



ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Each reading 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 program list. Peer Review will be noted but does not disqualify overall approval.

Study: Evaluation of Curriculum Associate's Literacy Portfolio by i-Ready

Date of Study: 2023–2024 school year

Grade Levels of Study: K-5

Core Program's Marketed Name: Curriculum Associates/Literacy Portfolio by i-Ready

	Rating or Measure Select: Y or N	Rationale
ESSA Evidence Tier	Y	Although this evaluation employed a quasi-experimental design, based on guidance provided by The Institute for Education Science, it is likely to meet Tier 3 evidence standards (not Tier 2).
Independent Researchers (Y/N)	Y	Curriculum Associates contracted with LiCalsi Education Evaluation Consulting to conduct an independent quasi-experimental evaluation. Christina LiCalsi, Ph.D.
Established Measure (Y/N)	Y	Student performance was measured with Curriculum Associates' fall and spring i-Ready Diagnostic for Reading assessment.
Sample Size	Y	20,635 comparison students, the 20,635 students who used a Learning Portfolio program, and the full sample

Table 1
Student Baseline Characteristics by Literacy Portfolio Use

Baseline Characteristic	Comparison Students		Literacy Portfolio Users		Full Sample		Standardized Difference
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Grade							
K	2,416	11.71	2,416	11.71	4,832	11.71	--
1	3,326	16.12	3,326	16.12	6,652	16.12	--
2	3,878	18.79	3,878	18.79	7,756	18.79	--
3	3,793	18.38	3,793	18.38	7,586	18.38	--
4	3,725	18.05	3,725	18.05	7,550	18.05	--
5	3,497	16.95	3,497	16.95	6,994	16.95	--
Gender							
Male	9,492	46.0	3,669	17.8	13,161	31.89	-0.635
Female	9,445	45.8	3,532	17.1	12,977	31.44	-0.649
Missing	1,698	8.2	13,434	65.1	15,132	36.67	1.462
Race							
Black	1,864	9.0	2,045	9.9	3,909	9.47	0.030
White	10,444	50.6	3,632	17.6	14,076	34.11	-0.743
Asian	942	4.6	90	0.4	1,032	2.50	-0.267
American Indian/Alaskan	215	1.0	374	1.8	589	1.43	0.065
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	71	0.3	0	0.0	71	0.17	-0.083
Two+ Races	1,384	6.7	1,062	5.1	2,446	5.93	-0.066
Missing	5,704	27.6	13,432	65.1	19,136	46.37	0.810
Disabled							
Yes	1,773	8.59	1,486	7.20	3,259	7.90	-0.052
No	9,883	47.89	5,712	27.68	15,595	37.79	-0.426
Missing	8,979	43.51	13,437	65.12	22,416	54.32	0.444
English Learner							
Yes	1,331	6.45	1,504	7.29	2,835	6.87	0.033
No	9,226	44.71	19,126	92.69	28,352	68.70	1.209
Missing	10,078	48.84	5	0.02	10,083	24.43	-1.380

Research Design

Y

EQ1) What is the effect of participating in one or more of The Literacy Portfolio programs on (a) students' overall spring Diagnostic assessment score, (b) students' spring phonics Diagnostic subscale score (Grades K–2 only), (c) students' spring comprehension Diagnostic subscale score (Grades 3–5 only), (d) the likelihood that students met their Typical Growth target, and (e) the likelihood that students met their Stretch Growth target?

This evaluation uses a matched comparison design to estimate the effect of Literacy Portfolio program usage by pairing each student in a school that used Literacy Portfolio programs with a similar student in a school that did not, and comparing spring literacy Diagnostic assessment outcomes for the two groups

The evaluation examined the effect of Literacy Portfolio program use on three main spring literacy outcomes: (1) students' average overall spring Diagnostic assessment scores, (2) the percentage of students who met Typical Growth targets, and (3) the percentage of students who met Stretch Growth targets. Typical Growth and Stretch Growth targets are targets for spring assessment scores that are based on students' fall scores and informed by

		the distribution of fall-to-spring student score gains. The evaluation also examined the effects of The Literacy Portfolio on two important subscales: phonics (for Grades K–2 only) and comprehension (for Grades 3–5 only).
Outcome	Y, however Spring Score (SD units) Effect size of .138 is considered small to moderate positive effect size but statistically robust due to sample size. The strongest effect is on Spring Score ($\beta = 0.138$), suggesting Literacy Portfolio use has its clearest impact on overall achievement rather than growth probabilities. Met Typical Growth of .080 is considered small effect size. Met Stretch Growth of .094 is small-to-moderate.	Literacy Portfolio students scored nearly seven points higher on the spring Diagnostic assessment ($b = 6.963$, $SE = 0.889$), representing a difference of approximately 14 percent of an SD. Literacy Portfolio users were also eight percentage points more likely to meet Typical Growth targets ($b = 0.080$, $SE = 0.009$) and 9.5 percentage points more likely to meet Stretch Growth targets ($b = 0.094$, $SE = 0.010$) compared with matched comparison students. All effects are of a substantial magnitude and are statistically significant at the 0.01 level, providing strong evidence that Literacy Portfolio use results in improved literacy outcomes for students. Literacy Portfolio students in Grades K–2 also performed more than nine points better on the iReady spring Diagnostic assessment phonics subscale ($b = 9.458$, $SE = 1.505$), and nearly six points better on the comprehension subscale in Grades 3–5 ($b = 5.768$, $SE = 0.911$). These findings suggest that use of Literacy Portfolio programs has a substantive positive effect on both early foundational skills and later reading comprehension
Statistical Significance	Y	Effects were positive and statistically significant at the < 0.01 level for every outcome and across every subgroup of students.
Effect Size	Y	The overall standardized effect size was 0.138 SD units, with students in the earliest grades experiencing the largest effects—0.240, 0.177, and 0.163 SDs for Grades K, 1, and 2 students, respectively.

		Effects were largest for students who began the year with the lowest literacy scores—0.155 SDs, and students who attended schools in the lowest-income neighborhoods—0.265 and with the poorest average literacy levels—0.185 SDs.
*Peer Review (Y/N)	N	Not stated

The Literacy Portfolio by i-Ready® includes the following programs: adaptive and Diagnostic Literacy Tasks, Magnetic Foundations™, Magnetic Comprehension™, Ready® Reading, Ready Writing, i-Ready Personalized Instruction, Phonics for Reading®, and Teacher Toolbox.

MOWR Review Committee Findings:

-Will be added to MOWR Vetted Core List contingent on assurances that trainings will include utilization of explicit teacher led instruction and that AZ teachers will be trained on how to utilize the program to meet the AZ required minutes for core reading instruction.