Curriculum Associates®

September 24, 2025

Arizona Department of Education
Attn: MOWR Review Committee
1535 West Jefferson Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

RE: Assurance of Training Requirements for *i-Ready Assessment & Personalized Instruction*

Dear MOWR Review Committee:

On behalf of Curriculum Associates, LLC (Curriculum Associates), I would like to thank the MOWR Review Committee for the opportunity to share our updated intervention guidance for ***i-Ready Assessment & Personalized Instruction***.

This letter serves as formal assurance that our training sessions will include:

1. **Explicit Teacher-Led Instruction:**
   All training modules will incorporate and emphasize the use of explicit, teacher-led instructional strategies. Educators will be guided on how to implement these practices effectively within their classrooms to support student learning outcomes.

2. **Alignment with Arizona Instructional Minute Requirements:**
   Arizona teachers will receive comprehensive training on how to utilize our program in a manner that meets the Arizona Department of Education's required instructional minutes. This includes clear guidance on scheduling, pacing, and integration of our resources to ensure compliance with state mandates.

Curriculum Associates remain committed to supporting Arizona educators with high-quality, standards-aligned training and resources, and we look forward to our continued collaboration with MOWR. Should you require any additional documentation or clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,



Erin Rush
VP, Adoptions and Proposals
Curriculum Associates, LLC

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Each reading intervention program will be scored using a rubric. A response must meet **all** the criteria in each scored area to be included on the K-3 MOWR vetted reading intervention program list. Peer Review will be noted but does not disqualify overall approval.

Study: Impact Evaluation of Reading i-Ready for Striving Learners Using 2018-2019 Data

Date of Study: published on 12/10/2020; academic year of study was 2018-2019

Grade Levels of Study: 2nd-5th

Reading Intervention Program's Marketed Name: i-Ready Assessment and Personalized Instruction

	Rating or Measure Select: Y or N	Rationale
ESSA Evidence Tier	Y	Tier 2 ESSA
Independent Researchers (Y/N)	Y	The research was conducted by the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) and Century Analytics. HumRRO is an independent research organization that specializes in program evaluation and quantitative methodology. Century Analytics is a small business with various education research expertise including quasi-experimental design and What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) standards.
Established Measure (Y/N)	Y	i-Ready® Diagnostic (Diagnostic) was used as both the baseline and outcome measure for all students participating in this study (i.e., i-Ready students and comparison group students). Limitation- our treatment group was compared to a matched comparison group using the Diagnostic. It is possible that use of the Diagnostic itself increases student achievement. However, the design of this study did not allow for an estimation of that impact. Use of the Diagnostic only schools and students as a comparison group may have attenuated the effects of i-Ready use had this treatment group been compared to a "business as

		usual" comparison group. Future studies might examine the impact of i-Ready using a set of comparison schools and students not implementing any Curriculum Associates products. This would require an external achievement measure, potentially a state assessment, as the baseline and outcome measure.
Sample Size	Y	Grade 2 (i-Ready)= 11,464 students Grade 2 (comparison)= 11,464 students Grade 3 (i-Ready)= 14,965 students Grade 3 (comparison)= 14,965 students Two populations of striving learners were examined at each grade – those who tested two or more grade levels below their current grade in reading at baseline and a subset of these students who fell at the bottom 20th percentile of reading achievement.
Research Design	Y	Quasi-experimental design (QED) using academic year 2018–19 i-Ready data to evaluate the impact of i-Ready reading instruction on student reading achievement for striving learners in grades 2–5 on a nationally normed cognitive assessment. Questions: What is the impact of *i-Ready* usage on student reading achievement for striving learners in schools that implement *i-Ready* compared to striving learners in schools that implement the Diagnostic only? What is the impact of *i-Ready* usage on student reading achievement for striving learners at the bottom 20th percentile in schools that implement *i-Ready* compared to these striving learners in schools that implement the Diagnostic only? Do Black or African American striving learners experience similar impacts of *i-Ready* use on student reading achievement compared to striving learners overall? Do striving learners of Hispanic origin experience similar impacts of i-Ready use on student reading achievement compared to striving learners overall? For a student within a treatment school to be eligible for inclusion, they must have used *i-Ready* for reading a minimum of 18 distinct weeks for an average of at least 30 minutes per week

		(Curriculum Associates, 2018). This was consistent with guidance on the minimum *i-Ready* usage at the student-level for attaining intended goals of improved student reading achievement. Treatment schools were only included if they began using *i-Ready* to some extent prior to the 2018–19 school year. To be eligible for inclusion as a student in a comparison school, students must not have used any *i-Ready* for reading in 2018–19. Prior to the onset of this study, we defined a striving learner as one who tested two or more grade levels below their current grade at baseline. Each student is assigned a grade- classification based on their Diagnostic score. Only students assigned a classification of two or more grade levels below their current grade were included in our study. We also identified students at the lowest 20th percentile of reading achievement at baseline as a subset of striving students to examine. First, we conducted school-level matching to identify a set of *i-Ready* (treatment) and a set of comparison schools from which to match students. Next, we conducted student-level matching with students within the selected matched schools to identify a set of *i-Ready* students and comparison students equivalent on reading achievement, as measured by the Diagnostic.
Outcome	Y	For all grade levels, the adjusted mean differences were positive and statistically significant, indicating the *i-Ready* group earned higher reading scores than the comparison group. We consider the reading effect sizes for all grades modest for an education intervention. This includes striving learners who tested two or more grade levels below their current grade in reading achievement at baseline, and a subset of these students who fell at or below the 20th percentile in reading achievement. At each grade, striving learners who received *i-Ready* performed statistically significantly better on the reading Diagnostic than those in a comparison group.

Table 1. Impact Analysis Results for Striving Learners of i-Ready (Treatment) Schools Compared to Striving Learners of Comparison Schools for Reading Student Achievement at Grades 2–5

Grade	Group	Schools	Students	Diagnostic Mean	Diagnostic SD	ICC	Adj Mean Diff (SE)	*p*-value	Effect Size	Improvement Index
2	*i-Ready*	1,281	11,464	449.60	41.15	0.14	4.98 (0.70)	<.0001	0.12	4.78
	Comparison	1,253	11,464	444.62	39.31					
3	*i-Ready*	1,443	14,965	482.40	44.22	0.14	6.25 (0.61)	<.0001	0.14	5.57
	Comparison	1,404	14,965	476.15	43.49					
4	*i-Ready*	1,558	12,397	495.64	46.32	0.12	5.30 (0.64)	<.0001	0.12	4.78
	Comparison	1,502	12,397	490.33	45.25					
5	*i-Ready*	1,716	22,448	531.56	46.13	0.14	5.60 (0.52)	<.0001	0.12	4.78
	Comparison	1,682	22,448	525.97	44.86					

Notes: ICC = intraclass correlation, SD = standard deviation of Diagnostic scores, Adj Mean Diff = adjusted mean difference between *i-Ready* and comparison groups, SE = standard error of the adjusted mean difference, and Effect Size = Hedge's *g*.

Table 2. Baseline to Outcome Change in Reading Diagnostic Performance for Striving Learners in i-Ready (Treatment) Schools Compared to Comparison Schools at Grades 2–5

Grade	Group	Schools	Students	Diagnostic Baseline Mean	Diagnostic Outcome Mean	*Baseline to Outcome Gain*
2	*i-Ready*	1,281	11,464	394.87	449.60	54.73
	Comparison	1,253	11,464	395.09	444.62	49.53
3	*i-Ready*	1,443	14,965	433.85	482.40	48.55
	Comparison	1,404	14,965	434.25	476.15	41.90
4	*i-Ready*	1,558	12,397	456.39	495.64	39.25
	Comparison	1,502	12,397	457.11	490.33	33.22
5	*i-Ready*	1,716	22,448	498.67	531.56	32.89
	Comparison	1,682	22,448	499.86	525.97	26.11

Although the gain scores were calculated by subtracting the baseline mean from the outcome mean, the difference between the gain scores of the two study groups does not provide an accurate or model-based estimate of the impact because they do not adjust for covariates. Please refer to Table 1 above for the impact estimates.

Further, this study suggests *i-Ready* is equally effective for Black or African American striving learners as it is for all striving learners. The study also suggests *i-Ready* is equally effective for striving learners of Hispanic origin at grades 2, 3, and 4 as it is for all striving learners. Therefore, Black or African American striving learners in the *i-Ready* group performed better than Black or African American striving learners in the comparison group, and striving learners of Hispanic origin in the *i-Ready* group performed better than striving learners of Hispanic origin in the comparison group.

A positive Hispanic origin by treatment interaction suggests students of Hispanic origin at grade 5 benefited more from i-Ready than students not of Hispanic origin. Similar to the results of other grades, striving learners of Hispanic origin at grade 5 performed better than striving learners of Hispanic origin in the comparison group. In addition, the positive interaction indicated striving learners of Hispanic origin in the i-Ready group saw greater benefit from i-Ready than students in the i-Ready group who were not of Hispanic origin. In other words, i-Ready provided additional benefit to Hispanic origin treatment group students over and above what it provided to other striving

		learners. Because we only saw this impact in one of the four grades examined, we recommend Curriculum Associates conduct additional studies to examine the impact of i-Ready on striving learners of Hispanic origin to determine if this was an anomaly or a meaningful finding.
Effect Size	Y	*Table 1. Impact Analysis Results for Striving Learners of i-Ready (Treatment) Schools Compared to Striving Learners of Comparison Schools for Reading Student Achievement at Grades 2–5* Grade | Group | Schools | Students | Diagnostic Mean | Diagnostic SD | ICC | Adj Mean Diff (SE) | *p*-value | Effect Size | Improvement Index 2 | *i-Ready* | 1,281 | 11,464 | 449.60 | 41.15 | 0.14 | 4.98 (0.70) | <.0001 | 0.12 | 4.78 Comparison | 1,253 | 11,464 | 444.62 | 39.31 3 | *i-Ready* | 1,443 | 14,965 | 482.40 | 44.22 | 0.14 | 6.25 (0.61) | <.0001 | 0.14 | 5.57 Comparison | 1,404 | 14,965 | 476.15 | 43.49 4 | *i-Ready* | 1,558 | 12,397 | 495.64 | 46.32 | 0.12 | 5.30 (0.64) | <.0001 | 0.12 | 4.78 Comparison | 1,502 | 12,397 | 490.33 | 45.25 5 | *i-Ready* | 1,716 | 22,448 | 531.56 | 46.13 | 0.14 | 5.60 (0.52) | <.0001 | 0.12 | 4.78 Comparison | 1,682 | 22,448 | 525.97 | 44.86 *Notes:* ICC = intraclass correlation, SD = standard deviation of Diagnostic scores, Adj Mean Diff = adjusted mean difference between *i-Ready* and comparison groups, SE = standard error of the adjusted mean difference, and Effect Size = Hedge's *g*. *Table 3. Impact Analysis Results for Striving Learners at the Bottom 20th Percentile of i-Ready (Treatment) Schools Compared to these Striving Learners of Comparison Schools for Reading Student Achievement at Grades 2–5* Grade | Group | Schools | Students | Diagnostic Mean | Diagnostic SD | ICC | Adj Mean Diff (SE) | *p*-value | Effect Size | Improvement Index 2 | *i-Ready* | 1,241 | 9,392 | 444.58 | 41.17 | 0.14 | 5.10 (0.77) | <.0001 | 0.13 | 5.17 Comparison | 1,204 | 9,426 | 439.47 | 39.21 3 | *i-Ready* | 1,355 | 9,809 | 468.99 | 44.47 | 0.14 | 7.24 (0.75) | <.0001 | 0.17 | 6.75 Comparison | 1,280 | 9,784 | 461.75 | 43.10 4 | *i-Ready* | 1,499 | 9,925 | 488.19 | 46.64 | 0.11 | 5.19 (0.71) | <.0001 | 0.11 | 4.38 Comparison | 1,426 | 9,961 | 483.00 | 45.53 5 | *i-Ready* | 1,598 | 11,715 | 509.26 | 47.80 | 0.12 | 5.39 (0.69) | <.0001 | 0.12 | 4.78 Comparison | 1,492 | 11,707 | 503.87 | 45.41 *Notes:* ICC = intraclass correlation, SD = standard deviation of Diagnostic scores, Adj Mean Diff = adjusted mean difference between *i-Ready* and comparison groups, SE = standard error of the adjusted mean difference, and Effect Size = Hedge's *g*. ***Table 5. Summary of Black or African American by Treatment Interactions, by Grade*** Grade | Group | Schools | Students | Interaction Coefficient | *p-value* 2 | *i-Ready* | 808 | 7,306 | -1.95 | 0.276 Comparison | 629 | 5,201 3 | *i-Ready* | 952 | 10,096 | -0.51 | 0.709 Comparison | 716 | 7,292 4 | *i-Ready* | 1075 | 8,796 | 1.02 | 0.491 Comparison | 764 | 5,992 5 | *i-Ready* | 1,228 | 16,615 | -0.97 | 0.362 Comparison | 858 | 11,414 ***Table 6. Summary of Hispanic Origin by Treatment Interactions by Grade*** Grade | Group | Schools | *Students* | *Interaction Coefficient* | *p-value* 2 | *i-Ready* | 856 | 8,218 | 0.06 | 0.966 Comparison | 676 | 6,087 3 | *i-Ready* | 989 | 11,185 | 0.77 | 0.495 Comparison | 773 | 8,321 4 | *i-Ready* | 1,123 | 9,507 | 1.95 | 0.112 Comparison | 812 | 7,002 5 | *i-Ready* | 1,260 | 17,495 | 1.74 | 0.046 Comparison | 894 | 12,619
*MTSS Level of Support	Y	Tier 2 & Tier 3
*Peer Review (Y/N)	N	

MOWR Committee findings:

-Will continue to be on the MOWR Intervention Program Vetted List