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Executive Summary

The Maine Department of Education contracted with the Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI) to evaluate the Maine Reading First program. This mid-year report summarizes project activity during the 1st year of the grant, including both statewide professional development activities and interventions with the seven subgrant schools. The report also includes baseline data on the seven subgrant schools.

The data collected to date indicate that the Maine Reading First (MRF) staff has successfully conducted the proposed and required actions for selecting subgrant schools, collaborating with stakeholders across the state, planning and delivering professional development for subgrant schools and educators statewide, providing technical assistance to subgrant schools, and conducting progress monitoring in subgrant schools. The summer institute for principals statewide was not held in summer 2004, as Maine received its Reading First grant award late in 2003. This event will be held in summer 2005.

Subgrant schools have also met most of their requirements to date. Schools have hired literacy coaches, formed literacy leadership teams, and participated in the required professional development. While three schools did not quite reach a participation rate of 85% in the Reading First course, MRF staff and school principals are addressing the need to work toward full participation. Overall, participation in Reading First professional development is high.

A review of baseline data for the seven subgrant schools indicates that these schools are small—some with only one classroom per grade level. At the time of their grant application, schools reported a need for more consistency and coordination in their reading programs. Schools also indicated a need for instructional materials for reading, more time for reading in the instructional day, improved teacher knowledge of literacy, and more teacher collaboration on literacy instruction.
Surveys were conducted with participants of the summer institute (statewide event), core curriculum training (subgrant schools), Reading First course (both statewide and subgrant schools), and a 1-day workshop (statewide) during year one. These surveys measured participant satisfaction with the professional development and teacher knowledge of literacy concepts, including the five essential elements of reading. Overall, the feedback on professional development indicates a high level of satisfaction with the content, format, and presenters of the events. Data on measures of teacher knowledge indicate that teachers rated their level of knowledge across the five elements of reading at roughly the same levels. There were statistically significant differences in knowledge gained for all five elements when before and after summer institute responses were compared. Respondents indicated they felt they had gained the most knowledge in the area of fluency.

The evaluator will collect additional data on program implementation and program impacts on teacher knowledge and classroom practice in the subgrant schools, student assessment data for subgrant schools, and statewide professional development activities during year two.
Introduction

Maine received its Reading First grant award in September 2003. The Maine Department of Education contracted with the Maine Education Policy Research Institute (MEPRI) to conduct an external evaluation of the federally funded program. The late award of the grant and the late identification of priority schools by the state meant that Maine began implementing the grant approximately a year after some other states had already begun their grant projects. Despite this late start, Maine has successfully delivered the planned technical support services and professional development for seven subgrant schools and for educators statewide.

This report describes the progress made on the project at mid-year in the 1st year of the grant. The first cohort of subgrant schools was selected in the early spring of 2004, and educators were introduced to the Reading First principles and a core reading curriculum (Houghton-Mifflin’s The Nation’s Choice 2005) in the summer of 2004. Formal training began in the early fall 2004 and will continue through the late spring 2005. At this time, a second cohort of subgrant schools is preparing grant proposals, which will be reviewed in March 2005. Notification of successful submissions will be made by March 31, 2005.

This report will begin to answer some of the broad questions guiding this evaluation. As the evaluation is still a formative one at this stage, it is too early to make conclusions about the program’s impact on students’ reading achievement and instructional practices. Student and teacher data will be presented in the annual report for year one in October 2005. Some data has been collected to date, while much more data is expected this spring. The mid-year report will focus on describing the activities and technical support that Maine Reading First staff members have delivered to date, and the status of program implementation by the seven subgrant schools. The report is organized into three sections: (1) A summary of planned and delivered program activities in subgrant schools and statewide, (2) a summary and analysis of baseline school and
teacher data provided by the seven subgrant schools, (3) a summary and analysis of survey data collected from professional development activities for subgrant schools and for educators statewide.

Part 1: Project Activities

Activities Coordinated/Provided by Maine Reading First

This section will summarize project activity coordinated or provided by the Maine Reading First staff during the 1st year of the grant project, and will describe plans for this spring and summer. Most of the activities described here were listed in a table in Maine’s grant application to Reading First. They are presented here in tables for ease in locating specific items for which the state is responsible.

Maine Reading First project staff includes the co-directors who coordinate project activities and help to deliver training and technical assistance (Patrick O’Shea and Lee Anne Larsen), school technical assistance provider (Julie Scammell), and statewide professional development coordinator (Janet Trembly). All four individuals have taught in grades K-3 and are certified literacy specialists. The four individuals provide technical assistance to the seven subgrant schools during monthly site visits. Ms. Scammell works part time on the project and is also a literacy specialist in a school. For simplicity sake, the four individuals will be referred to as Maine Reading First staff in this report, unless tasks were performed only by certain members of the staff, such as the co-directors. Maine Reading First also contracts with other individuals to provide professional development as needed on the grant. Ellen Almquist and Lucie Boucher provide the Maine Literacy Partnership training for school literacy coaches for the subgrant schools. Janet Spector, higher education faculty member, provides training to subgrant school educators on assessment components, such as the DIBELS assessment. Other literacy experts and representatives from the curriculum publisher (Houghton-Mifflin), DIBELS, or other
business representatives are recruited to help conduct training at the various workshop events held for subgrant schools and for schools statewide.

Maine Reading First co-directors have communicated frequently with the external evaluator, and provided the evaluator with documentation for evidence of activities and technical support provided to subgrant schools and other educators statewide. This information includes dates of all activities, providers, meeting agendas, presentation or handout materials, and copies of project management, monitoring, evaluation tools. The co-directors have also provided detailed information and documentation to the American Institute of Research (AIR), a monitoring agency under contract with the U.S. Department of Education for the Reading First Program. AIR made a field visit with the Maine Reading First Program in 2004 and again in January 2005, and made site visits at three of the seven subgrant schools.

Table 1. Selection of Subgrant Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed and Delivered Activities/Technical Support</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Selection, training of grant proposal reviewers     | MRF co-directors and SERVE (regional education laboratory) | Winter 2004                   | 1st: 10 people trained to review grants  
2nd: 8 previously trained reviewers and 2 additional reviewers trained |
| Grant writing workshop for LEAs                     | MRF co-directors | 1st round: 12/10/03  
2nd round: 12/3/04 | 1st: 28 LEAs  
2nd: 27 LEAs |
| Technical assistance workshop for LEAs              | MRF co-directors | 1st round: 1/04  
2nd round: 1/21/05 | 1st: 17 LEAs  
2nd: 17 LEAs |
| Review and selection of grant proposals. Notification of awards to subgrant schools. | Trained reviewers | 1st round: April 2004  
2nd round: March 2005  
Notification 3/31/05 | 1st: 7 schools selected out of 9 submissions  
(56 LEAs were eligible to apply)  
2nd: not known yet |

MFR= Maine Reading First

Table 1 summarizes Maine Reading First activities around the selection of subgrant schools. Maine Reading First (MRF) contracted with the SERVE Center for Continuous Improvement (a regional education laboratory located at the University of North Carolina at
Greensboro) to design and deliver the training for grant reviewers. SERVE trained ten people to review grant applications from schools in the first round (April 2004). Eight of these people will review grants again in the second round (March 2005) along with two other, newly trained people. A team of three people reviewed each grant proposal. The team members included a higher education faculty member, a literacy specialist, and a school administrator.

A general grant writing workshop was held for both rounds of proposals to provide eligible LEAs from around the state with information about the Reading First legislation and program goals, and what LEAs needed to provide in their grant proposals. A second meeting provided more detailed information about program goals, responsibilities of LEAs participating in subgrants, assessments required, professional development provided by Maine Reading First, and core reading programs and interventions. The external evaluator attended the technical assistance session for round two on January 21, 2005.

Table 2. Statewide Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed and Delivered Activities</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Participation/Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/meetings between MRF and higher education literacy faculty</td>
<td>MRF staff and University of Maine faculty</td>
<td>Two meetings. Last meeting was 5/28/04. Frequent communication year round on course development.</td>
<td>1. Planned the Reading First course for K-3 educators 2. Planning for alignment of preservice courses. 3. Planning preservice educator conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration/meetings with the State Reading First Leadership Team</td>
<td>MRF staff and state team members</td>
<td>6/9/04  Second meeting planned for June 2005.</td>
<td>Informed stakeholders of Reading First activities statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with other stakeholders in state</td>
<td>MRF staff</td>
<td>Nov., Dec. 2004 March 2005</td>
<td>Informed regional superintendents’ associations about Reading First Activities and other state literacy initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a Reading First website</td>
<td>MRF staff</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Website established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of Reading First course instructors, monitoring of instructor quality</td>
<td>MRF staff</td>
<td>May-Dec. 2004</td>
<td>Trained 25 instructors, only 20 were needed 1st year. Conducted an instructor evaluation survey.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 summarizes statewide activities coordinated or provided by Maine Reading First.

MRF staff members have worked closely with other stakeholders in the state to inform and develop project activities, and to inform the wider public in the state of the availability of professional development activities.

Maine Reading First worked with higher education literacy faculty to develop the syllabus for the Reading First course that is being offered in 13 locations around the state for educators from schools statewide. Literacy faculty from Maine colleges and universities are examining their preservice courses in literacy to determine how to better align these courses with Reading First principles, research-based reading instruction, and the five essential elements of reading. The same group of higher education faculty members is also planning a conference for
preservice educators on the same topic, to be held in the spring 2006. These initiatives are early evidence of a wider, statewide impact of the Reading First program, and efforts to reform literacy instruction on a system-wide basis. MRF staff also collaborated with Maine Public Broadcasting to develop videotapes of classroom reading instruction that will be used within the Reading First course starting in the fall of 2005.

Maine Reading First also meets annually with a state leadership team to keep other stakeholders apprised of the grant activities in the state. The team includes stakeholder representatives, including literacy and early childhood program staff of the Maine Department of Education, the state education commissioner, legislative members of the education committee, LEA administrators, teachers, a parent, higher education representatives, and community-based organization representatives. MRF staff presented information about the program at regional superintendents’ association meetings. A website for Maine Reading First is being developed. A statewide coordinator for professional development was hired in September 2004 to coordinate the statewide activities, disseminate information to the public, and to collect information.

Professional development activities provided in the 1st year to educators statewide included the Reading First course in 13 locations; a 2-day summer institute offered in two regional locations; and 1-day workshops focusing on the five elements of reading. The Reading First course focuses on the five elements of reading and is offered in 17 sessions (2 hours each). The course introduces participants to scientifically-based instructional and assessment practices in literacy, design of classroom environments that support literacy instruction, and the five essential elements of reading. A total of 346 educators participated in the course from schools statewide. The summer institute training actively engaged participants in an opening activity, text reading and discussion, overview of research, and work on instruction and assessment activities. A total of 219 educators were registered to participate in the institutes (94 in Bar Harbor and 125 in Portland). Approximately 150 educators statewide participated in a 1-day workshop in
December 2004 presented by W. Blevins. This workshop focused on concepts of phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency.

Table 3. Subgrant School Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed and Delivered Activities</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Outcome/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical assistance, site visits, to subgrant schools.</td>
<td>MRF staff (4 individuals)</td>
<td>Sept. 2004-May 2005</td>
<td>Made monthly site visits to seven subgrant schools, and provided support via phone, email, mail. Provided technical assistance on implementation issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy consultants</td>
<td>10/22/04, 11/16/04, 11/17/04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School literacy leadership team training</td>
<td>MRF staff, literacy consultants</td>
<td>8/17-8/19/04</td>
<td>Overview of change process, team responsibilities, team building, program fidelity, assessments, DIBELS screening assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on core reading curriculum</td>
<td>Curriculum publisher (Houghton-Mifflin)</td>
<td>Overview: 6/14-6/15/04</td>
<td>Trained K-3 teachers, literacy and special ed staff, coaches and principals on core reading curriculum. Total of 131 participants from 7 schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivers Reading First course</td>
<td>Reading First course 7 instructors</td>
<td>Oct. 2004-May 2005</td>
<td>Course delivered at each of the seven subgrant schools. Total of 162 participants from 7 schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of Maine Literacy Partnership Course for school literacy coaches</td>
<td>Ellen Almquist, Lucie Boucher, Maine Literacy Partnership</td>
<td>July 2004-May 2005</td>
<td>Literacy coaches attended the course. Literacy Partnership also did on-site training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Monitoring</td>
<td>MRF staff</td>
<td>Feb.-March 2005</td>
<td>Monitors observed classrooms, completed a monitoring tool, and met with leadership teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MRF=Maine Reading First

Table 3 summarizes MRF activities in subgrant schools. In the 1st year of the grant project, each of the four MRF staff members visited the seven subgrant schools on a monthly basis to provide technical assistance with implementation issues, such as administering and recording data from student assessments. Additional technical assistance was provided by
literacy specialists or consultants, such as training on DIBELS data recording and reporting. Additional training will take place later in the year. During March-April 2005, a vendor will instruct K-3 educators in the subgrant schools in use of Palm Pilots to record and transmit DIBELS data.

Houghton-Mifflin consultants provided training to the subgrant schools on the core reading curriculum chosen by those schools (*The Nation's Choice 2005*), in a large-group session for K-3 teachers and principals on June 14-15, 2004 (1-1/2 days). Participants had the opportunity to work in grade-level groups during the training. Two of the seven schools were not able to participate in the whole group session in June 2004 as their schools were still in session, so Houghton-Mifflin conducted their training at their school sites on June 21, 2004 and July 27, 2004. Houghton-Mifflin also provided training for the literacy coaches on December 14, 2004, and provided 1-1/2 days of on-site training at each of the seven schools later in the fall and winter. Houghton-Mifflin will provide additional on-site training at each school in spring 2005.

MRF staff, along with literacy consultants, provided team leadership training to the seven subgrant schools August 17-19, 2004. The training included an overview of the change process and team responsibilities, team planning activities, and information on the use of DIBELS assessment data.

The Reading First course was coordinated by MRF staff and was delivered at each of the seven subgrant school sites by trained instructors. The Reading First course is a basic introduction to the five elements of reading, and is offered in 17 sessions (2 hours each) over the school year. Course participants earn 70 contact hours. A total of 162 educators participated in the course from the subgrant schools and other schools in their districts. Maine Reading First also collaborated with Maine Literacy Partnership to ensure the delivery of a training course for the school literacy coaches. This course is taught by Maine Literacy Partnership staff at the University of Maine and includes site visits to subgrant schools.
Maine Reading First has conducted progress monitoring in each of the seven subgrant schools, to determine to what extent each school is implementing the program as intended, and to meet with leadership teams to recommend actions needed to ensure full implementation.

Responsibilities of Subgrant Schools

The seven subgrant schools must take certain actions in order to participate in the grant project and receive funding. This section highlights an abbreviated list of those responsibilities—the primary responsibilities for schools in the 1st year. In addition, schools must select and use a core reading curriculum, administer and report data for various student reading assessments, and engage in professional development to promote research-based reading instruction and assessment.

Table 4. Subgrant School Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>How Monitored</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each subgrant school hires a full-time Literacy Coordinator/Coach</td>
<td>1. MRF monthly site visits</td>
<td>Each of the seven subgrant schools has hired/named a full-time literacy coordinator/coach for this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Staffing rosters for project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Needs assessment survey in original grant application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Course participant roster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Leadership Team survey (to be done April 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Literacy Coaches attend the Maine Literacy Partnership course in year one</td>
<td>1. Course participant roster</td>
<td>All seven coaches are attending the course. Three coaches were already trained; four are new.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Leadership Team survey (to be done April 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each subgrant school forms a Literacy Leadership Team with required membership</td>
<td>1. MRF monthly site visits</td>
<td>Each subgrant school has formed a team with the required members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Staffing rosters for project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Needs assessment survey in original grant application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Leadership Team survey (to be done April 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each Leadership Teams meets monthly to plan, implement, monitor program</td>
<td>1. Meeting agendas, minutes are shared with MRF representative during site visits.</td>
<td>Each subgrant school is meeting monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Leadership Team survey (to be done April 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 85% of the K-3 teachers, special education teachers, literacy support staff, principals,</td>
<td>1. Course participant lists from each subgrant school.</td>
<td>Total of 154 participants from 7 schools and an additional 29 participants from other schools in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and coaches in each subgrant school participate in the Reading First course in year one. Participation rates were: 100% for 3 schools; 87%; 82%; 80%; and 76%.

K-3 teachers, special education staff, literacy support staff, principals, and coaches participate in the Core Curriculum Training.

1. Course participant lists From each subgrant school.

Total of 131 participants from 7 schools attended this training in summer 2004.

MRF=Maine Reading First

Table 4 summarizes the responsibilities of subgrant schools. Data on these activities are collected by MRF staff members who provide technical assistance to each school on a monthly basis. This information is shared with the evaluator. The evaluator also collected information through phone calls to the subgrant schools and interviews with professional development providers. Additional data will be collected in the spring 2005 Leadership Team survey and in the 2nd year from focus groups and/or a teacher survey to assess the progress made on implementing the program and core curriculum, attitudes about Reading First principles and the core curriculum, professional development activities, technical assistance from the MRF representative, support from coaches, teachers’ use of research-based instructional and assessment practices, use of student assessment data, interventions used, and early impacts of the program. Analysis of that data will be presented in later evaluation reports.

All seven subgrant schools have hired or named full-time literacy coaches. Prior to their participation in the grant, two schools had coaches, one school had a literacy specialist, and four schools had no coach or specialist. The three experienced coaches/specialist had previously received training through the Maine Literacy Partnership, while the four new coaches are receiving this training for the first time. The difference in capacity meant that three schools had literacy coaches who were able to help K-3 teachers and perform some coaching tasks from the start of year one, while the other four coaches will begin their coaching work in year two.
New and previously trained coaches attended separate sessions of the Maine Literacy Partnership course, to meet their different needs. For new coaches, the course met in 2- and 5-day sessions totaling 7 full weeks of instruction from July 2004 through May 2005 at the University of Maine. Literacy Partnership also provided on-site training twice during the year at each of the four schools that had new literacy coaches. The course is taught by Ellen Almquist and Lucie Boucher of the University of Maine. The course trains participants to be literacy coaches in their schools and helps to build their understanding of scientifically-based reading research through course readings. Participants earn nine graduate course credits. In the 2nd year of the project, coaches will be teaching, modeling, and coaching other teachers in their schools, and they will provide a different version of the Maine Literacy Partnership course for the K-3 teachers at their school sites. Previously trained school literacy coaches attended 7 days of professional development with Maine Literacy Partnership and had a site visit from Maine Literacy Partnership. Maine Literacy Partnership also provided at least two training sessions for school literacy leadership teams during spring 2005.

All seven subgrant schools have formed a literacy leadership team and meet monthly to plan and monitor program implementation. Team members also meet with the MRF representatives who visit the schools monthly. Data on team activities will be collected from a team survey in April 2005, and results will be reported in later evaluation reports.

All seven subgrant schools participated in the Reading First course. Four of the schools met or exceeded the minimum participation rate of 85%. The rates were: 100% for three schools, 87%, 82%, 80%, and 76%. Additional staff members, such as educational technicians, librarians, family literacy coordinators, and district administrators also participated in the course, but were not required to attend. A few teachers were not able to take the course due to personal scheduling conflicts. One teacher did not take the course due to planned retirement at the end of the school year. One school’s unusually small staff size (six classroom teachers) was a factor in
that school’s ability to reach the required participation rate. All but one staff member in that school attended the Reading First course. The Maine Reading First staff has discussed the need to work toward full participation in the Reading First course with administrators of schools that did not reach the 85% participation rate. The administrators have agreed to make this a priority in the remainder of year one. Participation in the Core Curriculum Training, conducted by Houghton-Mifflin in summer 2004, was also high. A total of 131 participants attended the training from the seven schools.

Section Summary

At mid-point in the first full school year for the grant project, the evidence collected and analyzed by the evaluator indicates that Maine Reading First staff members have designed and delivered the planned and required activities, services, and interventions to the seven subgrant schools and to other schools/educators statewide. Maine Reading First planned and carried out numerous professional development activities for subgrant schools and other educators from across the state, and has worked closely with the subgrant schools to provide technical assistance on a monthly basis. The summer institute for administrators could not be held until summer 2005, due to the later start of Maine’s Reading First grant.

Maine Reading First staff members have also communicated and collaborated with other stakeholders across the state, to effect systemic change in literacy preservice training for teachers. The seven subgrant schools have met their basic requirements for hiring literacy coaches, developing literacy leadership teams, and sending their coaches to training. Participation in the Reading First course was high; four schools met or exceeded the required participation rate of 85% while the other three schools had a rate of about 80%. Additional staff members also participated in the course. Further evidence of program implementation at the school and teacher levels will be collected this spring and in year two and will be reported in subsequent evaluation reports.
Part 2: Baseline School and Teacher Data

This section presents a summary and analysis of baseline school and teacher demographic data for the seven subgrant schools participating in the Maine Reading First program. Data were obtained from the Needs Assessment Surveys that schools submitted with the original grant application, from enrollment and staff rosters submitted by school literacy leadership teams in fall 2004, and from the Maine Department of Education.

School Size

Table 5 shows the grade configurations for the seven subgrant schools, along with approximate figures for current attending enrollment and number of classrooms for K-3 grades. Approximations were used to maintain school confidentiality. The schools have a K-5, K-6, or K-8 grade configuration. As the table shows, schools vary somewhat in their K-3 enrollment and classroom size. Two of the schools have only one or two classrooms per grade level, while the other five schools have three or even up to five classrooms per grade level. Three schools (marked by an asterisk) have half-day kindergarten sessions in both morning and afternoon, which are counted as separate class groupings for the purpose of approximating class size. The other four schools have full-day kindergarten sessions.

Table 5. Subgrant School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade Configuration</th>
<th>Approximate K-3 Attending Enrollment*</th>
<th>K-3 Classrooms</th>
<th>Approximate Class Size**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B*</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E*</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G*</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are for the 2004-2005 school year and were obtained from the schools.
*Schools with morning and afternoon kindergarten classes.
**Approximate class size was estimated by dividing the total K-3 attending enrollment by the number of K-3 classrooms.
Student and Teacher Demographics

Student and teacher demographic data for the seven subgrant schools and their districts are shown in Table 6 and were obtained from the Maine Department of Education for the 2003-2004 school year. Data for 2004-2005 are not yet available. Teachers’ educational attainment is shown in the second column, which shows the percentage of instructional staff members for the entire school (not only K-3 grades) holding a masters’ degree. As the data indicate, there is some variation in teacher educational attainment across the seven schools. The percentage of all instructional staff holding a master’s degree in these schools ranges from zero to 45%, but is about 25% in the other five schools.

Table 6. Student and Teacher Demographic Data (2003-2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Instructional Staff with Master's Degree (school)</th>
<th>Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch (school)</th>
<th>Students in Special Education (district)</th>
<th>Elementary LEP Students (district)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maine Department of Education.

While data in Table 6 indicate some variation in student poverty rates across the school districts, the variation is not great. Across the seven school districts, the percentage of students who are eligible for the free or reduced lunch ranges from 40% to 63% with a mean of 52%.

Minimal variation was also found in special education rates across the school districts. Data on the percentage of students in special education were only available at the district level and are for the 2003-2004 school year. Across the seven school districts, the percentage of students in special education ranges from 11% to 21% with a mean of 17%.
Data on the percentage of students who are Limited English Proficiency (LEP) were only available at the district level by elementary or secondary grades and are for the 2003-2004 school year. Across the seven school districts, the percentage of elementary LEP students ranges from zero to 2% with a mean of less than one percent. Approximate percentages are shown in order to maintain confidentiality for schools. Overall, the data indicate a very low percentage of LEP students in these school districts, which is not surprising, given that the districts have few or no ethnic minority students. Student and teacher ethnicity data are not included in the table, as the student and teacher populations in these districts are almost entirely Caucasian (from 95% to 99%).

Student Achievement

Baseline data on the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) for fourth-grade reading and writing were available at the school level for the 2003-2004 school year, just 1 year prior to the subgrant schools’ participation in the Maine Reading First Project. MEA data were obtained from the Maine Department of Education, and are reported as the percentage of tested students in a grade who performed at each of the four performance levels (exceeding standards, meeting standards, partially meeting standards, and not meeting standards).

Table 7. Grade 4 MEA Data (2003-2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Meeting or Exceeding Standards</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maine Department of Education

Table 7 shows the combined percentages of students in each of the seven subgrant schools that meet or exceed performance standards on the reading and writing assessments for
the MEA and the combined statewide percentages. The percentage of students meeting or exceeding standards on the reading assessment ranges from 30% to 60%. Five schools are below the statewide percentage of 50%. The percentage of student meeting or exceeding standards on the writing assessment ranges from 0% to 12%. Six schools are below the statewide percentage of 9%. Two schools have a larger percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard on reading than the statewide percentage, and one school has a larger percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard on writing than the statewide percentage. The percentages of students performing at the other two performance levels are not shown in order to maintain school confidentiality.

Needs Assessment Survey Data

The Maine Reading First subgrant application included a Needs Assessment Survey for the purpose of helping educators in each subgrant school to reflect on the strengths and weaknesses of their reading program and curricula. Although this survey is not a formal evaluation instrument, it does provide a “snapshot” picture of each school’s program for reading instruction at the time of their grant application—before these schools engaged in professional development on Reading First. The evaluator has provided MRF co-directors with a full report of the survey results. This report will address the highlights.

Instructional time (baseline). Table 8 summarizes the time that K-3 teachers typically spend on direct reading instruction and on independent reading (at the time of grant application).
Table 8. Average Daily Instructional Time for K-3 Reading (Baseline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Mean Time Direct Instruction</th>
<th>Mean Time Independent Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A*</td>
<td>85 mins.</td>
<td>23 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B*</td>
<td>64 mins.</td>
<td>25 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>75 mins.</td>
<td>30 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*</td>
<td>56 mins.</td>
<td>24 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>90 mins.</td>
<td>30 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>45 mins.</td>
<td>15 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>60 mins.</td>
<td>23 mins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>68 mins.</td>
<td>24 mins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schools for which mean instructional time was computed based on total number of instructional minutes across classrooms divided by the number of classrooms.

While the mean time spent on direct reading instruction across the schools (68 mins.) is less than 90 minutes per day, there is a good deal of variation across the seven schools and across different grades or classrooms in the K-3 grade span. Two of the schools had a mean close to or equal to 90 minutes, while the other five schools spent approximately an hour per day on direct reading instruction. There was less variation across the seven schools in time spent on independent reading. The overall mean of 24 minutes is very close to the Reading First goal of 15-20 minutes for grades K-1 and 20-30 minutes for grades 2-3. Most schools spent 25-30 minutes per day on independent reading, while one school spent only 15 minutes per day, on average.

Components of reading program (baseline). The Needs Assessment Survey included a list of potential components of a K-3 reading program. Schools were asked to indicate the components of their K-3 reading programs. Schools indicated they predominantly used guided reading with leveled texts, and to a lesser extent, they include literature-based and phonics-based components. Schools reported little or no use of basal programs or “other” components.

Class size and instructional grouping. Schools indicated the typical class size for K-3 classrooms on their Needs Assessment form. Three schools indicated that class size varies across the grades, so that kindergarten classes are typically smaller than for grades 1-3. Schools indicated they used whole groups, small groups, and flexible grouping. Five schools indicated
class size is typically under 20 students, and two schools indicated class size to be under 25 students.

**Areas of strength.** Schools listed many different strengths of their reading programs. These included staffing and expertise (e.g. literacy specialist, coach), intervention programs (e.g., Title I, Reading Recovery, Literacy Partnership, extended-day kindergarten), reading program components (e.g., phonics instruction, using leveled reading books, writing process), program alignment with state standards (*Maine Learning Results*), grouping decisions (e.g., use of small or flexible grouping), time for reading instruction (e.g., time spent on direct instruction), professional development efforts in literacy, and integration of reading and writing into other subject areas. Two schools listed their extended-day kindergarten programs, and two schools listed their K-3 teacher participation in a Literacy Partnership course as strengths.

**Areas needing improvement.** All seven schools indicated a strong need for more coordination in their K-3 reading program and instructional practices. Other than the need for better coordination, schools identified similar areas needing improvement such as: staffing; classroom management and planning of reading instruction time; knowledge of five essential elements of reading; instructional time; instructional materials; time for teachers to confer; and more of a focus on literacy. One school listed the need to raise students’ reading achievement, and one school mentioned the desire to increase family/community involvement in literacy.

**Section Summary**

Baseline demographic data for the seven subgrant schools indicate that the schools are fairly small—some with only one classroom per grade level. While there is some variation in teachers’ educational attainment (one school had almost twice the percentage of teachers with masters’ degrees), there is little variation on student demographic variables at the district level (e.g., eligibility for free or reduced lunch, percentage of special education students, and percentage of LEP students). The combined percentage of students meeting or exceeding
performance standards on the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA) for fourth grade reading and writing for the seven schools was below the combined statewide percentage. Yet, two schools have a larger percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard on reading than the statewide percentage, and one school has a larger percentage of students meeting or exceeding the standard on writing than the statewide percentage.

Information from the Needs Assessment Survey revealed that the seven schools typically provided, on average, less than 90 minutes of direct reading instruction per day. The survey was intended to help educators in each school reflect on the strengths and weaknesses in their K-3 reading programs. All seven schools indicated a strong desire to develop more consistency or coordination across classrooms and grades in their reading curriculum. Schools identified specific areas needing improvement including: more time for direct and independent reading instruction; more time for teachers to discuss students’ reading needs and literacy instruction; additional staffing to support literacy instruction; instructional materials for literacy such as leveled books; improved teacher knowledge of literacy concepts; and improved teacher knowledge for classroom management and instructional planning. Subgrant schools identified needs that are being addressed through their participation in Maine Reading First. Additional data will be collected to see how subgrant schools’ reading programs improve during their 3-year participation in Maine Reading First.

Part 3: Survey Data

The evaluator worked closely with Maine Reading First co-directors to develop survey instruments. Surveys were administered in year one to teachers in subgrant schools and to educators participating in statewide Reading First professional development activities. These instruments were designed to measure the impact of the Maine Reading First professional development on teachers’ knowledge of concepts of research-based reading practices, reading
development, literacy environments, and the five essential elements of reading. The surveys also included items allowing educators to give feedback on the content and format of the professional development activities and presenters. The primary intervention for improving teachers’ knowledge in year one was the 9-month-long Reading First course. The core curriculum training for subgrant educators and the summer institute for educators statewide were also important vehicles for developing teacher knowledge.

All survey data were analyzed and results were promptly shared informally with the MRF co-directors prior to this report. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS (version 12.0), and qualitative data were analyzed for themes. This section describes surveys that were administered during the first half of year one and the survey results. Surveys discussed in this section include: (a) teacher knowledge survey, (b) core curriculum training survey, (c) summer institute survey, and (d) other statewide professional development surveys.

Teacher Knowledge Survey

K-3 teachers and other literacy educators in the seven subgrant schools were required to participate in a Reading First course; for other educators around the state, participation was voluntary. For all students of this course, a measure of teachers’ self-perceived knowledge of literacy concepts was collected just prior to participation in the course. This baseline data will be compared to the same measure that will be collected immediately following the course in May 2005. Comparisons of the pretest/posttest surveys will be presented in the annual report in October 2005.

The pretest version of the survey (Appendix A) was administered to educators from the seven subgrant schools in June 2004, and to educators from other schools statewide in October 2004 (Appendix B), prior to participation in the Reading First course. In the subgrant schools and their school districts, 139 of the 162 (86%) Reading First course participants completed the survey. For other schools statewide, 335 of the 346 (97%) course participants completed the survey. All
respondents were invited to provide demographic information, self-ratings of their level of understanding of specific literacy concepts, and written responses to two open-ended items. Analysis of the open-response items will be presented in the annual report.

The survey instrument for subgrant and statewide educators was identical, with the exception that the survey for subgrant educators included three additional items within the section on research-based reading practices. These items relate to instructional and assessment practices that were included in the more extensive professional development provided to educators in subgrant schools, and also relate to their use of a core reading curriculum. The items are: \textit{definition of systematic instruction}; \textit{knowledge and use of flexible grouping strategies for the provision of instruction}; and \textit{knowledge and experience utilizing a comprehensive/core reading program}. A brief summary of the results for the selected-response items is presented below in table format.

**Results of Teacher Knowledge Survey for Teachers in Subgrant Schools**

**Demographics.** Over half of the respondents were regular classroom teachers (51.5%), and had been teaching more than 10 years (59.6%). Nearly two thirds of the respondents held a Bachelor’s degree (64.2%). A large majority of respondents taught within the kindergarten to third-grade level. Over three quarters of the respondents held a professional teaching certificate (79.7%). The following five tables present these demographic data in their entirety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9. Position at School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Literacy Related Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three respondents did not answer this item.
Table 10. Number of Years Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Three respondents did not answer this item.

Table 11. Grades Currently Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre kindergarten</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindergarten</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12. Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D/Ph.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 master's degrees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two respondents did not answer this item.

Table 13. Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eleven respondents did not answer this item.

Knowledge of literacy concepts. Using a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (limited understanding) to 4 (extensive understanding), respondents rated the extent of their knowledge in the areas of research-based reading practices, reading development, and literacy environments.

In the area of research-based reading practices, respondents indicated they were most knowledgeable about essential components of reading instruction and the purpose of uninterrupted blocks of time for reading instruction. In the area of reading development, respondents were most knowledgeable about concepts of print that young children develop, followed closely by stages of reading development, and cue systems readers use while reading.

In the area of literacy environments, respondents indicated they had the most understanding in the knowledge and use of reading aloud, shared reading, guided reading, and independent reading as instructional components. The following three tables present this information.
### Table 14. Research-Based Reading Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of scientifically based reading research</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of schools with effective school-wide literacy programs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential components of reading instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components of explicit instruction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of systematic instruction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of screening, progress monitoring, and outcome assessment to inform instruction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of flexible grouping strategies for the provision of instruction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of uninterrupted blocks of time for reading instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of Maine’s Learning Results with scientifically based reading research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and experience utilizing a comprehensive/core reading program (e.g. Houghton Mifflin core reading program)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15. Reading Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of oral language development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection of oral language to reading development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for supporting oral language development in primary classrooms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of reading development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts of print that young children develop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cue systems readers use while reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for supporting reading development during the preschool years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16. Literacy Environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical organization of classrooms to promote reading development</td>
<td>10 7.2%</td>
<td>25 18.1%</td>
<td>66 47.8%</td>
<td>37 26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for selecting research based materials to support instruction</td>
<td>14 10.1%</td>
<td>44 31.9%</td>
<td>68 49.3%</td>
<td>12 8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for the design of classroom libraries that include a wide range of high quality children's literature</td>
<td>15 10.9%</td>
<td>35 25.4%</td>
<td>63 45.7%</td>
<td>25 18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of reading aloud as an instructional component</td>
<td>0 .0%</td>
<td>17 12.2%</td>
<td>64 46.0%</td>
<td>58 41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of shared reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>3 2.2%</td>
<td>17 12.2%</td>
<td>64 46.0%</td>
<td>55 39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of guided reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>3 2.2%</td>
<td>18 13.0%</td>
<td>63 45.7%</td>
<td>54 39.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of independent reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 .7%</td>
<td>19 13.7%</td>
<td>67 48.2%</td>
<td>52 37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of word work as an instructional component</td>
<td>5 3.6%</td>
<td>25 18.0%</td>
<td>70 50.4%</td>
<td>39 28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of writing instruction to promote reading instruction</td>
<td>2 1.5%</td>
<td>20 14.6%</td>
<td>71 51.8%</td>
<td>44 32.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the same 4-point scale, respondents rated the extent of their understanding of the five elements of reading: phonological awareness, alphabetic principle and phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Within each of these five elements, respondents were asked to rate their knowledge in five areas: basic understanding of definitions or components of the element; reading research on the element; instructional practice for the element; ways to monitor progress for the element; and differentiation of instruction for the element. Table 17 presents the mean scores for these elements and areas of knowledge.
Table 17. Mean Scores for Five Elements of Reading (Subgrant Educators’ Pretest Knowledge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions/ Components</th>
<th>Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading research</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.7939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.6090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor progress</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.8144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating instruction</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.5381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data indicate, subgrant school educators rated their level of knowledge on the pretest survey fairly consistently across the five elements of reading and across the five areas of knowledge. Tables 1a through 5a (Appendix C) present the frequency tables for each of the five elements.

Results of Teacher Knowledge Survey for Educators from Schools Statewide

Demographics. Less than half of the respondents were regular classroom teachers (42.9%), and more than half had been teaching for more than 10 years (53.9%). A large majority of the respondents taught within the kindergarten to third-grade level. Just over two thirds of the respondents held a bachelor’s degree (67.6%). Slightly more than three quarters of the respondents held a professional teaching certificate (76.7%).

Table 18. Position at School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position at School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education Teacher</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Literacy Related Position</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four respondents did not answer this item.
Table 19. Number of Years Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-seven respondents did not answer this item.

Table 20. Grades Currently Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre kindergarten</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindergarten</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 1</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 4</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21. Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years college</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years college</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventeen respondents did not answer this item.

Table 22. Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty-nine respondents did not answer this item.

Knowledge of literacy concepts. Using a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (limited understanding) to 4 (extensive understanding), respondents rated the extent of their knowledge in the areas of: research-based reading practices, reading development, and literacy environments. In the area of research-based reading practices, respondents indicated they were most knowledgeable about essential components of reading instruction and the purpose of uninterrupted blocks of time for reading instruction. In the area of reading development, respondents were most knowledgeable about concepts of print, followed closely by stages of reading development and cue systems readers use while reading. In the area of literacy environments, respondents indicated they had the most understanding in the knowledge and use of reading aloud as an instructional component, followed closely by knowledge of shared
reading, guided reading, and independent reading. The following three tables present this information.

Table 23. Research-Based Reading Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of scientifically based reading research</th>
<th>Limited understanding n</th>
<th>Some understanding n</th>
<th>Basic understanding n</th>
<th>Extensive understanding n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of systematically instruction</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of flexible grouping strategies for the provision of instruction</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of uninterrupted blocks of time for reading instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment of Maine's Learning Results with scientifically based reading research</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and experience utilizing a comprehensive/core reading program (e.g. Houghton Mifflin core reading program)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Reading Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of oral language development</th>
<th>Limited understanding n</th>
<th>Some understanding n</th>
<th>Basic understanding n</th>
<th>Extensive understanding n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of oral language development</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection of oral language to reading development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for supporting oral language development in primary classrooms</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stages of reading development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts of print that young children develop</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cue systems readers use while reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods for supporting reading development during the preschool years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the same 4-point scale, respondents rated the extent of their understanding of the five elements of reading: phonological awareness, alphabetic principle and phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Within each of these five elements, respondents were asked to rate their knowledge in five areas: basic understanding of definitions or components of the element; reading research on the element; instructional practice for the element; ways to monitor progress for the element; and differentiation of instruction for the element. Table 26 presents the mean scores for these elements and areas of knowledge.
As the data indicate, statewide school educators rated their level of knowledge on the pretest survey fairly consistently across the five elements of reading and across the five areas of knowledge. Tables 1b through 5b (Appendix C) present the frequency tables for each of the five elements.

Core Curriculum Training Survey

K-3 teachers and other literacy educators in the seven subgrant schools attended a core curriculum training session in June and July 2004. This training provided educators with an overview of the core reading program they would implement in the fall of 2004 (Houghton-Mifflin’s *The Nation’s Choice 2005*). The session was conducted by the curriculum publisher. A survey was conducted at the conclusion of the core curriculum training to solicit participants’ feedback on the training content, format, and presenter (see Appendix D). Five of the subgrant schools attended this training together in June 2004, while two of the schools received training at their individual school sites later in June and July 2004. A total of 125 educators of the 131 participants (95.4% response rate) completed the survey.

Respondents were first asked to identify their position in their school. Next, using a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*), respondents rated ten items pertaining to the training session. Respondents were also given the option of indicating if the

### Table 26. Mean Scores for the Five Elements (Statewide Educators’ Pretest Knowledge)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitions/Components</th>
<th>Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading research</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.4913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.3123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring progress</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.4623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating instruction</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.2402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td><strong>2.3130</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3167</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3511</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3382</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4256</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
item was “not applicable” to them or if they were “unsure” of their response. Three open-ended prompts were also included on the survey. The open-ended items were as follows: (1) “The most positive features of the core program training were…”; (2) “Improvements that could be made to the core program training are…”; (3) “I would like additional professional development related to Reading First on the topic(s) of…”

Results of Core Curriculum Training Survey

Demographics. Table 27 presents the number and percentage of respondents by their job role. Slightly more than half of the respondents were classroom teachers (52%). Five respondents checked “other” for job role. The “other” positions included librarians, a grant coordinator, an intervention specialist, and a speech pathologist.

Table 27. Position at School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Teacher</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Technician</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Position</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two respondents did not answer this item.

Feedback on training session. Respondents rated their level of agreement with ten statements on the effectiveness of the training. For ease of analysis, the 5-point scale was reduced to a 3-point scale, with “strongly agree” and “agree” being combined as well as “strongly disagree” and “disagree” being combined. Overall, respondents were very positive about the training that was provided by Houghton-Mifflin. Nearly all respondents (96%) indicated that “The instruction presented helped me identify the components of the Houghton-Mifflin core reading program.” Slightly fewer (95.2%) reported that the “Consultants communicated information clearly and at a comfortable pace.” Less than 7% of respondents
disagreed with any of the items presented. It is important to note that this training session was only intended to be an introduction or overview of the core curriculum, and that Houghton-Mifflin provided additional training at each school site on at least two occasions later in the fall and winter of 2004. Results for the core training session are presented in their entirety in Table 28 below.

Table 28. Perceived Effectiveness of the Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree/Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree/Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NA or Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I gained new knowledge and/or skills that I can apply in my work.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I reinforced knowledge/skills I already had.</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instruction presented helped me identify the components of the Houghton-Mifflin core reading program.</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instruction presented helped me understand the organization and integration of the Houghton-Mifflin core components.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants communicated information clearly and at a comfortable pace.</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants were knowledgeable about their content and able to answer my questions.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The materials supplied by Houghton-Mifflin contributed to my learning during the institute.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of the training, I will be able to get started with the implementation of the Houghton-Mifflin core reading program in my classroom.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization and time allotment for core program training was adequate.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I found the core program training to be a valuable professional development experience.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to open-ended items. Written comments (n = 120) to the first open-ended question cited positive features of the training. Comments most frequently included praise for: knowledgeable speakers; clear presentation; friendly answers to questions; provision of instructional materials that were grade appropriate; pacing of the presentation; and opportunity for hands-on learning.
Comments ($n = 96$) on improvements for the training included suggestions for more time for the training, provision of training materials ahead of time, allowing teachers to keep a teachers’ edition of the manual so teachers could write in their manuals, color coding for sections of the manual, modeling of a typical classroom reading block using the core curriculum, and inclusion of a Maine Literacy Partnership representative to demonstrate how the core curriculum could be combined with Maine Literacy Partnership.

Seventy-three respondents commented on their desire for additional professional development related to Reading First in response to the third open-ended item. These comments varied widely, as expected. Respondents indicated they would like more training on the following topics: the five essential elements of reading; guided reading, implementation of core curriculum; assessments; integrating writing workshop with the core curriculum; using leveled books; classroom management; time management; and learning how to combine Maine Literacy Partnership with Reading First.

Summer Institute Survey

Maine Reading First conducted two summer institutes in the summer 2004 to provide educators from around the state with opportunities for professional development on research-based reading concepts and the five essential elements of reading. The first institute was held June 24-25, 2004 in Bar Harbor and the second institute was held June 28-29, 2004. Each institute included two full days of training with five sessions. Although some presenters varied across the two institutes, the format and content of each institute was the same. Presenters included MRF co-directors and other literacy specialists.

In order to measure the impact of this professional development on teachers’ knowledge of reading, a survey (similar to the teacher knowledge survey) was administered at the end of each institute (see Appendix E). Of the 219 educators registered for the institutes, a total of 202 educators completed the survey (88 in Bar Harbor and 114 in Portland) for an overall response
rate of 92%. Aggregate results are presented in the following section. The survey asked respondents for demographic information on educational attainment, certification, length of teaching experience, grade levels they teach, school and district names. The next section asked participants to rate their level of knowledge on specific areas within the five essential elements of reading both before and after the institute. Then, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with ten statements about the usefulness of the training. The final section included three open-ended prompts for respondents to comment on positive features of the summer institute, improvements needed, and additional professional development that respondents would like to receive.

Results of Summer Institute Survey

Demographics. Nearly two thirds of the respondents (65.8%) indicated they had taught for more than 10 years, and most of the respondents indicated they were teaching in one or more grades within the kindergarten to grade 5 level. Other respondents indicated they taught pre-kindergarten or within grades 6-8. Five percent of the respondents indicated they had not earned a bachelor’s degree, while slightly over half of the respondents (56.3%) held a BA/BS degree. Slightly over a third of the respondents (36.7%) indicated they had a master’s degree (MAT, M.Ed., or MA/MS degree), and 2% indicated they held a Certificate of Advanced Studies (CAS) degree. Most respondents indicated they held a “professional” certification (84.4%), while 11.3% had a “provisional” certification. Only 1.6% of the respondents indicated they held a “conditional” certification and 1.1% held a “transitional” certification. Demographic data are presented in Tables 29-32 below.
Table 29. Number of Years Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Thirteen respondents did not answer this item.

Table 30. Grades Currently Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre kindergarten</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindergarten</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grade 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 31. Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years college</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Four respondents did not answer this item.

Table 32. Certification Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification Held</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. Tech</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Seventeen respondents did not answer this item.

Knowledge of literacy concepts. Respondents rated their level of knowledge of the five essential elements of reading, using a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (limited understanding) to 4 (extensive understanding). In order to determine if there were any significant differences in respondents’ mean scores from the two summer institutes, T-tests were conducted on respondents’ self-ratings of knowledge prior to the institute. The results are shown in Table 33. For each of the five elements of reading, a mean score was computed for each institute. There was not a statistically significant difference between phonological awareness mean scores for the two institutes ($p < .05$). In examining the other four elements of reading scores for the two institutes, a statistically significant difference was found ($p < .05$) with Portland respondents scoring higher. Although the differences in mean scores were statistically significant, in practical terms the mean score differences were negligible, with scores differing from .19 to .37.
Therefore, data for the Summer Institute Survey are presented primarily in aggregate form in this report.

Table 33. Knowledge Prior to Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.5051</td>
<td>.7243</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.6658</td>
<td>.7218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.4489</td>
<td>.7320</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.7262</td>
<td>.7065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Fluency</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.3028</td>
<td>.5850</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.4978</td>
<td>.7269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Vocabulary</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.1965</td>
<td>.5877</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.4886</td>
<td>.6102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Comprehension</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2.3644</td>
<td>.5182</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>2.7386</td>
<td>.6918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the five elements of reading (phonological awareness, alphabetic principle and phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension), respondents were asked to rate their level of knowledge in five areas. These areas include basic understanding of definitions and components of the element, research on the element in relationship to learning how to read, instructional practices and activities for teaching the element, ways to monitor progress in the element, and differentiating element instruction to meet the students’ needs. Respondents rated the extent of their knowledge using a 4-point scale, ranging from 1 (*limited understanding*) to 4 (*extensive understanding*). Tables 1a,b to 5 a,b (Appendix F) present the aggregate findings in their entirety.

Mean scores were computed for each of the five elements of reading for extent of knowledge both before and after the institute (see Table 34). The before institute mean scores range from 2.36 to 2.58. Thus, it appears that respondents rated their knowledge across the five elements before the institute at roughly the same level. Comparison of the before- and after-
institute mean scores indicates that respondents believed they had gained the most knowledge in the element of fluency.

Table 34. Mean Scores for Each Element of Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Prior to Institute</th>
<th>203</th>
<th>2.6027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Institute</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3.4717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</td>
<td>Prior to Institute</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.6122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Institute</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3.3603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Fluency</td>
<td>Prior to Institute</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>2.4193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Institute</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.4230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Vocabulary</td>
<td>Prior to Institute</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2.3692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Institute</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3.1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Comprehension</td>
<td>Prior to Institute</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2.5806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After Institute</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>3.3299</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional analyses were conducted to determine if respondents rated their level of knowledge differently across the five areas (basic understanding, research, instructional practices, progress monitoring, and differentiation of instruction). Respondents’ mean scores across these five areas before the institute range from 2.41 to 2.67 (see Table 35). Thus, it appears that respondents rated their levels of knowledge at roughly the same level across the five areas before the institute. Comparison of the before- and after-institute mean scores indicates that respondents believed they had gained slightly more knowledge in the area of basic understanding of the element than in the other four areas.
### Table 35. Mean Scores for Areas of Knowledge within Each Element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Knowledge</th>
<th>Prior to Institute</th>
<th>After Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Understanding of the Element</strong></td>
<td>N: 203 <strong>Mean</strong>: 2.6123</td>
<td>N: 196 <strong>Mean</strong>: 3.5061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research on element in relationship to learning how to read</strong></td>
<td>N: 203 <strong>Mean</strong>: 2.4438</td>
<td>N: 195 <strong>Mean</strong>: 3.3178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the element</strong></td>
<td>N: 203 <strong>Mean</strong>: 2.6761</td>
<td>N: 198 <strong>Mean</strong>: 3.4882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ways to monitor progress in the element</strong></td>
<td>N: 203 <strong>Mean</strong>: 2.4100</td>
<td>N: 191 <strong>Mean</strong>: 3.2559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Differentiating element instruction to meet students' needs</strong></td>
<td>N: 203 <strong>Mean</strong>: 2.4342</td>
<td>N: 192 <strong>Mean</strong>: 3.1823</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, respondents’ self-ratings appear to be rather high. On average, respondents indicated their level of knowledge before the institute was between the levels of *some* and *basic*, and their level of knowledge after the institute was between the levels of *basic* and *extensive*. Few respondents rated the level of their knowledge as *limited* before the institute. Across all survey items, between 3.5% and 13% of the respondents rated their level of knowledge as *limited* before the institute. Of the respondents who rated their level of knowledge as *extensive*, between 2.5% and 21% gave this rating before the institute and between 22.5% and 66.5% gave this rating after the institute.

Feedback on training session. Respondents were asked to indicate how useful they felt the training had been. Respondents rated their level of agreement with ten statements, using a scale of 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*). Respondents were also given the option to select “not applicable” or “unsure” as a response. For ease of analysis, the 5-point scale was reduced to a 3-point scale, with “strongly agree” and “agree” being combined and “strongly disagree” and “disagree” being combined.

Overall, respondents gave very positive ratings on the usefulness of the training session (see Table 36). Across the ten items, between 74% and 91% of the respondents agreed or
strongly agreed with the statements. Respondents indicated the highest level of agreement with the statements: “I reinforced knowledge/skills I already had” (90.5% agreed), “The materials included in the Reading First Institute Binder contributed to my learning during the institute” (88.5% agreed), and “Session presenters were knowledgeable about their content and able to answer my questions” (87.8% agreed). Respondents indicated the least agreement with the statement “The examples of instructional activities provided me with sufficient insight into how and when to apply the concepts/information presented” (74.4% agreed). Overall, responses to the ten items indicated that the majority of participants felt that the training was a worthwhile professional development experience.

Table 36. Respondents Ratings of the Summer Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I gained new knowledge and/or skills that I can apply in my work.</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I reinforced knowledge/skills I already had.</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The examples of instructional activities provided me with sufficient</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insight into how and when to apply the concepts/information presented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When participating in the sessions, I had an opportunity to learn from</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session presenters communicated information clearly and at a comfortable</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pace.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session presenters were knowledgeable about their content and able to</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answer my questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The materials included in the Reading First Institute Binder contributed</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to my learning during the institute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The materials included in the Reading First Institute Binder will serve</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a resource to my instruction after the institute.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organization and time allotment for Institute sessions was adequate</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I found the Reading First Summer Institute to be a valuable</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development experience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to Open-Ended Items. The last section of the survey asked participants to respond to three open-ended items to provide feedback on the training. The first item asked respondents to comment on the most positive features of the Reading First Summer Institute.
Respondents (n = 193) noted the following positive features most frequently: well organized sessions; knowledgeable presenters, useful materials in binders, the Reading First booklet, opportunity to obtain research-based information about literacy, hands-on activities in the sessions, and opportunities to meet and learn from teachers from other schools.

The second item asked respondents to comment on what improvements could be made to the Reading First Summer Institute. Respondents (n = 180) offered the following suggestions for improving the institute: making sure handout materials are clear photocopies; having a shorter keynote speech; more time on hands-on learning; giving participants materials ahead of time; more information on differentiating instruction; more information by grade level; and more information on assessments.

A third item asked respondents to describe what additional professional development related to Reading First they would like to have. Respondents (n = 147) indicated several areas where they would like additional training. Respondents indicated a desire for more professional development across all five elements of reading, and opportunities to go into more depth. Respondents also indicated they wanted to learn more about other topics, including linking reading and writing, differentiating instruction, research behind reading theories, application to ELL and Title 1 students, building listening comprehension; interpreting assessment data, using leveled books and guided reading, and how to balance attention to all five elements of reading.

Other Statewide Professional Development Events/Surveys

Two workshop days were planned for educators/schools from across the state in the first half of year one. W. Blevins presented a workshop on phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency on December 9, 2004 and also spent a day on December 10, 2004 with 25 Reading First course instructors. Participants in the December 9, 2004 workshop included 150 educators and approximately 75 LEAs. The evaluator has not completed analysis of the survey that was administered on December 9, 2004 (see appended survey). The survey asked participants to rate
their level of understanding of the concepts in the three reading elements before and after the workshop and to give feedback on the workshop. Data results will be shared in later reports.

Another workshop was planned for February 10, 2005 with C. Block and J. Mangieri, focusing on reading comprehension and vocabulary. This workshop was cancelled due to a snowstorm but will be rescheduled. A survey will be administered at that workshop asking participants to rate their level of understanding of reading comprehension and vocabulary before and after the workshop, and to give feedback on the workshop.

Section Summary

Survey results for professional development activities in year one indicate that both subgrant school educators and other educators statewide found the Reading First training to be helpful and informative. Surveys had a high response rate. Respondents indicated that the content and format of the training were helpful to their learning, that presenters were knowledgeable and helpful in answering questions, and that training materials were helpful. Respondents indicated that the training increased their knowledge of scientifically based reading research and concepts within the five essential elements of reading. Overall, the comments were very positive and any suggestions for improvements were relatively minor ones.

Survey data on teacher knowledge indicate that respondents rated their pretest knowledge across the five elements or reading (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) at roughly the same levels. With the Summer Institute Survey, there were statistically significant differences in knowledge gained for all five elements, though respondents felt they gained the most knowledge in the element of fluency. Respondents also rated their pretest knowledge across five areas (basic understanding of element, research, instructional practices, progress monitoring, and differentiation of instruction) at roughly the same levels. Summer Institute Survey respondents indicated they gained slightly more knowledge in the area of basic understanding than in the other four areas.
A limitation of the survey data is that it relied on self-reported ratings of knowledge. Accordingly, the evaluator will gather evidence of program impacts on educator knowledge, instructional skills, and implementation efforts through the use of additional research methods and instruments. Data will be collected in year two from other surveys that measure educators’ knowledge of basic concepts of literacy. Data will also be collected in year two from classroom observations using a formal observation instrument and trained observers. Data on program implementation will be collected from subgrant schools and literacy leadership teams at the end of year one and in year two.

Conclusion

At mid-point in the 1st year of the grant project, the evidence collected to date indicates that Maine Reading First has delivered the planned and required interventions and technical assistance to both subgrant schools and to other educators statewide. In addition, collaboration with higher education faculty has prompted a review of preservice course content for literacy, and holds the potential for more systemic reforms in literacy education. Given the small staff size and resources for the Maine Reading First program (relative to that in other states), the number of activities coordinated and delivered by MRF staff, and the complexity of technical assistance provided by MRF staff, are noteworthy. The professional development and technical assistance provided by MRF staff appears to be of high quality and is wholly informed by and consistent with Reading First principles and scientifically-based research on reading.

The subgrant schools have formed literacy leadership teams and a large percentage of their K-3 teachers, special educators, and other literacy support staff participated in the core curriculum training and the Reading First course. In schools where the participation rate was below 85% for the Reading First course, MRF staff and school administrators have addressed this concern and have made it a priority to attain this goal. Principals of all subgrant schools
participated in the core curriculum training except for one school that was in the process of hiring a new principal. All principals participated in the Reading First course. Literacy Coaches have been named or hired and have participated in training through the Maine Literacy Partnership Course. Subgrant school educators gave positive feedback on surveys administered at the Core Curriculum Training.

Educators from other schools statewide have also had opportunities to participate in professional development to build a stronger understanding of the five essential elements of reading for K-3 literacy instruction. Summer Institute participants gave positive feedback on surveys about the training they received. Additional workshops have been held and will be held in spring 2005, and data on these events will be reported in October 2005.

The Maine Reading First staff is currently planning professional development activities for the 2nd year and selecting additional subgrant schools from the applications that have been submitted. MRF staff has worked closely with the external evaluator to review survey results in order to inform program decisions for the 2nd year. Additional research methods and instruments will be used in spring 2005 and in year two to collect data on program implementation at the school and classroom levels, teacher knowledge of literacy concepts, and student achievement in reading. Data on teachers and students will be presented in the October evaluation report.
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Teacher Knowledge Surveys
Maine Reading First  
Initial Survey  
(Appendix A)

Thank you for taking time to complete this survey. The Maine Reading First Team greatly appreciates the information you provide, as it will help us track the effectiveness of the Maine Reading First grant program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District:</th>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Your position (check one):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Regular Classroom Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Special Education Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Other Literacy Related Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years teaching including this year:</th>
<th>Highest level of educational attainment:</th>
<th>What type of certification do you hold?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—10+</td>
<td>□ less than 2 yrs. college</td>
<td>□ Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ 2 yrs. college</td>
<td>□ Provisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ MA/MS</td>
<td>□ Transitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ BA/BS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ MAT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ M.Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Ed.D./Ph.D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade(s) currently teaching (circle all that apply): PreK—K—1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—11—12

What type of certification do you hold?

Rating (circle one)

1. Please rate your present knowledge of the following topics and concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Based Reading Practices</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definition of scientifically based reading research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Characteristics of schools with effective school-wide literacy programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Essential components of reading instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Components of explicit instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Definition of systematic instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Knowledge and use of screening, progress monitoring, and outcome assessment to inform instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Knowledge and use of flexible grouping strategies for the provision of instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Purpose of uninterrupted blocks of time for reading instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Alignment of Maine’s Learning Results with scientifically based reading research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Knowledge and experience utilizing a comprehensive/core reading program (e.g. Houghton Mifflin core reading program)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Development</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stages of oral language development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Connection of oral language to reading development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Methods for supporting oral language development in primary classrooms</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stages of reading development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Concepts of print that young children develop</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cue systems readers use while reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Methods for supporting reading development during the preschool years</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy Environments</strong></td>
<td>Rating (circle one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical organization of classrooms to promote reading development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for selecting research based materials to support instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for the design of classroom libraries that include a wide range of high quality children’s literature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of reading aloud as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of shared reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of guided reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of independent reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of word work as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of writing instruction to promote reading instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Phonological Awareness</strong></th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of phonological and phonemic awareness to learning how to read</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching phonological awareness, particularly phonemic awareness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonological awareness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonological awareness instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</strong></th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fluency</strong></th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the components of fluency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of fluency to effective reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting fluent reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in fluency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating fluency instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Vocabulary</strong></th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of vocabulary development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in vocabulary development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating vocabulary instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of comprehension strategies that promote reading comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of comprehension to effective reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching comprehension strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in comprehension</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating comprehension instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please respond to each of the following prompts.**

What are two goals you have for your school’s participation in the Maine Reading First Grant Initiative?

1. 

2. 

What are two goals you have for your own professional growth as a result of your participation in the Maine Reading First Grant Initiative?

1. 

2. 

—*Thank you for your participation.*—
Thank you for taking time to complete this survey. The Maine Reading First Team greatly appreciates the information you provide, as it will help us track the effectiveness of the Maine Reading First grant program.

**District:**

**School:**

**Your position (check one):**
- Regular Classroom Teacher
- Special Education Teacher
- Other Literacy Related Position
- Administration
- Other: ________________________

Number of years teaching including this year:
1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—10+

Highest level of educational attainment:
- less than 2 yrs. college
- 2 yrs. college
- BA/BS
- MA/MS
- MAT
- CAS
- M.Ed
- Ed.D./Ph.D.

Grade(s) currently teaching (circle all that apply): PreK—K—1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—11—12

What type of certification do you hold?
- Conditional
- Provisional
- Transitional
- Professional

1. Please rate your present knowledge of the following topics and concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research-Based Reading Practices</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of scientifically based reading research</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristics of schools with effective school-wide literacy programs</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Essential components of reading instruction</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features of explicit, systematic instruction</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and use of screening, progress monitoring, and outcome assessment to inform instruction</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of uninterrupted blocks of time for reading instruction</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment of Maine’s Learning Results with scientifically based reading research</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Development</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stages of oral language development</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection of oral language to reading and writing development</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods for supporting oral language development in primary classrooms</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stages of reading and writing development</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concepts of print that young children develop</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cue systems readers use while reading</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods for supporting reading development during the preschool years</strong></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy Environments</td>
<td>Rating (circle one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical organization of classrooms to promote reading development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for selecting research based materials to support instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria for the design of classroom libraries that include a wide range of high quality children’s literature</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of reading aloud as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of shared reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of guided reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of independent reading as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of word work as an instructional component</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and use of writing instruction to promote reading instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonological Awareness</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of phonological and phonemic awareness to learning how to read</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching phonological awareness, particularly phonemic awareness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonological awareness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonological awareness instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the components of fluency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of fluency to effective reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting fluent reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in fluency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating fluency instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Rating (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of vocabulary development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to each of the following prompt.

What are two goals you have for your own professional growth as a result of your participation in the Maine Reading First Course?

1. 

2. 

—Thank you for your participation.—
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### Appendix C
Frequency Tables for Subgrant School Respondents

**Table 1a. Phonological Awareness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of phonological and phonemic awareness to learning how to read</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching phonological awareness, particularly phonemic awareness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonological awareness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonological awareness instruction to meet students' needs.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2a. Alphabetic Principle and Phonics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3a. Fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the components of fluency</td>
<td>n=4 (2.9%)</td>
<td>n=44 (31.7%)</td>
<td>n=63 (45.3%)</td>
<td>n=28 (20.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of fluency to effective reading</td>
<td>n=9 (6.5%)</td>
<td>n=49 (35.3%)</td>
<td>n=66 (47.5%)</td>
<td>n=15 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting fluent reading</td>
<td>n=7 (5.0%)</td>
<td>n=39 (28.1%)</td>
<td>n=66 (47.5%)</td>
<td>n=27 (19.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in fluency</td>
<td>n=14 (10.1%)</td>
<td>n=49 (35.3%)</td>
<td>n=55 (39.6%)</td>
<td>n=21 (15.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating fluency instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>n=14 (10.1%)</td>
<td>n=47 (33.8%)</td>
<td>n=63 (45.3%)</td>
<td>n=15 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4a. Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of vocabulary development</td>
<td>n=2 (1.4%)</td>
<td>n=35 (25.2%)</td>
<td>n=76 (54.7%)</td>
<td>n=26 (18.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading</td>
<td>n=16 (11.5%)</td>
<td>n=37 (26.6%)</td>
<td>n=70 (50.4%)</td>
<td>n=16 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development</td>
<td>n=7 (5.0%)</td>
<td>n=32 (23.0%)</td>
<td>n=80 (57.6%)</td>
<td>n=20 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in vocabulary development</td>
<td>n=15 (10.8%)</td>
<td>n=55 (39.6%)</td>
<td>n=58 (41.7%)</td>
<td>n=11 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating vocabulary instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>n=16 (11.7%)</td>
<td>n=52 (38.0%)</td>
<td>n=54 (39.4%)</td>
<td>n=15 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5a. Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of comprehension strategies that promote reading comprehension</td>
<td>n=7 (5.1%)</td>
<td>n=24 (17.4%)</td>
<td>n=73 (52.9%)</td>
<td>n=34 (24.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of comprehension to effective reading</td>
<td>n=16 (11.6%)</td>
<td>n=39 (28.3%)</td>
<td>n=55 (39.9%)</td>
<td>n=28 (20.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching comprehension strategies</td>
<td>n=8 (5.8%)</td>
<td>n=26 (19.0%)</td>
<td>n=70 (51.1%)</td>
<td>n=33 (24.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in comprehension</td>
<td>n=14 (10.1%)</td>
<td>n=37 (26.8%)</td>
<td>n=70 (50.7%)</td>
<td>n=17 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating comprehension instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>n=13 (9.6%)</td>
<td>n=38 (27.9%)</td>
<td>n=64 (47.1%)</td>
<td>n=21 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Frequency Tables for Statewide Respondents**

#### Table 1b. Phonological Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research on the relationship of phonological and phonemic awareness to learning how to read</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching phonological awareness, particularly phonemic awareness</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonological awareness</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonological awareness instruction to meet students' needs.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2b. Alphabetic Principle and Phonics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3b. Fluency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited Understanding</th>
<th>Some Understanding</th>
<th>Basic Understanding</th>
<th>Extensive Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the components of fluency</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of fluency to effective reading</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting fluent reading</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in fluency</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating fluency instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4b. Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited Understanding</th>
<th>Some Understanding</th>
<th>Basic Understanding</th>
<th>Extensive Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of vocabulary development</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in vocabulary development</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating vocabulary instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5b. Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited Understanding</th>
<th>Some Understanding</th>
<th>Basic Understanding</th>
<th>Extensive Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of comprehension strategies that promote reading comprehension</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of comprehension to effective reading</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching comprehension strategies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in comprehension</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating comprehension instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Core Curriculum Training Survey
Appendix E
Summer Institute Survey
The Maine Reading First team greatly appreciates feedback on its professional development initiatives. Your responses to the questions below help us improve future events and more adequately meet the professional development needs of Maine educators. Thank you for taking time to complete this feedback form. **Please return completed forms to the registration table at the end of the Institute where you can obtain a certificate of your contact hours.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District:</th>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Location of Reading First Summer Institute:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bar Harbor</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>☐ Bar Harbor ☐ Portland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of years teaching including this year: 1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—10+

Highest level of educational attainment: ☐ less than 2 yrs. college ☐ BA/BS ☐ MA/MS ☐ 2 yrs. college ☐ MAT ☐ CAS ☐ M.Ed ☐ Ed.D./Ph.D.

Grade(s) currently teaching (circle all that apply): PreK—K—1—2—3—4—5—6—7—8—9—10—11—12

What type of certification do you hold? ☐ Conditional ☐ Provisional ☐ Transitional ☐ Professional

1. Please rate your knowledge of Institute topics and concepts, prior to the Institute and after attending the Institute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Limited Understanding</th>
<th>2 Some Understanding</th>
<th>3 Basic Understanding</th>
<th>4 Extensive Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonological Awareness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Research on the relationship of phonological and phonemic awareness to learning how to read</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Instructional practices and activities for teaching phonological awareness, particularly phonemic awareness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonological awareness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Differentiating phonological awareness instruction to meet students’ needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Alphabetic Principle and Phonics</strong></th>
<th>Rating Prior to Institute</th>
<th>Rating After Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Research base on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fluency</strong></th>
<th>Rating Prior to Institute</th>
<th>Rating After Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. Understanding of the components of fluency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Research base on the relationship of fluency to effective reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Instructional practices and activities for promoting fluent reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Ways to systematically monitor progress in fluency</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Differentiating fluency instruction to meet students’ needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Vocabulary

| p. Understanding of vocabulary development | Rating Prior to Institute 1 2 3 4 | Rating After Institute 1 2 3 4 |
| q. Research base on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| r. Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| s. Ways to systematically monitor progress in vocabulary development | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| t. Differentiating vocabulary instruction to meet students’ needs | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |

### Comprehension

| u. Knowledge of comprehension strategies that promote reading comprehension | Rating Prior to Institute 1 2 3 4 | Rating After Institute 1 2 3 4 |
| v. Research base on the relationship of comprehension to effective reading | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| w. Instructional practices and activities for teaching comprehension strategies | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| x. Ways to systematically monitor progress in comprehension | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |
| y. Differentiating comprehension instruction to meet students’ needs | 1 2 3 4 | 1 2 3 4 |

2. Please read each statement and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NA or Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. I gained new knowledge and/or skills that I can apply in my work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I reinforced knowledge/skills I already had.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The examples of instructional activities provided me with sufficient insight into how and when to apply the concepts/information presented.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. When participating in the sessions, I had an opportunity to learn from my peers.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Session presenters communicated information clearly and at a comfortable pace.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Session presenters were knowledgeable about their content and able to answer my questions.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The materials included in the Reading First Institute Binder contributed to my learning during the institute.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The materials included in the Reading First Institute Binder will serve as a resource to my instruction after the institute.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. The organization and time allotment for Institute sessions was adequate.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Overall, I found the Reading First Summer Institute to be a valuable professional development experience.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please respond to each of the following prompts.

The most positive features of the Reading First Summer Institute were . . .

Improvements that could be made to the Reading First Summer Institute are . . .

I would like additional professional development related to Reading First on the topic(s) of . . .

—Thank you for your participation.—
Appendix F
Summer Institute Survey: Frequency Tables (Aggregate)

Table 1a. Knowledge of Phonological Awareness Prior to the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1b. Knowledge of Phonological Awareness After the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences between phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, and phonics</th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2a. Knowledge of Alphabetic Principle and Phonics Prior to the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding n</th>
<th>Limited understanding %</th>
<th>Some understanding n</th>
<th>Some understanding %</th>
<th>Basic understanding n</th>
<th>Basic understanding %</th>
<th>Extensive understanding n</th>
<th>Extensive understanding %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2b. Knowledge of Alphabetic Principle and Phonics After the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding n</th>
<th>Limited understanding %</th>
<th>Some understanding n</th>
<th>Some understanding %</th>
<th>Basic understanding n</th>
<th>Basic understanding %</th>
<th>Extensive understanding n</th>
<th>Extensive understanding %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the definitions of the alphabetic principle and phonics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of the alphabetic principle and phonics to learning how to read</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching the alphabetic principle and phonics (letter sound knowledge, decoding, encoding)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in phonics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating phonics instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3a. Knowledge of Fluency Prior to the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the components of fluency</th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3b. Knowledge of Fluency After the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the components of fluency</th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4a. Knowledge of Vocabulary Prior to the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of vocabulary development</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in vocabulary development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating vocabulary instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4b. Knowledge of Vocabulary After the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of vocabulary development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of vocabulary to effective reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for promoting vocabulary development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in vocabulary development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating vocabulary instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5a. Knowledge of Comprehension Prior to the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of comprehension strategies that promote reading comprehension</th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of comprehension to effective reading</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching comprehension strategies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in comprehension</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating comprehension instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5b. Knowledge of Comprehension After the Institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of comprehension strategies that promote reading comprehension</th>
<th>Limited understanding</th>
<th>Some understanding</th>
<th>Basic understanding</th>
<th>Extensive understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research base on the relationship of comprehension to effective reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional practices and activities for teaching comprehension strategies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to systematically monitor progress in comprehension</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating comprehension instruction to meet students' needs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>