic	51.8%	48.2%
Proficient	28.4%	26.2%
Advanced	5.7%	5.7%

The chi square computed on the above data equaled 7.908, $p = .048$. As can be seen from the table, Program students are more typically at the Basic and Proficient Levels, and less typically at the Below Basic level, as compared to non-program students. A comparable analysis for the third grade data was not significant.

I · Analysis Using the Implementation Scores

The Program routinely collects data which indicates how extensively the Program is actually been implemented in each school and each classroom. These data include the percentage of students reading 100 books, the percentage reading 200 books and 300 books, and an implementation score derived from classroom observation. In the previous evaluation, these data were used as a form of within-Program evaluation since it should be the case that students in classrooms in which the Program has been implemented to a greater extent should be reading at higher levels as compared to students in classrooms in which the Program had been implemented less extensively. An identical analysis was conducted for the present study.

Two analyses were conducted: one using the school as the unit of analysis and one using the individual classroom. Pearson correlations were computed between the SAT-9 open-ended

reading scores and the percentage of students reading 100, 200 and 300 books, as well as the Implementation Score. The correlations are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Pearson Correlations Between SAT-9 Scores and Implementation Indices

	Pearson Correlations Using the School as the Unit of Analysis	Pearson Correlations Using the Classroom as the Unit of Analysis
Percentage Reading 100 Books	.40	.05
Percentage Reading 200 Books	.44	.39*
Percentage Reading 300 Books	.56*	.58†
Implementation Score	.29	NA

NA: Implementation score data were not available for the individual classrooms.

It is evident from Table 11 that there is a relationship between implementation and Program success. This is most evident in the correlations for the percentage of students reading 200 or 300 books. It should also be remembered that the sample size for the analysis using the school as the unit is only 10, making it difficult to obtain significance. In general, the more extensively the Program has been implemented, the better the students are reading.

J • Analysis of Questionnaire Data

The following section presents the results of the brief questionnaire which was administered to the principals and teachers in the Program schools. These results are presented below, with the data from the principals contained in Table 12 and the teacher's data in Table 13. Nine of the ten principals completed the questionnaire. A total 89 teachers completed the questionnaire.

* $p < .05$

† $p < .01$

Table 12: Responses of Principals to the Attitude Questionnaire

Question from Questionnaire	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
1 Usage of the 100 Book Challenge has stimulated teacher professionalism and creativity.	0	0	1	4	4	4.33
2 Usage of the 100 Book Challenge has stimulated positive teacher attitude	0	0	0	4	5	4.56
3 Involvement in the 100 Book Challenge has strengthened the overall reading instruction program in the school.	0	0	0	2	7	4.78
4 The support provided by the 100 Book Challenge staff has assisted in strengthening the overall reading instruction program in the school.	0	0	0	1	8	4.89
5 Following the initial training and follow-up support by 100 Book Challenge staff, school staff are comfortable with continuing the Challenge in subsequent years	0	0	0	4	5	4.56
6 I intend to continue the 100 Book Challenge program in subsequent years.	0	0	1	0	8	4.78
7 Overall, I would rate the 100 Book Challenge as a valuable program.	0	0	1	0	8	4.78

Note: 1 is rated as “Do not Agree”
 5 is rated as “Strongly Agree”

It is evident from the data in Table 12 that the principals are overwhelmingly positive about the Program. With the exception of Question # 1 (which concerns the increase in teacher professionalism), all of the means are above 4.5 (and this mean is only slightly below this level). In general, then, the principals of Program schools believe that the Program is having a positive effect on the students in their schools and strongly support its value.

Table 13: Responses of Teachers to the Attitude Questionnaire

Question from the Questionnaire	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
1 Using the 100 Book Challenge has stimulated my personal professionalism and creativity.	4	3	23	28	21	3.78
2 Involvement in the 100 Book Challenge has strengthened the overall reading instruction program in my class.	0	2	12	27	48	4.36
3 The support provided by the 100 Book Challenge staff has strengthened my personal skills in providing reading instruction.	3	7	22	36	21	3.73
4 Following the initial training and follow-up support by 100 Book Challenge staff, I am comfortable with continuing the Challenge in subsequent years	1	3	7	24	54	4.43
5 As a result of participating in the 100 Book Challenge program, my students care more about reading.	0	0	6	18	65	4.66
6 As a result of participating in the 100 Book Challenge program, my students have increased their vocabulary.	0	3	12	41	33	4.17
7 As a result of participating in the 100 Book Challenge program, my students have increased their writing capability.	0	6	29	40	14	3.70
8 As a result of participating in the 100 Book Challenge program, my students more likely will go to the library.	0	3	25	37	24	3.92
9 Overall, I would rate the 100 Book Challenge as a valuable program.	0	1	5	23	60	4.60

Note: 1 is rated as “Do not Agree”
5 is rated as “Strongly Agree”

Although the means of the questions in Table 13 are somewhat lower than the comparable means in Table 12 it is evident from the data in Table 13 that the teachers are also positive about the Program. This is evidenced by an overall mean of 4.6 (out of a possible 5) for Question # 9 which assesses the teacher’s overall perception of the Program. It is also evident that the teachers believe that the Program causes the students to care more about reading (a mean of 4.66 for Question # 5), and that they are comfortable continuing the Program in subsequent years (4.43 for Question # 4). The two lowest means are for Question # 7 which concerns the impact of the Program on students’ writing skills, and Question # 3 which asks about the support from the Program staff. Overall, however, the rating data from both the principals and teachers are clearly positive about and supportive of the Program. As further evidence of this, several

of the teachers and principals included comments at the end of the questionnaire. A complete list of these comments is contained in Appendix A. With only minor exceptions, all of these comments are positive.

K · Summary and Conclusions

In general, the data presented in this report support the contention that the “100 Book Challenge Program” is having a significant impact on the reading achievement of students participating in the Program who are in the 10 schools funded by the William Perm Foundation. There are several aspects of the data which support this contention:

- The SAT-9 scores for second grade students are significantly higher than the scores for the students from the matched schools. Moreover, the percentages of students performing at the Basic and Proficient levels in the second grade Program schools are higher than the percentages at these levels in the comparison schools. This is coupled with the fact that the percentage of Program students performing at the Below Basic level is somewhat lower than the percentage of students in the comparison schools performing at this level.
- Although the evidence for the performance of students in Program first grade classes is indirect (since no comparison first grade classes were included in the sample), the evidence that was presented indicated that the first grade Program students are also performing at higher levels than would be expected if the Program had not been implemented.
- Although significant differences were not found for third grade Program students, there was a slight trend for these students to be performing at higher levels than comparison students.
- The implementation data indicated that students in classrooms in which the Program had been more strongly implemented demonstrate higher reading achievement than students in the classrooms with lower implementation scores.

In addition to these reading achievement data, the responses from the questionnaire administered to principals and teachers in Program schools were uniformly positive about the Program. What is perhaps most interesting about these positive findings is that the Program has been implemented in the Program schools (that is, the ten schools which constitute the cohort sample funded by the William Perm Foundation) for less than one full school year. It is evident from the data that the extent of Program implementation among the cohort schools, and among classes within single schools, is uneven. Even with this limitation, the Program has been shown to have an impact on the reading achievement of the participating students. When the Program has been more fully implemented, its impact may be even greater.

While in no way diminishing the positive findings of the evaluation, there are some aspects of the results that warrant consideration. Among these are the following:

- The fact that there was not a significant difference at the third grade between Program and comparison students might be worth an investigation into possible discrepancies between the motivational impact of the Program on older students as compared to students in the first and second grades. In particular, if the Program intends to increase its coverage into the upper elementary grades, it is perhaps worth finding out if a somewhat different approach is necessary for these students. One possible source of this information would be the current third grade teachers to ascertain in more depth their perception of the Program (since only one third grade teacher responded to the questionnaire).
- The least positive response to the teacher questionnaire was about support from Program staff. It may be that the participating teachers expected a somewhat higher level of support than they received. If this is a mis-match between perception and reality, or if the Program is not able to provide the support it would like because of resource limitations, it would seem to be worthwhile for the Program to find out why the teachers are somewhat less satisfied with this aspect of the Program.
- Consistent with the research design used in the last study, the impact of the Program is being assessed within a relatively short time after the Program has been implemented in a school. There are two possible effects that this might have. On one hand, it is possible that the Program's impact is being under-estimated since any new program takes time to be fully realized. On the other hand, there is ample evidence in the educational literature that some programs have a short-term impact because they are new and innovative, but lose their impact with time. It is critical that long-term studies of the "100 Book Challenge Program" be completed to ascertain what effect the Program has when implemented in a school for several years.
- As a related comment, it is also important to conduct follow-up studies on the students who participate in the Program to see if the improvement in their reading is maintained as they continue with their schooling. In this regard, follow-up data were collected on students from the previous evaluation who were in the first grade and are now in second grade within the School District. These data are currently being analyzed and will be reported shortly.

All things considered, therefore, these results, like the results from the previous evaluation, support the conclusion that the "100 Book Challenge Program" is having a positive impact on the reading achievement of its participants.

Appendix A: Comments from the Open-Ended Question on the Principal and Teacher Questionnaire

Note: The respondent is indicated by a “P” for a principal and “T” for a teacher. For teachers, the grade level taught is also indicated.

- The ratings indicated above speak for themselves. This has been a positive and rewarding program at every level for students, parents and educators. The expense involved, although difficult for schools with small budgets, is not exorbitant. We are working to expand the program in our upper grades. (P)
- Excellent program. I use the program at home with my children. Really believe highly in the validity of the program. (T-K)
- I think the program is very useful overall, for book handling skills and pre-reading skills. (T-K)
- 100 Book Challenge is an excellent program for motivating children to read independently. The skill cards are excellent tools for teaching and reinforcing reading skills. It is also a great dual-purpose reading program. (T-1)
- Excellent program for balanced literacy, especially with regard to the “Independent Reading” by the students (T-2)
- The 100 Book Challenge is an excellent program to motivate/stimulate reading. The children have developed a love for books and are avid readers. They look forward to the 100 Book Challenge Program every morning. (T-1)
- I would even use the program in the middle and upper grades as incentives to keep on reading. (P)
- It’s going very well. Thank you for helping us with the program. (P)
- The first year was more difficult. Correcting last year’s mistakes has made this year flow much more smoothly. This class is much farther in the number of books than last year’s class, at the same point in time. The children love it and so do I. (T-K)
- I love the program. The children are so motivated to read. (T-1)
- My students have become very competitive and motivated by the program. (T-2)
- 100 Book Program provided individual opportunities for growth at a comfortable level. (T)

-----Original Message-----

From: Tahra Nichols
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 8:10 AM
To: What Works
Subject: FW: WWC--Beginning Reading

Attachments: APPENDIX 1 -- Baltimore Report.pdf; APPENDIX 2 -- Dr
Offenberg Study 8-22-05.pdf; APPENDIX 3 -- Temple University Study
(2001).pdf

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Riccards [mailto:priccards@100bookchallenge.com]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 2:45 PM
To: Tahra Nichols
Subject: WWC--Beginning Reading

Tahra -- I have heard through a colleague that Mathematica is looking to update the current WWC information on beginning reading. In the initial data, American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge was listed, but was found to have no research. I would like to provide the following studies for your information. Hopefully, these will merit inclusion in the Clearinghouse.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at 703-298-8283 or priccards@americanreading.com.

Best,

Patrick Riccards
Senior Vice President
American Reading Company

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 3:45 PM
To: 'priccards@americanreading.com'
Subject: WWC--Beginning Reading
Dear Mr. Riccards,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) and thank you for your submission of research for American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge. We were unable to open the three attachments you provided in your email.

It would be very helpful if you could resend the attachments in response to this email address (WhatWorks@icfi.com).

In the future, if you would like to submit studies on a program(s), please visit the following website: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/openinvite.asp>. Also, you may want to access an overview of WWC review processes and standards, which is available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/overview/review.asp>.

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is in the process of determining the timeline for upcoming reviews and has not released this information yet. The WWC is conducting an ongoing submission process for the topic of Beginning Reading. Studies on the 100 Book Challenge will be considered for review under the next round of reviews (as they are determined by IES). We are unable to provide a timeline for the review process at this time.

If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tahra Nichols
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 8:10 AM
To: What Works
Subject: FW: WWC--Beginning Reading

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Riccards [<mailto:priccards@100bookchallenge.com>]
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 2:45 PM
To: Tahra Nichols
Subject: WWC--Beginning Reading

Tahra -- I have heard through a colleague that Mathematica is looking to update the current WWC information on beginning reading. In the initial data, American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge was listed, but was found to have no research. I would like to provide the following studies for your information. Hopefully, these will merit inclusion in the Clearinghouse.

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at 703-298-8283 or priccards@americanreading.com.

Best,

Patrick Riccards
Senior Vice President
American Reading Company

From: Patrick Riccards [priccards@100bookchallenge.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2008 10:04 AM
To: WhatWorks
Subject: Re: WWC--Beginning Reading

Attachments: APPENDIX 5 -- Baltimore Report.pdf; APPENDIX 3 -- Temple University Study (2001).pdf; APPENDIX 2 -- Dr Offenberg Study 8-22-05.pdf

Thank you for following up. Attached are the original documents that were previously forwarded. These are all PDFs, and should be easy to open.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

P

> Dear Mr. Riccards,
>
>
>
> Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) and thank
> you for your submission of research for American Reading Company's 100
> Book Challenge. We were unable to open the three attachments you
> provided in your email.
>
>
>
> It would be very helpful if you could resend the attachments in
> response to this email address (WhatWorks@icfi.com).
>
>
>
> In the future, if you would like to submit studies on a program(s),
> please visit the following website:
> <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/openinvite.asp>. Also, you may want to
> access an overview of WWC review processes and standards, which is
> available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/overview/review.asp>.
>
>
>
> The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is in the process of
> determining the timeline for upcoming reviews and has not released
> this information yet. The WWC is conducting an ongoing submission
> process for the topic of Beginning Reading. Studies on the 100 Book
> Challenge will be considered for review under the next round of
> reviews (as they are determined by IES). We are unable to provide a
> timeline for the review process at this time.
>
>
>
> If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.
>

>
>
> What Works Clearinghouse
>
>
>
> The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of
> Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators,
> policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted
> source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more
> information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Tahra Nichols
>
> Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 8:10 AM
>
> To: What Works
>
> Subject: FW: WWC--Beginning Reading

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----

> From: Patrick Riccards [mailto:priccards@100bookchallenge.com]
>
> Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 2:45 PM
>
> To: Tahra Nichols
>
> Subject: WWC--Beginning Reading

>
>
> Tahra -- I have heard through a colleague that Mathematica is looking
> to update the current WWC information on beginning reading. In the
> initial data, American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge was
> listed, but was found to have no research. I would like to provide
> the following studies for your information. Hopefully, these will
> merit inclusion in the Clearinghouse.

>
>
>
> Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at
> 703-298-8283 or priccards@americanreading.com.

> Best,
>
>
>
> Patrick Riccards
>
> Senior Vice President
>
> American Reading Company
>
>
>
>

> NOTICE:

> This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain
> privileged or confidential information. If you have received it in
> error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original.
> Any other use of this e-mail by you is prohibited.
>

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2008 1:28 PM
To: 'Patrick Riccards'
Subject: RE: WWC--Beginning Reading

Dear Mr. Riccards,

Thank you for resending the attachments. We were able to open and download them.

As we stated in our previous email, we are conducting an ongoing submission process for Beginning Reading and studies on the 100 Book Challenge will be considered for review under the next round of reviews (as they are determined by IES). We are currently unable to provide a timeline for the review process.

Thank you,
What Works Clearinghouse

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Riccards [mailto:priccards@100bookchallenge.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2008 10:04 AM
To: WhatWorks
Subject: Re: WWC--Beginning Reading

Thank you for following up. Attached are the original documents that were previously forwarded. These are all PDFs, and should be easy to open.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

P

> Dear Mr. Riccards,
>
>
>
> Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) and thank
> you for your submission of research for American Reading Company's 100
> Book Challenge. We were unable to open the three attachments you
> provided in your email.
>
>
>
> It would be very helpful if you could resend the attachments in
> response to this email address (WhatWorks@icfi.com).
>
>
>
> In the future, if you would like to submit studies on a program(s),
> please visit the following website:
> <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/openinvite.asp>. Also, you may want to
> access an overview of WWC review processes and standards, which is

> available at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/overview/review.asp>.

>
>
>

> The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is in the process of
> determining the timeline for upcoming reviews and has not released
> this information yet. The WWC is conducting an ongoing submission
> process for the topic of Beginning Reading. Studies on the 100 Book
> Challenge will be considered for review under the next round of
> reviews (as they are determined by IES). We are unable to provide a
> timeline for the review process at this time.

>
>
>

> If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.

>
>
>

> What Works Clearinghouse

>
>
>

> The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of
> Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators,
> policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted
> source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more
> information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

>
>
>

> From: Tahra Nichols
> Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 8:10 AM
> To: What Works
> Subject: FW: WWC--Beginning Reading

>
>
>

> -----Original Message-----

>
>
>

> From: Patrick Riccards [mailto:priccards@100bookchallenge.com]
> Sent: Monday, June 16, 2008 2:45 PM
> To: Tahra Nichols
> Subject: WWC--Beginning Reading

>

>
>
> Tahra -- I have heard through a colleague that Mathematica is looking
> to update the current WWC information on beginning reading. In the
> initial data, American Reading Company's 100 Book Challenge was
> listed, but was found to have no research. I would like to provide
> the following studies for your information. Hopefully, these will
> merit inclusion in the Clearinghouse.

>
>
>
> Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at
> 703-298-8283 or priccards@americanreading.com.

>
>
>
> Best,

>
>
> Patrick Riccards
>
> Senior Vice President
>
> American Reading Company

>
>
>
> NOTICE:
> This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain
> privileged or confidential information. If you have received it in
> error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original.
> Any other use of this e-mail by you is prohibited.
>

From: Joanne Pfeiderer [JPfeiderer@mathematica-mpr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2008 8:47 AM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: FW: American Reading Company

Hello WWC Help Desk—

This message came to Mathematica's communications office for some reason--but it should have come to you. Would you please forward to the right person for followup? Thanks.

Joanne Pfeiderer

Joanne Pfeiderer
Communications Director
Mathematica Policy Research
P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
609-275-2372 (voice)
609-799-0005 (fax)
www.mathematica-mpr.com

From: Jane Hileman [mailto:jhileman3@americanreading.com]
Sent: Mon 11/17/2008 4:55 PM
To: Cheryl Pedersen
Subject: Re: American Reading Company

Cheryl,

Thanks for getting back to me. I am referring to the What Works Clearing House review of reading programs.

Jane

Below is the email from our former employee:

The original contact was Tahra Nichols at Mathematica. I was then directed to send all of our materials to:
WhatWorks@icfi.com

All materials were received by What Works on June 24. At the time, they could not identify any timeline for the early reading review process.

Hope that helps.

On Nov 17, 2008, at 3:52 PM, Cheryl Pedersen wrote:

I'm in the communications dept. and I'm not sure what you're referring to. Is it for one of our projects? Do you know who the materials were submitted to?

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Hileman [<mailto:jhileman3@americanreading.com>]

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 2:45 PM

To: Cheryl Pedersen

Subject: American Reading Company

Cheryl,

I'm checking on the status of our program review. Patrick Riccards, who was working with us at the time, submitted our materials on June 24. He is no longer with us and I wanted to follow up to be sure we are in line for a review.

Jane Hileman
CEO American Reading Company
610-992-4150

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2008 11:39 AM
To: 'jhileman3@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (876)
Dear Ms. Hileman,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). We received the studies previously submitted on 100 Book Challenge.

We would like to tell you a bit more information about the timeline for reviews. As you may know, studies are not reviewed immediately upon request by the public, authors or developers. Rather, the WWC and IES determine the topics for review and the review teams proceed with the reviews in accordance with the topic protocols. We are currently unable to provide a timeline for the review process; IES is in the process of determining the timeline for upcoming reviews and has not released this information yet.

All publicly available information about future reviews is on our website. Please continue to check our website for updates at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact us again.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: Jane Hileman [mailto:jhileman3@americanreading.com]
Sent: Mon 11/17/2008 4:55 PM
To: Cheryl Pedersen
Subject: Re: American Reading Company

Cheryl,

Thanks for getting back to me. I am referring to the What Works Clearing House review of reading programs.

Jane

Below is the email from our former employee:

The original contact was Tahra Nichols at Mathematica. I was then directed to send all of our materials to: WhatWorks@icfi.com

All materials were received by What Works on June 24. At the time, they could not identify any timeline for the early reading review process.

Hope that helps.

On Nov 17, 2008, at 3:52 PM, Cheryl Pedersen wrote:
I'm in the communications dept. and I'm not sure what you're referring to. Is it for one of our projects? Do you know who the materials were submitted to?

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Hileman [<mailto:jhileman3@americanreading.com>]

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2008 2:45 PM

To: Cheryl Pedersen

Subject: American Reading Company

Cheryl,

I'm checking on the status of our program review. Patrick Riccards, who was working with us at the time, submitted our materials on June 24. He is no longer with us and I wanted to follow up to be sure we are in line for a review.

Jane Hileman
CEO American Reading Company
610-992-4150

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:37 PM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)
Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

The WWC welcomes any study submissions you may have. You may submit them in response to this email or via our website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/help/webmail/index.aspx?submitstudy=1>.

Please feel free to respond to this email if you have any further questions.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID
Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenber Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward. I would like to provide the Offenber Study-how do I do this through your website?
Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: Francine Rosenthal [frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:44 PM
To: WhatWorks
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Attachments: Attachment E Results Offenber Study
_scientificallybasedresults_offenberg.pdf

Attached please find the Offenber Study. Please read the details in my message below.

Thank you,

Francine Rosenthal

From: WhatWorks [mailto:WhatWorks@icfi.com]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 4:37 PM
To: Francine Rosenthal
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

The WWC welcomes any study submissions you may have. You may submit them in response to this email or via our website at

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/help/webmail/index.aspx?submitstudy=1>.

Please feel free to respond to this email if you have any further questions.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID
Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenber Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program

nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward. I would like to provide the Offenberg Study-how do I do this through your website?
Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:54 PM
To: 'Francine Rosenthal'
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)
Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for submitting your study for consideration of review by the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). We successfully downloaded the attachment that you sent.

We would like to tell you a bit more information about the timeline for reviews. As you may know, studies are not reviewed immediately upon request by the public, authors or developers. Rather, the WWC and IES determine the topics and interventions for review and the review teams proceed with the reviews in accordance with the topic protocols. We are currently unable to provide a timeline for the review process; IES is in the process of determining the timeline for upcoming reviews and has not released this information yet.

Please be assured that the WWC will contact you if the review team needs any further information.

All publicly available information about future reviews is on our website. Please continue to check our website for updates at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

There is a resource on our website called the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook that provides detailed information about the WWC review process, including the evidence standards used when reviewing studies (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>).

We hope this information is helpful. If you have any questions about the WWC, please feel free to respond to this email.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: Francine Rosenthal [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:44 PM
To: WhatWorks
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Attached please find the Offenberg Study. Please read the details in my message below.

Thank you,

Francine Rosenthal

From: WhatWorks [mailto:WhatWorks@icfi.com]

Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 4:37 PM

To: Francine Rosenthal

Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

The WWC welcomes any study submissions you may have. You may submit them in response to this email or via our website at

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/help/webmail/index.aspx?submitstudy=1>.

Please feel free to respond to this email if you have any further questions.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: froenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:froenthal@americanreading.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM

To: info@whatworks.ed.gov

Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID

Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: froenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenberg Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenberg Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Monday, February 15, 2010 1:18 PM
To: 'Francine Rosenthal'
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)
Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). This email is in response to your voicemail received today, February 15, 2010.

WWC staff are looking into your concerns about the 2007 Beginning Reading topic report that you mentioned in your email dated February 10, 2010. If you have additional concerns, please submit them to us in writing. You may respond to this email.

Please note that studies on interventions are gathered through an extensive search of published and unpublished research literature, including submissions from intervention developers and the public. There is a resource on our website called the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook that provides detailed information on the WWC review process, including the process of defining and prioritizing interventions within topic areas (under Section II, E <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/Doc.aspx?docId=19&tocId=3#prioritizing>).

If you have any additional questions or concerns, please respond to this email.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: WhatWorks
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:54 PM
To: 'Francine Rosenthal'
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for submitting your study for consideration of review by the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). We successfully downloaded the attachment that you sent.

We would like to tell you a bit more information about the timeline for reviews. As you may know, studies are not reviewed immediately upon request by the public, authors or developers. Rather, the WWC and IES

determine the topics and interventions for review and the review teams proceed with the reviews in accordance with the topic protocols. We are currently unable to provide a timeline for the review process; IES is in the process of determining the timeline for upcoming reviews and has not released this information yet.

Please be assured that the WWC will contact you if the review team needs any further information.

All publicly available information about future reviews is on our website. Please continue to check our website for updates at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

There is a resource on our website called the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook that provides detailed information about the WWC review process, including the evidence standards used when reviewing studies (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/references/idocviewer/doc.aspx?docid=19&tocid=1>).

We hope this information is helpful. If you have any questions about the WWC, please feel free to respond to this email.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: Francine Rosenthal [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 3:44 PM
To: WhatWorks
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Attached please find the Offenberg Study. Please read the details in my message below.

Thank you,
Francine Rosenthal

From: WhatWorks [mailto:WhatWorks@icfi.com]
Sent: Friday, February 12, 2010 4:37 PM
To: Francine Rosenthal
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (WWC 1908)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Thank you for contacting the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

The WWC welcomes any study submissions you may have. You may submit them in response to this email or via our website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/help/webmail/index.aspx?submitstudy=1>.

Please feel free to respond to this email if you have any further questions.

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: froenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:froenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: froenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenber Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward. I would like to provide the Offenber Study-how do I do this through your website? Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: What Works
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:40 AM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)
Attachments: 2010004.pdf

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID
Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenbergs Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenbergs Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: Francine Rosenthal [frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2010 12:00 PM
To: What Works
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Deborah,

On behalf of American Reading Company, thank you for your very thoughtful and comprehensive response.

We genuinely appreciate the WWC Quality Review Teams' attention to our request.

Best regards,

Francine

Francine Rosenthal
Director of Strategic Business Development

[American Reading Company](#)

201 South Gulph Road

King of Prussia, PA 19406

Toll-Free: 866-810-2665

frosenthal@americanreading.com

Transforming School Cultures for Sustainable Reading Achievement PreK-8th Grade

From: What Works [mailto:whatworks@mathematica-mpr.com]

Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:40 AM

To: Francine Rosenthal

Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]

Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM

To: info@whatworks.ed.gov

Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID

Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenbergs Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools.I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenbergs Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: What Works
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 2:53 PM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

In response to the concerns raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) and the subsequent quality review, the WWC website has been revised to make clear that the literature search for the 100 Book Challenge closed in June 2005. You may review the revised listing for the 100 Book Challenge by viewing the list of all interventions at

<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/Topic.aspx?tid=01>.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: What Works
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:40 AM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID
Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenbergl Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools.I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenbergl Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: Francine Rosenthal <frosenthal@americanreading.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 4:13 PM
To: What Works
Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Thank you for your attention to this matter.
Will the Offenberg Study we submitted be reviewed next?

From: What Works [mailto:whatworks@mathematica-mpr.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 2:53 PM
To: Francine Rosenthal
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

In response to the concerns raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) and the subsequent quality review, the WWC website has been revised to make clear that the literature search for the 100 Book Challenge closed in June 2005. You may review the revised listing for the 100 Book Challenge by viewing the list of all interventions at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/Topic.aspx?tid=01>.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: What Works
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:40 AM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM

To: info@whatworks.ed.gov

Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID

Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: froenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenbergs Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenbergs Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: WhatWorks

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 2:52 PM

To: 'Francine Rosenthal'

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004) (WWCPC 1908)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

At this time, the 100 Book Challenge is not currently in the queue to be reviewed in the near future. Intervention suggestions and studies submitted by the public are forwarded to the topic area team. For intervention suggestions, the team searches the standard databases using the intervention name and incorporates all returned studies into a database. Study submissions are also included in the studies database. Therefore, when the topic area has completed its current set of reviews and is ready to prioritize a new set of interventions, those interventions and studies are reflected in the set of research we consider. Interventions are then prioritized according to the process laid out in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook, which ranks interventions by quantity and type of research design.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: Francine Rosenthal [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 4:13 PM

To: What Works

Subject: RE: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Will the Offenberg Study we submitted be reviewed next?

From: What Works [mailto:whatworks@mathematica-mpr.com]

Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 2:53 PM

To: Francine Rosenthal

Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

In response to the concerns raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) and the subsequent quality review, the WWC website has been revised to make clear that the literature search for the 100 Book Challenge closed in June 2005. You may review the revised listing for the 100 Book Challenge by viewing the list of all interventions at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/reports/Topic.aspx?tid=01>.

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

From: What Works
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:40 AM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID
Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenbergs Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenbergs Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: What Works
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2010 10:40 AM
To: 'frosenthal@americanreading.com'
Subject: What Works Clearinghouse (2010004)
Attachments: 2010004.pdf

Dear Ms. Rosenthal,

Attached is a response to the questions you raised in your February 10 message to the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC).

Thank you,

What Works Clearinghouse

The What Works Clearinghouse was established by the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences to provide educators, policymakers, researchers, and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education. For more information, please visit <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>.

-----Original Message-----

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com [mailto:frosenthal@americanreading.com]
Sent: Wednesday, February 10, 2010 1:44 PM
To: info@whatworks.ed.gov
Subject: IES Website: Contact Us: Submit a Study to Review, Reference ID
Number: 266434603

info@whatworks.ed.gov, this email was automatically sent through the Contact link on the WWC website.

From: frosenthal@americanreading.com

Message: US DOE Assistant Deputy Secretary Jim Shelton-Office of Innovation & Improvement & Acting Division Director Richard Smith-Office of English Language Acquisition advised CEO & Founder of American Reading Company Jane Hileman to reconnect with your organization. In 2007 you published incorrect information about the company. We were not contacted nor given the opportunity to submit the Offenbergs Study before this incorrect information was published. over 1 million kids are doing the program nationwide. Also, we are being submitted by both AIR and P/PV for an IES Scale Up Grant. NYC Chancellor Joel Klein sent Bob Klein, Director of Special Projects SINI Schools to Camden, NJ to evaluate Action 100. He has recommended the framework to all of his schools. I think you will agree that the time has come to revisit our program for evaluation. Please let me know what I can do to get things moving forward.

I would like to provide the Offenbergs Study-how do I do this through your website?

Francine Rosenthal, Director of Strategic Business Development

From: Cassandra Pickens on behalf of Mark Dynarski
Sent: Thursday, May 29, 2008 3:09 PM
To: 'aprocopio@americanreading.com'
Cc: Jill Constantine; Scott Cody
Subject: 100 Book Challenge
Attachments: 2007002 Findings Letter.doc

Dear Ms. Procopio:

I am attaching the findings from our review of the issue raised regarding the exclusion of the Offenberg (2005) study for the 100 Book Challenge. Thank you for bringing this concern to our attention.

Mark Dynarski
Director,
What Works Clearinghouse

Mark Dynarski
Project Director
What Works Clearinghouse

P.O. Box 2393
Princeton, NJ 08543-2393
Telephone (609) 799-3535
Fax (609) 799-0005
www.mathematica-mpr.com
609-275-2397

WWC-56

May 27, 2008

Alison Procopio
Director of Academic Credibility
American Reading Company
201 S. Gulph Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Reference: QR2007002

Dear Ms. Procopio:

In response to your September 27, 2007 e-mail concerning the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) exclusion of the Offenberg (2005) study, we conducted a quality review of the procedures used for examining research on the 100 Book Challenge. The WWC Quality Review Team responds to concerns raised by study authors, curriculum developers or other relevant parties about WWC ratings of studies. The finding of this review, discussed in detail below, is that the study was not available when the initial report on beginning reading interventions was prepared. Additionally, while we intend to release updates of our beginning reading reports, the current version of the Offenberg (2005) study available on the American Reading Company website is not sufficient for determining whether the study meets WWC evidence standards; more details about the study methodology and results would be needed.

Your September 27 e-mail questioned why the 2005 study by Dr. Robert Offenberg of the 100 Book Challenge was not included in our review of studies pertaining to this program. The WWC analysis of beginning reading interventions was conducted in 2005. Relevant studies were identified and assessed through the summer of that year. Relevant studies were identified through various sources, including:

- Searching electronic databases of research articles and reports
- A review of education-related journals
- A review of conference programs for the annual meetings of education-related associations
- Studies submitted to the WWC

LETTER TO: Alison Procopio
FROM: Mark Dynarski
DATE: May 27, 2008
PAGE: 2

The Offenberg study, dated August 2005, was not identified through our search procedures. Given the timing, it is likely that the summary of the Offenberg study was posted to the American Reading Company website after the WWC completed collecting studies of beginning reading interventions. While it is true that some studies with 2006 publish dates were included in our review of beginning reading interventions, these studies either were submitted directly to the WWC or were prominently published.

The fact that the Offenberg study did not make the initial review does not mean that it cannot be reviewed under the WWC. We are currently establishing procedures to update our existing intervention reports as new studies are released over time.

Please note that the summary of the Offenberg study contained on the American Reading Company website contains insufficient information for the WWC to determine whether the study meets evidence standards. To assess the study, we would need full details about the study, including the number of students in treatment and comparison schools, evidence that the treatment and comparison groups are equivalent at baseline, documentation of attrition, and means and standard errors of outcome estimates. A full description of the characteristics of studies that are examined during a WWC review can be found in the Beginning Reading review protocol at: http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/BR_protocol.pdf.

Please feel free to submit a copy of the full report through our website at: <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/openinvite.asp>. Unfortunately, at this time we are not able to estimate when the next update to the beginning reading intervention will be available. However, by submitting the Offenberg study and any other studies as they become available, you can ensure that they will be reviewed by the WWC team when we update the intervention reports.

I hope this has answered your questions.

Sincerely,

Mark Dynarski

cc: (b)(6)