

Appendix

Reading First Year 6 Supplemental LEA Survey Responses

SECTION A: Background Information (faced by both Reading First and non-Reading First LEAs)

A1: What are your position(s)? Select all that apply.	Frequency
Superintendent	27
Assistant Superintendent	18
Reading First Coordinator	53
Director of Curriculum and Instruction	28
Other	28

A2: If you selected "Other" in question A1, please enter your position(s).

1. Coach
2. Curriculum Coordinator
3. Deputy Superintendent
4. Deputy Superintendent Curriculum and Instruction
5. Director Elementary Language Arts
6. Director Instructional Support
7. Director of Categorical Projects
8. Director of Educational Services
9. Director of Specialized Programs: GATE Reading First ECE Prof. Development and Student Events
10. District Literacy Coordinator
11. Early Childhood Education Program Director
12. ELA Coach
13. ELA Content Expert
14. Elementary Principal (x2)
15. Executive Director
16. Executive Director independent charter school
17. Executive Service Specialist
18. Intervention Teacher
19. K-3 Administrator (evaluator)
20. Principal (x5)

21. Principals--Dir. Curriculum/Testing/Categorical
22. Project Administrator K-8 ELA/
23. Projects Director
24. Reading Coach
25. Reading First Content Expert
26. Reading First Project Director
27. Reading First School Site Principal

SECTION B: Considerations in Deciding Whether or Not to Participate in Reading First
(faced by both Reading First and non-Reading First LEAs)

B1: How Involved were you in your LEA's decision to apply, or not apply, to the Reading First program?

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Not involved	20	20.0	7	21.9	27	20.5
Somewhat involved	19	19.0	6	18.8	25	18.9
Very involved	61	61.0	19	59.4	80	60.6
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

Items B2 through B21 have the following stem question: How positively or negatively were the following factors viewed when your LEA was considering whether or not to apply for Reading First funding?

B2: Funding to purchase curricular materials for a state-approved reading program

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	45	45.0	8	25.0	53	40.2
Moderately Positive	23	23.0	5	15.6	28	21.2
Did not play a Significant Role	23	23.0	10	31.3	33	25.0
Moderately Negative	1	1.0	1	3.1	2	1.5
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	2	6.3	2	1.5
Don't know	7	7.0	6	18.8	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B3: Funding for professional development

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	78	78.0	7	21.9	85	64.4
Moderately Positive	15	15.0	7	21.9	22	16.7
Did not play a Significant Role	1	1.0	10	31.3	11	8.3
Moderately Negative	0	0.0	2	6.3	2	1.5
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B4: Funding to support a reading coach

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	85	85.0	13	40.6	98	74.2
Moderately Positive	5	5.0	4	12.5	9	6.8
Did not play a Significant Role	4	4.0	6	18.8	10	7.6
Moderately Negative	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	2	6.3	2	1.5
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B5: Using the state-required 6 - 8 week skills assessments

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	40	40.0	2	6.3	42	31.8
Moderately Positive	24	24.0	3	9.4	27	20.5
Did not play a Significant Role	25	25.0	6	18.8	31	23.5
Moderately Negative	2	2.0	8	25.0	10	7.6
Extremely Negative	2	2.0	7	21.9	9	6.8
Don't know	7	7.0	6	18.8	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B6: Perceiving the Reading First program as being overly prescriptive

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	4	4.0	3	9.4	7	5.3
Moderately Positive	14	14.0	0	0.0	14	10.6
Did not play a Significant Role	44	44.0	3	9.4	47	35.6
Moderately Negative	22	22.0	6	18.8	28	21.2
Extremely Negative	7	7.0	13	40.6	20	15.2
Don't know	8	8.0	7	21.9	15	11.4
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B7: Requiring teachers to use a pacing schedule for coverage of the adopted program content

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	32	32.0	5	15.6	37	28.0
Moderately Positive	34	34.0	4	12.5	38	28.8
Did not play a Significant Role	20	20.0	12	37.5	32	24.2
Moderately Negative	5	5.0	1	3.1	6	4.5
Extremely Negative	2	2.0	4	12.5	6	4.5
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B8: Requiring a minimal amount of daily instructional time to implement the adopted core program

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	43	43.0	3	9.4	46	34.8
Moderately Positive	26	26.0	4	12.5	30	22.7
Did not play a Significant Role	17	17.0	15	46.9	32	24.2
Moderately Negative	5	5.0	1	3.1	6	4.5
Extremely Negative	2	2.0	3	9.4	5	3.8
Don't know	7	7.0	6	18.8	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B9: Requiring annual professional development for all K-3 teachers

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	58	58.0	6	18.8	64	48.5
Moderately Positive	24	24.0	3	9.4	27	20.5
Did not play a Significant Role	4	4.0	8	25.0	12	9.1
Moderately Negative	5	5.0	5	15.6	10	7.6
Extremely Negative	2	2.0	3	9.4	5	3.8
Don't know	6	6.0	7	21.9	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B10: Requiring time for teachers to plan lessons and review assessment results collaboratively

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	53	53.0	7	21.9	60	45.5
Moderately Positive	26	26.0	5	15.6	31	23.5
Did not play a Significant Role	10	10.0	12	37.5	22	16.7
Moderately Negative	3	3.0	1	3.1	4	3.0
Extremely Negative	2	2.0	1	3.1	3	2.3
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B11: Improving school performance on the state API and AYP measures

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	74	74.0	7	21.9	81	61.4
Moderately Positive	14	14.0	6	18.8	20	15.2
Did not play a Significant Role	4	4.0	11	34.4	15	11.4
Moderately Negative	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Don't know	7	7.0	6	18.8	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B12: Anticipating the effects of improved student achievement

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	76	76.0	9	28.1	85	64.4
Moderately Positive	16	16.0	5	15.6	21	15.9
Did not play a Significant Role	2	2.0	10	31.3	12	9.1
Moderately Negative	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B13: Anticipating the effects of improved English learner achievement

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	70	70.0	10	31.3	80	60.6
Moderately Positive	11	11.0	4	12.5	15	11.4
Did not play a Significant Role	10	10.0	9	28.1	19	14.4
Moderately Negative	3	3.0	1	3.1	4	3.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B14: Anticipating the effects of reclassification of English learners as FEP

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	50	50.0	8	25.0	58	43.9
Moderately Positive	15	15.0	4	12.5	19	14.4
Did not play a Significant Role	26	26.0	11	34.4	37	28.0
Moderately Negative	3	3.0	2	6.3	5	3.8
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did not respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B15: Anticipating the effects on achievement of students in special education

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	42	42.0	10	31.3	52	39.4
Moderately Positive	28	28.0	1	3.1	29	22.0
Did not play a Significant Role	22	22.0	13	40.6	35	26.5
Moderately Negative	2	2.0	2	6.3	4	3.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B16: Anticipating reduction in the number of students being referred to special education

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	47	47.0	10	31.3	57	43.2
Moderately Positive	23	23.0	2	6.3	25	18.9
Did not play a Significant Role	22	22.0	13	40.6	35	26.5
Moderately Negative	1	1.0	1	3.1	2	1.5
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't know	6	6.0	6	18.8	12	9.1
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B17: Perceiving reduced curricular flexibility due to exclusive use of adopted core programs

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	13	13.0	2	6.3	15	11.4
Moderately Positive	21	21.0	5	15.6	26	19.7
Did not play a Significant Role	32	32.0	7	21.9	39	29.5
Moderately Negative	22	22.0	4	12.5	26	19.7
Extremely Negative	4	4.0	8	25.0	12	9.1
Don't know	7	7.0	6	18.8	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B18: Requiring replacement of the existing reading program

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	14	14.0	2	6.3	16	12.1
Moderately Positive	15	15.0	1	3.1	16	12.1
Did not play a Significant Role	56	56.0	10	31.3	66	50.0
Moderately Negative	3	3.0	4	12.5	7	5.3
Extremely Negative	4	4.0	7	21.9	11	8.3
Don't know	8	8.0	7	21.9	15	11.4
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	1	3.1	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B19: Assisting teachers through professional development to use test data to guide instruction

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	55	55.0	7	21.9	62	47.0
Moderately Positive	28	28.0	8	25.0	36	27.3
Did not play a Significant Role	8	8.0	9	28.1	17	12.9
Moderately Negative	1	1.0	2	6.3	3	2.3
Extremely Negative	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Don't know	7	7.0	6	18.8	13	9.8
Did Not Respond	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B20: Responding to opinions of teachers in your LEA regarding Reading First

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	15	15.0	2	6.3	17	12.9
Moderately Positive	30	30.0	5	15.6	35	26.5
Did not play a Significant Role	35	35.0	13	40.6	48	36.4
Moderately Negative	9	9.0	1	3.1	10	7.6
Extremely Negative	1	1.0	4	12.5	5	3.8
Don't know	10	10.0	7	21.9	17	12.9
Did Not Respond	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

B21: Responding to opinions of parents in your district regarding Reading First

	District Type				Total	
	Reading First		Reading First Eligible		Frequency	Percent
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent		
Extremely Positive	13	13.0	2	6.3	15	11.4
Moderately Positive	18	18.0	4	12.5	22	16.7
Did not play a Significant Role	49	49.0	14	43.8	63	47.7
Moderately Negative	3	3.0	2	6.3	5	3.8
Extremely Negative	1	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.8
Don't know	14	14.0	9	28.1	23	17.4
Did Not Respond	2	2.0	1	3.1	3	2.3
Total	100	100.0	32	100.0	132	100.0

SECTION C: Reading Programs (faced by non-Reading First LEAs only)

Items C1 through C5 had the following stem question: What percentage of schools in your LEA use the following primary and supplemental reading programs for K-3?

C1: SRA/McGraw-Hill's Open Court Reading program	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	22	68.8
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
100%. All of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
Did not respond	8	25.0
Total	32	100.0

C2: SRA/McGraw-Hill's Foro Abierto para la lectura program	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	23	71.9
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
100%. All of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
Did not respond	9	28.1
Total	32	100.0

C3: Houghton-Mifflin's Reading: A Legacy of Literacy program	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	6	18.8
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	3	9.4
100%. All of our schools in K-3	16	50.0
Did not respond	6	18.8
Total	32	100.0

C4: Houghton-Mifflin's Lectura program	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	15	46.9
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	6	18.8
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
100%. All of our schools in K-3	5	15.6
Did not respond	6	18.8
Total	32	100.0

C5: What percentage of your schools use exclusively, either the SRA Open Court or Houghton-Mifflin reading programs for K-3 instruction?	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	6	18.8
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	2	6.3
100%. All of our schools in K-3	17	53.1
Did not respond	6	18.8
Total	32	100.0

C6: What, if any, other primary K-3 reading programs, professional development programs, and reading intervention programs, including programs designed for special education pupils and teachers, are being implemented in your LEA? Please list.

1. Accelerated Reader
2. Avenues
3. Avenues Program for EL intervention
4. Balanced Literacy -- Guided Reading using leveled texts from the school site Literacy Library
5. Cancionero
6. Columbia University
7. Comprehensive Language and Literacy Program (based on the Arkansas model of Linda Dorn)
8. Comprehensive Literacy Model
9. Corrective Reading
10. Corrective Reading for our special education
11. CRLP Front Loading
12. Destination Reading.
13. Different Ways of Knowing
14. DRA assessments
15. Early Literacy Groups
16. Elements of Reading Vocabulary
17. grades 4-8/Hampton Brown
18. grades 4-8/SRA
19. grades K-3/Hampton Brown

20. grades K-3/SRA
21. guided reading
22. Guided Reading as a strategy for Struggling readers
23. High Point Program for EK intervention
24. Intensive ELD training and coaching
25. Intensive vocabulary development
26. Intervention & Special Education Students - Reading Mastery
27. Language for Learning
28. Leap Frog Learning
29. literacy coach for Reader's and Writer's Workshop
30. Oracy and Oral Language
31. REACH Program for reading intervention
32. Read 180
33. READ Naturally
34. Reader's Workshop with professional development
35. Reading Mastery
36. Reading Mastery Program for reading intervention
37. Reading Workshop - Units of study developed by district Literacy Coaches
38. Reading Recovery
39. Renaissance Learning
40. resource teacher for individual and small group tutoring
41. SIPPS (x2)
42. Soar to Success
43. SRA Direct Instruction at all our K-3 regular and Special Ed classes.
44. SRA Reading Mastery +
45. SRA--Early Interventions in Reading
46. Staff Development from Teachers College
47. Step Up to Writing
48. Success for All Reading and Passport Voyager curriculum
49. Teachscape
50. UCLA Seeds literacy training
51. Voyager is used for those schools piloting the RtI Program at grades K-2.

52. Voyager Passport for our intervention at our PI schools

53. Waterford

SECTION D: Professional Development (faced by non-Reading First LEAs only)

Items D1 through D8 have the following stem question: What percentage of K-3 teachers in your LEA have, at any time in the last five year[s], participated in the following professional development opportunities?

D1:SB 472/AB466 40-hour institute	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	7	21.9
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	5	15.6
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	11	34.4
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	9	28.1
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0
Did not respond	0	0.0
Total	32	100.0

D2: SB 472/AB466 80-hour follow-up practicum	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	10	31.3
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	12	37.5
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0
Did not respond	2	6.3
Total	32	100.0

D3: 40-hour Advanced Institute focused on HM Reading or Lectura	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	17	53.1
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0
Did not respond	3	9.4
Total	32	100.0

D4: 4[0]-hour Advanced Institute focused on Open Court Reading or Foro Abierto	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	25	78.1
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0

Did not respond	5	15.6
Total	32	100.0

D5: 40-hour institute for English learners	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	14	43.8
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	3	9.4
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	3	9.4
Did not respond	3	9.4
Total	32	100.0

D6: 40-hour institute focused on special education instruction	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	20	62.5
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
Did not respond	4	12.5
Total	32	100.0

D7: Support for differentiation of reading instruction	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	7	21.9
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	9	28.1
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	9	28.1
Did not respond	2	6.3
Total	32	100.0

D8: Support for intensive reading intervention	Frequency	Percent
0% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	9	28.1
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	7	21.9
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
Did not respond	2	6.3
Total	32	100.0

SECTION E: Providers of Professional Development (faced by non-Reading First LEAs only)

Items E1 through E5 have the following stem question: What percentage of K-3 teachers in your LEA receive professional development from the following sources?

E1: Reading Implementation Center (RIC) at County Office of Education	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	13	40.6
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	9	28.1
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	3	9.4
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
Did not respond	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

E2: LEA	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	5	15.6
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	3	9.4
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	11	34.4
Did not respond	3	9.4
Total	32	100.0

E3: Private/External Provider	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	7	21.9
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
Did not respond	3	9.4
Total	32	100.0

E4: School site as provider	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	7	21.9
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
Did not respond	5	15.6
Total	32	100.0

E5: University as provider	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	50	
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	0	0.0
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	3	9.4
Did not respond	4	12.5
Total	32	100.0

E6: Other external providers, including for special education teachers (please list)

1. California State University Fresno
2. Columbia University (x2)
3. Diana Browing-Wright (TAASA--Through Accommodations All Students Achieve)
4. District Literacy Coaches
5. Fresno County Office of Education
6. GRA- Academic Improvement Model
7. Heidi Koski -Wld Trainer
8. Kevin clark ELD trainer
9. Los Angeles County Office of Education
10. PearsonLanguage!
11. Principals and Learning Directors
12. Region 7 Regional System of District and School Support
13. Saint Mary's College of California (CLLM Reading Recovery)
14. Springboard
15. Step Up to Writing (Sopris-West)
16. Teachers College
17. UC Davis (Reading Certificate Program)
18. UCLA

SECTION F: Coaching (faced by non-Reading First LEAs only)

F1: What percentage of K-3 teachers in your LEA have access to a reading coach?	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	5	15.6
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	11	34.4
Did not respond	0	0.0
Total	32	100.0

F2: What percentage of K-3 teachers in your estimation actually use a teacher coach?	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	8	25.0
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	11	34.4
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	1	3.1
Did not respond	0	0.0
Total	32	100.0

F3: What percentage of K-3 special education teachers in your LEA have access to a reading coach?	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	11	34.4
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	12	37.5
Did not respond	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

F4: What percentage of K-3 special education teachers, in your estimation, actually use a reading coach?	Frequency	Percent
0% None of our K-3 teachers	10	31.3
1% to 33% of our K-3 teachers	9	28.1
34% to 66% of our K-3 teachers	4	12.5
67% to 99% of our K-3 teachers	6	18.8
100%. All of our K-3 teachers	2	6.3
Did not respond	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

SECTION G: Reading Assessments (faced by non-Reading First LEAs only)

Items G1 through G4 have the following stem question: What percentage of schools in your LEA use the following types of assessments for K-3?

G1: Reading Lions/SCOE 6-8 Week Skills Assessments	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	26	81.3
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	4	12.5
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
100%. All of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

G2: Other publisher curriculum-embedded assessments	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	2	6.3
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	2	6.3
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	3	9.4
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	7	21.9
100%. All of our schools in K-3	17	53.1
Did not respond	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

G3: Teacher-created assessments	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	0	0.0
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	7	21.9
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	8	25.0
100%. All of our schools in K-3	16	50.0
Did not respond	0	0.0
Total	32	100.0

G4: Standards-based benchmark assessments	Frequency	Percent
0% of our schools in K-3	2	6.3
1% to 33% of our schools in K-3	1	3.1
34% to 66% of our schools in K-3	3	9.4
67% to 99% of our schools in K-3	4	12.5
100%. All of our schools in K-3	21	65.6
Did not respond	1	3.1
Total	32	100.0

G5: Other assessments (please list)

1. 4Sight Testing materials from SFA
2. Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) English and Spanish
3. DIBELS
4. Dibels is used by those schools involved in piloting the RtI Program.
5. DRA (x2)
6. Edusoft
7. EduSoft system
8. ELD Benchmarks
9. Houghton Mifflin
10. LitConn or the Literacy Connection reading tests/benchmarks
11. RESULTS

SECTION H: Instructional Strategies and Interventions (faced by non-RF LEAs only)

H1: What types of instructional approaches and early intervention strategies do you think would be most effective at improving the reading achievement of K-3 and special education pupils? Please list.

1. a 3-year K-1 program for those developmentally behind
2. additional phonemic awareness and phonics instruction
3. After/Before School interventions
4. Balanced approach to literacy with a combination of phonics and whole language
5. choral reading
6. classroom observations and demonstrations with debriefs
7. Classroom support to lower student numbers
8. Cooperative learning strategies and use of writing as a means of having students respond to instruction should be more part of the core rather than separate pieces or additional activities that are over and above the worksheet/workbook.
9. Diagnose the individual student's learning strengths/needs
10. differentiated instruction for strategic students.
11. Differentiated Instruction using Universal Access
12. differentiation of instruction as a regular classroom structure
13. Direct instruction
14. Direct instruction
15. early screening of visual/focusing problems
16. effective use of SST with accompanying training of parents to help at home
17. Explicit Direct Instruction
18. Explicit Direct Instruction Training
19. Extended day for extra reading support
20. extended time for intensive classes
21. flexible grouping
22. Flexible grouping
23. focus walks focused on Best Classroom Practices (i.e. checking for understanding rigor of program direct instruction interventions using data to direct instruction effective use of classroom time and interventions
24. front loading
25. Guided Reading

26. home visits
27. Improved teacher education programs to address the specific skills and needs of early literacy
28. Improved use of Instructional/Reading Coaches
29. Increased focus on differentiated instruction
30. individual tutoring in K-2
31. intensive classes
32. Intervention Strategies
33. K-3 Early Intervention as part of adoption materials
34. Lindamood Bell Phonemic Sequencing Strategies (LiPs)
35. Lindamood Bell Reading Strategies (Seeing Stars for Reading & Spelling)
36. Mandatory preschool for all students
37. monitoring of children's eating and sleeping habits etc.
38. More emphasis on data-driven instruction
39. More PD for principals in R/LA
40. occupational therapy
41. organize small groups of students with similar learning needs/potentials and when possible of similar age
42. Parent training in language development and self-care skills and nutrition for pre-k students
43. Pearson SuccessMaker Software
44. Provide all students with highly qualified adequately developed reading teachers and with curriculum that is likely to address the particular learning levels in a manner that is both challenging and engaging to all students.
45. provide an appropriate period of time with as few students and as much paraprofessional assistance as possible
46. Pullout with Reading specialist
47. reading at home programs
48. Response to Intervention--regular data analysis during collaboration sessions...
49. re-teaching based on assessment
50. Rituals and routines
51. SDAIE Strategies
52. Small group
53. Small group instruction

54. small group instruction based on needs and current levels 80% of the time. the other 20% should be whole class using common themes and discussions in the text.
55. Small group reading instruction differentiated to meet the needs of the students
56. Strategies/standards should be the emphasis of training rather than strict adherence to a particular set of stories
57. Systematic explicit instruction in phonemic awareness based on specific data results
58. Teachers understanding that direct instruction and use of the core does not equate to lack of educational freedom or rigor
59. The current structure is fragmented and not very efficient. A P-3 block would be much better and would close the achievement gap most effectively. We are going to do this unless the legislature stops us in favor of their own pork barrel interests which is more than likely. If it works and is in the best interest of children legislate against it I always say. Never pay attention to those who educate children for a living.
60. The use of a deployment model for ELD instruction
61. Thinking Maps
62. Thinking Maps
63. variety of materials tailored to their level but of high interest
64. We believe that the SRA Direct Instruction program addresses the needs of our students. It is structured learned which is used exclusively for intensive intervention students. It is also used for those students 2 or more years behind in grade level.
65. Write from the Beginning
66. Writing

SECTION I: Reading First Program: Perceptions (faced by Reading First districts only)

Items I1 through I27 have the following stem question: How has the Reading First Program been perceived in the following areas in your K-3 schools?

I1: Funding to purchase curricular materials for a state-approved reading program	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	55	55.0
Moderately Positive	26	26.0
Not much of an effect	17	17.0
Moderately Negative	0	0.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I2: Funding for professional development	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	68	68.0
Moderately Positive	29	29.0
Not much of an effect	1	1.0
Moderately Negative	1	1.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I3: Funding to support a reading coach	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	79	79.0
Moderately Positive	16	16.0
Not much of an effect	3	3.0
Moderately Negative	0	0.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I4: Using the state-required 6 - 8 week skills assessments	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	37	37.0
Moderately Positive	37	37.0
Not much of an effect	7	7.0
Moderately Negative	17	17.0
Extremely Negative	1	1.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I5: Perceiving the Reading First program as being overly prescriptive	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	4	4.0
Moderately Positive	27	27.0
Not much of an effect	25	25.0
Moderately Negative	41	41.0
Extremely Negative	2	2.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I6: Requiring teachers to teach the same content at approximately the same time	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	20	41.0
Moderately Positive	41	17.0
Not much of an effect	17	18.0
Moderately Negative	18	3.0
Extremely Negative	3	1.0
Did not respond	1	100.0
Total	100	

I7: Requiring a minimal amount of daily instructional time to implement the adopted core program	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	29	29.0
Moderately Positive	43	43.0
Not much of an effect	18	18.0
Moderately Negative	8	8.0
Extremely Negative	1	1.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I8: Requiring annual professional development for all K-3 teachers	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	39	39.0
Moderately Positive	49	49.0
Not much of an effect	3	3.0
Moderately Negative	8	8.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I9: Requiring time for teachers to plan lessons and review assessment results collaboratively	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	58	58.0
Moderately Positive	35	35.0
Not much of an effect	3	3.0
Moderately Negative	2	2.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I10: Improving school performance on the state API and AYP measures	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	64	64.0
Moderately Positive	22	22.0
Not much of an effect	12	12.0
Moderately Negative	1	1.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I11: The effect of the Reading First program on improving student achievement	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	58	58.0
Moderately Positive	31	31.0
Not much of an effect	9	9.0
Moderately Negative	0	0.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I12: The effect of the Reading First program on improving achievement for English learners	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	46	46.0
Moderately Positive	37	37.0
Not much of an effect	11	11.0
Moderately Negative	5	5.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I13: The effect of the Reading First program on reclassifying English learners as FEP	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	27	27.0
Moderately Positive	36	36.0
Not much of an effect	28	28.0
Moderately Negative	5	5.0
Extremely Negative	2	2.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I14: The effect of the Reading First program on improving achievement for students in special education	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	29	29.0
Moderately Positive	41	41.0
Not much of an effect	22	22.0
Moderately Negative	7	7.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I15: The effect of the Reading First program on reducing the number of students being referred to special education	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	27	27.0
Moderately Positive	41	41.0
Not much of an effect	24	24.0
Moderately Negative	6	6.0
Extremely Negative	1	1.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I16: The effect of reducing curricular flexibility due to the exclusive use of adopted core programs	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	11	11.0
Moderately Positive	28	28.0
Not much of an effect	23	23.0
Moderately Negative	30	30.0
Extremely Negative	7	7.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I17: The effect of requiring replacement of the existing reading program	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	17	17.0
Moderately Positive	21	21.0
Not much of an effect	53	53.0
Moderately Negative	4	4.0
Extremely Negative	3	3.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I18: Assisting teachers through the professional development to use test data to guide instruction	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	50	50.0
Moderately Positive	41	41.0
Not much of an effect	7	7.0
Moderately Negative	1	1.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I19: The opinion of teachers in your LEA regarding Reading First	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	22	22.0
Moderately Positive	50	50.0
Not much of an effect	15	15.0
Moderately Negative	8	8.0
Extremely Negative	3	3.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I20: The opinion of parents in your LEA regarding Reading First	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	26	26.0
Moderately Positive	31	31.0
Not much of an effect	33	33.0
Moderately Negative	3	3.0
Extremely Negative	5	5.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I21: The effect of the Reading First program on reading comprehension	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	43	43.0
Moderately Positive	44	44.0
Not much of an effect	10	10.0
Moderately Negative	0	0.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	3	3.0
Total	100	100.0

I22: The effect of the Reading First program on reading fluency	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	53	53.0
Moderately Positive	43	43.0
Not much of an effect	3	3.0
Moderately Negative	0	0.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I23: The effect of the Reading First program on student writing	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	19	19.0
Moderately Positive	45	45.0
Not much of an effect	21	21.0
Moderately Negative	10	10.0
Extremely Negative	3	3.0
Did not respond	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

I24: The effect of the Reading First program on spelling	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	35	35.0
Moderately Positive	48	48.0
Not much of an effect	12	12.0
Moderately Negative	4	4.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I25: The effect of the Reading First program on mastery of vocabulary	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	33	33.0
Moderately Positive	52	52.0
Not much of an effect	11	11.0
Moderately Negative	1	1.0
Extremely Negative	0	0.0
Did not respond	3	3.0
Total	100	100.0

I26: The effect of the Reading First program on student engagement (with a reduction in the number of behavioral issues)	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	31	31.0
Moderately Positive	39	39.0
Not much of an effect	24	24.0
Moderately Negative	4	4.0
Extremely Negative	1	1.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

I27: The consistency of the curriculum for students who move within the district to another RF school	Frequency	Percent
Extremely Positive	57	57.0
Moderately Positive	17	17.0
Not much of an effect	23	23.0
Moderately Negative	1	1.0
Extremely Negative	1	1.0
Did not respond	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

128. What have you found to be the greatest benefit of the Reading First program for pupils?

1. A common vision for reading/language arts
2. A consistent and cohesive research-based Reading Program.
3. A consistent approach for teaching phonemic awareness/phonics, (systematic)
4. A focused and structured program.
5. A systematic, standards based language arts program that provides high standards with pupil support. The RF program provides data for teachers to analysis to focus on student individual needs for the benefit of students.
6. Academic Conferences
7. ACOE tech support is excellent
8. Additional training provided by the grant at our three RF schools.
9. Additionally, funding allowed the district to purchase supplementary materials that were not part of the initial core purchase.
10. Adherence to scientifically based reading research
11. Administrator modules for principals to enable them to monitor instruction.
12. Along with exceptional instruction, using the skills assessment and obtaining data has allowed our teachers to differentiate instruction based on student needs. This process has lead to remarkable progress from our students, as reflect in local and state assessment data.
13. Also of benefit is the professional development provided to teachers, coaching and support staff, and availability of student materials.
14. Also the professional development teachers have received on the main 5 areas of reading
15. An assessment that focused on improving the instructional program!
16. Analyzing data (6-8 week assessments) to improve instruction
17. Articulation between Special Education and Regular Education when developing the RTI plan for at-risk students.
18. As the Assurances were fully implemented and became everyday instructional practices, we began to notice a change in our district. We were able to train teachers, follow up that training with coaching, use the same curriculum at all sites, follow a district pacing schedule and use on-going assessment to guide instruction. Expectations were raised for all stakeholders, from the superintendent to the students and everyone in-between! Student achievement improved which is the ultimate benefit of the Reading First Program.

19. Assurance of students receiving a systemic grade level standards reading curriculum and materials on a daily basis.
20. Assurances spelled out
21. Becoming a data driven district
22. Being able to provide sites with well-trained coaches who, through their preparation to reinforce summer institute training, to assist teachers in applying training within their own classroom, and to assist grade level teams in building instructional cohesion, have significantly increased teachers' and administrators' understandings about the teaching of reading .
23. better monitoring of student progress or lack thereof.
24. Boosts the awareness level of principals on beginning reading
25. Building our instructional capacity as a district!
26. California's Reading First Assurances!
27. CDE tech support is excellent
28. Clear expectations and monitoring of school progress
29. Coach and Content Expert Model- Building on a Community of Learners
30. coaches to support for teachers
31. coaching
32. Coaching Support
33. Coaching support for all teachers
34. coaching support for teachers
35. Coaching support to teachers to provide effective engaging instruction
36. Coherence and Consistency District wide
37. Coherence of program
38. Collaboration amongst the grade level team
39. collaboration between teachers
40. Collaboration regarding student data
41. Collaboration Time w/ Grade Level Meetings
42. Common assessments across district
43. common assessments for teacher collaboration and planning
44. Common Assessments/OARS computer program which facilitated a greater focus on use of data to guide instruction.
45. common language and routines
46. Consistency and equity of curriculum, instruction and expectations for student achievement.

47. Consistency in content and instruction
48. Consistency in lesson delivery
49. consistency of assessment K-3
50. Consistency of Assessments every 6-8 weeks
51. Consistency of curriculum, consistency of instructional routines and procedures, consistency of format across grade levels have reduced the amount of "cognitive capital" students are required to invest in figuring these things out each year and have opened up more opportunities for meaningful collegial conversation among teachers about meeting student needs and improving the quality of instruction.
52. Consistency of instruction for students who move frequently between schools.
53. Consistency of instruction K-3
54. consistency of instructional strategies & curriculum
55. Consistency of program across district
56. Consistency throughout the elementary schools.
57. Consistency, opportunities for intervention, being taught by teachers who have received staff development and who have strategies for fixing problems before gaps develop
58. consistent academic language and procedures across grade levels in ELA
59. consistent daily reading instruction & practice
60. Consistent, standardized implementation, directed instruction, Universal Access time every day coupled with in depth and ongoing professional development delivered and supported by Literacy Coaches has made a tremendous difference in the achievement of students attending RF schools. This is particularly true for our EL students, as we see the gap continue to narrow, and API continue to move forward.
61. Constant instruction
62. content expert
63. Continuity of program
64. CTAC modules and AB466 training
65. Curricular consistency
66. Data Analyses and monitoring
67. Data Based Decisions
68. Deep / Cognitive Lesson Planning
69. Developing teacher capacity through coaching strategies
70. Direct, Systematic, and Explicit Instruction.

71. District Wide Consistency
72. emphasis on collaboration
73. Encouraging/Supporting Administrators to be Instructional Leaders
74. Enhanced teacher and principal knowledge and rationale for the five essential reading components and the implementation of Universal Access.
75. equity of program for English Learners
76. Every school in the district whether Reading First or not is now focused on an aligned, coherent reading program. All teachers have received support through staff development and/or coaches. The rigor and level of student achievement is significantly higher than before Reading First. We will continue the program and hope that additional funding can be found.
77. everyone on the same page about understanding how to teach reading to different needs of pupils
78. Explicit and systematic instruction as an outcome of on-going collaboration and professional development focused on improvement for all students.
79. Explicit instruction
80. Explicit, direct instruction from curriculum
81. Familiar structure of the lesson format on a daily and weekly basis
82. Fidelity to the adopted curriculum.
83. Fidelity to the curriculum
84. Fidelity to the instruction
85. Five year grant period to support full implementation of major initiatives.
86. Flexibility to design our own annual training after Year 1 AB466 to focus on the specific needs of our own teachers and to incorporate lesson design and SDAIE strategies early on.
87. Focused instruction on the core program!
88. Formative assessment every 6-8 weeks.
89. Funding & Support to implement
90. Grade level collaboration - focused on data and instructional delivery
91. Grade Level Meetings
92. Having a coherent and consistent approach to the teaching of ELA. Students benefit greatly as they move from grade to grade and/or school to school and can immediately engage in the routines and procedures of ELA.
93. Having a district Reading Content Specialist
94. Having a literacy coach to support teachers - demos, analyzing data, and on-going support

95. Having Literacy Coaches at each site
96. Having the reading coach as a support system
97. Help with effective instruction and delivery of the reading program
98. high quality professional development
99. Higher expectations for student performance as a result of professional development and effective implementation of the core reading program.
100. Highly trained teachers (4 years of AB466/SB472)!
101. I see great benefits from consistent collaboration time for grade level teams, with an emphasis on looking at data, and making improvements in teaching in an effort to increase student achievement.
102. Improved instruction due to Reading Institutes, on-going site-based staff development, and models of grade level collaboration.
103. Improved student achievement, Improved student engagement
104. Improved/increased dialogue among educators focused on student improvement
105. Improvement in student scores on state tests
106. Improving the quality of teaching reading in a scientific approach
107. In addition to funds for regular professional development activities the teachers have said that the time they have to collaborate on analyzing assessment data identifying student needs and planning Universal Access/differentiated small group instruction that meets student needs has had the greatest impact on student achievement.
108. In addition, coaches have received on-going professional development on how to support teachers.
109. In addition, professional development, coaching, and detailed HM curriculum benefits our newest teachers.
110. Increased capacity of their teachers to deliver standards based instruction - greater opportunity to access standards and approach or reach grade level reading levels.
111. Increased Instructional minutes in reading instruction.
112. increased professional growth of staff through training and collaboration
113. Increased test scores across the board.
114. Inducting new teachers into a highly positive well laid out course of action in the teaching of reading.
115. Instruction is more consistent because of professional development and coaching.
116. Instructional coach support for teachers in using the adopted ELA curriculum

117. Instructional leadership support to principals
118. Instructional routines and strategies have benefited our students.
119. Literacy Coaches at sites
120. Literacy Coaches have been a key component to ensure fidelity and to raise the bar on instruction.
121. Literacy Coaches who provide on-going support, meeting facilitation, analysis of data, and support for improved teacher instructional strategies. The effect of coaches has been significant in implementing effective school practices.
122. mandated collaboration time
123. Money to support equipment to better analyze student data
124. Money to support professional development
125. Money to support supplemental materials in the classroom
126. Most of the benefit of the program for students is in the area of fluency and decoding skills.
127. universal Access for all students
128. Now that is everything that NCLB states is required and finally we had it provided to us!
129. OARS - very helpful
130. OARS data collection system
131. OARS data system which allows us to view trends over time.
132. Ongoing assessment
133. Ongoing support of teachers through Professional development and demonstrations from literacy coach
134. Ongoing Training
135. Our API scores went up and our CELDT redesignation has improved
136. Our students have benefited from improved instruction .
137. Our teachers are better prepared to give students a program of excellence.
138. Overall increased reading-language arts achievement.
139. Pacing of program
140. Pacing schedule
141. Peer coaching through CLASS Team model
142. principals required to know the ELA program.
143. Professional development

144. Professional development (regional/state level) for administrators/teachers/District
145. Professional development and collaboration time to maintain the focus on the essential best practices school-wide
146. Professional development for Administrators, Teachers and Coaches
147. Professional development for our teachers. Fidelity to the curriculum.
148. Professional development for teachers and consistency of program between classes and Reading First schools.
149. Professional development geared towards building teachers' skills
150. Professional development trainings
151. Professional growth - Reading Certificate program
152. professional learning for Reading First site administrators as it pertains to ELA instruction
153. professional learning opportunities for Reading First teachers (i.e., AB466/SB472 training, district-wide professional learning meetings for grade level teachers at Reading First schools)
154. progress monitoring emphasis
155. Provision of coaches
156. Reading First is a great model of program implementation from state (C-TAC) to county (R-TAC) to district to classroom!
157. refined delivery of language arts instruction
158. Regional and State Support from Bette Harrison & Roberta Nichols
159. Regional Meetings for networking
160. RF also provides a high quality professional development for all teachers to improve instruction to meet the varied needs of pupils in each classroom.
161. RTAC support
162. RTAC support for teachers, principals and school sites
163. SCOE assessments
164. skill assessments to use to guide instruction
165. Some of our principals never really bought in and would prefer their coaches to tutor instead of work in classrooms but the ones that maximized the coaching will see the long-term results
166. Special Events (e.g. Kevin Maddox)
167. Staff Development Component
168. Standardized assessment (Reading Lions)
169. Standards-based instruction

170. Standards-based instruction has led to increased early reading ability.
171. Structure and requirements to teach the program as it was designed. Academic equity and not allowing teachers to be independent practitioners.
172. Structure in many areas which leads to student achievement across the board. We hope we can continue the program indefinitely because we have seen so many positive changes. It has made a huge impact on our district!
173. Students have benefited from intentional, well planned and delivered instruction in reading skills and strategies. Teachers through training have been better able to provide consistently high quality instruction that has increased student achievement in our district.
174. support for teacher instruction through the demonstrations and modeling of the coach
175. Support from county to provide ongoing sustained highly quality professional development!
176. Support from RIC
177. support to the district from the RIC via the county office
178. systematic skills instruction
179. Systematic system for collecting and analyzing data which leads to improvement in student achievement
180. Teacher accountability and high expectations for student achievement
181. Teacher Collaborative Planning
182. Teacher collaboration
183. Teacher now have a much greater understanding of how students learn to read. They are now able to strategize and pinpoint problems students are having know how to help rectify the situation. Teachers know we expect them to use the adopted program. They are not at liberty to bring in materials that they 'feel' will help the kids. All teachers are held accountable for keeping up the pace for the language arts and reading instruction. The 'Reading First' program is the best program I've ever seen and this is my 30th year as an educator and my 20th year as an administrator. The money will go away but not the level of instruction my teachers will be able to give as a result of the training and coaching they have had.
184. teacher training
185. Teacher understanding of the adopted program.
186. Teachers and administrators overall felt the program was working
187. teachers' developing ability to utilize data to drive instruction

188. Teaching Reading in a very prescriptive manner has leveled the playing field across our schools. Kids are receiving a much stronger reading program at our RF schools, better PD, coaching, and overall support. I only wish that all elementary schools in our district could participate
189. Technical assistance, support, and guidance
190. That students are given equitable instruction regardless of which class they end up in. That the fluff and downtime are removed from instructional minutes.
191. The ability to develop preventative interventions around a common curriculum.
192. The ability to provide professional development and ongoing training for our teachers, has supplied them with the tools needed for successful implementation of the core curriculum.
193. The achievement of our students in the area of English Language Arts has consistently improved each year our district has been involved in the Reading First program.
194. The addition of a Reading (Literacy) Coach to assist teachers.
195. The additional funding for the Reading Coach position has been the greatest benefit. There is nowhere else in our limited budget to fund this significant position. That position has been the impetus for all the other assurances to be carried out with true fidelity.
196. The administrator training modules are wonderful.
197. The built-in accountability set the standard for Reading 1st schools and also for the entire district.
198. the coaches
199. The cohesive implementation of the HMRP across our 20 district schools utilizing RF pacing schedules
200. The consistency of instruction within grade levels and between schools. The focus is continually on improving the instruction to improve student achievement. Students receive more individual instruction based on their needs and are more engaged in the instructional process. Students believe they can learn!!
201. The consistency of the curriculum
202. The consistency of the curriculum and the pacing guide as we have a large transient rate
203. The consistency of the program for the students has been the greatest benefit
204. The consistency of the program from grades K-5.
205. The consistency of the program from school to school

206. the effectiveness of coaching support on implementation of program has been critical
207. The extensive training for teachers and the coach support
208. The greatest benefit for our students is they receive a consistent research-based program. The manner in which the content is delivered, within the routines and procedures, allows for students to have repeated exposures to the content.
209. The greatest benefit has been having a consistent ELA program district-wide
210. The greatest benefit of Reading First is that all students are presented with the same curriculum across the board. Every child is given the same opportunity to expand their vocabulary and at the same time increase fluency. Reading is one of the main pillars of education and we as educators need to instill that concept and promote learning and comprehension anytime anywhere. Focusing on state standards while promoting Reading First will ensure success for all students across the state.
211. The greatest benefit of the Reading First program for pupils is the full implementation of a researched-based reading program that creates consistency for all students within and across grades (in some cases across schools and districts.)
212. The greatest benefit of the Reading First program for pupils are the literacy coaches that provide teachers with ongoing, consistent professional development directly in their classrooms. This immediate professional development has a higher transfer of learning rate and has shown increase in student achievement.
213. The greatest benefit to the program is having a reading coach and grade levels covering the same material so there are no gaps in what the students learn.
214. The greatest benefit to the RF program is that ALL students receive the same curriculum and instruction. Previously teachers were using the materials in any way they saw fit. Students who moved within the school or district missed skills/concepts due to inconsistency between classrooms. The requirement to have fidelity to the program has helped quell issues of wanting to bring in "other" materials that would have supplanted the core curriculum.
215. The greatest benefit was the Professional Development opportunities.
216. The greatest benefits to our students have been consistency, focus on direct explicit instruction and improved teacher implementation thus improved student outcomes.
217. The guidance of the RF staff, their knowledge and support and willingness to help us "get there from here"
218. The impact that the Literacy Coaches have had on supporting teachers in the improvement of their instructional delivery, refine the use of strategies in

the classroom, and implementation of the learning received through the many professional development opportunities they have participated in.

219. The implementation of a consistent program for reading
220. The positive effect of the Reading First coaches supporting teachers, which in turn is the greatest benefit to students.
221. The presence of reading coaches.
222. The professional development is aligned with the core program and a strong emphasis has been placed on increasing student achievement through instructional reflection and change.
223. The Reading Coach working with teachers to pull data from testing and providing demonstration and modeling of core lessons. Focus on the most important parts of instructions
224. The Reading First program has been very beneficial to our district. We have been able to elevate the level of rigor for all students and provide our teachers with quality professional development and support from daily coaching.
225. The SCOE assessments were a difficult transition the first year but then the teachers really liked them and felt they provided good information about their students
226. The site administrators have also received extensive training to assist teachers and monitor student achievement.
227. The students are receiving a strong foundation in reading.
228. The systematic, explicit approach to reading instruction required from all teachers (for us, even in non-Reading First schools).
229. The teachers have developed an in-depth understanding of content knowledge and are better prepared to deliver lessons based on extensive and on-going staff development that is provided to all K-3 teachers by Reading First.
230. The teaching of sound/spelling cards
231. The time for teachers to collaborate has been useful.
232. The training for the teachers to teach the program consistently is beneficial as well.
233. The training of the Coaches and therefore the turnaround training of classroom teachers in using strategies and components of the reading program to enhance student achievement.
234. The training/support provided by the Reading Lions Center for our literacy coaches, teachers, and administrators has been highly effective.
235. The use of data to collaborate and develop action plans to meet student needs.

236. The use of scientifically based research strategies on the delivery of the lessons on a daily basis and the importance of implementing a comprehensive and cohesive program.
237. The use of the Sound/Spelling cards and the Universal Access for English learners.
238. There are many benefits of the Reading First program for students. The rigor of the instructional program which is used by all teachers, use of frequent assessments, data analysis and modification of instruction based upon assessment results have resulted in improved student achievement. The professional development provided by SB472 as well as district and site staff development provided by highly trained reading coaches help to ensure a deeper understanding of the reading process and a refinement of the core program.
239. There are many benefits for our students including but not limited to improved test scores, differentiated instruction with UA time, overall positive view of the spiral of skills, improvement in grade level fluency and comprehension
240. There is a consistent use of curriculum for all students within the district
241. They rise to the expectations that the teachers and the program set for them
242. trained teachers in the classroom
243. Use of assessments
244. Use of collaboration and data analysis
245. Use of data by teachers working together to improve reading.
246. Use of data to inform instruction has made teachers more aware of how to plan more succinctly for all students.
247. Use of the 6-8 week assessments and the colorful graphics produced by the online system have helped move teachers toward having more meaningful, data-driven conversations about their students.
248. using data from common assessments to inform instruction
249. Using test data to plan instruction.
250. We believe our AB 75/AB430 trained principals as well as our highly trained Literacy coaches drive the successes we have achieved in program implementation.
251. We were able to purchase the entire reading program.

SECTION J: Suggestions (faced by both RF and non-RF LEAs)

J1: What changes do you think would improve the Reading First program? Please list.

FROM THE NON-RF LEAs -

1. In recent years three of our 30 elementary sites, PI schools, have participated in the AB 466 training and have found it helpful in better understanding the use of the HM program materials. These sites continue to use the strategies (cooperative learning, writing, PLC, etc.) supported by the district to enhance their strong use of the core materials and HM training provided by AB46 All sites continue to use effective instructional strategies and support a strong use of the core material.
2. Allow schools who wish to participate to select their own materials and assessments that are appropriate for the students they serve. We are a dual language program following the 90:10 model. Reading First does not take into consideration the requirements and values of our program which is highly successful.
3. Allowing for flexibility in implementation of the adopted materials
4. Appropriate funding
5. Be more flexible with formative assessments district and schools already use rather than impose specific assessments.
6. Don't have the Reading First Program.
7. Having access for teachers that is within reach and at a convenient time.
8. I am not familiar with the particulars of the Reading First Program.
9. I am not interested in Reading First in any configuration. For a small district, the paper chase is far too cumbersome and demanding, and I don't have the staff to generate the supporting documents. Our district already performs items B2-B21 admirably without the Reading First money. This program is not for us, it is for large districts with a strong special interest lobby. I don't have time to contend with that. Thank you for asking though. And thank you for performing this survey. It allows other opinions to surface and be discussed most admirable indeed!
10. I do not have the program, nor were we allowed to apply for the funding.
11. I do not know enough about the program
12. I think the model is fine the way it is.
13. LEA allowed to select/deliver PD based on District needs
14. Less prescriptive in program and PD
15. Let the districts use their own benchmark assessments without addition of specific SCOE assessments which in a lot of cases is another layer of assessments. Some flexibility on staff development as well relative to required number of hours.
16. Mandate that PI District must use it without the OK of the union.
17. Mandatory 40 hour training each summer was the reason we did not pursue this grant.

18. Many of the Reading First requirements are very restrictive and the funding provided would not be adequate to fully meet the requirements of the program, thus becoming an encroachment on general fund and other categorical funds.
19. More flexibility to improve the perception of "do this this way, or else..." You folks are helping to beat up our staffs precisely at the time when they are already down... The process smacks of "the beatings will continue until the morale improves..." I would like to know if anyone really has read and analyzed my responses?
20. My district was not eligible for the Reading First program.
21. options for the assessment instruments, particularly if a district has their own
22. Our school is 78% ELD learners--in speaking with schools and consultants, ELD students were not as successful in reading First schools
23. The decision to not participate was made by this district about five years ago. At that time the district was making good progress, had full time reading specialists at all sites, core aligned pacing guides, assessments, and staff development, and no schools in PI. Upon investigation into the training and requirements, it was determine to not participate.
24. This is not applicable since we are not using it!
25. Unknown. We have not participated in the Reading First Program.
26. Use of the funds to respond to the needs of the students being served
27. We are a mid-sized district of about 1900 students and we simply do not have the staff to administer and manage all of the elements of the program and paperwork that goes along with a grant of this size. Great idea, but we would also like to see a little more flexibility (quite possibly we don't fully understand the flexibility available).
28. We do not use it.
29. Work with districts whose populations are mostly EL on a different approach to teaching children how to read in English with a focus on learning the English Language first.

J1: What changes do you think would improve the Reading First program? Please list.

FROM THE READING FIRST LEAs -

1. A definite factor that will impact the Reading First Program this coming fiscal year is the dramatic cut in funding. Our district, as well as most with whom we speak, identify the coaching model and Reading First, in general, as of the most important components in increasing student achievement. Continuity and the ability to sustain the program at a high level of

implementation which fosters success would be an important matter for the State to take into consideration during the current fiscal crisis.

2. A program that allows Districts to apply for Reading First funds for all underperforming schools (i.e., API levels 1 and 2 or schools not making AYP in language arts overall or in at least two subgroups
3. A program that covers the entire school and is fully funded
4. A suggestion would be to continue focusing on English learners access to the core.
5. Acknowledgement that with any core program there are gaps which need to be filled with other non-state approved materials to provide the strongest instruction program possible, i.e. writing and Open Court
6. Additional Coaching support
7. Additional funding - budget too tight, barely pays for training & coaches
8. Additional funding which would enable other eligible sites to participate and benefit from the assurances of Reading First.
9. Additional guidelines for students reading significantly below grade level. This should include professional development as well as materials that meet the needs of these students.
10. Additional help for RICs, they are spread thin
11. Additional support materials (HM) to "teach to the state test"
12. Adjusting the Pacing Guide to better meet our students' needs.
13. Administrator Institutes out of district w/ neighboring regional RF Districts Admin -- Time to train and network with other administrators and include Coach Coordinator or Lead Coaches w/some.
14. Allow for instructional flexibility to address discrepancies between some widely recognized and highly touted research-based "Best Instructional Practices" and the prescribed instructional delivery methods associated with "implementation with fidelity" required by Reading First
15. Allow for the work of Literacy coaches to include providing intervention for part of the time.
16. Allow Highly Qualified Teachers to teach reading standards through literature studies, research projects, and content area texts. In Reading First, students spend their day in skills- based practice. There is no connection to meaningful learning (reading and writing with purpose) or content areas (very few HM stories are expository). Reading First stifles the ability of teachers to teach cross-curricular based on content based themes. Brain research

has shown that students learn through Integrated Thematic Instruction. Houghton Mifflin is not a perfect program. Highly Qualified Teachers deserve to have the ability to think critically about how to best meet the needs of their students, they deserve to be passionate about their subject matter (It's difficult to be passionate about endless practice pages, there are many more engaging activities than worksheets.)

17. Allow more flexibility for assessment options.
18. Also a deeper focus on instructional strategies versus practice.
19. Also, there should have been a mandatory in-service for superintendent or whomever is the evaluator of the principals. If the principal is not held accountable for implementation or never learns to monitor, the coach coordinator is little more than a disseminator of information. Overall, the principals felt the program was having a positive impact on achievement, but the assistant superintendent decided to refuse funding due to all the resistance from the principals. One principal expressed that she wished we would have kept the program. I agree. I have never been a part of a program that provided such great support for all levels, from teachers to coaches to administrators. I was a first grade teacher, and I have learned so much about reading instruction and curriculum implementation through my work with Reading First. It was probably the most difficult two years of my career, but I truly benefitted on a professional level and am grateful for the opportunity!
20. Another suggested change would be to have the topics of staff development be completed and ready by March of the previous year to allow the participants to plan to attend the trainings.
21. As a small rural district who adopted Open Court and no other district around with Open Court, it became very difficult for us to get our teachers trained every year. We had to ask teachers to spend 5 days in a hotel room away from home during the summer vacation. We also have a problem getting substitutes and therefore it was very difficult to train teachers during the school day. I don't know what could have been done to change this.
22. Assessment needs to be revamped. The 6-8 Week measures were not always helpful. Consider having more choices for selecting a 6-8 week assessment system.
23. Assessments that are more closely tied to the standards, curriculum and STAR testing program
24. At least a 5 year grant commitment to make significant impact on school reform and student achievement
25. Be more realistic about time constraints and expectations. It must be streamlined to be realistic, without taking out important components.

26. Because of the lack of availability of local training, we had to spend a large portion of our grant money on travel expenses and accommodations for teachers who had to go far outside the area for their training.
27. Better collaboration with other Reading First Schools
28. bring principals together the way we bring coach coordinators and coaches to Institutes.
29. Broaden the amount of schools that have access to coaches & training to ANY school in danger of, or recently moved into PI status
30. Broader use of supplemental materials.
31. Closer monitoring of principal knowledge of core programs
32. Continue funding and provide additional support for districts with high English language Learner populations. Having the training available now, only after funding has been decreased is ineffective!
33. Continue multiple year funding so that schools can work for a 7 year period of time on improving quality of instruction and learner outcomes.
34. Continue to develop the high quality of professional development available for teachers.
35. Continue to fund the Grant! Expand it to include monies for a 4th and 5th grade Coach as well.
36. continued funding particularly for coaches.
37. Diagnostic testing
38. Differentiated training for principals, coaches, and teachers earlier on.
39. Differentiation for teacher institutes (to meet the teacher's learning needs)
40. Districts should be allowed to use their own evaluation tools to measure student achievement. Using the SCOEs was not effective especially since we have our own district wide benchmark assessments. The districts that have already focused on using data to direct instruction should be able to continue their practice. The county offices should have been more involved in the training of principals and/or district level administrators.
41. Encourage less use of workbook type materials and provide more student engagement.
42. Ensuring the support for Reading First districts remains the same, and an increase in funding for each classroom.
43. even more emphasis on small group instruction

44. Expand the coaching and the professional development to the intermediate grades so that the progress in student achievement can be sustained and grow.
45. Explicitly focusing on EL students as part of the assurances with specific expectations stated.
46. Extensive "coaching" training for coaches, not just program training
47. Fewer restrictions on funding expenditures and school identification for participation.
48. Five years into Reading First we can appreciate the cohesiveness, planning, pacing, staff development and the tools at our disposal for implementation but in the beginning the teachers were ready to revolt over the rigidity. How can we avoid the negative start up issues long enough so they can appreciate the end results?
49. Fund what is mandated!
50. Funding for a Reading First Coordinator.
51. funding insufficient, changes in funding caused problems, costs of testing and OARS passed on to districts,
52. Going beyond the "mechanics" of reading and infusing in children a love for reading!
53. Greater ease in getting district teachers certified to be trainers of AB466 or whatever the required training
54. Greater flexibility in the instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners.
55. Greater funding that fully covers the costs for personnel (coaches), professional development (including stipends) and assessments
56. Have principals attend regional RTAC meeting once a year in place of the Principal/Coach summit
57. Having local trainings available in our county to continue the annual and progressive training of all teachers.
58. Help us reduce the cost of new materials. I am dreading the E/LA adoption, since I am quite happy with our OCR materials. A new adoption is not likely to be significantly better and it will cost us millions. Can we get 7 year waivers for the adoption?
59. Higher per teacher allocation for funding.

60. I believe that the program is working well for our district, the only thing that would be of benefit is more support from the RTAC, which includes frequent visits and support as well as relative feedback pertinent to the needs of the school sites and reflective of the instruction seen.
61. I think all teachers should have intense 40 hour training from trained leaders their first year. 25 hours their second year and then topical the rest of the years within the program. Requiring 40 hours each year is what turned most teachers off to the whole thing. The 80 hours was just another reason to upset them. The first year or two it was beneficial then it just became mundane to them.
62. I think provisions need to be made for students in the upper grades.
63. I think the Leadership Series that was introduced this year is very effective and involves lead teachers in training by the RTAC Director. This is something that should continue. It works!
64. I think when the new ELA reading adoptions come out next year, the improved reading programs will make the biggest difference. The programs will include better materials for English Learners and interventions.
65. If more teacher institutes were offered in our area, it would better enable our teachers to attend. If the other resources that are available in Sacramento area were available to rural areas.
66. I'm very satisfied with the RF program and the great support we are receiving.
67. Improve the quality of principal reading-language arts leadership training.
68. improvement to the writing component
69. Include a progress monitoring system, like DIBELS, that would provide more ongoing data for those students experiencing difficulties.
70. Include training component for progress monitoring and targeted interventions.
71. Increase funding to allow each Reading First site to have a literacy coach.
72. increase resources to Grades 4-5
73. Increase the funding to include an additional reading coach at least in the first couple of year as we initiate the program.
74. Increased focus on independent reading in and out of class.
75. Integrate RtI into Reading First.
76. integration of ELL strategies

77. It has improved each year that it has been implemented. We need to remember the brain overload of OCR for first year teachers.
78. It has taken time to get the program up and running. I believe that the biggest improvement would be to have another year or two so that we can see the continued benefit of elements such as professional development with accountability, continued test data evaluation and the benefit of coaching.
79. It is a great program. None
80. It would have been helpful to require the principals to attend an orientation meeting with the state, and attend all events that the coach coordinator attended.
81. Less professional development from RTAC and CTAC and more hands on support
82. Less training for staff as they move into the later years of the grant
83. Maintain the level of funding for another 2-3 years (Cohort 3) to ensure the sites can sustain the principles/programs that result in student achievement
84. Making the curriculum (Open Court) age-appropriate would be an improvement
85. Making the funding an on-going event and expansion into the other grade levels.
86. modification of the Theme Skills Assessments
87. More accountability for schools with on-site coaching support
88. More attention to the real needs of our teachers and schools to provide support for our English Learners through the Reading/Language Arts program.
89. More choice in assessments.
90. More CLASS Team model support for teachers
91. More explicit direction for the teaching of English Learners.
92. More flexibility in implementation of annual staff development.
93. More focused Administrator professional development
94. More funding, extension of Grant
95. More funds for aides at the lower levels (K-1)

96. More of a web network to share ideas that are working -- that has been extremely valuable with our regional symposium started last year for Coordinators.
97. More relationship building for Coaches
98. More research into the affect of Direct Instruction and literature in elementary classrooms.
99. More support for dealing with negative staff
100. more support for engaging, worthwhile activities for larger group while small group is working with the teacher
101. More support for the ELL students.
102. More training on how to look at and use data to drive instruction
103. More visits and recognition of ideas and improvements.
104. More/continued long term funding to continue to support the systems change we have engaged throughout our district using the Reading First model as our template K-6 for both RF and non RF schools.
105. Most important a better approach and instructional strategies for English Learners. It was assumed that just teaching them to read in English would provide students with academic English and this is not true. We have had to develop our own lessons to supplement the adopted texts.
106. Most of the changes our district would like to see involve curriculum changes in the new adoption. Because of the way the Houghton Mifflin teachers' materials are set up, we had to train the teachers on Direct Instruction, instead of it being explicit in the Teachers Editions. We are looking forward to having the ELD materials included instead of just EL support. We are also hoping for Trimester Assessments from the publisher that are standards based to help teachers guide instruction and fill out standards based report cards.
107. Move coaching from the optional assurance to the mandatory.
108. Need to improve SCOE assessments
109. no diagnostic tests provided
110. No recommendations! This is a great program! Please continue to provide funding to support our efforts! We continue to implement according to the assurances and it does take time! Reading First makes a difference!
111. None. We find it to be working very well

112. Nothing! The Reading First program has greatly improved the academic achievement for our students.
113. One change would be to have the trainings and or staff developments in a 6 central locations. Utilizing Redding, Sacramento, Fresno, Bakersfield, Los Angeles and San Diego would maximize the exposure and allow each region and or school district to attend without spending so much on conference and travel.
114. Only minimal or minor changes, nothing significant or worth listing.
115. Open-forum Regional principal/coach networking meetings to report out what's working, what's not, allowing time for dialogue, and have question & answers
116. opportunities for school visitations
117. Our district is experiencing declining enrollment so funding has been reduced, but costs have risen. Providing dollars to off-set the rising costs of personnel and materials would be extremely helpful.
118. Our district is in Cohort one therefore being able to sustain the Reading First program with our coaches in place would be a great benefit to our student, teachers and district.
119. Our teachers would be more receptive to RF staff if a more "nurturing" approach was used when addressing the current practice. Things have improved this year tremendously.
120. Please continue your EL training!
121. PLEASE FULLY FUND THE PROGRAM, it is essential in order for us to continue the success we have already built. It would be a catastrophe to reduce funding and not have the adequate resources to continue effective practices for children. It would also impede our progress in meeting NCLB benchmarks.
122. Professional development for teachers in bilingual programs and teachers of English Learners
123. Professional Development opportunities are difficult to come by in the smaller districts. Because we are in an outlying area it is often difficult to find training opportunities nearby. Sending teachers out of town only adds to the cost and cannot be covered by the grant amount. It would be nice if the RICs were more localized. We are currently tied to the Los Angeles RIC center, but they are over 100 miles away and may offer only one training opportunity per year in our area, and only if there are large numbers to train.
124. Professional development that directly addresses common pitfalls across districts

125. Provide a diagnostic assessment to use for identifying specific technical skill deficits in struggling readers
126. Provide Districts that have successfully implemented the Reading First Program with documented positive student achievement results for six years with on-going funding for continued on-going professional development.
127. Readers/writers Workshop alignment with grade level standards.
128. Reading First has been the catalyst for change in our district. Reading First provides parameters for good teaching.
129. Reading First, specifically for California, must assist teachers as they continue to support the foundational coaching model as we transition from our current ELA adoption to our new ELA adoption to be implemented in 2010.
130. Realize that the research used in the formation of the program, while sound, is not definitive. Provide LEAs with more flexibility in implementation.
131. Reduce the cost of SCOEs
132. Reliable comprehension tests that can be measured within the curriculum
133. Requirement of a plan to address the need to develop principals as instructional leaders of the reform while teachers and coaches grow.
134. rethinking the theme tests--there is too much variability between the tests which are in series at a particular grade level
135. revisions to the 6 week assessments to more closely align the state test and the core taught during the unit.
136. Send the best Reading First Coaches to the neediest schools. Mediocrity never suits well with schools with 90% ELL and high levels of Socio-Economic students.
137. Some kind of classroom teacher institute or summit once a year to honor them and get their full buy-in?
138. Some of our principals never really bought in and would prefer their coaches to tutor instead of work in classrooms. They did not like the district oversight of the program, so there was a lot of conflict between district and site administration.
139. Some training or web based communication provided for those schools in outlying areas.
140. Spanish normed fluency tests

141. specific support for troubleshooting pervasive issues, such as: combination classrooms, half-day kindergarten, and intensive instruction for students very far below basic
142. Stronger materials for English language learners
143. Stronger professional development for teachers in years 3 and 4
144. Stronger publisher materials that are standards-based
145. students are not given time or permission to read at their independent level for the hours of practice it takes to become a proficient reader beyond the classroom instructional period.
146. Teacher institutes spread out throughout the year.
147. Teacher/student friendly writing rubrics
148. Teachers became frustrated when RTAC would conduct walk throughs with their checklist on a clipboard. The focus became the program and being on the same page on the same day rather than on teaching to the standards.
149. Teachers struggle with the intervention component of the program and I believe more training is necessary in this area.
150. testing has errors and is not significantly standards-based,
151. Thank you Reading First, it has been good for all our students.
152. The Kindergarten books are sometimes numbered 0 as the first page. Why?
153. The on-going and ever deepening training clearly has been a critical component. Relying upon face to face as the sole delivery mechanism doesn't deal with the reality of peoples' lives. even if many (and maybe most) would prefer to go to a 'live' series, some would be well served by moving training components into web-based versions.
154. The only thing that I would say is we need more time and funding to sustain or institutionalize these practices so they become our way of teaching.
155. The pictures in the Kindergarten and first grade materials are not very clear. Many times students and teachers cannot figure out what a picture is.
156. The program has focused on teachers, effective instruction and student improvement because those are factors within a classroom teachers control, however adding expectations for schools to increase parent education could be a helpful component.
157. The RF program is fantastic with wonderful support from CTAC and RTAC providers. We are an HM school and the greatest problem for us was the

poorly laid out teachers manuals which really does cause difficulties for teachers and substitutes.

158. The rubrics need to be better aligned to the ELA Framework.
159. The state to adopt additional materials for ELD and English learners
160. The theme assessments need to be more rigorous and better aligned to the California Standards Tests.
161. The writing assessment situations need to be consistent and cohesive across the grades.
162. There are many mistakes and typos in the teacher's editions.
163. Training for coaches to be for longer periods only a couple of times a year.
164. Trainings should be district conducted after year 1 so allow for a district focus and not a generic presentation. This district focus could be driven by district needs and data.
165. Visits to the school sites that have made the most growth and have the same demographics.
166. Waiting until 4th-5th graders are 2 years behind is a huge mistake! Early intervention is a much better model. By 4th-5th grade a pattern of failure has been established. Bring back the reading recovery teachers and literacy support specialists to K-1 grade classroom.
167. We are in our 5th year of RF and it seems like the professional development that is offered is limited as we get deeper into the years we have participated in RF. Teachers would like to have more options that meet their needs for the initial 40 hours of PD that is required each year.
168. We feel students need to master concepts instead of spiraling throughout the grades, commonly referred to as the hit and miss approach.
169. We have been challenged to provide the mandated training with the amount of money provided
170. We still struggle with the AB466 professional development piece. Being an OCR District makes it difficult for our teachers to access local training, so the expense of sending our people out of the area is overwhelming,
171. Web based communication in enrolling coaches etc to restrictive and cumbersome....all else good. Except of course increased funding would be nice.