

Elgin Independent School District
(Fiscal Agent)

Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR)

Final Report
October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2017

Prepared By Zajonc Corporation
Kyle D. Barrington, Ph.D. and Joel Whitt, M.A.

Published
October 2017

Note: This Report is not an evaluation of the efficiency or efficacy of the Program staff. The Report is evaluating Program services as described in the Original Application for Grant Award.

Executive Summary

This summative Final Evaluation Report (Report) is intended to assess the extent by which the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (i.e., STAR), operated by the Elgin Independent School District (EISD), has progressed towards or achieved its goals and objectives as anticipated under its U.S. Department of Education (ED) Grant Award. This Report provides information to STAR and EISD personnel so that STAR operations may be optimized versus STAR's goal of improving students' literacy. The Report is limited to those EISD campuses and facilities participating in the STAR Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant (IALG), specifically: (1) Neidig Elementary (NES); (2) Booker T. Washington Elementary (BTW); (3) Elgin Elementary (EES); (4) Elgin Middle School (EMS); and (5) Elgin High School (EHS). Each of these campuses are located within, or very near, the boundaries of the City of Elgin. The STAR Project was funded for two full years; however, in order to allow the Project to achieve all of its original goals a no-cost extension was approved allowing for a third year of STAR services utilizing unspent funds remaining after Year One and Year Two.

Over the life of the grant, the STAR Project worked to implement evidenced-based programs and practices that involved parents, teachers, students, and community stakeholders. As reading is a fundamental to all school successes, EISD was dedicated to improving literacy over the life of the grant and implemented evidence-based practices that targeted literacy enhancement through access to resources and professional development. Specifically, EISD proposed and implemented a project that contained multiple reading/literacy components: (1) Increase the number of EISD parents who read to their new born children (modeled after the Reach Out and Read program) by collaborating with local pediatricians; (2) Increase a student's interest and engagement in reading by providing each child with a new book each month (modeled after the Imagination Library program); (3) Increase preschool teachers' use of evidence-based practices, specifically dialogic reading, via school professional development (PD) opportunities; (4) Increase campus library utilization by enhancing the collection and

technology at each campus library; and (5) Increase the integration of school library resources into the classroom by providing extensive PD opportunities for all R/ELA (Reading and English-Language Arts) teachers.

The STAR Evaluation Plan was designed to address six (6) Project-related research questions: (1) The extent that the implementation of STAR R/ELA the STAR Logic Model/Management Plan (i.e., implemented as it was intended); (2) The extent that participants (e.g. students, parents, community partners, teachers, library staff, principals, etc.) received the intended intensity and duration of services; (3) The number of participants utilizing the different STAR services; (4) The extent that STAR participants are satisfied with the services received; (5) The extent the STAR services result in improved outcomes; and (6) The extent that participants receiving STAR services improved on the targeted outcomes compared to non-STAR participants in a comparison group based on the use of the Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL).

In addition to the six (6) Project-related research questions, the Grant Performance Reporting Act (GPRA) required that each U.S. Department of Education STAR IALG includes four (4) required Outcome Performance Measures that are reported directly to Congress: (1) The percentage of 4-year-old participants who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) The percentage of participating 3rd-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the state's R/ELA assessments under section 1111(b) (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA); (3) The percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the state's R/ELA assessments under section 1111(b) (3) of the ESEA; (4) The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the state's R/ELA assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. In the body of this Report the results of all Outcome Measures, both Project-related and GPRA-related, are presented and analyzed.

As presented in the following report; the STAR Project made many enhancements to each EISD campus library. The Project showed positive outcomes from the strategies implemented and where possible, EISD has sustained the successful strategies with local funding

into the 2017-2018 school-year. EISD plans to continue to track and support of the enhancements at the campus libraries and in the classrooms, that have occurred because of the IAL funding.

This Final Evaluation Report focuses on the goals, objectives, performance measures, and outcomes identified in the original proposal and subsequent amendments. Year One focused largely on the acquisition of resources as designed by the project for campus libraries and the Reach Out And Read Program. Additionally, towards the end of Year One and during Year Two Professional Development was provided to teachers to encourage their coordination between the classroom and the library. During Year Two the Project was fully implemented with all materials purchased during Year One. However, costs were lower than originally projected and start-up delays allowed for a partial Year Three at no additional cost. The U.S. Department of Education allowed the Project to utilize all unused Year One and Year Two funds in a Third Year. This was truly beneficial to the students at EISD and allowed for additional support of the strategies implemented and found successful in Year One and in Year Two.

This report is summative and inclusive of the most current available data for each goal, objective, and performance measure. This report includes the final outcomes for each GPRA Measure and Project Measure. It is the intent of this report to identify the Projects successes and short-comings and final outcomes of the Project.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction to the Report.....	5
II. Focus of the Evaluation.....	6
III. Overview of Evaluation Goals and Objectives.....	7
IV. Definitions and Key Terms.....	11
V. Presentation of Evaluation Results	13
<i>Background</i>	15
<i>Goal One: Increase Utilization of Campus Libraries by Faculty, Students, and Parents. ...</i>	17
Data Collection	17
<i>Evidence of Progress</i>	17
Output Measures	17
Outcomes	19
<i>Analysis</i>	46
<i>Goal Two: Improve Literacy Skills</i>	48
Data Collection	48
<i>Evidence of Progress</i>	48
Output Measures	48
Outcomes	51
<i>Analysis</i>	70
<i>Conclusions</i>	70
VI. Supplemental Information	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<i>Unanticipated Outcomes or Benefits</i>	72
<i>Changes to the Logic Model and Evaluation Plan</i>	73
<i>Demographics</i>	<i>Error! Bookmark not defined.</i>
Supplemental TOPEL Findings	73
<i>Statistical Significance Testing: Methodology and Results for Year One</i>	73
Statistical Significance Testing: Methodology and Results for Year Two.....	80
<i>Statistical Significance Testing: Methodology and Results for Year Three</i>	87
<i>Year Two Focus Groups</i>	94

I. Introduction to the Report

This summative Final Evaluation Report (Report) is intended to assess the extent by which the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (i.e., STAR), operated by the Elgin Independent School District (EISD), has progressed towards or achieved its goals and objectives as anticipated under its U.S. Department of Education (ED) Grant Award. This Report provides information to STAR and EISD personnel so that STAR operations may be optimized versus STAR's goal of improving students' literacy. The Report is limited to those EISD campuses and facilities participating in the STAR Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant (IALG), specifically: (1) Neidig Elementary (NES); (2) Booker T. Washington Elementary (BTW); (3) Elgin Elementary (EES); (4) Elgin Middle School (EMS); and (5) Elgin High School (EHS). Each of these campuses are located within, or very near, the boundaries of the City of Elgin. The STAR Project was funded for two full years; however, in order to allow the Project to achieve all of its original goals a no-cost extension was approved allowing for a third year of STAR services utilizing unspent funds remaining after Year One and Year Two.

Over the life of the grant, the STAR Project worked to implement evidenced-based programs and practices that involved parents, teachers, students, and community stakeholders. As reading is a fundamental to all school successes, EISD was dedicated to improving literacy over the life of the grant and implemented evidence-based practices that targeted literacy enhancement through access to resources and professional development. Specifically, EISD proposed and implemented a project that contained multiple reading/literacy components: (1) Increase the number of EISD parents who read to their new born children (modeled after the Reach Out and Read program) by collaborating with local pediatricians; (2) Increase a student's

interest and engagement in reading by providing each child with a new book each month (modeled after the Imagination Library program); (3) Increase preschool teachers' use of evidence-based practices, specifically dialogic reading, via school professional development (PD) opportunities; (4) Increase campus library utilization by enhancing the collection and technology at each campus library; and (5) Increase the integration of school library resources into the classroom by providing extensive PD opportunities for all R/ELA (Reading and English-Language Arts) teachers.

II. Focus of the Evaluation

The focus of this evaluation is to track the STAR Project's final achievements towards its six (6) Project-related research questions: (1) The extent that the implementation of STAR R/ELA the STAR Logic Model/Management Plan (i.e., implemented as it was intended); (2) The extent that participants (e.g. students, parents, community partners, teachers, library staff, principals, etc.) received the intended intensity and duration of services; (3) The number of participants utilizing the different STAR services; (4) The extent that STAR participants are satisfied with the services received; (5) The extent the STAR services result in improved outcomes; (6) The extent that participants receiving STAR services improved on the targeted outcomes compared to non-STAR participants in a comparison group.

In addition to the six (6) Project-related research questions, the Grant Performance Reporting Act (GPRA) required that each U.S. Department of Education STAR IALG includes four (4) required Outcome Performance Measures that are reported directly to Congress: (1) The percentage of 4-year-old participants who achieve significant gains in oral language skills; (2) The percentage of participating 3rd-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the state's

R/ELA assessments under section 1111(b) (3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA); (3) The percentage of participating 8th-grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the state’s R/ELA assessments under section 1111(b) (3) of the ESEA; (4) The percentage of participating high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the state’s R/ELA assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. In the body of this Report the results of all Outcome Measures, both Project-related and GPRA-related, are presented and analyzed.

III. Overview of Evaluation Goals and Objectives

STAR had two major Program Goals and each Goal had one or more Program Objectives and Outcomes. The resultant six Program Objectives and 19 Program Outcomes (including the four Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA] Performance Measures required of every IAL Grant Program) are shown in **Table 1** and **Table 2**, respectively. Note that the Program’s Goals, Objectives, Outcomes, and Outputs are discussed using a labeling system that refers to Goal 1 Objective 1, for example, as 1.1; and refers to Goal 1 Objective 1 Outcome 1, for example, as 1.1-1; and refers to Goal 1 Objective 1 Output 1, for example, as 1.1.1 throughout this Report.

Table 1. STAR Program Goals and Objectives	
<i>Goal</i>	<i>Objective</i>
Goal One: Increase utilization of campus libraries by faculty, students, and parents.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decrease the age of the EISD campus library collection by adding 600 new books at each campus library. 2. Increase the quantity of technology offered at each campus library. 3. Increase EISD Reading and Language Arts faculty’s knowledge of how to use the new library resources through annual professional development (PD) at each campus.
Goal Two: Improve literacy skills.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recruit local area pediatricians or family practitioners to help implement the Reach Out and Read (ROR) Program. 2. Provide age and culturally appropriate books to students in EISD’s preschool through 3rd grade classrooms.

Table 1. STAR Program Goals and Objectives	
<i>Goal</i>	<i>Objective</i>
	3. Provide professional development (PD) opportunities for EISD Reading and Language Arts faculty in the use of Dialogic Reading (DR).

Table 2. STAR Project Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Goal One: Increase utilization of campus libraries by faculty, students, and parents.
Objectives and Outcomes

Goal 1, Objective 1, Outcome 1 (1.1-1): Decrease the collection age at each EISD campus library in the areas of Social Sciences, Language, Literature and Rhetoric, Technology, Geography and History, and General Fiction by 15% as measured by the Baseline Collection Analysis Report collected prior to Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure) and compared to the collection age at each EISD campus library at the end of the Project.

Goal 1, Objective 1, Outcome 2 (1.1-2): Increase the total number of faculty, students, and parents who utilize the library collection by 10.0% as measured by the annual *Library Utilization Reports* compared to the baseline established in Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure) at the end of the Project.

Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 1 (1.2-1): Increase the number of up-to-date computers at each campus by 35.0% as measured by the *Technology Replacement Report* at the end of the Project compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 2 (1.2-2): Increase the number of computers at each campus (desktop, tablet, etc.) that have continuous access to the Internet by 35.0% as measured by the *Technology Accessibility Report* at the end of the Project compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 3 (1.2-3): Increase the number of multimedia devices at each campus that supplement reading and literacy development by 35.0% as measured by the *Multimedia Device Inventory Report* at the end of the Project compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 4 (1.2-4): Increase the number of EISD faculty, students, and parents who utilize the library technology by 20.0% as measured by the *Library Utilization Report* at the end of the Project compared to the Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 1 (1.3-1): Increase, by 75.0%, compared to August 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), the number of PK – 3rd Grade Reading and Language Arts (R/ELA) faculty who are provided professional development (PD) on how to utilize the new library resources as measured by the PD Sign-In Sheets in August 2017.

Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 2 (1.3-2): Increase by 50.0%, compared to January 2015 (i.e., the Baseline Measure) the number of R/ELA faculty who integrate their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology) as measured by the *Library Utilization Survey*.

Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 3 (1.3-3): Increase the number of 3rd grade students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading assessment from the 2013-2014 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

GPRA Measure

Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 4 (1.3.4.): Increase the number of 8th grade students who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading assessment from the 2013-2014 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure). **GPRA Measure**

Table 2. STAR Project Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes

Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 5 (1.3-5): Increase the number of high school students who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading assessment from the 2013-2014 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure). . **GPR**
A Measure

Goal Two: To improve literacy skills
Objectives and Outcomes

Goal 2, Objective1, Outcome 1 (2.1-1): Increase the number of parents who are provided books that they can read to their children by 50.0% from May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the ROR Distribution Log.

Goal 2, Objective 1, Outcome 2 (2.1-2): Increase the number of parents who read aloud to their children by 20.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the *Family Reading Survey*.

Goal 2, Objective 1, Outcome 3 (2.1-3): Increase the oral language skills of 4-year-old children participating in the ROR program by 10.0% from the 2014-2015 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL). **GPR**
A Measure

Goal 2, Objective 2, Outcome 1 (2.2-1): Increase the number of elementary school students who have books in their homes by 50.0% from the 2013-2014 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure)., as measured by the *Imagination Library Distribution Log*.

Goal 2, Objective 2, Outcome 2 (2.2-2): Increase the number of parents who read aloud to their children each week by 20.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the *Family Reading Survey*.

Goal 2, Objective 3, Outcome 1 (2.3-1): Increase the number of Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade Reading and Language Arts faculty trained in DR by 80.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the DR Survey.

Goal 2, Objective 3, Outcome 2 (2.3-2.): Increase the number of minutes PK thorough 3rd Grade children are exposed to DR instruction each week by 25.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the DR Survey.

Goal 2, Objective 3, Outcome 3 (2.3-3): Increase the number of 3rd grade students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STARR) reading assessment by 20.0% compared to 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

IV. Definitions and Key Terms

To assist the readers of this Report, STAR definitions are delineated here.

- 1. Grant Year One:** The time period from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015.
- 2. Grant Year Two:** The time period from October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016.
- 3. No Cost Extension:** The time period from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017.
- 4. Project Period:** The time period from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2017.
- 5. Output Measure (Output):** The actual number of student/clients served or the level of services provided during an identifiable period of time. In short, something that can be counted.
- 6. Project Targeted Output:** The total targeted output number expected to be completed and/or served during the Project Period.
- 7. Total Performance To Date:** The total output number completed and/or served to date (i.e., since the STAR started in October 2014 through a specific date, like this reporting Period).
- 8. Percent of Project Targeted Output To Date:** Total Performance To Date divided by Project Targeted Output, expressed as a percentage.
- 9. Outcome Measure (Outcome):** What STAR expects to achieve in terms of a quantifiable outcome, such as degree of change (e.g., a 10% increase or a decrease of an identified behavior or attitude) from the **Baseline Measure** by the end of a service intervention or by the end of an identifiable period of time.
- 10. Baseline Measure:** A measure obtained from STAR participants, or about the actual program, before STAR services were implemented. An example would be the percent of 3rd grade students meeting or exceeding proficiency in reading on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) before starting STAR Project services.

11. GPRA Performance Measures: US Depart. Of ED requires grantees of every IAL Grant to measure their program’s performance on four specific Government Performance and Results Act [GPRA] Performance Measures, which provide ED a way to create and monitor fiscal accountability for its federal programs.

12. Reporting Period: The time period from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2017; also known as Project Period.

V. Presentation of Evaluation Results

Over the life of the IALG (i.e., October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2017), evaluation data were continuously gathered to report on the progress towards meeting the two STAR Goals and six STAR Objectives. Below, STAR’s performance for each of the two Goals is discussed in detail in five sections under each Goal: “Background;” “Data Collection;” “Evidence of Progress;” “Analysis;” and “Conclusions.” The “Background” section includes general information about the original need and root causes that led to IALG funding. “Data Collection” follows and explains how the data are being collected for the Output Measures (Outputs). The actual Output Measure (Output) data for each STAR Goal is presented next in a table in the “Evidence of Progress” section, which also includes a table of Outcomes for each STAR Goal/Objective by year. The purpose of the Output Measures data table is to delineate what STAR expected to achieve versus the actual performance of all the processes (i.e., services and activities) as outlined in the original application for an Innovative Approaches to Literacy Grant. In this section of this Report the annual Output and Outcome data and performances are discussed, along with the Baseline Measure data. Following the “Evidence of Progress” section is the evaluation and assessment of the data in a section entitled “Analysis.” The final section, entitled “Conclusions,” identifies all conclusions determined as a result of the project’s performance and through the delivery of evidence-based practices originally proposed in the Project’s grant application. As indicated in the original Proposal and previous annual reports many of the performance measures were targeted by year. Many measures were focused on completion during Year One and were not included in subsequent years. If these measures were successfully completed in Year One they have been identified as completed for the Project as

funding was limited and the majority of funding was focused on library and technology purchases.

Background

The Elgin Independent School District (EISD) is located primarily in Bastrop County, Texas, with a small portion of the district’s catchment area extending into Travis County, Texas. EISD is a 157-square mile district in Central Texas, approximately 40 miles due east of Austin, Texas. EISD is home to 19,879 residents of which 4,150 of these residents are students attending EISD. Ethnically the student population is comprised of **54.9%** Hispanic or Latino, **28.5%** White, and **13.3%** African-American with the remaining **3.3%** considered “other” (i.e., Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, or two or more races). Further, the school district is considered “high-need” as, per the Texas Education Agency (2014), **70.8%** of all EISD students are considered “economically disadvantaged” and, according to the 2012 Census, **25.4%** of all families living in the school district are living in poverty. In addition, **47.6%** of all EISD students have one or more identifiable conditions (e.g., failed a grade, teen parent, etc.) that place them “at-risk” of educational failure (TEA, 2014). With this myriad of issues, it is not surprising that, academically, EISD is struggling to raise the overall academic standards and performance of its students and that its leadership is concerned about the academic achievement gaps between subgroups of students. For example, EISD students identified as “White” performed at or above the State of Texas averages in the number and percentage that passed the 2013 *State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness* (STAAR), the state’s mandated achievement test, while the results showed significant achievement gaps between other student subgroups. For example, Hispanics are **22.5%** and African-Americans are **27.5%** less likely to pass all STAAR tests compared to their White counterparts. These academic achievement gaps also persist when analyzing EISD’s college readiness skills as Hispanics are **65.0%** more likely to drop out of school and are **15.6%** less likely to be college ready in the areas of English and Math upon high

school graduation while African-American students are 45.0% more likely and 53.3% less likely, respectively when compared to their White peers. Despite these difficulties, EISD is making headway under the direction of the new EISD Superintendent. In the past year, third grade reading levels, as measured by the *State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR)*, have increased while the district's dropout rate has decreased (TEA, 2014). Under the direction of the new Superintendent and the dedicated and highly-trained staff, EISD has the documented capacity to provide for, improve upon, and expand services that address the needs of all the youth it serves. However, to continue this trend of academic attainment and standards EISD understands that it needs to continue to develop programs and practices that are evidenced-based and involve more parents and community stakeholders. Further, as reading is fundamental to all school successes, EISD is dedicated to improving literacy using evidenced-based practices that more fully utilize campus libraries. Specifically, EISD proposed and is implementing a project containing multiple reading/literacy components: (1) Increase the number of EISD parents who read to their newborn children (modeled after the *Reach Out and Read* program) by collaborating with local area pediatricians; (2) Increase a student's interest and engagement in reading by providing each child with a new book each month (modeled after *Imagination Library* program); (3) Increase preschool teachers' use of evidenced-based practices, specifically *dialogic reading*, via school PD opportunities; (4) Increase campus library utilization by enhancing the collection and technology at each campus library; and (5) Increase the integration of school library resources into the classroom by providing extensive PD opportunities for all R/ELA (*Reading and English-Language Arts*) teachers. The EISD Project is entitled *Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR)*.

Goal One: Increase Utilization of Campus Libraries by Faculty, Students, and Parents.

Data Collection

Training and PD data were provided to the STAR Program Evaluator by the STAR Grant Director in the form of training logs upon completion and reviewed annually. Library resources and usage data were provided to the Program Evaluator by the STAR Grant Director through library, technology, and multimedia reports.

Evidence of Progress

Output Measures

To determine the intensity and duration of STAR services, the STAR Program Evaluator established *Output Measures* (Outputs) to assist STAR to track its progress. Output data collection began the moment the STAR Project was awarded its ED Grant Award. **Table 3**, below, documents STAR’s final performance towards each of the targeted outputs over the life of the Project.

Table 3. STAR Output Measures (Outputs)			
Output Measures (for STAR Goals and Objectives)	Project Targeted Output	NCE Actual Performance	Percent of Project Targeted Output Achieved
1.1.1. Number of new books, titles, and periodicals purchased for each campus.	NES – 600	NES – 968	NES – 161.3
	EES – 600	EES – 1,150	EES – 191.7
	BTW – 600	BTW – 759	BTW – 126.5
	EMS – 600	EMS – 810	EMS – 135.0
	EHS – 600	EHS – 1,806	EHS – 301.0

Table 3. STAR Output Measures (Outputs)

Output Measures (for STAR Goals and Objectives)	Project Targeted Output	NCE Actual Performance	Percent of Project Targeted Output Achieved
1.2.1. Number of SmartBoards purchased for each campus.	NES – 1	NES – 1	NES – 100.0
	EES – 1	EES – 1	EES – 100.0
	BTW – 1	BTW – 1	BTW – 100.0
	EMS – 1	EMS – 1	EMS – 100.0
	EHS – 1	EHS – 1	EHS – 100.0
1.2.2. Number of tablet computers purchased for each campus.	NES – 20	NES – 22	NES – 110.0
	EES – 20	EES – 22	EES – 110.0
	BTW – 20	BTW – 22	BTW – 110.0
	EMS – 20	EMS – 22	EMS – 110.0
	EHS – 20	EHS – 22	EHS – 110.0
1.2.3. Number of EISD Reading and Language Arts faculty in Pre-K through 3 rd Grade (60) and in 4 th through 12 th Grade (62) receiving 5 hours of PD focused on knowledge of how to use the new library resources through PD.	Pre-K to 3 rd Grade - 60	Pre-K to 3 rd Grade - 60	Pre-K to 3 rd Grade – 100.0
	4 th through 12 th Grade - 62	4 th through 12 th Grade - 62	4 th through 12 th Grade – 100.0

Versus 1.1.1, STAR targeted the purchase of 600 new books, titles, and periodicals for each campus library during the STAR Project totaling 3,000 for EISD. As shown in **Table 3**, STAR met the target for each campus and purchased a total of **5,493** new books, titles, and periodicals for the campuses (NES 968, EES 1,150, BTS 759, EMS 810, and EHS 1,806), yielding a performance that was **183.1%** of the Project Targeted Output for new books, titles, and periodicals. This target was met prior to the end of Year One. The Project ensured that these newly acquired resources were available and utilize for the remainder of the Project.

Versus 1.2.1 and 1.2.2, STAR purchased one new SmartBoard for each campus in Year one. Thus, the Project achieved and surpassed 100% of the Project Targeted Output of SmartBoards. The SmartBoards were maintained for the remainder of the grant cycle. The total number of tablet computers purchased was **132** (i.e., 22 at each of five [5] campuses). The original target was 20 per campus; thus, the STAR exceeded its Project Targeted Output of tablet computers by **110.0%**. This was possible due to the lower than anticipated cost of tablet computers created by the increased number of manufacturers with quality products now on the market. The target was met in Year One and the Project ensured that these newly acquired resources were available and utilize for the remainder of the Project.

For 1.2.3, STAR original proposed 5 hours of PD for faculty in Reading and Language Arts. This training was to focus on how to utilize the new library resources and to integrate these resources into the classroom to enhance literacy. As shown in **Table 3**, STAR provided all EISD Reading and Language Arts teachers (i.e., a total of 122 teachers -- 60 Pre-K through 3rd Grade and 62 4th through 12th Grade teachers) with 7 hours of PD in Reading and Language Arts, equating to having achieved **100.0%** of its Total Project Output for the number of teachers and **140.0%** of the Total Project Output for hours of training.

Outcomes

As noted in **Table 1**, above, STAR had three Objectives associated with Goal One. Each Objective has at least one Outcome. Data for each Outcome for Goal One come from specific Library Reports, Technology Reports, and PD sign-in sheets.

In **Table 4** through **Table 14**, the ‘Target’ column is the specific ‘Grant Year Outcome Target’ expressed as the targeted number or percentage of reduction or increase; ‘Baseline’ (i.e., the Baseline Measure) is the initial number or percentage found during the baseline year; ‘Goal’

is the actual number or percentage needed to meet the ‘Target’; and ‘Post’ is the number or percentage measured after intervention. ‘Difference’ is calculated by subtracting the ‘Baseline’ from the ‘Post’. Finally, ‘Change’ is calculated by dividing the ‘Difference’ by the ‘Baseline’ and expressing as a percentage.

Goal One-Objective One-Outcome One (i.e., 1.1-1): Decrease the collection age at each EISD campus library in the areas of Social Sciences, Language, Literature and Rhetoric, Technology, Geography and History, and General Fiction by 15% as measured by the Baseline Collection Analysis Report collected prior to Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure) and compared to the collection age at each EISD campus library at the end of Year Two.

The Baseline Measure data came from the *Collection Analysis Report* for the 2013-2014 school year. During the 2013-2014 school year the average collection age Social Sciences, Language, Literature and Rhetoric, Technology, Geography and History, and General Fiction books at (1) Neidig Elementary was 15 years; (2) Booker T. Washington Elementary 18 years; (3) Elgin Elementary 16 years; (4) Elgin Middle School 17 years; and (5) Elgin High School was 13 years. For the district, this resulted in an average of 15.8 years, which serves as the Baseline Measure for 1.1-1. The Target is to decrease the average collection age by 15%. This led to a Goal of an average age of 12.8 at Neidig Elementary; 15.3 at Booker T. Washington Elementary; 13.6 at Elgin Elementary; 14.5 at Elgin Middle School; and 11.1 at Elgin High School. For the school district, the targeted average is 13.5 years.

Table 4. Goal 1, Objective 1, Outcome 1 (1.1-1): Decrease the average collection age by 15%

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcomes</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (of Age in Years)</i>	<i>Goal (of Age in Years)</i>	<i>Post (Age in Years)</i>	<i>% Change (of Age in Years)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
1.1-1	Year 1	NES	-15	15	12.8	13	-13.3	No
	Year 2					13	-13.3	No
1.1-1	Year 1	BTW	-15	18	15.3	15	-16.7	Yes
	Year 2					15	-16.7	Yes
1.1-1	Year 1	EES	-15	16	13.6	15	-6.3	No
	Year 2					15	-6.3	No
1.1-1	Year 1	EMS	-15	17	14.5	16	-5.9	No
	Year 2					16	-5.9	No
1.1-1	Year 1	EHS	-15	13	11.1	11	-15.4	Yes
	Year 2					10	-23.1	Yes

The *Collection Analysis Report* for the 2014 – 2015 school year indicated the average age of the collection was 13 years at Neidig Elementary; 15 years at Booker T. Washington Elementary; 15 years at Elgin Elementary; 16 years at Elgin Middle School; and 11 years at Elgin High School. The Project met or exceeded all its target measures for new library resources to be purchased and these resources were placed in the libraries on each campus. At the end of Year Two EHS and BTW had achieved a decrease of 15.0% or greater in the average age of books and titles in their libraries. BTW showed a 16.7% decrease in age compared to baseline; while EHS showed a 23.1% decrease in age compared to baseline. NES achieved a 13.3% decrease in the average age of books and titles. EES showed a decrease of 6.3% in the average age of books and titles; and EMS showed a 5.9% decrease in the average age of books and titles. The 15.0% target was not met at NES, EES or EMS. While all the library resources and materials were purchased and placed into the library collections prior to the end of Year Two. This resulted in the decrease in average age at each of the campuses. However, as planned NES,

BTW, and EHS ‘weeded’ old and worn titles from their collections. This process ensured that the libraries maintained a high ratio of books to students while decreasing the average age of the books and titles. EES and EMS had not; at the time of this report, completed the weeding process to show the true decrease in average age of books and titles in the two libraries. This process is still planned and upon completion the average age of the books and titles in these two libraries will decrease significantly as originally proposed.

Goal One-Objective One-Outcome Two (i.e., 1.1.2): Increase the total number of faculty, students, and parents who utilize the library collection by 10.0% as measured by the annual Library Utilization Reports compared to the baseline established in Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure) at the end of Year Two.

All of the 1.1.2 data comes from the *Library Utilization Report* and in Year One there were some issues with the data collection because not all of the Library Utilization Reports included the campus name and many users signed “in” but not “out”. Due to these Year One issues with reporting, the Year One data are being used as the Baseline Measure because as shown in Table 5 full implementation of the Project’s resources will not begin until Year Two for Measure 1.1-2. (Note: In Table 5 the NA means “Not Applicable” and TBD means (To Be Determined.)

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (Year One #)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference (%)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
1.1-2	+10%	Baseline: Students: 597 Parents: 168 Faculty: 36	Students: 657 Parents: 185 Faculty: 40	Year 2: Students: 1,212 Parents: 402 Faculty: 42 NCE: Students: 806 Parents: 247 Faculty: NA	Year 2: Students: +84.5 Parents: +139.3 Faculty: +16.7 NCE: Students: +35.0 Parents: +47.0 Faculty: NA	Year 2: Yes NCE: Yes

The *Library Utilization Reports* for Year One indicated that over a nine (9) month period there were an average of **89** duplicated library users per month (66.3 students, 18.7 parents, 4.0 faculty), which established the Baseline Measure. It is anticipated that EISD Library usage will increase in Year Two as over the summer month's new books, titles, and periodicals were acquired, PD was provided, and new technologies were prepared for use in Year Two. In Year One, an average of 66 EISD Students used the school libraries each month (597 students across 9 months); of these **66.8%** utilized technology, available through the libraries. In Year One, an average of 19 parents used the school libraries each month (168 parents across 9 months); of these **50.0%** accessed library technologies. Finally, in Year One an average of 4 faculty members (36 faculty members across 9 months) utilized the libraries each month; of these **69.4%** utilized the available technologies in the school libraries.

As anticipated Year Two and the NCE showed a significant increase over the Year One Baseline. It is also believed that sign-in sheets were not always completed and that the numbers in Year Two and the NCE may be under reported. However, the Project met and surpassed the targeted 10% increase in both Year Two and the NCE. As the table above illustrates, in Year Two there was an **84.5%** increase in student library utilization at EISD. During the NCE there was also an increase over baseline of 35.0%; while less than Year Two this outcome was significantly above the 10% target. The Library Utilization Forms collected indicate that students accessed technology **62.3%** in Year 2 and **63.8%** in the NCE during library use. The reported use of library technology decreased; however, this may be due to the access to new print materials or access during the regular school day to technology by students. The level of increased library utilization in both Year Two and the NCE by students was impressive and

indicated that the added resources in the library and extended hours of library access increased student use of the campus libraries.

Parent and faculty use also increased during Year Two to meet and surpass the targeted level of increase. In Year Two library utilization by parents increased by **139.3%**. Year Two library utilization by parents during the NCE increased by **47.0%**. The increased level of access by parents of campus libraries was very significant and impressive over the life of the Project. Parents reported utilizing technology **70.6%** of the time during Year Two and **67.9%** of the time during the NCE when visiting the libraries. This showed a substantial growth in parent use of technology at campus libraries over baseline. This was a success for the Project as it is essential for parents to understand the technology utilized and available by their children to assist them in accessing the resources needed to increase literacy. Faculty use of the libraries is believed to be under reported in Year Two; however, the targeted increase for Year Two of 10% was met and surpassed. During Year Two documented use of Library Utilization by faculty increased by **16.7%**; a level that significantly surpassed the targeted 10%. During the NCE these data were not tracked as the focus was the continuation of extended hours during this period. Towards Goal One-Objective One-Outcome Two the Project was successful in achieving a 10% increase or greater for students, parents, and faculty by increasing the resources within the libraries and access to the libraries.

Status Chart Report Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Decrease the collection age at each EISD campus library in the areas of Social Sciences, Language, Literature and Rhetoric, Technology, Geography and History, and General Fiction by 15% as measured by the Baseline Collection Analysis Report collected prior to Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure) and

compared to the collection age at each EISD campus library at the end of Year Two. All Baseline Measure data came from the Collection Analysis Report for the 2013-2014 school year. During the 2013-2014 school year the average collection age Social Sciences, Language, Literature and Rhetoric, Technology, Geography and History, and General Fiction books at (1) Neidig Elementary was 15 years; (2) Booker T. Washington Elementary 18 years; (3) Elgin Elementary 16 years; (4) Elgin Middle School 17 years; and (5) Elgin High School was 13 years. For the district, this resulted in an average of 15.8 years, which serves as the Baseline Measure for 1.1-1. The Target is to decrease the average collection age by 15%. This led to a Goal of an average age of 12.8 at Neidig Elementary; 15.3 at Booker T. Washington Elementary; 13.6 at Elgin Elementary; 14.5 at Elgin Middle School; and 11.1 at Elgin High School. For the school district, the targeted average is 13.5 years. Overall the 2013-2014 average age of the collection at EISD was 15.8 years old. The averaged Year One targeted outcome to reduce the age of the collection by 15% established a target an average age of 13.4 years in age.

The *Collection Analysis Report* for the 2014 – 2015 school year indicated the average age of the collection was 13 years at Neidig Elementary; 15 years at Booker T. Washington Elementary; 15 years at Elgin Elementary; 16 years at Elgin Middle School; and 11 years at Elgin High School. Thus, overall during Year One EISD decreased its library collection's average age to 14 years of age which is a decrease of 11.4% in Year One. EISD did not achieve its targeted outcome in Year One; however, these data were based on the Title Wise Collection Analysis completed in June of 2015. Additional purchase was made later at the end of Year One and they are not included in this Report. These age-related data will be updated in subsequent STAR reports and the average ages are expected to change significantly as new books are put into circulation and older books are “weeded” out.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): The *Collection Analysis Report* for the 2015 – 2016 school year indicated the average age of the collection was 13 years at Neidig Elementary; 15 years at Booker T. Washington Elementary; 15 years at Elgin Elementary; 16 years at Elgin Middle School; and 10 years at Elgin High School. Thus, overall during Year One EISD decreased its library collection’s average age to 13.8 years of age which is a decrease of 12.7% in Year One. EISD did not achieve its targeted outcome in Year Two. The result is largely effected by the lack of “weeding” of old books once the new materials arrived. EISD anticipates this process will be completed during the NCE.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): These data were not reported for the NCE.

Goal One-Objective Two-Outcome One (i.e., 1.2-1): Increase the number of up-to-date computers at each campus by 35.0% as measured by the Technology Replacement Report in May 2015 compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

All Baseline Measure data came from the *Technology Replacement Report* for the 2013-2014 school year, received in 2014. In the 2013-2014 school year there were a total of 1,952 computers, tablets or iPads available for student use at EISD Schools. During Year One of the Project, STAR purchased 110 wireless tablet computers or iPads. EISD ensured that 22 of these wireless tablet computers were provided to each of the five campuses. This achieved a **5.6%** increase in the computers available for student use at EISD utilizing STAR Project funding. However, EISD had a large influx of iPads and computers during the 2013-2014 school year and the 2014-2015 school year. Based on the Technology Report from September 2015 there was an

overall increase of **228.1%** in iPads, computers and tablets accessible to students at EISD as the school district utilized local funds to purchase **2,390** iPads, tablets, and computers during Year One to meet for student access to technology and on-line subscriptions purchased by the grant. Although STAR funding was not entirely responsible for the tremendous increase in access to iPads, computers and tablets by students; the development of the STAR Project brought to light the increased need for student access to the technology needed to access the proposed on-line subscriptions proposed by the STAR Project that includes TumbleBooks and the EBSCO Databases. The target was met in Year One and the Project ensured that these newly acquired resources were available and utilize for the remainder of the Project.

Table 6. Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 1 (1.2-1): Increase the number of up-to-date computers at each campus by 35.0%

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcomes</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (# of up-to-date computers)</i>	<i>Goal (# of up-to-date computers)</i>	<i>Post (# of up-to-date computers)</i>	<i>% Change (# of up-to-date computers)</i>	<i>Met Target ?</i>
1.2-1	EISD	+35	1952	2,635	4,452	228.1	Yes

In Year One, STAR added 22 additional up-to-date tablet computers at NES; 22 at BTW; 22 at EES; 22 at EMS; and 22 at EHS. Each of the 5 campuses; 100% received a SmartBoard as proposed in the original grant. These additions along with the additional support of EISD brought the total number of up-to-date library computers across the 5 EISD libraries to **4,452** units, which was an increase of **228.1%** versus the Baseline Measure district wide. As the funding was expended in Year One and the targeted outcome achieved; this Goal was met for the life of the Project. The target was met in Year One and the Project ensured that these newly acquired resources were available and utilize for the remainder of the Project.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the number of up-to-date computers at each campus by 35.0% as measured by the *Technology Replacement Report* in May 2015 compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure). All Baseline Measure data came from the *Technology Replacement Report* for the 2013-2014 school year, received in 2014. In the 2013-2014 school year there were a total of 1,952 computers, tablets or iPads available for student use at EISD Schools. During Year One of the Project, STAR purchased 110 wireless tablet computers or iPads. EISD ensured that 22 of these wireless tablet computers were provided to each of the five campuses. This achieved a 5.6% increase in the computers available for student use at EISD utilizing STAR Project funding. However, EISD had a large influx of iPads and computers during the 2013-2014 school year and the 2014-2015 school year. This created a very high baseline of 1,952 iPads, computers and tablets for Year One. However, based on the Technology Report from September 2015 there was an overall increase of 228.1% in iPads, computers and tablets accessible to students at EISD as the school district utilized local funds to purchase 2,390 iPads, tablets, and computers during Year One to meet for student access to technology and on-line subscriptions purchased by the grant. Although STAR funding was not entirely responsible for the tremendous increase in access to iPads, computers and tablets by students; the development of the STAR Project brought to light the increased need for student access to the technology needed to access the proposed on-line subscriptions proposed by the STAR Project that includes TumbleBooks and the EBSCO Databases.

In Year One, STAR added 22 additional up-to-date tablet computers at NES; 22 at BTW; 22 at EES; 22 at EMS; and 22 at EHS. Each of the 5 campuses; 100% received a SmartBoard as proposed in the original grant. These additions along with the additional support of EISD

brought the total number of up-to-date library computers across the 5 EISD libraries to **4,452** units, which was an increase of **228.1%** versus the Baseline Measure district wide.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): All proposed technology was acquired during Year One.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): All proposed technology was acquired during Year One.

Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 2 (1.2-2): Increase the number of computers at each campus (desktop, tablet, etc.) that have continuous access to the Internet by 35.0% as measured by the *Technology Accessibility Report* in May 2015 compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

All Baseline Measure data came from the *Technology Accessibility Report* for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that all 1,952 of the districts computers, tablets, and iPads had continuous Internet access in the 2013-2014 school year, leading to a Baseline Measure of 1,952 for 1.2-2. During Year One the STAR Project purchased 110 new iPad tablet computers and EISD supported this by purchasing an additional **2,390** brought the total to an additional **2,500** new iPad tablet computers that had continuous internet access. This made a significant change at each of the district's 5 campuses as shown below in Table 7.

Table 7. Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 2: Increase Computers with Continuous Internet Access by 35%							
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline Number of Computers</i>	<i>Goal Number of Computers with Continuous Internet Access</i>	<i>Post Number of Computers with Continuous Internet Access</i>	<i>% Change in computers with Continuous Internet Access</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
1.2-2	EISD	+35	1,952	2,635	4,452	228.1	Yes

In Year One, STAR added 22 additional up-to-date tablet computers at NES; 22 at BTW; 22 at EES; 22 at EMS; and 22 at EHS. Each of the 5 campuses; 100% received a SmartBoard as proposed in the original grant with continuous internet access. These additions along with the additional support of EISD brought the total number of up-to-date iPad tablet computers with continuous internet access across the 5 EISD libraries to **4,452** units, which was an increase of **228.1%** versus the Baseline Measure district wide. As the funding was expended in Year One and the targeted outcome achieved. The target was met in Year One and the Project ensured that these newly acquired resources were available and utilize for the remainder of the Project.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the number of computers at each campus (desktop, tablet, etc.) that have continuous access to the Internet by 35.0% as measured by the *Technology Accessibility Report* in May 2015 compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure). All Baseline Measure data came from the *Technology Accessibility Report* for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that all 1,952 of the districts computers, tablets, and iPads had continuous Internet access in the 2013-2014 school year, leading to a Baseline Measure of 1,952. During Year One the STAR Project purchased 110 new iPad tablet

computers and EISD supported this by purchasing an additional 2,390 bring the total to an additional 2,500 new iPad tablet computers that have continuous internet access.

In Year One, STAR added 22 additional up-to-date tablet computers at NES; 22 at BTW; 22 at EES; 22 at EMS; and 22 at EHS. Each of the 5 campuses; 100% received a SmartBoard as proposed in the original grant with continuous internet access. These additions along with the additional support of EISD brought the total number of up-to-date iPad tablet computers with continuous internet access across the 5 EISD libraries to **4,452** units, which was an increase of **228.1%** versus the Baseline Measure district wide.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): All proposed technology was acquired during Year One.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): All proposed technology was acquired during Year One.

Goal One-Objective Two-Outcome Three (i.e., 1.2-3): Increase the number of multimedia devices at each campus that supplement reading and literacy development by 35.0% as measured by the *Multimedia Device Inventory Report* in May 2015 compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

All Baseline Measure data came from the *Technology Accessibility Report* for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that all 1,952 of the districts computers, tablets, and iPads had continuous Internet access in the 2013-2014 school year, leading to a Baseline Measure of 1,952 for 1.2-2. The STAR Project purchased 110 new iPad tablet computers and EISD supported this by purchasing an additional **2,390** increasing the total to an additional 2,500 new

iPad tablet computers that have continuous internet access. This made a significant change at each of the district’s 5 campuses as shown below in Table 8.

Table 8. Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 3 (1.2-3): Increase Multimedia Supplementation by 35%							
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>District</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline Number of multi-media supplementation</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>% Change in multimedia supplementation</i>	<i>Met Target ?</i>
1.2-3	EISD	+35	1,952	2,635	4,452	228.1	Yes

With IAL funding STAR added 22 additional up-to-date tablet computers at NES; 22 at BTW; 22 at EES; 22 at EMS; and 22 at EHS. Each of the 5 campuses; 100% received a SmartBoard as proposed in the original grant with continuous internet access. These additions along with the additional support of EISD brought the total number of up-to-date iPad tablet computers with continuous internet access across the 5 EISD libraries to **4,452** units, which was an increase of **228.1%** versus the Baseline Measure district wide. As the funding was expended in Year One and the targeted outcome achieved. The target was met in Year One and the Project ensured that these newly acquired resources were available and utilize for the remainder of the Project.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the number of multimedia devices at each campus that supplement reading and literacy development by 35.0% as measured by the *Multimedia Device Inventory Report* in May 2015 compared to May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure). All Baseline Measure data came from the *Technology Accessibility Report* for the 2013-2014 school year. All Baseline Measure data came from the *Multimedia Device Inventory Report* for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that EISD had 1,952 multi-media devices in the 2013-2014 school year, leading to a Baseline Measure of 1,952.

During Year One the STAR Project purchased 110 new multi-media devices and EISD supported this by purchasing an additional 2,390 multi-media devices to bring the total to an additional 2,500 new multi-media devices.

In Year One, STAR added 22 additional up-to-date tablet computers at NES; 22 at BTW; 22 at EES; 22 at EMS; and 22 at EHS. Each of the 5 campuses; 100% received a SmartBoard as proposed in the original grant to increase multi-media devices. These additions along with the additional support of EISD brought the total number of multi-media devices across the 5 EISD libraries to **4,452** units, which was an increase of **228.1%** versus the Baseline Measure district wide.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): All proposed technology was acquired during Year One.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): All proposed technology was acquired during Year One.

Goal One-Objective Two-Outcome Four (i.e., 1.2.4): Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 4 (1.2-4): Increase the number of EISD faculty, students, and parents who utilize the library technology by 20.0% as measured by the Library Utilization Report in Year Two compared to the Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

All of the 1.2.4 data came from the Library Utilization Report. All of the 1.1.2 data came from the Library Utilization Report. There are some issues with the data collection as not all Library Utilization Report Forms included the campus name and many users signed in but not out. Due to these Year One issues with reporting Table 5 compiles the district data and available time utilized and compares each year to the Baseline for Measure 1.2.4.

Table 9. Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 4 (1.2.4): Increase Library Technology Utilization by 20%

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (Year One, #)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
1.2-4	+20	508	610	1,122	+614	+120.9	Yes

The Library Utilization Reports for Year One indicated that there was an average of 56 duplicated library users per month indicating the use of technology which establishes the baseline. For Year Two the STAR Project has set a goal of a 20% increase in duplicated library users that indicate that technology was utilized while they were using the library. For Year Two the targeted was 610. The Year Two Library Utilization Reports indicated that library users accessed technology **1,122** times; which is an increase of **120.9%**. During Year Two the Project met and surpassed the targeted 20% increase of library technology use. This equates to a monthly average of use of technology of **112.2** uses per month; the outcomes towards Goal 1, Objective 2, Outcome 4 (1.2.4) were very successful as the increases occurred for students, parents, and teachers.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the total number of faculty, students, and parents who utilize the library collection by 10.0% as measured by the annual *Library Utilization Reports* in Year Two compared to Year One (i.e., the Baseline Measure was established in Year One). All data comes from the *Library Utilization Report* and in Year One there were some issues with the data collection because not all the Library Utilization Reports included the campus name and many users signed “in” but not “out”. Due to these Year One issues with reporting, the Year One data are being used as the Baseline Measure because full implementation of the Project’s resources will not begin until Year Two.

Overall the Year One baseline for Library Utilization was established at 801. For comparison to in Year Two, the Year One data has been broken into monthly averages. The *Library Utilization Reports* for Year One indicated that there was an average of **89** duplicated library users per month (597 students, 168 Parents, 36 Faculty across 9 months), which established the Baseline Measure. It is anticipated that EISD Library usage will increase in Year Two as over the summer month's new books, titles, and periodicals were acquired, PD was provided, and new technologies were prepared for use in Year Two. In Year One, an average of 66 EISD Students used the school libraries each month (597 students across 9 months); of these 66.8% utilized technology, available through the libraries. In Year One, an average of 19 parents used the school libraries each month (168 parents across 9 months); of these 50.0% accessed library technologies. Finally, in Year One an average of 4 faculty members (36 faculty members across 9 months) utilized the libraries each month; of these 69.4% utilized the available technologies in the school libraries. The outcome for Library Utilization will be determined in Year Two.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): As anticipated Year Two showed a significant increase over the Year One Baseline. It is also believed that sign-in sheets were not always completed and that the numbers in Year Two may be under reported. However, the Project met and surpassed the targeted 10% increase during Year Two. Year Two there was an **106.7%** increase in student library utilization at EISD; this outcome was significantly above the 10% target. The Library Utilization Forms collected indicate that students accessed technology **62.3%** in Year 2 during library use.

Parent and faculty use also increased during Year Two to meet and surpass the targeted level of increase. In Year Two library utilization by parents increased by **139.3%**. Year Two

library utilization by parents during the NCE increased by **47.0%**. The increased level of access by parents of campus libraries was very significant and impressive over the life of the Project. Parents reported utilizing technology **70.6%** of the time during Year Two when visiting the libraries. This showed a substantial growth in parent use of technology at campus libraries over baseline. This was a success for the Project as it is essential for parents to understand the technology utilized and available by their children to assist them in accessing the resources needed to increase literacy. Faculty use of the libraries is believed to be under reported in Year Two; however, the targeted increase for Year Two of 10% was met and surpassed. During Year Two documented use of Library Utilization by faculty increased by **16.7%**; a level that significantly surpassed the targeted 10%.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): The Project met and surpassed the targeted 10% increase during the NCE. As the table above illustrates, during the NCE there was also an increase over baseline of **31.4%**; while less than Year Two this outcome was significantly above the 10% target. The Library Utilization Forms collected indicate that students accessed technology **63.8%** in the NCE during library use. The level of increased library utilization during the NCE by students was impressive and indicated that the added resources in the library and extended hours of library access increased student use of the campus libraries. Library utilization by parents during the NCE increased by **47.0%**. The increased level of access by parents of campus libraries was very significant and impressive over the life of the Project. Parents reported utilizing technology **67.9%** of the time during the NCE when visiting the libraries. This showed a substantial growth in parent use of technology at campus libraries over baseline. This was a success for the Project as it is essential for parents to understand the technology utilized and available by their children to assist them in accessing the resources

needed to increase literacy. Faculty use was not tracked as the focus was the continuation of extended hours during this period.

Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 1 (1.3-1): Increase, by 75.0%, compared to August 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), the number of PK – 3rd Grade Reading and Language Arts (R/ELA) faculty who are provided professional development (PD) on how to utilize the new library resources as measured by the PD Sign-In Sheets in August 2015.

All Baseline Measure data came from PD Agendas and Sign in Sheets for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that no PD sessions for library resources and technology occurred in the 2013-2014 school year; therefore, the Baseline Measure became zero and the 75% targeted improvement was defined by STAR as being at least 5 hours of PD for R/ELA for at least 75 faculty members.

Table 10. Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 1 (1.3.1): Increase R/ELA Faculty Professional Development by 75%							
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (#)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference (#)</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
1.3-1	75.0	0	75	122	122	122.0	Yes

STAR conducted 7 hours of PD focusing on topics such as DR, SmartBoards, TumbleBooks, Tablets, and other added media. Compared to the Baseline Measure of zero and the definitions determined by STAR. STAR successfully achieved the targeted increase in Professional Development targeting DR and literacy resources by increasing the number of PD hours from 0 to 7 and recipients from 0 to 122.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase, by 75.0%, compared to August 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), the number of PK – 3rd Grade Reading

and Language Arts (R/ELA) faculty who are provided professional development (PD) on how to utilize the new library resources as measured by the PD Sign-In Sheets in August 2015. All Baseline Measure data came from PD Agendas and Sign in Sheets for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that no PD sessions for library resources and technology occurred in the 2013-2014 school year; therefore, the Baseline Measure became zero and the 75% targeted improvement was defined by STAR as being at least 5 hours of PD for R/ELA for at least 75 faculty members.

In Year One, STAR conducted a total of 1 PD sessions, totaling 7 hours focusing on topics such as SmartBoards, TumbleBooks, Tablets, and other added media. Compared to the Baseline Measure of zero and the definitions determined by STAR, STAR successfully achieved and surpassed its Year One Target of 75 as 122 R/ELA faculty attended the PD.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): All proposed professional development was provided at the end of Year One.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): All proposed professional development was provided at the end of Year One.

Goal One-Objective Three-Outcome Two (i.e., 1.3-2): Increase, by 50.0%, in Year Two compared to Year One (Baseline) the number of R/ELA faculty who integrate their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology) as measured by the Library Utilization Survey.

All Baseline Measure data for 1.3-2 came from the administration of the first *Library Utilization Survey*. As noted there were issues with proper completion of the Library Utilization

Survey all indicating campus; therefore, the baseline and outcomes were based on district wide data.

Table 11. Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 2 (1.3-2): Increase R/ELA Faculty integration of lesson plans with library resources by 50%.							
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (%)</i>	<i>Difference (%)</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
1.3-2	50.0	0	50	36	360.0	360.0	Yes

Prior to Year One, it was established that baseline was 0 as there were no fully integrated lesson plans identified that specifically integrated library resources. The Project target was set to increase the number of R/ELA faculty who integrate their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology), the *Library Utilization Survey*. During the Project, there were 36 R/ELA faculty who integrated their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology) as measured by the Library Utilization Survey. While the target number of 50 was not met; compared to the original baseline of 0 there was an increase of **360.0%** which achieved the targeted percentage increase over the life of the Project.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Prior to Year One, it was established that baseline was 0 as there were no fully integrated lesson plans identified that specifically integrated library resources. The Project target was set to increase the number of R/ELA faculty who integrate their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology), the *Library Utilization Survey*. During the Project, there were 36 R/ELA faculty who integrated their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology) as measured by the Library Utilization Survey. While the target number of 50 was not met; compared to the

original baseline of 0 there was an increase of **360.0%** which achieved the targeted percentage increase over the life of the Project.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): The Project target was set to increase the number of R/ELA faculty who integrate their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology), the *Library Utilization Survey*. During Year Two of Project, there were 42 R/ELA faculty who integrated their lesson plans with library resources (collection and technology) as measured by the Library Utilization Survey. While the target number of 50 was not met; compared to the original baseline of 0 there was an increase of **420%** which achieved the targeted percentage increase over the life of the Project and an increase of **16.6%** compared to Year One of the Project.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): These data were not collected during the NCE.

Goal One-Objective Three-Outcome Three (i.e., 1.3-3): Increase the number of 3rd grade students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading assessment from the 2013-2014 school year (Baseline). The state of Texas STAAR Reading assessment was administered in the spring of 2014. The results of this administration indicated that 77% of BTW, 67% of EES, and 71% of NES 3rd grade students that met or exceeded proficiency; establishing the baseline for the STAR Project. The STAR Project proposed to increase the percentage of 3rd grade students that met or exceeded proficiency by 5% each year of the Project.

Table 12. Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 3 (1.3.3): Increase 3rd Grade STAAR Reading passage rates by 5% annually.							
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Baseline (%)</i>	<i>Goal (%)</i>	<i>Post (%)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Goal?</i>
1.3-3	Year 1	BTW 77.0	80.9	69.0	-8	-10.4	No
	Year 2		84.7	52.0	-32.7	-42.5	No
1.3-3	Year 1	EES – 67.0	70.4	61.0	-6	-8.9	No
	Year 2		73.7	49.0	-24.7	-36.9	No
1.3-3	Year 1	NES -71.0	74.6	70.0	-4.6	-6.5	No
	Year 2		78.1	58.0	-20.1	-25.7	No

Towards the targeted annual increase of 3rd grade students who met criteria on the STAAR Test the Project was not successful. The outcomes did not increase by 5% annually and instead decreased significantly. These results are being reviewed across the state as the assessment has been brought into question. However, based on the most current data officially released by the Texas Education Agency the percentage of 3rd graders who meet criteria on the annual STAAR Reading Assessment decreased significantly. As a school district, EISD averaged a rate of students who met criteria for 3rd grade reading of **53.0%**; compared to the state average of **73.0%**. Students identified as White Non-Hispanic met criteria at a rate of **65.0%**; while Hispanics met criteria at a rate of **51.0%**. Students who identified as “Black” met criteria at a rate of **50.0%**. Students identified as English Language Learners met criteria at a rate of **47.0%** and students identified as economically disadvantaged met criteria at a rate of **48.0%**.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Of the 464 3rd grade students at EISD, the target was that **70% (325 of the 464)** would meet or exceed proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. Unfortunately, in Year One only **66.7% (310 of the 464)** met or exceeded proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): Of the 340 3rd grade students at EISD, the target was 70% (238 of the 340) would meet or exceed proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. Unfortunately, in Year Two only 52.0% of EISD 340 3rd Graders met or exceeded proficiency on the State reading and language arts assessments.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): At the time of this report the results of the 2016-2017 year have not been released by the Texas Education Agency.

Goal One-Objective Three-Outcome Four (i.e., 1.3-4): Increase the number of 8th grade students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) reading assessment from the 2013-2014 school year (Baseline). The state of Texas STAAR Reading assessment was administered in the spring of 2014. The results of this administration indicated that 71% of 8th grade students met or exceeded proficiency; establishing the baseline for the STAR Project. The STAR Project proposed to increase the percentage of 8th grade students that met or exceeded proficiency by 5% each year of the Project.

Table 13. Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 4 (1.3-4): Increase 8th Grade STAAR Reading passage rates by 5% annually.

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Baseline (%)</i>	<i>Goal (%)</i>	<i>Post (%)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Goal?</i>
1.3-4	Year 1	71.0	74.6	66.0	-7	-9.9	No
	Year 2		78.1	82.0	+11	+15.5	Yes

Towards Goal 1, Objective 3 Outcome 4 the Project showed significant success in assisting the increase in the percentage of 8th graders who met criteria on the annual STAAR Reading Assessment. At the end of Year Two the rate or passage or percent of students who met criteria increased by **15.5%** compared to baseline. During Year One there was a **9.9%** decrease; however, in Year Two during the full implementation of STAAR the passage rate increased significantly and surpassed the targeted level of **78.1%** passage and achieved a passage rate of **82.0%**. Students identified as White met criteria at a rate of **85.0%**, Hispanic students met criteria at a rate of **82.0%**, and students identified as “Black” met criteria at a rate of **76.0%**. EISD moved closer to the state average of **87.0%** in Year Two. The TEA report indicated that of all students those identified as ELL met criteria at the lowest rate of EISD 8th Grade students as only **57.0%** met criteria. While the Project was very pleased with the increase in 8th graders who met the passage criteria in Year Two; however, the need for efforts beyond the life of the Project were evident. The Project worked through the NCE with EISD to successfully identify and implement strategies for sustaining the extended library hours at the middle school and other campuses.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Of the 319 8th grade students at EISD, the target was that **70% (223 of the 319)** would meet or exceed proficiency on

State reading and language arts assessments. Unfortunately, in Year One only **66.0% (211 of the 319)** met or exceeded proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): Of the 331 8th grade students at EISD, the target was that **70% (232 of the 331)** would meet or exceed proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. Impressively, **82.0% (232 of the 331) of 8th grade students** met or exceeded proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments during Year Two.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): At the time of this report the results of the 2016-2017 year have not been released by the Texas Education Agency.

Goal One-Objective Three-Outcome Five (i.e., 1.3.5): Increase the number of High School students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) English/Language Arts assessment from the 2013-2014 school year (Baseline). The state of Texas STAAR Reading assessment was administered in the spring of 2014. The results of this administration indicated that 48.0% of EHS students met or exceeded proficiency; establishing the baseline for the STAR Project. The STAR Project proposed to increase the percentage of EHS students that met or exceeded proficiency by 5% each year of the Project.

Table 14. Goal 1, Objective 3, Outcome 5 (1.3-5): Increase High School STAAR Reading passage rates by 5% annually.

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Baseline (%)</i>	<i>Goal (%)</i>	<i>Post (%)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Goal?</i>
1.3-5	Year 1	48.0	50.1	54.0	+3.9	+8.1	Yes
	Year 2		52.8	62.0	+14.0	+29.2	Yes

Over the life of the Project the percentage of EISD High School Students met the criteria for passage in English/Language Arts (STAAR does not measure reading specifically after the 8th Grade) increased annually. There was an **8.1%** increase in Year One and a **29.2%** increase in Year Two compared to the original baseline. The Project was very pleased with these outcomes as the Year Two **62.0%** passage rate was just below the state average of 67.0%. EISD is committed to sustaining the activities of STAR and has implemented afterschool programming and extended library hours that will continue STAR during the current school year. The Project identified that 85% of students identified as “White” were able to pass the ELA STAAR; however, only 24% of ELL, 46% of “Black” and 56% of Hispanic students were able to meet criteria on the STAAR. During the NCE the Project and EISD worked on supplemental strategies to be implemented by EISD during the 2017-2018 school year; in addition to those that have been successful over the life of the Project.

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Of the 701 high school students at EISD, the target was that **70% (419 of the 701)** would meet or exceed proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. Unfortunately, in Year One only **54.0% (351 of the 701)** met or exceeded proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. While the Year One results did not achieve the GPRA targeted 70% increase; there was a significant increase in the percentage of students who met or exceeded proficiency of **8.1%** over the 2013-2014 school year.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): Of the 1,003 high school students at EISD, the target was that **70% (702 of the 1,003)** would meet or exceed proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. Unfortunately, in Year Two only **62.0% (622 of the 1003)** met or exceeded proficiency on State reading and language arts assessments. While

the Year Two results did not achieve the GPRA targeted **70%** increase; there was a significant increase (**14.8%**) in the percentage of students passing the STAAR compared to Year One and an increase of **29.2%** over the 2013-2014 school year.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): At the time of this report the results of the 2016-2017 year have not been released by the Texas Education Agency.

Analysis

Towards Goal One the Project showed impressive results. The Project's activities showed significant success towards increasing the access and use of print and electronic materials for students. The access to technology and library resources showed an increase of use by students and parents. Qualitative data indicated that both students and teachers found the increased access and extended hours of the library very beneficial. Family use of the library increased in addition to the increase of student use. Professional development was implemented in both Year One and Year Two. Student rates of passage of the reading section of the STAAR also improved for secondary school students. Both 8th Grade and high school grades showed significant increases in the passage rates. However, elementary school student passage rates dropped significantly. All activities that were delivered through the Project were evidence-based and had been found effective in similar populations. The targeted outcome to increase the passage rate on the state reading assessment or STAAR was not met; although all performance measures established to achieve this were met.

One possible explanation for the increase not being met may be that the 3rd grade STAAR did not measure the children most directly affected by the Project. During Year One the Project was only in full operation from January. While summer services were provided the majority of

students and families choose only to participate during the regular school year. Further, while 3rd grade at EISD may have had greater access to the library, resources, and technology there are other factors and variables that become a factor in the outcome. It is very likely that those students who accessed these resources were students who may have already been engaged in literacy. Early literature was a very large focus of the Project and resources were utilized for children in Pre-K and younger. It was the intent of the Project to begin the development of a culture of reading in the families of EISD. At this time, these data do not represent this population as Pre-K students from Year One will not participate in the STAAR Reading Assessment until the 2019-2020 administration. Although the evaluation has been thorough and meet the requirements established by GPRA and the Project Measures there was no established means to measure literacy of all groups annually included due to the limited availability of data, cost prohibitive nature, and administrative factors. It will be important for EISD to monitor the annual results of the STAAR Reading Project over the next five years to determine if the scores improve as a result of the increased resources and early reading efforts of the Project. Data collected at the secondary schools (focus groups, qualitative, extended hour usage) all indicated that because the resources were available and accessible they were accessed at a higher rate. Secondary school students in the 8th grade and in high school are able to attend extended hour sessions independently; unlike elementary students who must be accompanied by a parent or guardian when utilizing the school library outside of the normal school day. Extended hour usage was greater for secondary school students and this may have played a significant role in these final outcomes of the Project.

Goal Two: Improve Literacy Skills.

Data Collection

Book distribution data are provided to the STAR Program Evaluator by the STAR Grant Director in the form of ROR Distribution Logs. Outcome data are provided to the Program Evaluator by the STAR Grant Director through the Family Reading Surveys, Library Distribution Logs, and DR Surveys. Outcome data from student testing and improved literacy are provided to the Program Evaluator by the STAR Grant Director through the STAAR and TOPEL test.

Evidence of Progress

Output Measures

To determine the intensity and duration of STAR services, the STAR Program Evaluator established *Output Measures* (Outputs) to help STAR track its progress. Output data collection began the moment the STAR Project was awarded its ED Grant Award. **Table 15**, below, documents STAR’s performance for the Output Measures (Outputs) related to STAR’s Goal Two.

Table 15. Goal Two- STAR Output Measures (Outputs)					
Output Measures (for STAR Goals and Objectives)	Project Targeted Output	Grant Year One Actual Performance	Grant Year Two Actual Performance	Total Project Output	Percent of Total Target
2.1.1 Number of Reach Out and Read (ROR) Books distributed to parents of new borns via school, pediatricians, and family practitioners.	Number of ROR Books Distributed – 2,000	Number of ROR Books Distributed – 2,481	Number of ROR Books Distributed – 1,597	Number of ROR Books Distributed – 4,078	203.9
	Average number of ROR Books per child = 4	Average number of ROR Books per child = 4	Average number of ROR Books per child = 4	Average number of ROR Books per child = 4	100.0
2.2.1 Number of books distributed via local preschool providers and EISD to preschool through 3 rd grade children.	Number of Books Distributed – 9,000	Number of Books Distributed – 13,682	Number of Books Distributed – 3,770	Number of Books Distributed – 17,452	193.9
2.3.1 Number of campuses with TumbleBooks On-Line Subscriptions	Number of Campuses with TumbleBook On-Line Subscriptions = 4	Number of Campuses with TumbleBook On-Line Subscriptions = 4	Number of Campuses with TumbleBook On-Line Subscriptions = 4	Number of Campuses with TumbleBook On-Line Subscriptions = 4	100.0
2.4.1 Number of campuses with EBSCO Database On-Line Subscriptions	Number of campuses with EBSCO Database On-Line Subscriptions = 5	Number of campuses with EBSCO Database On-Line Subscriptions = 5	Number of campuses with EBSCO Database On-Line Subscriptions = 5	Number of campuses with EBSCO Database On-Line Subscriptions = 5	100.0

Versus 2.1.1, STAR projected purchasing and distributing 2,000 ROR books through area pediatricians during STAR’s two years. As shown in **Table 15**, STAR purchased and distributed a total of **4,078** ROR books through area pediatricians, yielding a performance that is **203.9%** of the Project Targeted Output. STAR was able to exceed the targeted level of books distributed due to the reduced price of print materials available at the time of purchase. Both

EISD and STAR were very pleased with this level of accomplishment and the number of children who had books in the home as a result of these efforts.

Versus 2.2.1, STAR projected purchasing and distributing 9,000 books to students attending preschool through 3rd grade during STAR's two years. As shown in **Table 15**, STAR purchased and distributed a total of **17,452** books to students attending preschool through 3rd grade, meaning **193.9%** of the Project Targeted Output. Over the life of the Project STAR met and surpassed the targeted number of books for distribution. STAR was able to exceed the targeted level of books distributed due to the reduced price of print materials available at the time of purchase. Both EISD and STAR were very pleased with this level of accomplishment and the number of children who had books in the home as a result of these efforts.

For 2.3.1, STAR anticipated securing subscriptions to TumbleBooks at each of the three elementary schools and the middle school. As shown in **Table 15**, STAR achieved **100.0%** of the Project Targeted Output as each of the STAR campuses obtained a subscription to TumbleBooks. EISD has maintained these subscriptions for the life of the grant and will continue to sustain them during the 2017-2018 school year.

Towards 2.4.1, STAR anticipated securing a subscription to the EBSCO Databases for each of the 5 campuses. As **Table 15** shows, STAR achieved **100.0%** of the Project Targeted Output as each of the STAR campuses has obtained a subscription in Year One. EISD has maintained these subscriptions for the life of the grant and will continue to sustain them during the 2017-2018 school year.

Outcomes

As noted in **Table 1**, above, STAR had three Objectives associated with Goal Two. Each Objective had one Outcome. Data for Goal Two's Outcomes were collected from book distribution logs, DR Surveys, Family Reading Surveys, TOPEL tests, and STAAR tests.

In **Table 16** through **Table 22**, the 'Target' column is the specific 'Grant Year Outcome Target' expressed as the targeted number or percentage of reduction or increase, 'Baseline' is the number or percentage of participants reporting the Outcome on the pre-test surveys (i.e., the Baseline Measure), 'Goal' is the actual number or percentage needed to meet the 'Target', and 'Post' is the number or percentage reporting the Outcome at post-test. 'Difference' is calculated by subtracting the 'Baseline' from the 'Post'. Finally, 'Change' is calculated by dividing the 'Difference' by the 'Baseline' and expressing as a percentage. This calculation shows the reader whether or not the 'Target' was met. All of those data and calculations are presented by Grant Year.

Goal Two-Objective One-Outcome One (i.e., 2.1-1): Increase the number of parents who are provided books that they can read to their children by 50.0% from May 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the ROR Distribution Log. It was determined that during the 2013-2014 school year, no parents received ROR books to read to their children; therefore, the Baseline Measure became 0 and the Target of a 100% improvement was defined by STAR as being at least 50 parents, per year.

Table 16. Goal 2, Objective 1, Outcome 1 (2.1-1): Increase the Number of Parents Receiving ROR Books to Read to Their Children								
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (#)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference (#)</i>	<i>Change %</i>	<i>Met Goal?</i>
2.1-1	Year 1	100.0	0	50	90	570	>100%	Yes
	Year 2	100.0		50	70	349	>100%	Yes

For Outcome 2.1-1, STAR targeted a Goal at least 50 parents to receive books that they can read to their children. In Year One, based on the ROR Distribution Logs, a total of **90** parents were provided books that they can read to their children. In Year Two the Distribution Logs indicated **70** parents were provided with books that they could read to their children. Based on distribution of books and the capacity built for parents to read aloud to their children STAR met and surpassed its targeted outcome. Originally it was intended that parents report back to the program on their reading in the home. These data were difficult to collect from busy parents and did not provide an adequate sample to determine if the books were utilized or under reported. However, as the goal targeted outcome was to provide parents with books to read to their children it was determined; based on the ROR Distribution Logs, that the Project was successful towards increasing the number of families who had books in the home to read to their children.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): STAR targeted a Goal at least 50 parents to receive books that they can read to their children. In Year One, based on the

ROR Distribution Logs, a total of **90** parents were provided books that they can read to their children.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): In Year Two the Distribution Logs indicated **70** parents were provided with books that they could read to their children. Based on distribution of books and the capacity built for parents to read aloud to their children STAR met and surpassed its targeted outcome.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): Target met in Year One and Year Two.

Goal Two-Objective One-Outcome Two (i.e., 2.1-2): Increase the number of parents who read aloud to their children by 20.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the *Family Reading Survey*. The Baseline Measure data for 2.1-2 came from the first administration of the *Family Reading Surveys* in the 2014-2015 school year.

Table 17. Goal 2, Objective 1, Outcome 2 (2.1-2): Increase the number of Parents Reading Aloud to their children by 50%

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline Year 1</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (#) of parents that read aloud to their children</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
2.1-2	Year 1	NA	33	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Year 2	50.0		50	7	7	21.2	NA

The Family Reading Surveys were administered in Year One for Baseline Measure data. The results indicated that a total of **33** parents responded they read aloud to their children at home. This 33 serves as the Baseline Measure for Outcome 2.1.2 and Post-Year Two surveys was collected at the end of Year Two and indicated the total number of parents who responded

they read aloud to their children at home. During Year Two the goal was to increase the number of parents who reported reading in the home to their children. Of the surveys sent out and provided to parents only seven were returned which provides an inconclusive number to determine the outcome. Books were made available at a higher rate than was targeted; however, data collection from parents was difficult. Many of these parents' children were not students at EISD yet but early readers younger than Pre-K. Contact and data collection with these families was limited after distribution. STAR was successful at book distribution but was not successful in obtaining the reportable data to determine if the books provided increased reading in the home. The results of this outcome can only be determined as inconclusive due to a lack of data.

Goal Two-Objective Two-Outcome One (i.e., 2.1-3): Increase the oral language skills of 4-year-old children participating in the ROR program by 10.0% from the 2014-2015 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL). The TOPEL pre-tests were administered in January 2015 and the post-tests were administered in May 2015 during Year One and from the fall baseline data collected in Year Two and compared to the post-tests to be administered in May of 2016. TOPEL examinations are administered not only to all Head Start and Pre-K classrooms associated with STAR but also to a comparison group of students established at Seguin ISD where the students were of similar socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds as those tested in EISD. This comparison group was built into the original grant to determine the effectiveness of STAR compared to another similar school district that received no STAR services. Students ranged in age from three to five years old. Each student earns a raw score on the test, which is then converted to a percentile ranking based upon their age.

Table 17. Goal 2, Objective 1, Outcome 3 (2.1-3): Increase the oral language skills of 4-year-old children participating in the ROR program by 10.0%

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline Number TOPEL Score</i>	<i>Goal</i>	<i>Post</i>	<i>% Change Oral Language Skills</i>	<i>Met Target ?</i>
2.1-3	Year 1	Elgin	+10	96.3	106.7	101.3	5.2	<i>No</i>
	Year 2			97.4	107.1	100.3	2.9	<i>No</i>
	NCE			92.5	101.8	104.4	12.8	<i>Yes</i>
2.1-3	Year 1	Seguin	NA	97.2	NA	104.3	7.3	<i>NA</i>
	Year 2			NA	NA	NA	NA	<i>NA</i>

At EISD the students tested in January 2015 showed an averaged ranked score of **96.3**. When retested in May the score increased to **101.3** indicating an increase of **5.2%** over baseline at EISD. At the comparison site at Seguin ISD that did not receive STAR services, the students tested in January 2015 showed an averaged ranked score of **97.2**. When retested in May the score increased to **104.3** indicating an increase of **7.3%** over baseline. Based on these data it may appear that students who did not receive STAR Program Services increased at a higher rate than those who did receive STAR Program Services. However, it is important to note that STAR was not fully implemented in Year One as much of the time was spent on start-up, purchasing, and coordination of extended hours. The vast majority of ROR books and books for Pre-K to 3rd Grade were distributed during the summer months and professional development did not occur until the summer months. As a result, key elements of STAR that targeted the oral language skills of a 4-year-old were not implemented until after the baseline and post-administration of the TOPEL in Year One.

During Year Two and the NCE there was no control group utilized. Administrative changes at the control site prohibited these data from being collected as they were in Year One. While the targeted level of increase was not met in Year Two; it was met surpassed in Year Three. Year Three showed a **12.8%** increase over baseline based on the scores of the TOPEL. The greatest gain by the Project may have been realized during the NCE as a result of the other activities directed at children prior to entering Pre-K that were implemented during Year One and Year Two; such as ROR. Further, during Year One and Year Two the Pre-K and other teachers participated in Professional Development targeting early/emerging readers and engaging students in reading and use of the library. Additionally, by the end of Year Two all resources were available and accessible to Pre-K students. By Year Three the PD and library resources should have had the greatest impact on Pre-K students and the results of the TOPEL indicate that there was a significant increase in the final year of the Project that surpassed the targeted 10%.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): At EISD the students tested in January 2015 showed an averaged ranked score of 96.3. When retested in May the score increased to 101.3 indicating an increase of **5.2%** over baseline at EISD. At the comparison site at Seguin ISD that did not receive STAR services, the students tested in January 2015 showed an averaged ranked score of 97.2. When retested in May the score increased to 104.3 indicating an increase of **7.3%** over baseline. Based on these data it may appear that students who did not receive STAR Program Services increased at a higher rate than those who did receive STAR Program Services. However, it is important to note that STAR was not fully implemented in Year One as much of the time was spent on start-up, purchasing, and coordination of extended

hours. The majority of ROR books and books for Pre-K to 3rd Grade were distributed during the summer months and professional development did not occur until the summer months. As a result, key elements of STAR that targeted the oral language skills of 4-year old students were not implemented until after the baseline and post-administration of the TOPEL in Year One. STAR anticipates more accurate results that should reflect the full implementation of STAR in Year Two.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): During Year Two the control group was moved to a New Braunfels Independent School District. The Campus of Lone Star Elementary School was utilized as the control site. The change was required as there was an administrative change at the original control site that did not wish to continue the participation in the Project. At EISD there were 30 matched sets of Pre-and Post-TOPEL Assessments collected during Year Two and 34 matched sets collected at the control site. At EISD 23 of 30 (76.7%) showed increases in oral language skills. Compared to the control site, the pre-assessment scores at EISD were lower than their peers at Lone Star Elementary School. Students that participated in the IAL at EISD showed an average increase of 9.33 from pre- to post- administration of the TOPEL in Print Awareness compared to the average increase of 4.14 at the control site. Students that participated in the IAL at EISD showed an average increase of 6.96 from pre- to post- administration of the TOPEL in Vocabulary compared to the average increase of 2.17 at the control site. Students that participated in the IAL at EISD showed an average increase of 2.31 from pre- to post-administration of the TOPEL in Phonological Skills compared to the average increase of 8.26 at the control site. Overall, the rate of increase for students who participated in the Project surpassed the rate of increase at the control site. The TOPEL Assessment indicates that a gain 3 points or more in Print Knowledge, 4 points or more

in Vocabulary, and 5 points are more in Phonological Skills are the indicators of significant growth between pre- and post-administration.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): During NCE there was no control group utilized. Administrative changes at the control site prohibited these data from being collected as they were in Year One. The Year NCE TOPEL Pre-and Post-Test results of 48 matched sets showed that 37 of 48 students had an increase in overall score. During the NCE the results indicate that 78.1% of 4-year old students showed an increase in oral language skills over baseline, as measured by the TOPEL. During Year Three EISD students showed average increase of 15.31 from pre- to post- administration of the TOPEL in Print Knowledge. Students that participated in the IAL at EISD showed an average increase of 11.79 from pre- to post-administration of the TOPEL in Vocabulary. Students that participated in the IAL at EISD showed an average increase of 3.0 from pre- to post-administration of the TOPEL in Phonological Skills. Overall as the Project progressed the early reading assessments score outcomes or increases improved. The TOPEL Assessment indicates that a gain 3 points or more in Print Knowledge, 4 points or more in Vocabulary, and 5 points are more in Phonological Skills are the indicators of significant growth between pre- and post-administration.

Goal Two-Objective Two-Outcome One (i.e., 2.2-1): Increase the number of elementary school students who have books in their homes by 50.0% from the 2013-2014 school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure) as measured by the Imagination Library Distribution Log. It was determined that during the 2013-2014 school year, no elementary students were provided books for home use; therefore, the Baseline Measure for 2.2.1 became zero and the 50% targeted improvement was defined by STAR as having 50% of the current

enrollment of elementary students having books in their homes each year, as shown in **Table 19**.

Table 19. Goal 2, Objective 2, Outcome 1 (2.2-1): Increase the number of elementary school students who have books in their homes by 50.0%								
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Total Enrollment (#)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Percentage Change in % of students with Books to Read in the Home.</i>	<i>Met Goal?</i>
2.2-1	Year 1	50	2,022	1,011	760	-251	+37.6	No
	Year 2	50	2,008	1,004	2008	+1,004	+100	Yes

It was determined that during the 2013-2014 school year, no elementary students were provided books for home use; therefore, the Baseline Measure for 2.2-1 became zero and the **50%** targeted improvement was defined by STAR as having **50%** of the current enrollment of elementary students having books in their homes each year. As shown in Table 19 at the end of Year One, based on the Library Distribution Log **37.6%** of the enrollment indicated that they had books in the home to read. During Year Two the book distribution focused on ensuring that all students received books for their homes provided by STAR. Based on the Distribution Logs it was possible to provide each student with a book of their own during Year Two. The Distribution Logs indicated that each student was provided at least one book for their home by the STAR Project. As a result, the Project met and surpassed its target in Year Two and as the result met the targeted increase of 50.0% and achieved **100.0%**.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the number of elementary school students who have books in their homes by **50.0%** from the 2013-2014

school year (i.e., the Baseline Measure) as measured by the *Imagination Library Distribution Log*. It was determined that during the 2013-2014 school year, no elementary students were provided books for home use; therefore, the Baseline Measure for 10-1 became zero and the **50%** targeted improvement was defined by STAR as having 50% of the current enrollment of elementary students having books in their homes each year.

In Year one of the project there were a total of 2,022 elementary school students at EISD. With a target of 50.0% of elementary school students to receive books to read in the home, the targeted output for Year One was 1,011. Based on the Library Distribution Logs collected in Year One, STAR was successful in providing 760 or **37.6%** of the enrollment with books to read in the home. While that performance failed to achieve the targeted 50.0% in Year One but it was considered significant progress based on the start-up delays caused by book selection and ordering times.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): During Year Two the book distribution focused on ensuring that all students received books for their homes provided by STAR. Based on the Distribution Logs it was possible to provide each student with a book of their own during Year Two. The Distribution Logs indicated that each student was provided at least one book for their home by the STAR Project. As a result, the Project met and surpassed its target in Year Two and as the result met the targeted increase of 50.0% and achieved **100.0%**.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): Objective met during Year Two.

Goal Two-Objective Two-Outcome One (i.e., 2.2-2): Increase the number of parents who read aloud to their children each week by 20.0% from 2015 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the *Family Reading Survey*. All Baseline Measure data for 2.2-2 came from the administration of the first *Family Reading Survey* in 2015.

Table 20. Goal 2, Objective 2, Outcome 2 (2.2-2): Increase the number of parents who read aloud to their children each week by 20.0%								
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline Year One</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
2.2-2	Year 2	20.0	33	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD

The first Family Reading Survey administered in 2015 indicated that a total of 33 non-duplicated parents responded that they read aloud to their children each week. This 33 serves as the Baseline Measure for Outcome 2.2-2 and it was used throughout Year Two to determine the effect of the distribution of ROR books and of books for Pre-K to 3rd Grade students on parents reading to their children. During Year Two the target was to increase the number of parents who reported reading in the home to their children. Of the surveys sent out and provided to parents only seven were returned which provides an inconclusive number to determine the outcome. Books were made available at a higher rate than was targeted; however, data collection from parents was difficult. Many of these parents’ children were not students at EISD yet but early readers younger than Pre-K. Contact and data collection with these families was limited after distribution. STAR was successful at book distribution but was not successful in obtaining the reportable data to determine if the books provided increased reading in the home. The results of this outcome can only be determined as inconclusive due to a lack of data.

To promote the importance of parents reading to their children the STAR Project utilized a professional trainer who presented at each elementary school to teachers and parents utilizing the Ready Rosie Software that was purchased by STAR. The presentation/trainings provided both parents and teachers with the professional guidance of Dr. Kern. The focus for both parents and teachers was the use of the literacy resources to increase student literacy. The promotion of parents reading to and with their children in the home was a focal point of the presentations/trainings. While the number of parents who increased their reading to their child in the home was not adequately collected; there were more than 50 parents who attended this training designed to foster literacy develop, support, and reading in the home.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the number of parents who read aloud to their children each week by 20.0% from 2015 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the *Family Reading Survey*. All Baseline Measure data for 10-2 came from the administration of the first *Family Reading Survey* in 2015. The first Family Reading Survey administered in 2015 indicated that a total of **33** non-duplicated parents responded that they read aloud to their children each week. This 33 serves as the Baseline Measure for Outcome 10-2 and it will be used throughout Year Two to determine the effect of the distribution of ROR books and of books for Pre-K to 3rd Grade students on parents reading to their children. As the Project was not fully implemented in Year One before the end of the school year, many of the ROR books were not distributed until the summer of 2015; after the Family Reading Surveys had been collected. The Project anticipates a significant increase in Year Two in the number of parents who read aloud to their children each week.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): The first Family Reading Survey administered in 2015 indicated that a total of 33 non-duplicated parents responded that they read aloud to their children each week. This 33 serves as the Baseline Measure and it was used throughout Year Two to determine the effect of the distribution of ROR books and of books for Pre-K to 3rd Grade students on parents reading to their children. During Year Two the target was to increase the number of parents who reported reading in the home to their children. Of the surveys sent out and provided to parents only seven were returned which provides an inconclusive number to determine the outcome. Books were made available at a higher rate than was targeted; however, data collection from parents was difficult. Many of these parents' children were not students at EISD yet but early readers younger than Pre-K. Contact and data collection with these families was limited after distribution. STAR was successful at book distribution but was not successful in obtaining the reportable data to determine if the books provided increased reading in the home. The results of this outcome can only be determined as inconclusive due to a lack of data.

To promote the importance of parents reading to their children the STAR Project utilized a professional trainer who presented at each elementary school to teachers and parents utilizing the Ready Rosie Software that was purchased by STAR. The presentation/trainings provided both parents and teachers with the professional guidance of Dr. Kern. The focus for both parents and teachers was the use of the literacy resources to increase student literacy. The promotion of parents reading to and with their children in the home was a focal point of the presentations/trainings. While the number of parents who increased their reading to their child in the home was not adequately collected; there were more than 50 parents who attended this training designed to foster literacy develop, support, and reading in the home.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): These data were not collected during the NCE.

Goal Two-Objective Three-Outcome One (i.e., 2.3-1): Increase the number of Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade Reading and Language Arts faculty trained in DR by 80.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the DR Survey. It was determined that during the 2013-2014 school year, no Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade Reading and Language Arts faculty were trained in DR; therefore, the Baseline Measure became 0 and the Target of a 80% improvement was defined by STAR as being at least 131 faculty members, per year.

Table 21 Goal 2, Objective 3, Outcome 1 (2.3-1): Increase the number of Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade Reading and Language Arts faculty trained in DR by 80.0%

<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (#)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
2.3-1	80.0	0	131	117	117	89.3	Yes

With a May 2014 baseline of 0 established a goal of 105 was set that would equate to 80% of Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade Reading and Language Arts faculty receiving DR Training as a result of the STAR Project. The Project met and exceeded the target as 117 out of a total of 131 teachers (89.3%) received DR Training due to the focus and resources of the IAL Grant.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase, by 75.0%, compared to August 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), the number of PK – 3rd Grade Reading and Language Arts (R/ELA) faculty who are provided professional development (PD) on how to utilize the new library resources as measured by the PD Sign-In Sheets in August 2015. All Baseline Measure data came from PD Agendas and Sign in Sheets for the 2013-2014 school year. It was determined that no PD sessions for library resources and technology occurred in the 2013-2014 school year; therefore, the Baseline Measure became zero and the 75% targeted improvement was defined by STAR as being at least 5 hours of PD for R/ELA for at least 75 faculty members.

In Year One, STAR conducted a total of 1 PD sessions, totaling 7 hours focusing on topics such as SmartBoards, TumbleBooks, Tablets, and other added media. Compared to the Baseline Measure of zero and the definitions determined by STAR, STAR successfully achieved and surpassed its Year One Target of 75 as 122 R/ELA faculty attended the PD.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): All proposed professional development was provided at the end of Year One.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): All proposed professional development was provided at the end of Year One.

Goal Two-Objective Three-Outcome Two (i.e., 2.3-2): Increase the number of minutes PK thorough 3rd Grade children are exposed to DR instruction each week by 25.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the DR Survey. It was determined that during the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years, no Pre-Kindergarten

through 3rd grade children were exposed to DR; therefore, the Baseline Measure became 0 in Year One.

Table 22. Goal 2, Objective 3, Outcome 2 (2.3-2): Increase the number of minutes children are exposed to DR instruction each week by 25.0%								
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Target (%)</i>	<i>Baseline (Year One, #)</i>	<i>Goal (#)</i>	<i>Post (#)</i>	<i>Difference (#)</i>	<i>Change (#)</i>	<i>Met Target?</i>
2.3-2	Year 2	25%	0	25	120	+120	+120.0	Yes

DR Training was not provided until the end of the school year in Year One and over Summer Months. There for there was no deliver of DR instruction during Year One and established a baseline of 0. Elementary school teachers at EISD were trained in DR and began implementation during Year Two. Focus Groups held at the elementary school campuses indicated that DR was integrated into the classroom daily. Based on the reporting of teachers in these sessions the approximate weekly average of DR focused instruction in the classroom was determined to be at least **120** minutes. Compared to the baseline of 0 this equates to an increase of **120.0%** in Year Two; this met and surpassed the targeted increase.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): Increase the number of minutes PK thorough 3rd Grade children are exposed to DR instruction each week by 25.0% from 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure), as measured by the DR Survey.] It was determined that during the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 school years, no Pre-Kindergarten through 3rd grade children were exposed to DR; therefore, the Baseline Measure became 0 in Year One. DR

Training was not provided until the end of the school year in Year One and over Summer Months. Therefore, there was no deliver of DR instruction during Year One and established a baseline of 0. However, teachers have been trained and the Project anticipates a profound increase in Year Two.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): DR Training was not provided until the end of the school year in Year One and over Summer Months. There for there was no deliver of DR instruction during Year One and established a baseline of 0. Elementary school teachers at EISD were trained in DR and began implementation during Year Two. Focus Groups held at the elementary school campuses indicated that DR was integrated into the classroom daily. Based on the reporting of teachers in these sessions the approximate weekly average of DR focused instruction in the classroom was determined to be at least **120** minutes. Compared to the baseline of 0 this equates to an increase of **120.0%** in Year Two; this met and surpassed the targeted increase.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): These data were not collected during the NCE.

Goal Two-Objective Three-Outcome Two (i.e., 2.3-3): Increase the number of 3rd grade students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STARR) reading assessment by 20.0% compared to 2014 (i.e., the Baseline Measure).

Table 23. Goal 2, Objective 3, Outcome 3 (2.3-3): Increase the number of 3rd grade students participating in DR who meet or exceed proficiency on the State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STARR) reading assessment by 20.0%							
<i>Goal/ Objective/ Outcome</i>	<i>Grant Year</i>	<i>Baseline (%)</i>	<i>Goal (%)</i>	<i>Post (%)</i>	<i>Difference</i>	<i>Change (%)</i>	<i>Met Goal?</i>
1.3-3	Year 1	BTW 77.0	80.9	69.0	-8	-10.4	No
	Year 2		84.7	52.0	-32.7	-42.5	No
1.3-3	Year 1	EES – 67.0	70.4	61.0	-6	-8.9	No
	Year 2		73.7	49.0	-24.7	-36.9	No
1.3-3	Year 1	NES -71.0	74.6	70.0	-4.6	-6.5	No
	Year 2		78.1	58.0	-20.1	-25.7	No

Towards the targeted annual increase of 3rd grade students who met criteria on the STAAR Test the Project was not successful. The target outcome of an increase of 20% annually was not achieved as measured by the state standardized test. These results are being reviewed across the state as the assessment has been brought into question. However, based on the most current data officially released by the Texas Education Agency the percentage of 3rd graders who meet criteria on the annual STAAR Reading Assessment decreased significantly. As a school district, EISD averaged a rate of students who met criteria for 3rd grade reading of **53.0%**; compared to the state average of **73.0%**. Students identified as White Non-Hispanic met criteria at a rate of **65.0%**; while Hispanics met criteria at a rate of **51.0%**. Students who identified as “Black” met criteria at a rate of **50.0%**. Students identified as English Language Learners met criteria at a rate of **47.0%** and students identified as economically disadvantaged met criteria at a rate of **48.0%**.

Status Chart Data:

Grant Year One (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015): At EISD the students tested in January 2015 showed an averaged ranked score of 96.3. When retested in May the score increased to 101.3 indicating an increase of 5.2% over baseline at EISD. At the comparison site at Seguin ISD that did not receive STAR services, the students tested in January 2015 showed an averaged ranked score of 97.2. When retested in May the score increased to 104.3 indicating an increase of 7.3% over baseline. Based on these data it may appear that students who did not receive STAR Program Services increased at a higher rate than those who did receive STAR Program Services. However, it is important to note that STAR was not fully implemented in Year One as much of the time was spent on start-up, purchasing, and coordination of extended hours. The majority of ROR books and books for Pre-K to 3rd Grade were distributed during the summer months and professional development did not occur until the summer months. As a result, key elements of STAR that targeted the oral language skills of 4-year olds were not implemented until after the baseline and post-administration of the TOPEL in Year One. STAR anticipates more accurate results that should reflect the full implementation of STAR in Year Two.

Grant Year Two (October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016): Due to administrative changes at the control site; there was no control site utilized in Year Two or during the NCE. The TOPEL was administered to three EISD Pre-K Classes in the Fall as Pre-Test and the Spring as Post-Test and scored in matched sets. During Year Two the baseline results indicated a Pre-Test Score on the TOPEL of 97.4. Post-Testing results indicated an average of 100.3. While there was an increase in Year Two of 2.9%, the Project did not achieve the target of 10% during the second year.

NCE (October 1, 2016 – September 30, 2017): The TOPEL was administered to three EISD Pre-K Classes in the Fall as Pre-Test and the Spring as Post-Test and scored in matched sets. During the NCE baseline results indicated a Pre-Test Score on the TOPEL of 97.5. Post-Testing results indicated an average of 104.4. During the NCE there was an increase of 12.8% over baseline. This level of increase met and exceeded the targeted 10% increase.

Analysis

Towards Goal Two the Project successfully implemented the Project as originally designed. The identified resources were acquired and were made available to children, student, parents and teachers. Teachers were provided with Professional Development focuses on DR and early reading. The TOPEL indicates that the efforts towards early reading were significant measurable at the end of the NCE and when compared to a control site in Year One. The available outcome data indicates that the Project was successful at increasing early reading, access to literacy, and family engagement. These outcomes should be followed past the grant period to determine if there is an increase in the 3rd grade over past year's scores in 2019-2020 and subsequent years because of the Project and its efforts in Pre-K and through the ROR strategies.

Conclusions

In review of the progress towards the goals, objectives, outcomes, and performance measures the data indicates that the STAR Project was well implemented as designed. The Project followed the Logic Model and ensured that all proposed activities were implemented as designed. STAR met and surpassed the targeted number of new books, titles, and periodicals to be purchased for each campus. STAR met and surpassed the targeted number of computers,

iPads, SmartBoards, software, and other technologies targeted for each campus. STAR met and surpassed the targeted Professional Development, training, family reading events, outreach, and book distribution targets. Towards all measurable output levels the STAR Program met and exceeded its targeted numbers. STAR allowed the campuses to increase the number of library resources available per student at each campus. Further, STAR lowered the average age of the collections at each campus to fall within the recommended range for age of books. The exception to this was at campuses that had not “weeded” the aged books from the collection; however, upon completion of this task this target will have been met. Overall the STAR Project brought a wealth of resources to the small, rural, and high percentage of economically disadvantaged students at EISD. The STAR Project’s performance towards its output measures was exceptional and surpassed the targets set due to the management team researching the best price for each resource acquired through grant funding. This allowed the funding provided for by the IAL to go much further than originally anticipated.

The U.S. Department of Education Status Charts are included in the Supplemental Section of this Report. Based on the structure of that reporting format the STAR Project was very successful and achieved **50%** of the four GPRA Measures and **90.9%** of the 11 Project Measures. As the scores of the high school students improved over the life of the grant and it is anticipated that the 3rd grade scores will improve as the students most impacted by the Project reach the 3rd grade; combined with the successful outcomes towards GPRA and Project Measures, the STAR Program has been very successful. The lessons learned from this Project have been identified based-on evidence-based models to increase resources and 21st Century Libraries. Further, PD for DR and utilization of resources are also based on evidence that was replicated at EISD. Further, ROR success is anticipated as students age and their increased

reading skills are measured district wide. Program data collection solutions were identified to better capture areas where data was not provided and will utilize technology in the form of on-line surveys to collect these data in the future. Overall, the STAR Project at EISD was significantly effective and will continue to make a difference in the lives of the children who attend EISD in future years. The commitment of EISD to continue the extended hours of the library is significant as students identified this as a strategy that works in the Year Two Focus Groups.

Unanticipated Outcomes or Benefits

STAR experienced start-up delays in Grant Year One. One of the results of these start-up delays was delayed collection of the Baseline Measure data for numerous Outcome Measures. In evaluating the data collection processes and limitations it was discovered that some processes and reports did not specifically yield enough information or data to be useful. In particular, in the tracking of individual users of library technology, it was discovered that many forms did not list the campus and that parents, teachers, and students often did not sign-out when they left the library, making it impossible to count accurately the hours of library use by campus. This issue was addressed by establishing a new data collection system for librarians to track the individual users of library technology.

It was also determined that teachers had little time in their schedules for additional PD regarding library technology. This issue was addressed by offering PD during the summer months of each school year when teachers have more availability in their schedules.

Changes to the Logic Model and Evaluation Plan

There were no significant changes to the logic model in Year One or Year Two. As required, for the No Cost Extension the STAR Project submitted a proposal to complete unmet targets originally proposed. These included the completion of ROR and extended hours. The same methodology was followed during the NCE; however, the activities were scaled down to only those targets that were not completed and approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

Supplemental TOPEL Findings

Statistical Significance Testing: Methodology and Results for Year One

The Program Evaluator examined formal student assessment results in light of research hypothesis statements to compare either pre- to post-assessments or experimental-to-comparison group results in terms of the impact of Reach Out and Read (ROR), a curriculum in the Elgin Independent School District's (EISD) **School Libraries** Grant, locally called the *Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR)*. Data analysis results from Year One were examined in terms of the impact of the ROR curriculum on student scores on the *Test Of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL)*. The research questions, methodologies and their results are included in the following.

#1. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment.

Methodology for Statement #1: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When $p\text{-value} < \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size

correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.000, which is less than our level of significance, leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STARS Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=33)

There is a statistically significant (i.e., p value =0.000) moderate correlation of 0.665 between pre- and post-test scores. This means a higher pre-test score is positively linearly related to higher post-test scores.

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#2. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test, from pre- to post-assessment.

Methodology for Statement #2: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.447, which is greater than our level of significance, leads us to conclude that students who have participated in the STARS Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=33)

The moderate correlation of 0.294 between pre- and post-test upper case scores is not a statistically significant result (p value =0.097).

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#3. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment.

Methodology for Statement #3: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.204, which is greater than our level of significance (0.05), leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STARS Program did not achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=30)

There is a statistically significant (i.e., p value =0.000) moderate correlation of 0.721 between pre- and post-test scores. This means a higher pre-test score is positively linearly related to higher post-test scores.

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#4. Students of teachers who in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test than students who did not receive the ROR program.

Methodology for Statement #4: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result

will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.213, which is greater than our level of significance (.05), leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who participated in the STAR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test than students who did not participate in the STAR Program.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of .067, thus assume non-equal variances and N = 66.

The weak correlation of .155 between the post test scores for students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value =.213).

Cohen's d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

#5. Students of teachers who in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test than students who did not receive the ROR program.

Methodology for Statement #5: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for

the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When $p\text{-value} < \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}}$$

where s_i^2 is the variance of group i ; $i = 1, 2$ and μ_1, μ_2 are defined as above

Results: A p-value of 0.254 which is greater than our level of significance (.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who participated in the STAR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test than students who did not participate in the STAR Program

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of .254, thus assume non-equal variances and $N = 66$.

The weak correlation of .142 between the post test scores and students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value = .254).

Cohen's d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

#6. Students of teachers who in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test than students who did not receive the ROR program.

Methodology for Statement #6: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.832 which is greater than our level of significance (.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who did not participate in the STAR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test than students who did not.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of .436, thus assume non-equal variances and $N = 63$.

The weak correlation of .027 between the post test scores and students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value = .832).

Cohen's d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

NOTE:

Limits for correlation:

<.5 is weak

.5-.79 is moderate

>.8 is strong

Limits for effect size correlation r:

<.148 is small

.148 - .371 is moderate

>.371 is large

Limits for Cohen's d:

<.2 is small effect

.2 - .79 is medium effect

>.8 is large effect

Description of effect size is at:

http://books.google.com/books?id=YEpMOQXofhwC&pg=PA456&lpg=PA456&dq=cohen%27s+d+in+terms+of+standard+deviation&source=bl&ots=j_2gVDYqbt&sig=wFZo4M6e_rhrpTmOvIXHp1_S70&hl=en&ei=1sB7TNKYLSBIAf6wensCw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CB4Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=cohen%27s%20d%20in%20terms%20of%20standard%20deviation&f=false

Percentile standings and Percent of non-overlap can be found at the following site:

<http://www.uccs.edu/~faculty/lbecker/es.htm>

Statistical Significance Testing: Methodology and Results for Year Two

The Program Evaluator examined formal student assessment results in light of research hypothesis statements to compare either pre- to post-assessments or experimental-to-comparison group results in terms of the impact of Reach Out and Read (ROR) program, a curriculum in the Elgin Independent School District's (EISD) **School Libraries** Grant, locally called the *Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR)*. Data analysis results from years one and two were examined in terms of the impact of the ROR curriculum on student scores (the *Test Of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL)*). The research questions, methodologies and their results are included in the following.

#1. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year two.

Methodology for Statement #1: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.000 which is less than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the ROR Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=30)

There is a statistically significant (p value =0.004) moderate correlation of 0.516 between pre- and post-test scores. This means a higher pre-test score is positively linearly related to higher post-test scores.

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#2. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test, from pre- to post-assessment, in year two.

Methodology for Statement #2: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.030 which is less than our level of significance leads us to conclude that students who have participated in the STARS Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=30)

The moderate correlation of 0.568 between pre- and post-test upper case scores is a statistically significant result (p value =0.001).

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#3. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment, in year two.

Methodology for Statement #3: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.430 which is greater than our level of significance (0.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the ROR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=30)

There is a statistically significant (p value =0.000) moderate correlation of 0.717 between pre- and post-test scores. This means a higher pre-test score is positively linearly related to higher post-test scores.

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#4. Students of teachers who in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test than students who did not receive the ROR program in year two.

Methodology for Statement #4: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.025 which is less than our level of significance (.05) leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who participated in the ROR Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test than students who did not participate in the ROR Program.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of .003, thus assume equal variances and N = 64.

The weak correlation of 0.280 between the post test scores for students participating in the STAR Program is a statistically significant result (p value =0.025).

Cohen's d for this test is calculated as

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Spooled= $\sqrt{((195.944+64.336)/2)}$ =11.408; thus d= (110.29 – 103.830) / 11.4080= 0.566

This means that the mean difference between the two groups is 0.566 of one standard deviation.

Effect size correlation (r) is calculated as

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

For this test the effect size correlation is 0.272. By calculating r^2 we can determine the amount of variation in scores that is attributed to being in the experimental group. Therefore, $r^2=0.0741$. Thus 7.41% of the variation in score is attributed to being in the experimental group.

#5. Students of teachers who in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test than students who did not receive the ROR program in year two.

Methodology for Statement #5: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.695 which is greater than our level of significance (.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who participated in the ROR Program did not achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test than students who did not participate in the STAR Program

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of 0.706, thus assume non-equal variances and $N = 64$.

The weak correlation of 0.049 between the post test scores and students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value =0.698).

Cohen’s d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

#6. Students of teachers who in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test than students who did not receive the ROR program in year two.

Methodology for Statement #6: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen’s d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.149 which is greater than our level of significance (.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who did not participate in the ROR Program did not achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test than students who did not.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of 0.001, thus assume equal variances and N = 64.

The weak correlation of 0.182 between the post test scores and students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value =0.149).

Cohen’s d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

#7. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year two, compared to year one.

Methodology for Statement #7: The Program Evaluator will examine the mean and standard deviation of the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment in year two compared to the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment in year one, and determine if there is significance difference in the gain between years.

Results: In year two, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 9.77 mean and 12.91 standard deviation, which is a larger gain in year one, when the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 7.64 mean and 12.91 standard deviation. However, the independent found a p value of 0.481 which is greater than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the ROR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment, one year two over year one. (N=63)

#8. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year two, compared to year one, and determine if there is significance difference in the gain between years..

Methodology for Statement #8: The Program Evaluator will examine the mean and standard deviation of the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment in year two compared to the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment in year one.

Results: In year two, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 7.17 mean and 17.24 standard deviation, which is a larger gain in year one, when the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 2.15 mean and 16.06 standard deviation. However, the independent found a p value of 0.238 which is greater than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the ROR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary, from pre- to post-assessment, one year two over year one. (N=63)

#9. Students who participate in the Reach Out and Read (ROR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test,

from pre- to post-assessment in year two, compared to year one, and determine if there is significance difference in the gain between years..

Methodology for Statement #9: The Program Evaluator will examine the mean and standard deviation of the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment in year two compared to the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment in year one.

Results: In year two, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 2.43 mean and 16.66 standard deviation, which is a slightly smaller gain from year one, when the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 2.63 mean and 11.12 standard deviation. However, the independent t-test found a p value of 0.957 which is greater than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the ROR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness, from pre- to post-assessment, one year two over year one. (N=63)

NOTE:

Limits for correlation:

- <.5 is weak
- .5-.79 is moderate
- >.8 is strong

Limits for effect size correlation r:

- <.148 is small
- .148 - .371 is moderate
- >.371 is large

Limits for Cohen's d:

- <.2 is small effect
- .2 - .79 is medium effect
- >.8 is large effect

Description of effect size is at:

http://books.google.com/books?id=YEpmOQXofhwC&pg=PA456&lpg=PA456&dq=cohen%27s+d+in+terms+of+standard+deviation&source=bl&ots=j_2gVDYqbt&sig=wFZo4M6e_rhrpTmOvlXHp1_S70&hl=en&ei=1sB7TNKYLSBIAf6wensCw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CB4Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=cohen%27s%20d%20in%20terms%20of%20standard%20deviation&f=false

Percentile standings and Percent of non overlap can be found at the following site:

<http://www.uccs.edu/~faculty/lbecker/es.html>

Statistical Significance Testing: Methodology and Results for Year Three

The Program Evaluator examined formal student assessment results in light of research hypothesis statements to compare either pre- to post-assessments or experimental-to-comparison group results in terms of the impact of Reach Out and Read (ROR) program, a curriculum in the Elgin Independent School District's (EISD) School Libraries Grant, locally called the *Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR)*. Data analysis results from years three were examined in terms of the impact of the STAR curriculum on student scores (the *Test of Preschool Early Literacy (TOPEL)*) Data was also compared to results from year one. The research questions, methodologies and their results are included in the following.

#1. Students who participate in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year three.

Methodology for Statement #1: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size

correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.000 which is less than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STAR Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=34)

There is not a statistically significant (p value =0.127) moderate correlation of 0.267 between pre- and post-test scores. This means a higher pre-test score is not positively linearly related to higher post-test scores.

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#2. Students who participate in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test, from pre- to post-assessment, in year three.

Methodology for Statement #2: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.000 which is less than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STARS Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=34)

The large correlation of 0.543 between pre- and post-test upper case scores is a statistically significant result (p value =0.001).

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#3. Students who participate in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment, in year three.

Methodology for Statement #3: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the pre-test scores and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. Effect size

correlations will not be used for this statement because the two groups are not independent.

Results: A p-value of 0.03 which is less than our level of significance (0.05) leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STAR Program did achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment. (N=34)

There is a statistically significant (p value =0.022) large correlation of 0.396 between pre- and post-test scores. This means a higher pre-test score is positively linearly related to higher post-test scores.

Cohen's d cannot be used for this question because the two groups are not independent.

#4. Students of teachers who in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test than students who did not receive the STAR program in year three.

Methodology for Statement #4: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value $< \alpha = .05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} =$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.213 which is greater than our level of significance (.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who participated in the STAR Program did not achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test than students who did not participate in the STAR Program.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of .000, thus assume equal variances and N = 62.

The moderate correlation of 0.160 between the post test scores for students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value =0.213).

Cohen's d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

#5. Students of teachers who in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test than students who did not receive the STAR program in year three.

Methodology for Statement #5: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value < $\alpha=0.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} =$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.034 which is less than our level of significance (.05) leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who participated in the STAR Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test than students who did not participate in the STAR Program.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of 0.002, thus assume equal variances and N = 62.

The moderate correlation of 0.269 between the post test scores and students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value =0.034).

Cohen's d for this test is calculated as

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Spooled= $\sqrt{((77.828+259.983)/2)}$ =12.996; thus d= (107.24 – 100.25) / 12.996= 0.538

This means that the mean difference between the two groups is 0.538 of one standard deviation.

Effect size correlation (r) is calculated as

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

For this test the effect size correlation is 0.260. By calculating r^2 we can determine the amount of variation in scores that is attributed to being in the experimental group. Therefore, $r^2=0.0675$. Thus 6.75% of the variation in score is attributed to being in the experimental group.

#6. Students of teachers who in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test than students who did not receive the STAR program in year three.

Methodology for Statement #6: The Program Evaluator will use the following hypotheses $H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2$ vs $H_1: \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$, where μ_1 is the mean of the post-test scores for the experimental group and μ_2 is the mean of the post-test scores for the comparison group. To test these hypotheses the p-value will be compared to the level of significance. When p-value < $\alpha=.05$ the null hypothesis (H_0) will be rejected. Otherwise the result will fail to reject the null hypothesis. If the result warrants, effect size correlations will be made. Those calculations will involve the following formulae:

Correlation for r

$$r = \frac{d}{\sqrt{d^2 + 4}}$$

Cohen's d

$$d = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_2}{s_{pooled}}; \text{ where } s_{pooled} = \sqrt{\frac{s_1^2 + s_2^2}{2}} \text{ where } s_i^2 \text{ is the variance of group } i; i = 1, 2 \text{ and } \mu_1, \mu_2 \text{ are defined as above}$$

Results: A p-value of 0.437 which is greater than our level of significance (.05) leads us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who did not participate in the STAR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test than students who did not.

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances has a p-value of 0.367, thus equal variances are not assumed and N = 62.

The weak correlation of 0.104 between the post test scores and students participating in the STAR Program is not a statistically significant result (p value =0.428).

Cohen's d was not calculated since the test failed to reject the null hypothesis.

#7. Students who participate in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year three, compared to year one.

Methodology for Statement #7: The Program Evaluator will examine the mean and standard deviation of the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment in year three compared to the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment in year one, and determine if there is significance difference in the gain between years.

Results: In year three, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 14.26 mean and 12.34 standard deviation, which is a larger than the gain in year one, when the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Print Knowledge Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 7.64 mean and 10.67 standard deviation. The independent sample t-test found a p value of 0.022 which is less than our level of significance leads us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STAR Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Print Knowledge Test, from pre- to post-assessment, year three over year one. (N=67)

#8. Students who participate in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year three, compared to year one, and determine if there is significance difference in the gain between years.

Methodology for Statement #8: The Program Evaluator will examine the mean and standard deviation of the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment in year three compared to the difference in

the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment in year one.

Results: In year three, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 13.56 mean and 14.98 standard deviation, which is a larger gain in year one, when the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 2.15 mean and 16.06 standard deviation. Also, the independent samples t-test found a p value of 0.004 which is less than our level of significance leading us to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STAR Program **did** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Definitional Vocabulary, from pre- to post-assessment, year three over year one. (N=67)

#9. Students who participate in the Striving Toward Academic Readiness for All (STAR) program will achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test, from pre- to post-assessment in year three, compared to year one, and determine if there is significance difference in the gain between years..

Methodology for Statement #9: The Program Evaluator will examine the mean and standard deviation of the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment in year three compared to the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment in year one.

Results: In year three, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 9.45 mean and 23.97 standard deviation. During year one, the difference in the standard score of TOPEL Phonological Awareness Test from pre- to post-assessment was a 2.63 mean and 11.12 standard deviation. However, the independent samples t-test found a p value of 0.159 which is greater than our level of significance leading us to fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that students who have participated in the STAR Program **did not** achieve statistically significantly higher scores on the TOPEL Phonological Awareness, from pre- to post-assessment, in year three over year one. (N=67)

NOTES:

Limits for correlation:

- <.5 is weak
- .5-.79 is moderate
- >.8 is strong

Limits for effect size correlation r:

- <.148 is small
- .148 - .371 is moderate
- >.371 is large

Limits for Cohen's d:

<.2 is small effect

.2 - .79 is medium effect

>.8 is large effect

Description of effect size is at:

http://books.google.com/books?id=YEpMOQXofhwC&pg=PA456&lpg=PA456&dq=cohen%27s+d+in+terms+of+standard+deviation&source=bl&ots=j_2gVDYqbt&sig=wFZo4M6e_rhrpTmOvIXHp1_S70&hl=en&ei=1sB7TNKYLSBIAf6wensCw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=3&ved=0CB4Q6AEwAg#v=onepage&q=cohen%27s%20d%20in%20terms%20of%20standard%20deviation&f=false

Percentile standings and Percent of non-overlap can be found at the following site:

<http://www.uccs.edu/~faculty/lbecker/es.html>

Year Two Focus Groups

EISD Administrator Focus Group

Moderator: Elgin ISD focus group for administrators, IAL. As a campus administrator, in what ways have you been involved in the development and implementation of the Innovative Approaches to Literacy grant program?

Participant 1: What ways have we been involved?

Moderator: Mm-hmm.

Participant 1: Making decisions on how best to utilize or what we thought was best for our campus. For example, moving books into classrooms – those were decisions that we made. And then also determining hours that we wanted to keep access open.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 2: Also, for the late library hours, we had some input in that regard, if there was a theme or a focus that we wanted to address at that time.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 3: And I – our teachers and librarian were able to choose the books that were purchased for the program, for each grade level, to give away.

Moderator: Okay. So in several ways – extended hours, choosing the resources, and –

Participant 1: And then we approve the resources too.

Moderator: Okay. As far as the grant's progressed, if there's been issues or areas of concern? Have you been able to alter things as they've gone along?

Participant 1: I haven't had any big issues of concern, but if we've had to – maybe bad weather or something like that, we had to rearrange hours or close the library. I mean, it's been easy to work with.

Moderator: Okay. Can you give any examples or ways you believe that the program has benefited your campus?

Participant 1: Absolutely. The updating of the collection – we're getting books with moneys that we wouldn't have had access to, and our library's – I can't speak for all, but ours at the high school – now we know who I am – was so old that it's allowing us to get new again. The hours, keeping the hours open – we're doing it twice a week. Kids are coming in – we generally have anywhere from 20 to 40 kids, staying late and working, whether it's using the books, using the technology, whatever it might be. It's been a good thing for our campus.

Participant 4: And also, at our campus, it's been a resource for some our parents as well. They have come in and used the extended library hours as well; I think they feel more comfortable coming at the extended, rather than being there during the day because kids – a lot of students are there or because of their work, so I've saw parents take advantage of it as well.

Participant 1: We've even done activities in conjunction with having that open library night to just generate more.

Participant 4: I know our – at our campus as well, they did a movie –

Participant 1: Yes, movie nights. We've done two movie nights.

Participant 4: – to a book that they were reading, and then they also – I think she had a different grant or maybe it was this one, that she also gave the students that attended a book that they could have for their personal –

Moderator: Yeah, that was part of this one.

Participant 4: Okay. Yes.

Moderator: Good. Okay, good. Kind of answered my next question already. Do you believe that what the program has provided in the additional resources of books, technology, multimedia, that sort of thing, early-reading materials, and the extended hours, have or will make a difference in student literacy on your campus, in regards to measurable outcomes that the grant wants, which is STAAR test results and literacy?

Participant 5: Well, absolutely. The – for youngest readers, they're taking home a book to have – their own personal books every month, and so there's more literature in the homes, and, obviously, for those teachers to be able to push our read-at-home initiative, now we know that they have quality literature to do that. And, plus, having the open library hours, our parents can come too. WE're really trying to teach our parents, “This is how you raise your kids to be literate, is to have books in your home and to take your kids to the library.” Without this, we

wouldn't have been able to – without this grant, we wouldn't have been able to do those things as well as we're doing now.

Participant: I agree.

Participant 4: Agree.

Participant 1: If anything, it's also helping not just our STAAR scores, but it's also helping with passing rates. Kids, giving them – some kids don't get to go home to an environment where they can do work, and so this is allowing that to happen.

Participant 4: And another way that we use it on the campus – every student has to have so many AR points, so when our students don't have it, we also invite them and their parents to come to the extended to get some of those AR testing and reading books, so that they can pass for the six weeks.

Participant 5: And I guess specifically to STAAR testing, in the beginning of kindergarten, in beginning-of-year assessment, if a child is reading on grade level at the beginning of kindergarten, that's an indicator for passing the STAAR test at third grade, so we can actually look at our kindergarteners right now and know who is and is not gonna pass STAAR reading in third grade, so if we're already working very hard on literacy right then, it has direct results for STAAR testing.

Moderator: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Are there areas that the program did not cover that you feel would have been beneficial towards increasing literacy at your campus?

Participant 4: I would like more. You know, the –

Participant 1: Yeah, that's what I was gonna say.

Participant 4: – extended nights – I mean, if we can have more –

Participant 1: More time.

Participant 4: – more time, that would be the only thing.

Participant 1: Keeping the library open and just having that be available has been huge. It really has. And, right now, for the high school, we're doing it two nights a week.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 1: One would.

Participant 4: Mm-hmm. 'Cause we only do one at the middle school right now.

Moderator: As far as the program has gone and progressed over the almost two years that it's been around now, have you seen any unanticipated outcomes, as a result of the program, like scheduling conflicts or strain on resources, like your technology staff, or...

Participant 4: No.

Participant 1: Not negative. No, it's just been a plus.

Moderator: So no negatives really that you've seen?

Participant 1: If anything, one of the pluses is we're forming book clubs now even. I mean, that wasn't happening two years ago, and I do think part of that is because of this.

Participant 5: In my campus, we've looked more – I think because of this, we've looked more at the library environment, and so we've actually working on upgrading that library facility. And a good problem to have is the fact that we have a lot of books – a lot more books than we had before, so if you do a lot more library science like weeding or appropriately cataloging and just changing up the environment so it's as user-friendly as possible. And I don't know if the emphasis was necessarily there before the grant.

Moderator: Mm-hmm. Okay. If you could apply for these funds again, and hopefully you will in the near future but not this year, what would you want to be different in the focus and implementation, if you could change it in any way?

Participant 5: I wouldn't change it. Maybe – oh, you know maybe I would. I think the books are for K-2 or K-3, the ones that we're giving them monthly. Maybe include 4th and 5th, maybe some high-interest chapter books. Maybe that – for my campus, that would be a change.

Participant 4: No changes.

Participant 1: Yeah. I think the only thing would be, like we talked about a minute ago, if there was a way to add more time and –

Participant 5: Yeah. ____ ____.

Participant 1: – keeping it open.

Moderator: More extended hours?

Participant 4: Right.

Participant 3: Maybe include a series of staff developments for parents to attend that was well-planned and thought of ahead of time, as a part of the grant, instead of so much autonomy given. I mean, I do believe in autonomy, but, you know, connecting some of our programs, our literacy programs, for parents 'cause I – I don't know – I think that that increases engagement, as opposed to involvement – teaching parents to be engaged with their kids as readers.

Moderator: Mm-hmm. So you would have that be kind of planned out and –

Participant 3: I would.

Moderator: – mapped out in advance?

Participant 3: Mapped out, whether we combined it with some of our early literacy, Latino literacy project or we have an English component, and so parents kind of sign up for maybe a five-week series, and so they kind of know which Mondays they're coming, and we could probably do a better job publicizing it. I think we do a good job, but I think we could even do better if they signed up ahead of time and they kind of knew this was a five-week series and we need you to come each time, for engagement. I mean, if we had to add, to do something a little bit different, that's what I would probably suggest.

Moderator: Okay. What grade levels would that be the most beneficial for, do you think? I mean, obviously, early ones, but...

Participant 3: K through two for sure. And I think you could – I mean, just in me, I would alternate the Mondays 'cause, a lot of times, parents are not gonna come every Monday in a row, but if the first and third Monday was for K through two, it was a series, and then the second and fourth was for third through fifth because there's lots to teach parents about comprehension or helping their kids build fluency that we could combine with that to help parents learn how to work with their kids, when it comes to a upper-elementary reader.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 3: Teaching them about AR. I mean, really connecting them to what literacy looks like here in Elgin.

Moderator: Okay. Anything else on that?

Participant 1: I don't think so.

Moderator: Part of the Geppert measures, in addition to the one on the four-year-olds, where we come in and do the pre and post with the TOPL enies and the comparison control site with – we did Seguin one year, and it'll be Braunfels this year, but is that they look at your third-grade, fifth-grade, and eighth-grade reading scores for STAAR, as reporting measures. Do you think that there will be an increased improvement this year over last year, versus the year before that, that this might have played some part in, specifically to reading?

Participant 3: So it'd be third grade this year, right, 'cause they would be third graders 'cause it was only K-through-second-focused, right?

Participant 1: Well, it hit middle school too.

Moderator: Yeah, although what –

Participant 3: But, for us, it would be our third graders, not our fifth graders, right?

Moderator: It would take fifth grade too.

[Crosstalk]

Participant 2: Because ____ got those books too.

Participant 3: Oh, did they?

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 5: But it's not just the book giveaway; it's the whole –

Participant 1: It's the whole program.

Participant 3: Oh, okay.

Moderator: Yeah, the resources and the library and that sort of thing.

Participant 1: Gracey, do you think that it helped with the eighth-grade scores?

Participant 4: Possibly.

Participant 1: The reading scores?

Moderator: I know you don't have 'em back yet, but...

Participant 4: Yeah, we got them back.

Moderator: Oh, yeah?

Participant 1: They just came back, yeah, and they –

Participant 4: First administration.

Participant 4: Yeah, first administration came back. And, last year, at first administration, we were – compared to this year, we went up 8 percent, so we had 39 more students pass first administration, compared to last year.

Moderator: Eight percent's good.

Participant 3: Mm-hmm. We don't have the same percentage at the elementary, though, at this time. Not for fifth grade.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 5: Actually, mine went up a little bit.

Participant 3: From last year to this year?

Participant 5: For reading – just STAAR, not STAAR-A – it went up about one percentage point, but it went up.

Participant 4: It went up. That's an increase. [*Chuckles*]

Participant 5: Up is up.

Moderator: Okay. And then what we do with those is we'll go back and compare 'em to the year before the grant started as well, so, ideally, they went up a little bit more than that, but, when you're talking about a one-year time frame that these resources are living here, it's really hard to say there's been that much change yet. And, over time, hopefully, there will be,

especially with continued efforts. Have you seen teachers increase their use of the library in coordination with the student lessons and things?

Participant 1: I can say that at the high school especially. Absolutely. And that's one of the reasons the books on cart came about, is because teachers were asking. Absolutely.

Participant 5: And I would say so too, with regard to the open library day that we have, teachers have used that opportunity to hold parent meetings or parent workshops during that time. And then they release the parents to go to the library to check out books. And it's been a draw for both – they're coming to learn something and they're coming to spend some time with their kids or using the library resources.

Participant 3: Do we have – is this the last year of the grant?

Moderator: Yes. It'll end, I think, September. Most of it's been implemented at this point – the resources have been put out there – and so it's winding down, with reports and evaluation and that sort of thing, yeah. It'll run extended hours through the summer, but then, yeah, this is the final year when the –

Participant 1: So do we – are we able to apply again for this next year or we're not in that _____?

Moderator: What happened for Elgin applying, right now, 'cause the grant is out, is that the poverty rate, based on what they go by, which is family poverty rate off the census, is Elgin went down to 24.7, and it has to be 25 or over, and so you don't qualify at this point. Next year, when this grant is out, it drops – they changed the law to where it goes to 20 percent family poverty rate – and Elgin will then fall into –

Participant 1: So – can I be stupid? – so in the poverty rate that you're talking about is based on the entire Elgin population?

Moderator: Mm-hmm.

Participant 1: So it's not based on the kids we serve?

Moderator: Right. You can have an outrageous amount of –

Participant 1: Now that's just _____...

Moderator: – free-and-reduced lunch, which you do –

Participant 1: But because the other people aren't free-and-reduced –

Moderator: Yeah, it goes –

Participant 1: – that don't have kids, it killed us on this.

Moderator: Yeah.

Participant 1: Okay, can I just say that's stupid?

Moderator: Absolutely.

Participant: You can say it – you just did.

Participant: For the record. It's on the record.

[Laughter]

Participant 1: For the record. And I know that's –

Moderator: Yeah, it can really offset –

Participant 1: Is that the federal government?

Moderator: Mm-hmm. That's, yeah, department of education decision.

Participant 1: So we can be rich and retired...

Participant 2: But don't retire the district that's, you know, near poverty.

Participant 1: Oh, no, it –

Participant 2: 'Cause you'll ruin it for them –

[Crosstalk]

Participant 1: Right.

Participant 2: – and ruin their chances of getting scored.

Participant 4: So our extended library and all of that'll end after the summer, so we won't have that next year?

Participant 1: That's what he's saying.

Moderator: Well, not through grant funding. Unless you find a way _____ or –

Participant 4: So was the grant for two years? 'Cause we only did it for – what? – like...

Moderator: Yeah, it's two years.

Participant 4: So we did it for a semester –

Participant 1: We did it for last –

Participant 4: A year-and-a-half?

Participant 1: Right.

Moderator: Yeah. Usually, it takes about six months for anything to even show up, but, you know –

[Crosstalk]

Participant 2: It kicked off _____.

Participant 1: That is absolutely unbelievable, that we're not gonna qualify for that anymore.

Moderator: You'd be surprised at some other places too.

Participant 4: We will; we just won't qualify for next year.

[Crosstalk]

Participant 7: ____ next year. Just not this year.

Participant 1: But, still, I'm talking about for the '16-'17 school year.

Moderator: Yeah. But, hopefully, you'll still get – you have a good shot at the 21st Century grant that I know that the district worked on. And that will take the place, with the extended hours and tutoring and things like that – it'll fill that gap that you would otherwise notice. I think it will build that in there.

Participant 1: How does the federal government think that by looking at the whole census, versus the schools? That makes no sense to me.

Moderator: Yeah. And you see it in several towns, where it's like the poverty rate at the school district is really high, but you have a lot of retirees and all that, and it just – they're at 19 percent, when, really, every kid at school is actually –

Participant 1: Is low-income.

Moderator: – low-income, yeah. So the way they do it is not how I would do it, but it's the way they have it set up, that you're either on the list or not of being able to apply for this one, so. Just the way it goes. So teachers have increased their coordination with the library.

Participant: Yes.

Participant 5: Yep. Absolutely.

Participant 1: So I need to set aside budget money so we can keep this going.

Participant: Yep.

Participant 1: It's insurance AP.

Participant 7: Well, unless 21st Century grant will.

Participant 1: I know, but if not, I wanna set aside budget money to keep this going.

Moderator: And the last question –

Participant 1: At least the...

[Side conversation]

Participant 5: Well, that speaks volumes _____, you know. That speaks volumes _____ we're talking.

Participant: I'm sorry.

Participant 5: It has an impact with those interactions.

Moderator: Oh, it's all right. Any comments, concerns, or questions you have overall about the program, as it's gone? I know we just kind of went through some of those just now, but –

[Crosstalk]

Participant 1: Yeah, we did.

Participant 5: Only concern is that's it's ending.

Participant 1: Now I'm pissy –

[Laughter]

Participant 5: That's my only concern.

Participant 3: So how will we – who keeps us posted about when to apply? What's that process for the following year?

Participant 7: Deb Mahone.

Moderator: Yeah, it'd be Deb.

Participant 3: Deb Mahone'll just have that on her radar, to apply for it?

Moderator: Yeah, and then we do too.

Participant 3: Okay.

Moderator: And...

Participant 1: Yeah, so I'm gonna get ready to change all that, change –

Moderator: Yeah, we know that people here one at a time.

Participant 3: So who do we need – is there someone we need to write to say, “Thank you”? I mean, how does this – you said it's funded by the federal government, so it's not by agent, you know –

Moderator: It's department of ed.

Elgin Elementary School Teacher Focus Group

Moderator: Elgin Elementary teacher focus group, ILA. As classroom teachers, in what ways have you been involved in the development and implementation and use of resources provided by the Innovative Approaches to Literacy grant program?

Participant 1: Can you repeat the question again? I'm sorry.

Moderator: In what ways have you guys been involved in the grant, as far as active role in selecting resources or utilizing them? In what ways have they sought any input from y'all, in that process?

Participant 2: Yeah, we were able to select the books that we wanted for our students to take home, so that was one of the things that was very, very helpful. It made a huge difference to read a book to the students that they were actually gonna take home because they were excited they were gonna go home and look at it, find letters that we'd been going over the week and punctuation marks, things like that. I really think it helped our students, with our population that we have – made a big, big difference. I saw a big change in their ability to want to learn because they had that book, and so many parents had said they didn't have books at home, and they were like, "Where are these books coming from?" so it was nice to say, "It's yours to keep."

Moderator: Great.

Participant 2: Anybody else?

Participant 1: Bilingual. ____ you guys had to give bilingual class?

Participant: Mm-hmm.

Participant 2: The other thing is the extended library time. I've seen quite a few students, their parents coming in, and I think that was real helpful because it's hard for parents to get home from job and – or whatnot and get everybody together and then go to the library and whatnot, so sometimes just being able to stop by after school and pick up some books to take home – that was very helpful, I think.

Moderator: Okay. How do you see that the grant program has benefited your campus, in addition to the way you just mentioned? I know the take-home books has been a great part. Any other ways?

Participant 1: Well, for me, it's created a conversation with parents because I got a lot of parents asking if those were my books, 'cause I'll lend books out of my own classroom library, so they were – then they thought, "Do I have to pay for these books?" and I said, "No, that's your

student's book for their personal library,” so that was a really good thing to hear from parents, and it told me that they were actually engaged, going through the folder, looking for those items.

The kids, when they see their same book in the library, because these books are books that the school holds as library books, they – there was a little bit of excitement. The kids are excited; these are new things that often these students don't have the opportunity, in their own daily life experiences, to have someone bring them a new book and there's just a lot of excitement around books, around reading. The first thing they wanna do is, “Can you read this, Ms. Robin? Can you read this?” So, I mean, sometimes, you're like, “All right. We're gonna go into this and you read a couple books,” and they are – and then, of course, you know, have five or six that don't believe that they get to take 'em home. And they ask the same thing – “That's gonna be our book, Ms. Robin?” “Yes, sweetie. This will be your book. You will each get your own book,” so, for the kids, I would say it's just that excitement around books and be able to not just have a taste of something but be able take a whole cake home. These kids are just so excited about that.

And they talk to their brothers and sisters, and a lot of them are in school here too, and they talk about how they talked to their brother or sister about these are their books, and they'll say, “My brother read the book *Spoon* to me” – that was our most recent book. And, sometimes, you're taken aback because you know that opportunity was probably not gonna present itself if they had not had those books, so, for me, personally, I see that in my classroom.

Participant 2: Yeah, it's really – it just sent the flag of “Reading is important,” and they just fly with it. It's almost like, “Can we have a book? Can we have another book?” And that's good to see that excitement because reading is the bottom line and key through all of the rest of education.

Participant 1: Better readers, better writers; better writers, better readers. And even starting now, getting excited about the books. Like she talked about, the library hours – getting the kids excited about coming in this space. And same thing in our own classroom libraries – get 'em excited about that center being the library center and creating excitement about that space and about what they can do with books, and, I mean, it's like – I mean, they just get really excited. I don't see them left in my backpacks as often as maybe the other, but mine, when they go home, they're not in the backpacks the next day. I can see report cards left in the backpacks the next day; I'll see sheets that need signatures by parents left the next day. But those books? They're out, so that always makes me smile a little bit.

Participant 2: I think too this for me, that they – the parents themselves are more inquisitive about the functions of the library itself, and I'm one of the bilingual teachers – a lot of my parents are non-literate themselves – but the fact that they're taking an interest, bring their kids, and become more acquainted with what the school may offer through the medium of the library is important because, very soon, there'll come a time when those parents are not able to help their kids any longer, so it's really up to their interest in coming to school and being involved. And I

think having the grant be funded through or in conjunction with the library has set a good tone in that direction.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 2: I know the training offered a dialogic reading training. That was very informative and helpful, especially for maybe some of us who've been out of college for a while and some that were maybe new and hadn't had that training. It's something we kind of do as teachers anyway, but I really like the focus of how they pulled out, you know, vocabulary words and setting it up so that it's like you name a couple of animal names, and then you're like, "What kind of book do you think we're gonna read about today?" So the anticipation was there. I'm not saying that right [*laughs*], but you know what I mean. You know, when I've done that with some small groups or even whole group, it really zeros them in and gets them focused more, so that was very helpful.

The other thing was assessments. I know that you all come in and assess our children at the beginning of the year and then again at the end. And, at the beginning, when – especially when y'all first did it, it was real exciting to see where my students had fallen and go, "That's exactly where I think they would be," but then you have the details of what objectives to work on with them, and then, at the end of the year, seeing the progress that's been made. So that was very helpful. We use those assessments to do small groups with.

Moderator: Good.

Participant 4: Maybe it could be more useful if more teachers had opportunities like that to get a deeper assessment of their kids so that we could have the same opportunities to see where they're starting out at and what we need to work more specifically with each child. 'Cause I would have liked to have that information with my kids, could've know more specific where they are, as far as literacy.

Participant 5: So only certain classrooms were tested?

Participant 4: I think only two classrooms were tested. Is that what you're – this –

Participant 2: I guess – no, it was Nernberg and mine.

Participant 5: Oh, okay. Any bilingual classes?

Participant 2: And I guess they did that group last year too.

Participant 4: I don't believe there was any bilingual classes that were tested.

Participant 2: No.

Moderator: Yeah, no, there was just two selected and then two selected at another school district that didn't get the grant and didn't get the resources that – you know, similar socioeconomics and all that sort of thing. And the reason why it was only done with two is just a matter of cost and what the grant would pay for – when it comes down to evaluations and

assessments and stuff like that, they limit the percentage that can be done – but that's something to keep in mind for the next time around, that doing more or all of that grade level or, you know, were they pre-K or K.

Participant 2: Yeah, it's pre-K.

Moderator: I know the four-year-olds –

Participant 2: Yeah, and there's –

Moderator: – it's harder, but, yeah.

Participant 2: – there's ten classes for English and – no, six English and four bilingual.

Participant 5: Six and four, mm-hmm.

Participant 2: Got it backwards _____.

Moderator: Okay. So doing more of those is a good idea. You guys kind of already answered this one, but do you believe that the increased access to the library during extended hours has been beneficial towards improving literacy?

Participant 1: Yes, of course, yes.

Participant 2: Yes.

Participant 5: Mm-hmm. Yes.

Participant 1: It's not hurting anything.

Participant 2: Yeah. It's definitely not hurting anything. The only thing I would add is increase of numbers. I mean, it definitely got more people in than before, obviously, 'cause the library wasn't open, but trying to get more parents up here. And I don't know if –

Participant 1: I think we could probably do it five.

Participant 2: – I don't know if a survey of who or –

Participant 1: Personally, I think that, as the teacher of my classroom, I could have done a better job of communicating not just that it's open but the benefits and, just like with anything else, making it part of my classroom community. And I know personally that that's something, that next year, I'm definitely gonna do a better job of. And I'm just saying 'cause I think that those numbers – I don't wanna put the blame all on my parents because I can't think right now how many times I made a personal effort to call or send out a note, talking about that or even setting that tone at the beginning of the year, about how important it is, about maybe I could reward my students for every parent that signs in – “This is what ___ – your child's gonna get recess,” or whatever it is that helps motivate those kids and then they see Mom and Dad motivated or even coming or Granny or Pappy, whoever – I think that that's something personally, for next year, that I'm definitely gonna do because I didn't do a good job this year of really pushing that, you know what I'm saying?

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 5: Or maybe we could have like a special pre-K night, you know?

Participant 1: Yeah, I don't –

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 1: – I don't think I communicated that well enough.

Participant 5: Like a _____ _____.

Participant 2: Try to drum up something, where their own –

Participant 1: I mean, I'm speaking for myself because it's not fair to label the entire group of – with all 200 of our children, but, yeah, I'm gonna say that that's something that on me, that wasn't a lack of training – it was just, I think, I did not prioritize enough to that and I didn't make it enough of my classroom community, which I can change, but I definitely would –

Participant 2: Kind of educating more about why the library's open more and what it can do and what it offers, trying to really emphasize the tools and the reference materials and things in the library. I know I did two workshops that I, because this library was open extended hours, I aligned it with that time so that I knew for a fact parents would be here. And one of them was on literacy and math games, and then the next one was on sequencing, how to retell a story using story props. And that went over very well, so –

Participant 1: I might even just start off with something simple as, instead of movie night, it's book night, and I'm going to have a little popcorn bag. I want the kids – just like we get excited about seeing Nemo for movie night, school book night, and I'm gonna pick a new book that we might have gotten in or that the kids can see for my class and try to do something where I can get them here, get parents to come and just look around and feel more comfortable, even in their own school, because, at the end of the day, this is where it's at.

Participant 2: Yeah, like a little library tour with their parent or something, kind of a –

Participant 1: Absolute – I mean, just...

Participant 2: Yeah, those are great ideas. That's –

Participant 1: Just gotta implement them.

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 2: I would love to see – and this is just me being nerdy, but I would love to see an even larger increase in the number and variety of books in Spanish, but also, I don't know, somehow – I know things are done usually by groups and committees and blah, blah, blah, but that, somehow, there is a way to look at the quality of the materials that are being brought into the library for the programs 'cause, often, translated books and adapted books, the quality's not

there, and so then you end up with books that do not serve us, but instead hurt. So those two things – that we get more Spanish books so that we can kind of match the amount of the English, and then that the quality of said books and programs is equal. So – I don't know – a link to Spain, a link to publishing houses in Spain, Mexico, what have you. Something like that.

Moderator: Yeah, and Spanish is different in different areas, so what might be a great book in Miami, in a highly Cuban population, isn't gonna be the same Spanish they speak in south Texas.

Participant 2: No, but we do wanna go for the standards.

Moderator: Right, right.

Participant 2: And that's where – I rather almost have one that is a standard of something than one that has been translated but without the background and the standards. I worked in a publishing company, and that's what guides this petition – I've seen the crap, so [*chuckles*]. So it's okay.

Participant 2: That's all right. It's there.

Participant 2: It's okay. So it's simply that the priority is not there because we are not a majority, because the language does not dominate the market. So, at the time of purchasing, we often go – and not – I don't mean this program, but we often go for the group of interpreters or translators that are cheapest to pay and, often, it doesn't translate – it doesn't come out as the best product.

Participant 2: It'd be like hiring me to, what little Spanish I do know, to write a book.

Participant 2: Yes.

Participant 2: And it's correct, but it doesn't have the quality because I don't have the quality to put there when I am translating.

Participant 2: Kind of. And –

Participant 6: Yeah. And something without – about this book, they receive these because it's in English and in Spanish. I like that because, some parents, they know Spanish, but some parents they wanted the kid was in a Spanish class and they don't know Spanish, so it's good for them. I really like it.

Participant 2: The dual one?

Participant 2: The dual one?

[*Crosstalk*]

Participant 2: The _____ one?

Participant 6: 'Cause it's in both languages, yeah.

Moderator: Okay. Good. Are there areas that the program did not cover that you feel would have been beneficial towards increasing literacy at the campus? Was the grant missing something that you guys realize, –

Participant 1: More books.

Moderator: – “I wish we would have had this”?

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 1: No, I wish – I do wish this. I wish that we had the books more spread out through the year, so at the beginning of the year, we had 'em, like we just got – and I shouldn't even complain – that's like saying, “I get all my presents at once” – but so I could really incorporate it into my monthly flow, so to speak, that I can make a bigger deal, every month, that we get our new books in, have sort of something around that event happening – again, that opportunity to communicate with parents and students – because we got five books a couple weeks ago, all at once. And I know that maybe it's not even a good thing to even whine about – just be thankful – but if the books came every month, where you really could take – and you could take those books in because, the books that we're able to choose, I mean, we can actually incorporate them into the curriculum that we're giving, so they could be on point. If we're dealing with bugs or insects or –

Participant 2: We did that more last year – we got 'em once a month – so, yeah.

Participant 1: So they could – but, this year –

Participant 2: You're right.

Participant 1: I'm only familiar with this year; I'm sorry.

Participant 2: Right. No, but I agree.

Participant 1: Yeah, I'm just saying that I could really incorporate – imagine them having books that we use within our own classroom curriculum. Then to be able to take those resources home, and so they have the opportunity – excuse me – to identify both with that, with what we're doing in the classroom. I could bring at home and classroom together and the whole real world, and I just think that that would be – it'd be nice if they could do that, but if they can't, that's okay – I'll still take 'em all at once. I have no problem; I just thought that would be really nice, if they came that way. But it's not a complaint – I know how it sounds – but if they could, that'd be great.

Moderator: That makes sense. Anything else?

Participant 2: I don't know. I mean, is it something like – I don't know – I'm thinking like a wish list type thing?

Moderator: Yeah, that –

Participant 2: You know, I think, too, with the stories, we have a listening center in the classroom, so getting a book – I don't know if they can do on tape or CD, for them to listen to.

Participant 1: Like one classroom set that would be CD? Like one set that would be a CD with it?

Participant 2: Yeah, for the classrooms, so that the children can filter through that center and actually listen to that story. And I think that would be really helpful too because, again, it's a book that they're taking home – they've heard it. And, with pre-K, it's repetition of books, and the more that they hear the rhythm and rhyme and things, then they tend to pick up, and they'll reread or copy reading, and that's a good skill to have. So that's just something that came to mind, that might be very beneficial.

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 6: So we can have an extra ones. That way, we can keep the ones in the library and classroom because we receive one copy for everybody and one for _____, but if we have like buy extra ones, that's better. I mean, I think.

Participant 1: It would be much better.

Participant 2: You're talking a book set?

Participant 6: Books. Yeah.

Participant 2: A set for the listening center – instead of just one book, you'd have at least three books to share with the small group, three or four books, so that they're sitting and they're following the words along with a tape. So that's – I think that's what she's saying. And then what's nice is that you can use that same book in a small group and go, “Can you find the letter T? Can you find the letter A? Can you find a period and a punctuation mark?” and every child has that book, so then they can take that skill and practice it with the same book at home. So, yeah, that would be great, especially the *Chicka Chicka Boom Boom* – we could learn our letters. [Laughs] Yeah, that would – yeah. If that could be done, that would be great.

But, overall, having a book in their hand made a huge, huge difference because I know, my first year coming back into pre-K, we didn't have that. Last year, we had got that, and it was like night and day – boy, they were... I mean, my kids are more excited about getting a book than they are a crayon – it's like, “Wow. Awesome. [Laughs] Something's changed.”

Participant 1: Also, when they have ownership of a book – and I know, for a lot of us, maybe it was the way we grew up, but have something that's your own and you have to really think about our kids – or our students, excuse me, what ownership looks like for them. Most of the time, ownership for them is something that's been handed down – it's not new. And building these students up, their stamina for reading, is so important for going to kindergarten and first grade that these kids, for me, it was so much easier to help build that stamina to read to self because they are so engrossed in their book. And I can't emphasize enough how important it is for them to have something that's theirs, with their name written in, because you never write in books.

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 1: We talk about how you hold a book like a treasure in your library. You don't even turn the pages – “Don't you dare turn the pages from the bottom; you turn your pages –” I mean, for them to have ownership and to have them – when they get those books, they wanna sit. I don't have to say, “I need you to sit down. Turn around, blah, blah” – no, I don't have that because they're so engrossed in their book. I have to set the timer so, when ten minutes is up, ten minutes is up. But they are – because it's theirs, and I think it's a whole ownership –

Participant 2: And they take care of their books. They've learned 'cause it's theirs.

Participant 1: Yeah. It would be a really big message, that it helps in those little things that you don't think about, but that reading to self, building that stamina? They're more willing to look at that than if I just pulled a book of the shelf and said, “Okay, this is your library book” – they're done about 20 seconds. But, when it's their book, they're so excited. It's like every picture belongs to them, and a lot of them, they take, from that book, when we go to art center, they wanna draw the pictures from their books. They wanna be an illustrator. So there's so much that comes from just that sense of having something, that I see in my own classroom.

Moderator: Okay. And then you had mentioned assessments. Other than that, do the kids – there's really no standardized until they hit third grade, right? That's the first time anything really gets done to evaluate the reading.

Participant 4: Yeah, we do –

Participant 5: We do DRA in kindergarten.

Participant 4: Yeah. I know we do an assessment every six weeks, and I don't know what all – the assessment that y'all provided entailed, but I just know, if anything, maybe just to switch it up 'cause I know – I'm pretty sure that you and Nernberg were selected last year, and I don't know if that's with y'all or if that's with us, but just to give other teachers a better idea of, “Okay, what do I need to –” it helps us as teachers, but then it also helps our students, if we can kind of move it around. And I also think it would be beneficial to do something like that for bilingual, absolutely, as well.

Participant 1: 'Cause we do have students that are actually – I mean, especially now, we have students who can read – I have those books where they can read, “I see a ball,” so there are students who are there. Of course, you have some that still can't, maybe in your classroom, can't identify a word, but we do have assessments, like she was saying, where they can identify words, letters, punctuation, numbers, how to sweep back – “Where do you start when you read? Where would you end if Ms. Robin was reading this?” Those types of assessments that we do. And, of course, we do all the phonemic and rhyming and all that, but we do have some students who are ready and who are asking for you to read to them, and then they wanna read to you. They also have a great memory, so a lot of it's just memorizing a book, which is fun. You know, most of them are learning right now; it's _____ but.

Participant 2: But, every now and then, we've got two – one to three that are actually reading per sight words, and I have one that's reading phonetically now, so you just never know – there's a wide range in there. And, as far as a question – back with you, their assessing – or assessment

is very similar to what we're doing in OWL every six weeks, per the report card. They check the beginning sounds, the rhymes, things like that. I don't know if you wanna share more about what's actually assessed, but –

Moderator: Yeah, what we use is the TOPL, and it is letter recognition and vocabulary and then phonetics, and that covers pretty much the three groups that it does. And some people really like the TOPL as an assessment, and I'm not a literacy-based educator person, so I just know how to administer –

Participant 2: The test.

Moderator: – test and then write reports about it, but Deb is kind of like, “Mmm, TOPL's okay,” but some of the department of ed people who fund the grants, they are fond of the TOPL at the moment, so that factors into it some, but – and other ones we've used, like OWL and PALS and Peabody and all that sort of thing, so it just depends on what really is gonna score points at the time you write the grant. But it's definitely a good thing to keep in mind if brought it up with definitely putting it into bilingual classes too. It'd be nice to do all of them, the classrooms.

Participant 2: Yeah, the one thing I can say, as far as that, is that when they first did it, I was really shocked that it was a test that was testing things that we were actually teaching, which was great, because I had just gotten used to OWL and I was – 'cause I taught pre-K 20 years ago and it's come a long way 'cause I know we were in a research project where we were saying three words with the same beginning sound, and this was every day, doing different things, and they would take the data back. And now it's implemented – it's in a curriculum – and it's paying off because, when they tested and then we went through OWL the second year, it's like, “Wow, okay. I know this is important 'cause y'all are gonna be testing it.” We wrote our report cards to align with the assessment as well, so I know we're gonna be checking on that. And, to me, it's brought up, overall, our pre-K objectives and standards for students. I think they're meeting it more so than what we were doing 20 years ago.

Moderator: Okay. Good. As far as the professional development provided by the program to you, as teachers, was that beneficial?

Participant 4: I found it to be very beneficial and just in terms of how to not only just read to your students but get them to start answering questions about a book before it's been read to 'em and kind of go through scenarios so that they're forming answers and hypotheses on what they think is gonna happen. So I think it was very helpful for me; I learned – took a lot from it. And then we, during that training, we were actually given a book for us teachers to keep and then use and practice in our room, which I found to be very helpful because we were able to work in the training and then go implement it in our own classrooms, so I found it to be very useful.

Moderator: Anyone else, on the professional development?

Participant 4: It's the one that we did last year.

Participant 2: Is it the dialogic...

Participant 4: Mm-hmm.

Moderator: Yeah. I think it was done in July or something like that.

Participant 2: So at the end of –

Participant 4: Yeah, the end of last year.

Participant 2: Oh, end of last year, okay. 'Cause we were remembering at the beginning of this year.

Participant 4: Yeah, mm-mmm.

Moderator: If the school district were to apply for these funds again, which it will at some point, what would you wanna see different about it? Added to it? Need more of? Be improved in what areas?

Participant 4: I think, in terms of Ms. Kimelt was saying, a lot of us try to include a listening center in our school – or classroom, so that children are given the opportunity to listen to a book, but, right now, we're having a really hard time finding the resources to make that happen. A lot – we don't have CD players. If we do, they're broken. Headphones don't always work. So that would be one thing that I'd like to see, and then that's also a way of integrating technology into literacy. But just being given those resources so that we can offer them, whether it is a book that we're receiving from the grant or just books that might be useful for the academics, but something like that would be really useful, I believe.

Participant 8: I think also more – the training seems to have been something that was really helpful, but I know several of us in this room weren't here last year, so we didn't get to partake in that, so maybe even more frequent trainings would be helpful.

Moderator: Yeah. Hopefully, y'all will be in it this summer or at the end of the school year there – I think it's scheduled to happen again. That's one of the tricky things with school districts, is a grant comes in and you wanna get training built into it, but school districts have the in-service trainings plotted out so far in advance, a lot of times, that it's really hard to work that in, but, yeah, I know what you mean, and I think it's scheduled to happen again this year – it's supposed to.

Participant 7: And then in summer we're in Cancun.

Participant 2: Cancun? I thought you said “cocoon.” *[Laughs]*

Moderator: And we can Skype from the beach.

[Laughter]

Participant 7: No. No _____ –

Moderator: You can –

Participant 2: Let me rephrase what she's saying.

Moderator: – talk about reading.

Participant 7: We'll be in vacation mode. *[Laughs]*

Participant 2: She is on vacation, not learning, from June 3rd through August return date.

Moderator: I watched an hour-and-a-half webinar yesterday on how to press a button, so, yeah, have fun in Cancun.

[Laughter]

Participant 3: She called the Tropic of Cancer is very good webinar. One hour and a half every day. ____ good. You will use that knowledge better than –

Participant 2: Pushing a button, learn how to –

Moderator: Well, it was really press your mouse to press the button.

Participant 2: But you have to know how to push the button –

[Laughter]

– to listen to the tape.

Moderator: It's ____ double-press.

Participant 7: Huh?

Participant 2: I said, “But you have to know how to push the button to listen to the tape.”

Participant 3: Oh. Well, you should know at that time. You're old enough, girl.

[Laughter]

Well, I think that, while we are in the manner – matter of trainings or education, I would like to see – and I don't know particularly how, but I would like to see parent – trainings for the parents. And, of course, I'm gonna be selfish about it – I want those trainings in Spanish because, usually, when those trainings are done in English for the Spanish-speaking parents, they lose a lot. A lot is lost.

Participant 2: And I agree because I've been on the opposite where it can be all in Spanish and, I mean, I lose a lot. It doesn't matter. If it's only in one language, the other person attending is losing a lot.

Participant 2: _____, so –

Participant 2: So I agree.

Participant 2: – more on that and maybe on teach them how to, when they don't read themselves, when they are not readers themselves, how to encourage reading at home, how to use things at home. What things other than themselves? Can you buy a little tape player for the

kid? Things that may educate them in the use of technology, in the use of books, in how to, you know –

Participant 2: Push a button?

Participant 2: No, how to get their kids interested when they themselves may not –

Participant 2: To motivate their children.

Participant 1: It'll help them all download the Kindle app. There must be some type of app or education app for free books or something.

Participant 2: That's assuming you have that type of phone.

Participant 2: Yeah, exactly. Yeah.

Participant 1: I haven't seen a parent yet without a smartphone in my classroom. They all seem to have smartphones, but they're – you know, I think that – I mean, building on what you're saying, having fun, like, you know, maybe through this grant, they already know about apps out there that are free, that have connections to books that they could be age-appropriate and already be offered in another language outside of English, but that would be something like that grant would say, “Okay, here. Provide that. Get us connected with those tools for our parents and remembering who our parents are.” These parents don't all have access to disposable income – some of them are working two jobs, working overnight – so having – what she's – building on what she said, in – and I know we kind of joke a little bit, but if you think about that – and I'm not saying all of our parents do have smartphones, but most of 'em do, and so having access to an app where their kids – and guess what?

Our kids are digital kids. They know how to go – they will be able to show parents how to download an app, to get to a book, so whether they're at the kitchen table, which I know sounds terrible, they're gonna be on their electronics. All of my – my kids all talk about what they have for gaming systems and whatnot, and, you know, getting them connected to those types of tools that can be offered for bilingual, in addition to the English-speaking parents, will be something great because kids, they're interested – they're gonna buy into that. And Mom and Dad have something where they don't have to feel – like she said, a lot of our parents maybe aren't the best readers and maybe are not as literate. Sometimes, just for us personally, if it's something that makes you uncomfortable, you're probably not gonna push on it too much; you're gonna do everything you can to wiggle around not doing it. And this would be something great, like she mentioned, to help our parents connect and get over that hump. So I think that's great, what you just said.

I mean, there's a lot of options there, with that technology piece. But I know that the people who write these grants and who are offering the dollars, they know of all those tools out there, making sure that we know about all of those tools, 'cause there're so many resources, but maybe they could say, “Look, help funnel some of that to us so that I could constantly be providing solutions to my parents, instead of just talking what – all the not,” so to speak, but be able to provide solutions and say, “Have we tried this?” One might be a better fit for a parent

than another, but at least she'll have an option to go to, versus just one thing – the book we sent home. I love that idea that she had.

Participant 2: And I think if – I'm gonna try to restate what I think I heard you saying because I feel that, when I'm try – I was trying to do a training. I didn't have any parents that were bilingual, and I hate to say it, but I was kind of glad because I knew I wasn't gonna be able to speak as well and translate to my parents, and so I was depending on the bilingual aide, but even then, she's not a certified teacher – she's very good, but still, I think another certified teacher being there and presenting the whole thing in nothing but Spanish so that it does get sent home in the correct manner in which it should be, rather than half-English, half-Spanish, and you're getting lost. But – 'cause I think some of those workshops that I did, if they could have been translated, but that was my personal goal, so it wasn't something I was looking to do, to translate, but I know that I was hoping that I would have more parents. And then the thought came across, “If I have someone bilingual, what am I gonna do?” so it was like, “Okay. At least I thought about it.” I thought, “Well, I can grab Mary,” because she was here during that extended time, but, at the same time, the quality would not have been as good.

Moderator: Okay. Has the additional resources in the library and the focus on this grant – has it increased your use of the library with your classroom as a whole and coordinating lesson plans, utilizing the library, or has it made any difference in that regard?

Participant 2: I'm trying – I hate to – what other resources...

Participant 1: We get one 20-minute – well, maybe so he would know. We get to come to the library out of our classroom once a week – it's 20 minutes – and the librarian does a wonderful read aloud and she does a lesson-based activity. It's not just read, “Okay, kids”; it's she ties and she pulls from it, whatever it might be. She'll do “What was the problem in the book? What was the –” you know, all types of great literacy activities.

Participant 2: Yeah, and activities that go with each book. That's been great.

Participant 1: So that's what we get once a week, with our students, and each class gets to go once a week. That's what we're allocated ___ for library time. Our students are allowed, after her lesson, right – she has books already pre-set at the tables, the pre-K again – they come to the table. She may have a simple “Find punctuation that's a question mark.” The students raise their hand – they found it – and then we immediately say, “Go line up to check out your books,” so they're learning that process. They take their books, check out, and we go back to the classroom. And then it's up to us, at that point, to carry on with an activity or a lesson with – incorporating library, or we go on to whatever's on our schedule next. If it's math, then we go into math.

Moderator: Yeah.

Participant 2: And there're some activities –

Participant 1: I'm just sharing that.

Participant 2: – are snatched from her copy. It's like, “Where'd my paper go? Is this my –” I'm like, “Yeah, I put it back where it belongs, but I went and took a copy of it so I could copy that lesson or expand from that,” from her, so that's been very beneficial.

Participant 1: So we get one 20-minute – that's what we have for our school on our schedules. Now, can we have more? I don't know. Our schedules are schedules – “This is what you're doing during these 20 minutes, 25 minutes. This is where y'all _____. This is where you are” – so I'm not sure if that was because of the grant that we have that amount of time allocated, that we have the librarian to provide that to us, but that's where we are right now with pre-K.

Participant 2: Yeah, that's why I was kind of asking if – what more was there or – 'cause I – that's pretty much all that I'm aware of.

Moderator: Okay. Yeah, I didn't know if you decided, “Okay, we're gonna do a special activity on this. We're gonna go use the library as a resource.” Y'all really have to just follow the schedule and can just go when necessary. Okay.

Participant: Pretty much. Mm-hmm.

Moderator: Okay. That makes sense.

Participant 1: Well, no one can say that you can't do those things, but that's not what we – it's 20 minutes.

[Crosstalk]

Participant 2: Yeah. And we are able to –

Participant 2: Because it's –

Participant 1: If there's another class.

Participant 2: _____.

Participant 1: There's another class right behind you, so even if we wanted to –

Participant 2: But we are able to check out as many books as we need or want, so we usually go with our themes or connection to OWL and – or science, social studies, and we'll check out a bunch of books and bring that to the classroom, so if there've been any extra books added with the grant or anything, then, yes, that's been beneficial 'cause I know they rotate old books and put in new books. And the old books, we get to take to the classroom and then put into our personal classroom library.

NES Elementary School Teacher Focus Groups

Moderator: NES IL Focus Group. So as classroom teachers, in what ways were you guys involved in the innovative approach to literacy grant, as far as from the beginning, to the end, anywhere in the middle, developmental implementation? Any ways that you can remember being involved in that process?

Participant 1: Was this starting from last year or starting this school year?

Moderator: Last year even.

Participant 1: Last year. I would say one of the ways was that we got to choose the books.

Participant 2: And the books that the kids got to take home.

Participant 1: Mm-hm, yeah, we got to look at their levels.

Participant 3: Last year.

Participant 2: This year too.

Participant 3: No. Not everyone got to this year.

Participant 4: I thought last year it worked a lot better. Last year we had more of a say. Last year they said "Make a list of books that you would like your class to have per month, and then those

are the books that we would give." They did that. Every month we chose a set of books, and every month they got them. It worked very well I thought. This year, they took a totally different approach. The only time our kids received books that I know of is during Christmas, and they were chosen by somebody else – not us.

Participant 3: They were delivered all at the same time.

Participant 4: They chose titles – somebody chose titles. I don't know who it is. The kids got to pick books from there. There's a kid's selection. I would have rather had the teacher choose like last year we had chosen. They got some for sure. I don't exactly how they're choosing the books this year.

Participant 3: What the rules are.

Participant 5: I also had certain requirements since I'm a dual language teacher. My kids had to get a certain amount of Spanish books, and they had to get a certain amount of English books, which is totally okay, but...

Participant 2: I had heard that they received some if they went to after school – after hours library time.

Participant 1: I heard that too.

Participant 5: I heard that but if that were true, I didn't hear anything along the lines of promoting something like that, like "Hey, if you come to after school library hours, you could receive a free book." I feel like if that was more – if that had been advertised more, students would have been involved with that. But yeah, I agree. Last year we all sat down as a team, we have 3 – 4 months left in the year. We picked the different books. We even picked themes.

Participant 2: We picked books that went along with what we were teaching so that they had something to relate to.

Participant 5: Like you said, we got them every month. This year, I felt like I had no idea what was going on. It was just like "Hey, here's a card. I have all these books for your kids." They just got books and so it would be awesome if it was just like last year. So we were involved in that respect early last year, which we agreed.

Participant 3: I felt the kids really enjoyed the books. They were very excited and pleased with it.

Participant 1: I thought that was the whole purpose of it for them. If they didn't have books at home, they were going to get books every month anyways. By getting books at home this year, it was Christmas, and they brought them. It was almost like "We got a gift from the librarian." That's what my kids thought. My kid goes to the CDC and she was even getting books. Every month, we were able if we read to them, we were able to go get another one. She got a lot of books from the CDC too last year. This year she maybe got one or two the whole year.

Participant 2: Is it because the funding lessened?

Moderator: It's really a front-loaded grant. The first year, the grant typically purchases as much materials as you can, and technology, if that's the case, which there wasn't that much in this one because the district had already had a plan on that to go to the iPads and all that stuff that they were already doing in place. So they didn't use as much grant funding on technology as a lot of school districts wind up doing, because they'd already built it into the budget. So it is kind of top-heavy.

The second year is really designed – this used to be a one-year grant. Everything had to happen in one year. The problem with that – how do you evaluate that? We bought everything and we put it out. What happened after that? Well, there's no way to measure that. That's why they added a second year. Really, the second year is designed to look at "Okay, after we did put all this stuff in place in year one, what happened?" How do we get – compare it to year one to year two, and to the year before that? So it's not really surprising that there weren't as many books in year two.

They probably should have done a better job of explaining that to you guys. Probably what happened was they wound up getting a better deal on books and the prices were lower, and they had extra funds, so they purchased more this year, or they came in late or something like that, so they distributed them like that. That would be my guess, although I didn't actually work on the budget this summer, but that's typically how it works. Almost everything gets done in year

one ideally. So then you have all of year two to evaluate how it works, and if it makes any kind of improvement.

Participant 2: I have a question. I know your question was what was our level of involvement. That's the only thing I can think of as far as my level of involvement. I also am curious as to what all the different components are of the grant. From my understanding, it was extra funding to give books to each child on campus periodically, or however they decide to do that, and paying for someone to be in the library for extended library hours. Is there another component that also is involved with this grant or know about? That's all I know about. I don't know if you guys know about anything else.

Moderator: On this campus – no. On lower grade levels, you have GEPR measure, which are the required government performance measurement things. That's your third grade STAR reading test scores, and your fifth grade and your eighth grade, then high school, but you also have to do four-year olds. Since they don't do STAR, we came in and did a TOPL assessment with them, and also used a control site in Seguin at their HeadStart who didn't get this grant. So you had a comparison of the kids who are getting what they got at that age here to one that didn't get it. There was a big difference in the first year. We haven't done year two yet. We do it in May.

Participant 2: Oh, so you guys are going to basically look at STAR data from last year and STAR data from this year and see if _____.

Moderator: And the year before that too. There's a small impact that could have happened from last year, but really it didn't really start getting things out from the grant until December, and even January with the extended hours, and then purchasing things takes a while to get it and then put it out on the shelves, and get it all inventoried in.

Participant 2: Were books donated to the library as well?

Moderator: They weren't donated.

Participant 2: Or as part – do we have funds purchased for – okay. So I didn't know that. Part of the funding for this grant went for our librarian basically to purchase certain books that would strictly be housed in the library?

Moderator: Mm-hm, and the idea with that is to increase the size of the library to match what the state standard is per student, but at the same time, bring in enough new titles to where you can eliminate titles that are longer than – older than 11 years old – 12 year old, because at that point, they are considered below standard. The problem is librarians don't like to get rid of books. A lot of times they'll get a bunch of new books in, but they'll keep the old books too. It's hard to get that average age of book title down, even though you increase the number of book titles significantly, if they don't get rid of the old books. That's neither here nor there, but that's typically how it works.

But yeah, each campus got funds for books that would either be in the library and also, at the high school, each of the English Language Arts classes got a book cart where they had their own library in their class that they could read in, that they could get interested and then go check the book out, that sort of thing. It's done a little bit different at each campus, but that was the – the book distribution. Give kids books to take home. They had that going all the way down to zero to really 12th grade, as an option to give – work through with pediatricians, to give parents early reading books that they would read to their kids, and get that going at an early age, and get the pediatricians and daycares involved, and the importance of reading to your child before they even get to school. So that was a big concentration.

It's very early reading focused, more and more. So high school and middle school got a lot less and everything before 3rd grade or 4th grade got a little bit more, then after that point it scales back. That's just their focus on that at a federal level. That's the overall intent. For the most part, you all's involvement was just in year one picking out books and titles. Did they get those?

Participant 2: Yes, the first year they didn't.

Moderator: The second year, they didn't involve you all, and they just gave out some that somebody picked out.

Group: Yes.

Moderator: Do you remember if before they even applied for this grant, did they survey teachers or anything to see if they had any?

Participant 1: I want to say – I think that you had to go onto the computer and do some kind of survey.

Participant 3: We did. We did do a survey on – it was like – didn't we do one last year too, or the beginning of this year? I don't know if that was just for our librarian. I remember filling out something "What books would you like to see in the library? What projects might you want for _____ year?" I don't know if that was grant-related or not, but I know we did a survey before last year, just like "What kind of books would you like to see? Would you like if X happened?" That kind of thing.

Moderator: Okay, well with the books going home, and some new titles in the library and extended hours, how do you think that's benefitted your campus, or do you think it's benefitted?

Participant 3: Well, the kids have books to read at home.

Moderator: Think they read them?

Participant 3: My kids probably do. Some of them do. Some of them don't.

Participant 2: Even my kids that came in from pre-K, they're like "Oh, my teacher gave it to me from last year." Yeah, I think it just depends on what type of home they're coming from. If they have involved parents, or some are just busy.

Participant 3: I think it's always a benefit, especially for the little kids. Even if nobody reads to them, at least they'll look at the pictures.

Participant 4: They've heard the book before. If we get to pick the books, it's probably a book that we've read to them before, or a book that they're somewhat familiar with so they can have some kind of sense of what the story's actually saying.

Participant 2: I feel like a lot of parents don't get books because they can't afford them. Whenever the kid can get it for free and have it at home –

Participant 3: To encourage them.

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 3: Maybe it encourages parents to read to their kids.

Participant 5: As far as extended library hours, I've seen – like a lot of things we do on campus, it's difficult to get a certain level of parent involvement in a lot of ways, for a lot of different reasons from our community. I've only had maybe two or three students this year actually attend the library hours. The kids told me they got excited, or I noticed, "Hey, you took some AR tests" or whatever it was. Last year, same thing.

It was maybe two or three of my students did that, which it impacted those students. Obviously they got more exposure to books. They had this great time with their parents. They boosted their AR goal. I think that was beneficial to them. Very few people took advantage of that.

Participant 4: We don't advertise it as much. Even on announcements, if we just had something that said that was going to be happening. I think another thing too for extended library hours, their parents might not be able to bring them up here at those times or whatever. I have a lot of parents that work nights. So I don't know what their kids are doing during that time. *[laughter]*

Participant 6: It is listed on the Elgin ISD web page about the extended hours. I've seen on the calendar, I've seen some in the newspaper and stuff. In that aspect, it's out there.

Participant 2: I think too, getting the teachers excited about it to talk about it. I'll be the first to admit, I don't talk about extended library time in my class.

Participant 1: Or giving them a reward if you go to *[crosstalk]*.

Participant 3: Last year they did. They got rewards.

Participant 4: Was it a homework coupon?

Participant 3: They did. They got five wows or something because I had two or three kids that went every single Monday. They would always, "Ms. Lechenstein" –

Participant 2: There was. They got Wows.

Participant 3: Yeah, she would bring them. Since last year we've gotten a new librarian and we've also gotten a new principal as well. So maybe some of those things, they don't – when the push was going in first, I don't know.

Participant 2: It's hard to follow through with a lot of those things. Keeping the same systems, or even if you want to change the system, just having those conversations are probably –

Participant 4: Were we even informed as to how things were going to work out with the grant? Was she even given the information she needs, because maybe she didn't know that we could choose the books. Communications, we really struggle.

Participant 1: Things like that falls through the cracks sometimes because you just expect someone to know what they're supposed to do.

Participant 4: Communication is rough.

Participant 2: We did this last year. We did this – sorry, it's not grant-related. Yes, I think that is probably one of the concerns, that it would have possibly been more impactful this year had it been a little bit more of the advertising on our front, getting teachers involved with it, then the communication with everyone in charge.

Moderator: Okay, yeah transition with staff mid-grant, any grant, always is interesting dynamic in place. We talked about extended hours quite a bit. Do you feel like the strategies of the grant, the approach of the grant, which was new resources in the library, new resources for the kids, take home books, and extended hours primarily, do you think that's affected literacy,

increased interest in it, gotten more kids focused on it, helped get them ready for STAR or anything like that?

Participant 2: I think the idea behind it does. Just exposure in general for any kid to literacy will help them with the STAR. So yeah, I think them having the resources available. I just think the execution of it could have better on our part, on all of our parts.

[intercom announcements]

Participant 3: Yeah, I guess just overall it's great. If we could do it again like last year. It's always a benefit.

Participant 2: Being more organized, if we are informed more of what exactly this all entails. I know the idea behind it, but what are the steps that I need to take in order to make it happen effectively?

Participant 3: It seems like last year when it was approached to it too, it was more of a kinder through second grade approach. So I think that's kind of where –

Participant 2: We got books too. When you all say every month, that didn't happen –

Participant 3: I know that you guys didn't get as many, just by hearing from talking – just talking, because I used to be a first grade teacher.

Participant 2: We got two, maybe three different chapter books, one for every kid in fifth grade.

Moderator: What grade?

Participant 2: Fifth grade.

Participant 1: I don't know if it's because picture books are cheaper than chapter books or something like that.

Participant 3: I know that last year we had that deadline. If you submitted it after the deadline, then your kids were just out of luck.

Participant 2: Oh no. I didn't know that.

Participant 3: We did have a deadline to meet.

Participant 2: That's what I thought happened this year. I thought I missed the deadline to turn in the books.

Participant 4: That's what I thought too. I thought I had missed an email, because I remember doing it last year.

Participant 1: I think the information you told her, I think we would have been really good to know in the beginning, like you said. I was going to ask in the beginning, "Well, can you tell us what this grant is, what is specified, and what is covered in it?" What I got out of it – they did tell us, "You're going to get books and they're going to be for your kids." I was like "Yay".

I didn't know some books could go in the afterschool program, and we're going to get books for the library too. When you're like "Oh, you're going to get books for your kids", we're always so excited about it. That's why we so thoroughly enjoyed it last year when we had more of a part of it than this year.

Participant 2: We did plan things around. I know our selection of books.

Participant 3: We totally did. We made sure they read the book beforehand, so they had some kind of connection to the book before they even – "Remember when we read this book and did the whole activity? We get to have this book." Yay. This year, it was like "What book did you get? Cool."

Moderator: Okay, makes sense. Let's see. As far as the professional development training, do you all remember taking part in that?

Participant 2: Yes.

Participant 3: You do? What is it?

Participant 2: That was kinder through 2nd. [*crosstalk*]

Participant 4: Was it last year? We got books there too, because we were able to [*crosstalk*]

Participant 5: It was an admin building. You had to take a book. Yes. I did do it.

Participant 3: You take a book there and then they pulled an _____ book. I remember.

[*loudspeaker announcement*]

Moderator: Do you feel like that had any impact on how you literacy...?

Participant 3: It gave us some cool ideas of how you could use certain books. So it was beneficial.

Participant 2: Weren't there bilingual books there too?

Participant 3: Yeah, and they showed us ones that were available obviously in English and Spanish and how to incorporate it. Yeah, I do remember that.

Participant 2: So much things you could do with a book. Before and after questions or they could [*crosstalk*]

Participant 1: It was good to hear even with the three and four year olds. We don't go all the way down to three and four year olds, but how it helps them develop, to when they get to kinder and first, to how it helps them. I guess I pay attention more to that, because I have a – had a three year old. She's four now. I was like "Oh wow, maybe I should read more to her even though she's three." That helped.

Moderator: Okay, good. Have you – I already know the answer to this, but have you increased your classroom coordination, lesson plans, to involve the library more since this came into place, or has that stayed about the same?

Participant 2: Last year, I would say yes, because towards the end of the year, we made sure we could tie in those books some kind of way. This year negative. Definitely haven't. I personally haven't.

Participant 3: That's what you were saying with the library, but the books I'm checking out are older books. It would have been nice to know "These are the new books that I bought." I didn't even know which are the new in the library.

Participant 4: Every time I go in the library and try to find a book that I want, it is never there.

Participant 5: Even when it says that it's there, it's not there.

Participant 4: Or sometimes it's not even there, and it's a really popular book. How is this not in our library? You know?

Participant 2: I feel that way sometimes.

Participant 4: Me, as a teacher, I stopped going. I'd rather go to the public library because I can find more of what I need there.

Participant 1: Even our Elgin public library is not that bad. But yeah. I guess I kind of feel the same way. We have a signup. There's a lot of things I don't want to voice about.

Participant 2: There's a bunch of resources. We just don't know [*crosstalk*].

Participant 1: We don't know the [*inaudible*]. We don't know where it comes from.

Participant 2: I do know there are new books in the library but I don't know how they were purchased. I would imagine they were through the grant. Does the school get money every year to purchase books? They do? Oh.

Moderator: Typically at some level, yeah.

Participant 4: I know one time, whenever I went, she did ask me what books did I want for the library for next year.

Participant 3: We had a document on that.

Participant 2: I built that whole thing.

Participant 4: I think they just do that to make us feel like we're a part of it and then they don't take our advice. [*laughter*] There's a lot of books with the _____.

Participant 5: There's no telling. We just don't know.

Moderator: I figured that when they were like "They got new books in the library with the grant", if they got \$5000 new books at a time, that's probably grant funding. When they get \$1000 or \$500 for a new school year, that's local funding. I mean that's why school districts have a hard time keeping up with the age of the library and the size and the content is because the funding is – books aren't cheap. The funding is not there. If the budget's in crisis, which so often they are in school districts, what are they going to cut first? Music and libraries.

"These books will be good for another year." That's what happens a lot of times. Do you think that – we kind of answered that one. I won't ask you again. If you guys had a chance for

this grant to be done again, what would be the best way to improve it and make it more beneficial for classroom teachers and library coordination?

Participant 5: Communication as to what all – and like there's some really great teachers here that would have really great ideas, and if we utilized everybody's brains and just came together and communicated, it would be more beneficial for everybody, for the teachers, for the kids, for the parents.

Participant 2: The communication was always so brief or by email. We all love staff meetings, but to have just a whole meeting. "We got this grant. Let's talk about this in Power Point. This is what you're going to get. We're going to have for the next two years. These are ways you can be involved. These are ways if you'd like to be involved, you can do that. Pow wow with your team. What would you like to see?"

Spending an hour at the beginning of the year or whenever we receive it, if we receive it again, and discussing this is what we'd like to see. This is how we use it. Everyone's on the same page. We know what we're getting. We know when it's going to happen. All of that. I think that's the communication piece. It's not just an email. "Hey, you guys are going to get these books", but actually sitting down with the teachers and getting that verbal feedback from everybody, I think would help a lot. We would feel more invested, more involved. Then could actually have it play out in our classrooms.

Participant 3: Maybe even having – you're a part of the marketing committee, for you to be a committee for the library, like the grant.

Participant 2: You could definitely tie this in with all of our different – not all of our different, but some of our different committees.

Participant 4: Maybe us even having impact on what type of books in the library. We are with our students as they check out books. There's all different levels, and sometimes those kids read – by the time they reach my grade, they've read every book in that series. It's like "Okay, let's try something else." This is what our kids are struggling with, these type of books.

Participant 1: We've seen really high readers. I know this is only up to fifth grade. I have some kids in my class on 10th, 11th, 12th grade reading levels. There's not books in the library that's on their level. Granted, I'm sure they'd rather read Percy Jackson.

Participant 2: But to help them grow as a reader.

Participant 1: Yeah, exactly. They would probably rather read the books that are in there, but there's no books that are challenging to them.

Participant 3: I remember in first grade. One of our first grade teachers, who was like this time last year, "My kids have read all the books that are in Spanish available, on their level and even a bit above, they've read them all." I'm like "That's just kind of sad." "I'm sorry, Katie. You don't have any other choices. You'll have to get an English book."

She wanted their kids to practice their literacy skills in Spanish. I know that was something. So I don't know how many or what the input was for our librarian, whoever is in charge of purchasing, if that was something ever even taken into consideration. That would have been something that would have been really nice for the teachers to voice. "Hey, can you please get some bilingual books or dual language books or Spanish books?"

Participant 2: That would do better just doing the English and Spanish together. That way it's both.

Participant 3: But again, that's something – maybe she did. Maybe there are more in there but we don't know. So communication, I think, would be helpful.

Moderator: That makes sense. Anything else? Other things that you think would help literacy on campus? It could be anything from additional technology in the classroom, whiteboards, that kind of stuff too.

Participant 2: It seems like this year with my group of kids, a lot more of them are wanting the audiobooks for different reasons: dyslexia, just the comprehension, some of their 504s, some of their IEPs. There's not a big selection on audiobooks that students could take.

Participant 3: There's those CDs and stuff.

Participant 2: Yeah, and I know slowly it's coming because I think they have that live, Ally or AllyLive or something. Something they could take home. I don't know. I'm trying – this is just a different group, and those are things that I see that they're struggling with.

Participant 1: I know it's wishing, but five iPads per class to use as guided reading group, to have at least sets on there. I think it would really help with the other group reading.

Participant 2: Well anyone, any grade level.

Participant 3: We're doing research projects and it's really hard to get the iPads.

Participant 1: At least five it would be good for them, especially now.

Participant 2: Especially in the general ed classroom, because we understand that there's things that count as bilingual classes, but in their regular ed class, we don't get – we have three computers. If one's on Ally, and one has to take a test, someone's out. Someone's out and they're missing those opportunities to get them engaged in reading because there's not enough resources in the classroom.

Participant 5: One of the things, I don't know if this is last year with you or the year before, where we wrote a grant. Me, you, and Niki sat down and wrote a grant and it was about having a grade level cart. It was supposed to be during – I think it was the year before, because it was when we had an aide in the classroom. Basically, the idea is that we would have a grade level [crosstalk]

During guided reading, we had an aide, but I remember us sitting down. We didn't get whatever it was, but we wrote this grant to have a grade level cart that was the first grade – back when I was first grade – first grade literacy cart, and it would have several titles, and it would be already stocked for us, or we would choose, and pick the books for let's say the week or the month that would be on all our kids' different levels, and it would have something like technology on it. We would just wheel it out during guided reading time. It would stay in our hallway.

A parent could come out and work with kids in the hall and read. It was our cart that we reserved. We, as teachers, I can go and check out 15 books that I would want to have in my classroom, but it would be like that, to have in addition to what's in the library, that each grade level would have their own level technology mini little library cart. I know you mentioned the carts before, but it would have books and things like iPads on it and it would be accessible during your – whatever your guided reading block was. It could be shared amongst the team.

I remember I wrote – we wrote a couple things. We even picked book titles, and how much the cart would be. I think that would be a great thing. Again, you're involving teachers. You're seeing the direct impact it has on your students. Yes, us getting titles. We know you have those books at home because we gave you those books. Remember? We're actually sitting there too reading them and all that and getting parents involved and stuff too. Own cart.

Participant 1: Even if it was just one iPad. I'm cool with just one iPad. I have my own personal iPad that I bring to school every day.

Participant 2: Or maybe four computers. I just wanted a small computer in the classroom. That'd be really nice. I don't know if that covers all of that.

Participant 3: I don't know if it's time for the kids to come in. They're coming to you. Are you ready [laughter]?

Moderator: I'm not used to the young ones. I worked the attention-type stuff that I want to.

Participant 4: The interview: "Do you like books?" "Yes, I like books." [laughter] "Do you like them all?" "Yes, I'd like to get them all."

Moderator: Okay, thank you. [inaudible] No, yeah, we're done too. I was joking with the kids. Anything else though you want to add though before we break?

Participant 4: I would just say that I think it's a privilege to have the grant. I would like for it to stay and maybe just redesign it somehow where we have a better understanding of what our job needs to be done also. The kids love receiving the books.

Participant 2: Yeah, it is something that's positive.

Moderator: Okay, I'm going to stop recording.

Focus group with NES students. There are 11 students in this group. Okay, over the past two years, have you guys seen an increase in books available in the library, additional books?

Group: Yeah.

Moderator: Have you guys have books to take home and keep as your own?

Participant 1: Checkout checkin.

Moderator: As far as the books that they got, are they books that you find interesting?

Participant 2: Kind of.

Participant 1: Yes. Nonfiction and fiction.

Participant 2: Diary of a Wimpy Kid.

Moderator: What?

Participant 3: Percy Jackson.

Participant 4: Cam Johnson.

Moderator: They need that?

Participant 4: Cam Jansen [inaudible].

Moderator: So at least some of the books you liked anyway.

Participant 1: There's not a lot. They need more interesting books like mysteries and _____ books. [crosstalk] They kind of need like a mystery book but I'm thinking of maybe they should get more.

Participant 3: More Nancy Drew.

Participant 1: More interesting, more educational like that.

Participant 4: Learning about animals.

Participant 3: Once I get to the point of where I've read all of them, I'm getting stuck, and I want to read another one but and I want to take an AR test but I can't.

Participant 2: Like a book that has all the animals in the world that you can learn about. Every page it has a book that says a Phoenix Fox. It has all the information about a Phoenix Fox. Next page it'll have any animal that you guess. A to Z animals.

Participant 3: They have one of those books at the public animals. But this is the Elgin library.

Participant 4: More tumbling books.

Participant 2: More books like more active books.

Participant 3: Oh yeah, like the teacher mods have to read and _____ and all that stuff.

Participant 2: I'm thinking they have a lot of Magic Treehouse books and Junie B. ones – Junie B. Jones. I don't really go with Magic Treehouse books anymore. I used to, but now I'm still on a –

Moderator: Yeah.

Participant 2: In second grade, I started reading Cam Jansen and now I'm still reading it. It's just something I like.

Moderator: What about audio books?

Participant 3: Those are good for kids who don't know how to comprehend words sometimes. So the audio books help them understand them.

Participant 4: We don't have that many audiobooks. They're like small children books, like those thin ones.

Participant 5: We don't have a lot.

Participant 2: What we need is more of those. I think there's a few with discs.

Participant 4: Only the teachers have that.

Participant 5: There's no chapter books. They're only the little baby books, like she said, like for little kids.

Participant 4: There's Charlotte's Web, which that one's pretty big. We actually are starting to read it with three other people, and well, our teachers are making us do a novel. My teacher is making us do novel studies.

Moderator: What about online books?

Participant 3: Tumble books is one great one.

Participant 1: It's a good way to help them understand CH and all that stuff.

Participant 2: They can see them. They can play some games. They can decorate the games and reading.

Participant 1: Like Starfall, ABCMouse, ABCY, BrainPops.

Participant 2: [inaudible] There's cookies to feed them if you did it the right way. Read the monster. We need something, then it will be blind and you have to figure out which answer or you will get the wrong...

Participant 1: CH.

Participant 2: CH, TH. You will find some little people and they will give you words, new words, and the monster will come and new words.

Participant 4: I think what we need in our library are a few dictionaries.

Participant 3: Encyclopedias. Most of them are in teacher's classrooms. They should have dictionaries in there. We have about four or five in our classroom.

Participant 5: We need more in the library who the kids who check it out and read all the things that are about animals and creatures.

Participant 1: Most of y'all. You all know where the lit lab is, right? The one by the janitor's room. They need to put those like the George Washington – like that book right there, that's kind of from the lit lab. It looks like that's from the lit lab and not from a library book. Usually the library books have a dot on it. I'm reading a red dot and those don't have those. Helen Keller and George Washington Carver doesn't have a dot.

Participant 3: The library's books are hard covers.

Participant 1: Yeah, they're hard covers. They're not soft covers.

Participant 4: We need biographies. [*crosstalk*]

Participant 5: We need Bibles.

Participant 6: Bibles, that would be really good. Ancient Greece, history.

Participant 2: We need Bibles to read. They could sometimes – people love Bibles, and some kids could get kids to understand how good the Bible's right then they would think [*inaudible*].

Moderator: Okay.

Participant 5: BookLinks is something. It has a few books and different groups, so you can choose this group and then see and find a book that you want to watch, and it will help you learn all the words.

Participant 7: There's a nonfiction book and a fiction book beside each other.

Participant 5: You can choose a story and then the real book.

Participant 1: Two books aside, _____ and then other nonfiction and –

Participant 5: You can choose the movie and then the book or then the book or the movie.

Participant 6: Real features, history. After you're done reading the book, a little four questions to answer or something like that.

Participant 7: Once you get a big book, it's more like ten questions.

Participant 5: Those are chapter books.

Participant 7: If you answer no on each question, you can practice on it or something. AR testing, you do answers and then like at the end –

Participant 6: Our computer lab –

Participant 7: I'm not finished. There's stars showing up so you can rate how you liked it. If you liked it really good, you can do it at the end. If you didn't really like it so much, you can do it at the beginning.

Participant 8: Our computer lab teacher, she teaches us – we go on this cool little website that it's called Math Facts. It makes us – it helps us learn about math, times, pluses, minus.
[crosstalk]

Moderator: How many of you all have parents that have come in and gone to the library with you?

Participant 2: My mom has.

Participant 3: My mom has a lot.

Moderator: Pretty much everybody.

Participant 2: Me and Jack's mom do that only if it's a book fair.

Participant 3: No, he means like to help you read and all that stuff. Do they go into the library reading lab?

Participant 2: Oh. She sometimes goes with me if I'm going to the library after school.

Moderator: With the library being open later, do you think parents come more?

Participant 5: I wish the library would be open later. Every time in the afternoons when I'm dying to go to the library, we can't because she already closed it.

Participant 6: Yeah, she's probably already gone. Today, she was gone for the whole day.

Participant 5: Yeah, the library was closed – I wish they would get a sub.

Participant 7: I tried to peek two times, and it was still closed.

Participant 8: We were supposed to go to the library but we couldn't. We're trying the AR tests for the AR party.

Participant 9: We can't reach our AR goal if she keeps shutting it early and not even being there.

Participant 2: Ms. Graves came in my classroom and my teacher asked her to go check in the library, and there were kids banging on the door.

Participant 9: They were dying to get in there because they just can't wait. Their AR goal is coming up next month and it's about two weeks after the month. We are just – there's going to be this huge carnival.

Participant 2: One time there's going to be candy. One time there's going to be _____.
[crosstalk]

Participant 9: Office all the way to the library, from the end of each hallway to [crosstalk] It's like a book fair [inaudible]

Participant 2: There were games the first time and then hot cocoa.

Participant 9: And then popsicles this time. Alexis.

Participant 2: Popsicles, remember it was the balls you could get in and roll around in.

Participant 9: What?

Participant 2: Remember you go like this and you walk in and you put it like this?

Moderator: How many days a week is the library open late?

Participant 3: Monday they're open really long, but then every Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, it's really short.

Participant 2: They're testing and today –

Participant 5: For teacher's kids, they should be open. We're all teacher's kids a little bit later. If she's here later, we should be allowed to go in there and check out books.

Participant 3: I've been trying to find a good book in the library, and the library's already closed when I'm trying to get there. I wanted to see if they have a good Narnia book, but we never come in there. We're in the same class and we can never usually come in there. It's always closed. We're usually taking a test and we can't go, but then we finish our test and we can't go because it's already closed.

Participant 2: I found some books that are in the library and I don't want to _____ because they sell some of my books that I need to finish in the library.

Participant 8: They need to have science, history, ancient Greece time, Jesus time.

Participant 2: Bible.

Participant 8: When she said Bible, ancient Greek, history books. What happened before we were old. What happened –?

Participant 4: The generation before us.

Participant 8: What did they do on Easter, Christmas? What made Christmas a holiday? I already know. I already know, but for little kids.

Participant 6: Every holiday, we could switch out the books: spring, summer, fall, winter. Autumn. It's the same thing as fall, but they should have more educational books and more – I don't know how to put it – better books like smaller ones, thicker ones, for the third, fourth, and fifth graders and all that stuff. For us like me, there's only three – wait four fourth and fifth graders right here, and we need bigger books, better books, more interesting books.

Moderator: Advanced, challenge you a little bit more.

Participant 2: There's mostly a lot of green dots and orange dots. There's at least five in each category. There's not a lot. Fifth graders, fourth graders, we need a lot of books to reach their goal, but they can't because there's not really a lot of stuff.

Participant 3: Some fourth and fifth graders try to read way below their level, so they can read it faster and get their level up to a high point easier.

Participant 5: But that means their accuracy goes down whenever they read smaller books.

Participant 3: Sometimes Ms. Pettyjohn will take some points away because you're reading too low.

Elgin Middle School Teacher Focus Group

Moderator: Elgin Middle School IAL Focus Group with teachers. As a classroom teacher, have you felt involved in the development or implementation of the resources provided through the library, to the library, as part of the innovative approaches to literacy grant?

Participant 1: Involved in what way?

Moderator: Identifying materials, picking out the books or anything like that.

Participant 2: Kelly did ask for suggestions for books, which I think I sent her a few.

Participant 1: I do remember that email.

Participant 2: Yeah, so we suggested some books definitely to be bought with the grant money, through email.

Participant 1: As to what was purchased with the grant money, as far as our suggestions go, I'm not sure, because I don't think we received a confirmation email.

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 1: I know that she bought books with it.

Participant 3: Were any of them purchased?

Participant 2: I know that books were purchased with it. I'm just not sure what titles she purchased. Yeah.

Moderator: Okay, so for the most part, you got asked through email if there were certain titles that you wanted. You're not sure if they got purchased or not. At this point, everything would have been purchased.

Participant 2: We got a lot of new books this year.

Participant 3: Is this the email – wasn't there another email about purchasing Spanish titles, or was that for something else?

Participant 2: That was the same one. We could get them in English or in Spanish, I think.

Moderator: Okay. Do you believe that your campus has benefitted from the library grant, literacy grant?

Participant 3: I would definitely say so in terms of extended hours. I know a lot of my students have taken advantage of that.

Participant 1: Many of my students go to the library extended hours as well.

Participant 2: I know also the audio books that were purchased. I see a lot of kids with the audio books.

Participant 1: I have three students this year with the audio books. They enjoy it very much.

Participant 2: I think the extended hours have made the biggest difference. Telling the kids, they have this place to go for homework – a lot of them use it, especially since it's not on a Saturday.

Participant 1: Correct. They would much rather have it Monday after school.

Moderator: Do you see many parents come to the extended hours?

Participant 2: I've seen a few, not nearly as many as kids who get picked up, but I've seen a couple parents in here.

Moderator: You already answered that question. Do you believe that the increased access to resources provided by the grant – the books primarily, the new titles – have made any difference in student interest in literacy or reading?

Participant 4: Yes. I've had several of my kids – I know they've talked to Ms. Clark about some books that I know she had pointed them in the correct area. It's a little fire under their tush.

Participant 1: My kids have also asked for suggestions from Ms. Clark and from me, myself, as well.

Participant 2: I think the kids were middle of the road who benefitted the most who kind of like to read, but aren't avid readers. I think they got the most benefit. The kids who hate reading, I don't think were much affected, but the kids who kind of like it but struggle finding books they like, I think they've benefitted the most from those new titles.

Participant 4: With some of my kids though, I've had – I've suggested some high interest books with low vocabularies, and she was able to direct them to some new books that she had purchased. Yeah.

Moderator: Good. Anything else you can think of? Are there areas that you feel that would have been beneficial that weren't met through this grant or through the program areas, that the library or literacy in general could be improved on the campus that wasn't?

Participant 3: One thing for some of my students, some of my students are reading on second and third grade levels. I don't know exactly which books were purchased with the grants, but I would like to see maybe a section or more on the lower levels. I see a lot of my kids that I know can't necessarily read at an 8th grade level walking out with huge books. I don't think they're

really reading them. So maybe some lower level mixed in. Maybe there are and I just don't know where to look.

Moderator: Yeah, not sure on that. Anyone else? Access to online subscriptions, things like that, would that be beneficial?

Participant 2: We have a few of those. Any of the ones we have with this, do you know?

Participant 1: Capstone, I think she purchased some with that.

Participant 3: Because we have that program.

Participant 2: There was one that they covered when I was out, but Fallit.

Participant 5: Was it iBooks or was that just for?

Participant 2: iBooks is just on the iPads. There's Fallit and there's Capstone that are both subscription.

Participant 3: Both of my – my kids are on that. I have a station. They're just boom, on that all the time. I'm like "Hey, you need AR points." They go on there and knock them out. That has been really beneficial.

Participant 1: My kids have taken advantage of Capstone as well.

Participant 2: Fallit, not so much, but the Capstone. They're on that.

Participant 3: I like Capstone because there's no excuse not to read. It's right there.

Participant 1: It reads to you even.

Participant 4: I can't go – I've got late books or whatever. Fine. Get on Capstone, so I really like that. And the fact that they're all AR.

Moderator: Okay, were you all included in any of the professional development that the grant provided?

Participant 4: Could you refresh our memories?

Moderator: It would have been last June or July.

Participant 4: I wasn't hired until August, so probably not.

Moderator: Yeah, you would remember it if you were there. It predominantly focused on K-3 and so sometimes they extend it out, but for the most part, the grant will only pay for K-3 to come, but other people can come as long as it's designed for K-3. So you probably didn't reach you guys. Okay. If the ISD were to apply for this grant again, what would you want to see happen with it at the middle school to improve things?

Participant 1: I think what they implemented this year: the extended hours, purchasing more books on Capstone, and I know she said there was – last time they were in three weeks ago, they had just purchased 180 or 138 – something to those numbers – more books. That widened the variety that my kids could pick. I'd like to see that continue.

Participant 2: One thing that might also be nice is class sets of novels that we can read. Class sets, like short novels, that can be done in one unit in our classrooms, because we encourage the kids to read on their own all the time, but we rarely have time to sit down and read a whole book together, and I think that's partly just timing and partly a lack of training and a lack of books that we have whole class sets of that are short and high interest.

Participant 1: I think that would be amazing to have that.

Participant 2: Yeah.

Moderator: Just asking on the library grant, the literacy grant, if there were ways you guys could improve it if the district were to apply for it again, any suggestions on that?

Participant 6: Increased book selection, extended hours, those kind of things.

Female 7: I don't want to repeat anything anyone's already said.

Participant 2: If you repeat anything we've said, we're going to kick you out.

Participant 1: You're fired.

Participant 6: I had talked to our librarian about getting more of the magazines that have the inferential texts, like Scholastic Scope we already get, but they have Scholastic Action which is for more struggling readers, and they have ones that are LEP-focused and things like that. If we could more subscriptions to those or more access to those, that would help us to have some information text tools, since that's especially where curriculum and testing seems to be headed is more towards informational text. The Scholastic Scope is a great resource for all genres, and it's got really good questions as far as that higher level questioning. It's a really good resource, if we just had – but it's very much at grade level and challenging to grade level. If we had something that would help our LEP and SPED even more, that would be great too.

Moderator: Okay, good. Overall, do you think having the project – the grant – on your campus, has helped improve standardized test scores since say two years ago to now? I mean, has it had – do you think it's had any additional effect having additional resources or anything like that? I know it's hard to take that and put it in a vacuum and say "Just because we had this, this got better". It's not necessarily the case, but having additional resources, do you think that has possibly helped or not?

Participant 1: Sure, to some extent. Like you said, it's hard to narrow down to say for sure, but any additional access to reading materials will affect.

Participant 6: I agree. Just having the freedom to have some more of those resources and for our kids to have more access to improve their literacy skills is – it's got to be beneficial in some aspects.

Participant 5: Even if it's just getting those students, like Rosie was saying – oh, I don't want to say names. Like you were saying, the ones that are deciding whether they like to read, having the extra options definitely help those students.

Moderator: Okay. As far as being a classroom teacher, have you increased your coordination with the library or the librarians in utilizing library materials in your coursework or integrating it into the classroom? Has that – have you felt like that's increased or have you felt like it's stayed the same as it always has?

Participant 2: I know that this year, I've definitely gone to our librarian a couple times to get resources for our class: mythology books, autobiographies when we were doing that kind of reading. _____ more than I did last year, just from the increased number of materials we had.

Participant 5: The students are enjoying reading more nonfiction and more biographies this year than they have in the past because they're available and because they're higher interest than they have been in the past. We have a great librarian that does a wonderful job of making sure that our kids and teachers in the library know how to use it and all of that. We've been blessed in the past that we've had great success, but I think that with the grant, it's definitely improved even more so.

Moderator: Anyone else? Other than that, any comments, concerns, questions about the grant, the impact it's had, complaints, anything that you would like to add that you feel like it affected your campus at all?

Participant 6: It's kind of – I guess what I was wondering is how does this tie in specifically with our STAR reading screener, at the beginning of the year, their reading test at the beginning of the year? Because that was something that supposedly it's hard to see where the money is coming from, and what it gets labelled as but supposedly the reason that we were able to test our students' reading levels at the beginning of the year this year was because of this grant. So that's helpful to be able to understand where your kids are at the beginning of the year. It would be helpful to be able to also test them at the end of the year or in the middle of the year, but as far as the number of licenses that we were awarded, the kids can't retest once they tested. So it's not until the next school year that we see growth or no growth, which as far as reading levels, getting

information as far as their instructional levels and their zone of proximal development and all of that is fantastic. The information that we got was really useful. But just being able to test multiple times throughout the year, at least one other time at the end to see that progress is huge. But that specifically with the STAR reading screening test that they take, and no other part of the grant.

Moderator: Yeah, that makes sense. If they do it the next year where they're already another, it has nothing to do with you at that point. What did they lose over summer and...? That makes sense. Anything else? Any unintended consequences that you saw like stressed out librarians from trying to figure out what to do with all these books and things like that?

Participant 1: They seem to have it together.

Participant 2: Yeah, Kelly's good.

Participant 3: I don't think Kelly's upset about having more books.

Participant 2: No. She is very an English, my good person, in that way. You can never have too many books, and she does a great job of keeping up with them and keeping them intact and in the system, and making sure that our kids treat them well.

Participant 5: We didn't have any issues with staffing for extended library hours or anything. Every week there are kids and parent here. The numbers fluctuate but there's always kids here. That means it's working for someone.

Moderator: Yeah, I get to read all those sign-in sheets. [laughter] Any questions or anything else on the grant that you would like on the record? Okay.

[End of Audio]

Elgin Middle School Student Focus Group

Moderator: Elgin Middle School Focus Group IAL. Nine participants. In your opinion as students, have the new resources, books, and technology in the library increased your interest in utilizing the school's library?

Participant 1: Yes, because it actually seems faster than what it used to be.

Participant 2: Yeah.

Participant 3: I agree with that.

Participant 1: It's a lot easier to come and do your work in the library.

Participant 1: It makes it easier to find the book that you want, especially if you know the exact book that you want, you can just type in the title, and it tells you where to find it.

Participant 1: Since there's after hours from 4:00 to 7:00, you can get all your Think Through Math lessons done and it gives you extra time to *[crosstalk]*

Participant 3: I would stay all the way until 7:00 on one of the couches, and just be reading books.

Participant 2: It gives you time to peacefully read or do homework without the chaos of house –

Participant 3: Big sisters in the house.

Participant 1: Or TVs all the way up.

Participant 3: A brother playing the drums downstairs extremely loud.

Participant 1: Not being able to focus because you want to eat.

Moderator: Okay, as far as being faster, are you talking about the process of finding books or computer speed?

Participant 1: Everything in general. Especially with looking up whatever book you want, and then it just shows you exactly where it is.

Participant 2: So you can just run and get it. Don't run, actually.

Participant 1: Speed walk to find it.

Moderator: That's good. Do you think that the teachers have included the library more in their lessons and assignments, or is that still about the same as it always was, or can you tell?

Participant 1: About the same.

Participant 2: Actually I think it's a little bit less. The time to go to the library – a little bit less than last year.

Participant 3: Yeah, because like this year, you have –

Participant 2: Every six weeks, every three weeks.

Participant 3: Every three weeks, you get to go to the library as a class, but sometimes you have to have in class to go by yourself, but not all the time.

Participant 1: Sometimes you don't get a lot of time during class. We do a lesson before we go get books. So we might only have 30 minutes to go get books, or we might have –

Participant 3: 15.

Participant 1: Sometimes we get lucky and we get the whole class period.

Participant 2: Yeah, if we get through it fast. One time it was supposed to be our class library, but we ended up two people at a time, because there was testing.

Moderator: You brought this up already, but with the extended hours after school, has it increased the use of the library.

Group: Yes.

Participant 1: A lot more people come than you would think would normally come.

Moderator: Do you see parents coming in?

Participant 1: Sometimes to pick up their kid, and sometime just to be here and watch if –

Participant 2: *[inaudible]* do their homework.

Participant 3: Sometime there's parents I see, they come in and sit with their kids and actually read another book while their kid is reading right next to them.

Participant 4: It's really cool because if a student needs to come in after school to do work online or something, their parents can come in and do work online too, or help their kid with the homework they have online, or stuff like that.

Participant 2: Or if your parents don't get off until later, and they can't pick you up, if you have tutorial, this could be your tutorial type thing. Work on extra work, but you still have help from the librarians.

Moderator: Okay, do you think that the increased books, the easier access, the online subscriptions and technology, has increased your – other students' interest in the library? Have you seen?

Participant 1: _____ got me into it.

Participant 2: Books assigned by the library or just any kind of apps, or any books?

Moderator: Any.

Participant 2: Then yes. I think a lot of people use Wattpad and stuff.

Participant 1: Capstone.

Participant 3: I write on my Whypad. I make books on Whypad.

Participant 1: Some people just don't like paper books or just don't like the hassle with keeping up with a book. A lot of people just want something they can easily _____ up on the internet and find whatever they want to find, or read, and read it.

Participant 1: It makes it easier for people who have dyslexia or something, because it can read it to them or people who doze off while they're trying to read.

Participant 2: That's what I get on the person or the people that I – the one that actually wants to read, it does gain their interest, but the ones that really don't care about reading, they don't.

Participant 1: I don't really care about reading, but it's increased my interest.

Participant 3: I don't like reading. It's boring. That's what I – because it helps me because I'm _____.

Moderator: Do you feel like the changes in the library have benefitted you academically? Do your grades go up?

Participant 1: You get extra time in library.

Participant 3: My grades stay the same all the time basically.

Participant 2: Well, maybe if you need AR points, it's way easier to read books after school than during school sometimes because you get distracted.

Participant 1: I do AR and math here. So it helps me get caught up on that kind of stuff.

Participant 2: Because you only get a certain amount of time to do AR either in reading class or in the library. So some people don't have that chance.

Participant 4: And Think Through Math, when you don't have time to do it in class, when it's due, then you can just go to the computers the night before it's actually due, and do all of them.

Participant 1: Especially for our Tapestry report. That's what this is for, to catch up on homework that you can't do at home, like you don't have a computer or printer. You come here and type your essay and print it out.

Moderator: With the improvements in the library, what do you think has been the biggest improvement or change that has affected you? Is it more online access, more technology, or just more book options?

Participant 4: I would say more technology and book options because I have more of a chance to do stuff on iPads and the technology in the library than I did last year. Well, actually in fifth grade. Sorry.

Participant 3: I get more sucked into history books. I think about history for some reason, and books online. Easier. Some books online aren't in the library and things like that.

Moderator: Okay. On average, how often do you use the library each week?

Participant 1: Every week it's open. You just – some people just come whenever they can. I go almost every time.

Participant 3: I try to come every time.

Participant 2: I come every Monday almost. Most of the time, every Monday. I come maybe once or twice a week.

Participant 4: Probably one day a week.

Participant 1: It's only on Mondays. You can come during class.

Participant 4: Oh, during school.

Participant 1: Yeah.

Participant 3: Every day.

Moderator: Okay, so having the extended hours on Monday, if that were to be more than one day a week, you would probably come when it was.

Participant 3: And it would give us more – sometimes when we have Mondays off, we can't go for _____. They plan something else.

Participant 2: I like when they do the movies.

Participant 4: After three weeks of doing learning and stuff, we do a movie. We watch a movie for a whole time.

Participant 2: That's the only reason you like it is because of the food.

Moderator: Do you read more at home?

Participant 1: Mm-mm.

Participant 2: I read at home.

Participant 4: I read everywhere.

Participant 2: Personally, I prefer math over reading. I don't really like reading.

Participant 3: I despise math.

Participant 1: I read at home. So it doesn't change.

Participant 3: You saw me with the book. I was like _____.

Moderator: So for most of you, the extended hours and that sort of thing has increased your reading, because you'll read here, but you don't read at home.

Participant 1: I read at home because I'm at home and I have to.

Participant 2: I'm not going to lie.

Moderator: Well, some people really enjoy reading. Other people enjoy other things.

Participant 1: I prefer math over reading or anything over reading, really.

Moderator: Okay, at this point, from where the library is at now, after having this grant almost two years, and buying everything that it's going to buy, what does this library still need to be even better?

Participant 3: More books.

Participant 4: More manga and books about other types of countries like Honduras and Prussia, because I can't find anything about those two. Those are my favorite ones.

Participant 2: More time to look at books and look up for books that you want to enjoy, instead of just rushing during the school day or during advisory or something.

Participant 4: Manga. Manga.

Participant 3: I wish every year they would refresh it, to where we could reread our old books and be able to take tests.

Participant 1: Yeah, our AR system. If you take it the year before, you can't retake it next year.

Participant 3: If you take it five years before that, you can't take it.

Participant 1: They should refresh it so you can read the same book.

Participant 3: Or just more books.

Moderator: Mm-hm, anything else you can think of there? Well, beyond those questions, are there any comments, suggestions, concerns with the library, or anything you'd like to add?

Participant 3: I just feel like we should do it every year, or if we can't, try to do it more times a week.

Participant 1: I think we should do it if we miss – if we have a bad weather day, or if we don't have school on a Monday, we should be able to come on a Wednesday or something.

Participant 4: Have it at least twice a week.

Participant 1: Yeah, there should be a makeup day if we can't come to school on Monday. We should have it twice a week.

Participant 3: Or somewhere we can come in during lunch.

Participant 4: Yeah, that would be good.

Participant 1: Yeah, you could come in and work on homework and stuff. That'd be cool.

Participant 3: You're eating and talking.

Moderator: Before school? Did they – is that [*crosstalk*]?

Participant 1: You can come during advisory to check out books, but you don't have as much time.

Participant 4: Oh yeah, because we have to go to see the news.

Participant 1: I might just accidentally stay past CNN. I don't like CNN.

Participant 3: I like the guys' puns. I'm just going to make that – his puns.

Participant 1: I don't like his puns. That's the only reason I don't like the show.

Participant 2: I'd rather be in the library doing my work than listen to somebody's terrible puns.

Participant 1: I'd rather read.

Participant 3: Don't underestimate his puns.

Participant 4: Don't go there. I have to deal with enough puns in the morning. I don't need any more.

Participant 3: By my friends, I'm considered the pun king.

Moderator: All right. Well, thank you guys very much. I really appreciate your time. Thanks.

Participant 1: Have a nice day, sir.

Moderator: You too. Thank –

[End of Audio]

Elgin High School Teacher Focus Group

Moderator: Elgin ISD Teacher Focus Group IAL. First question – as a classroom teacher, in what ways have you been involved in the development, implementation, and resources provided by the innovative approaches in literacy STAR program on your campus?

Participant 1: Can you repeat it one more time?

Moderator: In what ways have you been involved in the grant, as far as either in the selection of resources or using the resources that the libraries have been added, or the classrooms have added as a result of the grant?

Participant 1: Well, those of us who were here last year, at the end of the year, which would be three of us out of the five, we got to choose the first round of books. So we got to have complete input on titles. I think we got – I think we totally got to pick them, if I'm remembering correctly.

Participant 2: We did, but some of them didn't show up for some reason. So I guess, I would say more _____.

Participant 1: Okay, what else have we had input on?

Participant 2: I don't know. Just like she said, we chose – we were able to choose the books from a huge list, but for some reason or another, they just never...

Moderator: Not all of them came.

Participant 1: The second round that came, we didn't have any input on the choice of those novels. Some of them were great. Some of them were a little less than appropriate for –

Participant 2: I was excited because it was giving us a chance to do some alternative genres, rather than – graphic novels or adaptations that were more interest – high interest – and disappointed when they didn't show.

Moderator: Okay, so you got to give input, then not all of them showed up. Okay. That makes sense. What about as far as technology and that – those sorts of resources?

Participant 2: Can you explain that a little bit?

Moderator: The use of iPads in the classroom or...?

Participant 2: As it pertains to the grant?

Moderator: Yeah, or the grant purchaser. I think the school district was already purchasing a lot of that stuff.

Participant 1: Yeah, we already had that. So I don't – as far as I know, the only thing that we got purchased was the book cards.

Moderator: At the high school.

Participant 1: So I don't think we got any technology.

Participant 2: We were told that it wasn't going to be – I think we specifically asked about online licenses and stuff like that.

Moderator: Okay, and that wasn't included in this one?

Participant 2: I don't think so.

Moderator: Okay. Other than those shortcomings from the things not showing up that you had hoped for, do you believe – how do you believe the campus has benefitted from the program at this point?

Participant 1: Well, it's been nice to have a lot more resources in our own room for when we do independent reading.

Participant 3: I'll say I use the independent reading often. As my kids are doing reading comprehension, it's nice to have not outdated novels. At least this school, I've noticed, we've had a lot of good selections for books for my kids. My kids actually really like all the books on the carts and they're more apt to grab them and read them whenever we do independent reading time.

Participant 4: It's providing more choice for them as well. We don't have to stop and we don't have to stop and go to the library and leave class time for them to go to the library and check out a book. They can just go and grab one if they feel like they've got extra time that they want to read for a little bit.

Participant 6: It helped me a lot because I didn't have a large classroom library of my own to pick from to begin with. So the fact that I had enough books for every student and more than one choice for each of them was really helpful.

Moderator: Okay. With extended hours, the libraries being open earlier, later in the day – has that happened as planned at this campus?

Participant 3: Yes, absolutely.

Moderator: Do you think the students have used the library more because of that?

Participant 2: A small percentage probably. I've been in the library a couple times after – during the extended hours, for this or that meeting. There are maybe two or three students in there.

Participant 3: My students that don't have – that did not get the iPads – go in there to use the computers whenever they have homework online. They take advantage of it because they turn their stuff in. So.

Participant 4: I really don't know. I haven't had a lot of experience in there after hours.

Participant 3: I was going to say, we – all of us – our kids do not, until now as we're doing research papers, they have not had to actually type up papers as well, until this six weeks. So this six weeks will be more telling as my kids are doing research projects. If they run out of the time that I've allowed them to type their research paper, they're going to have to go to the library after hours and do it there, if they don't have one at home. That'll be more telling because we're 9th and 10th grade teachers, and we still have to have them hand write for STAR until now, because we're done with it. So this six weeks will be more telling, if they use it for that.

[phone sound]

Participant 1: Sorry.

Moderator: That's all right. With the new resources being available in the classroom, and also in the library, do you think that's had any impact on literacy? This is more of a question that's probably better suited for elementary and middle school when they're still developing. At this point, they're either reading or they're not, largely. Have you seen any difference, or more interest in reading from your students because there's more resources?

Participant 1: I'd say definitely more interest, if nothing else, because they'll see a book – they don't have just ten minutes to go pick out a book from the library. The books are in here every day. They might see a friend reading it and they can read it later. So, definitely more interest. As far as more literacy, maybe slightly, but it's hard to say.

Participant 3: Well, and one thing I noticed was a lot of the books, there were comic book versions of the novels, where I've not seen those even made before. So my kids that don't like to read a lot, whenever they would go choose their independent reading, I had the comic book versions to choose from as well. So that helped my kids at least.

Participant 6: I was able to kind of strategically move some of the kids who started off with just the comic books or just picture books to moving them into more full novels, which was really nice to be able to say "You got through this book. That was awesome. Try this book now." They're a little bit more willing to try because they had already read something that looked like a full book, and was a piece of literature.

Participant 2: See, this is where I think they were a little limited. They're speaking of the comic book version of it. Unfortunately, when I got in there, we didn't order enough copies of those. We tried to order more of a variety rather than a few copies of this. So I didn't see in my class, I didn't see a lot of difference. Maybe from a few students, but nothing that's terribly noticeable.

Moderator: Okay. Are there areas that the program did not cover that you think would have made a difference or been beneficial if it were added to it?

Participant 5: Do you mean areas of literature or...?

Participant 3: Just help in the English classroom in general?

Moderator: Additional resources or...

Participant 6: It would have been nice to have – I teach mostly ESL. So it would have been nice to have a few audio versions to be able to put on the iPads to be able to follow along in the book, especially with my really lower level kids. They're really bright, but the language is difficult for them. They would be those kids to follow along and listen, to help them understand the words better.

Participant 2: I would say more digital files as well. A way to, whether it's in the form of an app or something like that, to where they could browse easily and almost like a Good Reads type thing where they can create goals and what they want to do, track their – what they've read.

Participant 1: I also think if we had – like, right now, we have a one-to-one iPad initiative, but not all of our students have them. Not all of our students bring them every day. So if we had some sort of a cart where there were extra iPads that just don't, that have the digital versions or have internet, that would be really nice too.

Moderator: Okay. Did any of you guys participate in any of the professional development trainings?

Participant 2: For what?

Moderator: Reading specifically. I think it was more for K through 3 teachers.

Participant 1: I've never heard of it.

Participant 2: Yeah, they happened in the summer. So you guys are high school. They probably didn't include you all. I don't think the grant funds it for anybody over third grade, but I think they can give you the option to go, but obviously, you all didn't get one. If the school district were to apply for these funds again, what would you want to be different in the focus of the implementation of it?

Participant 1: I think, like we said, some more digital resources of some sort, either licenses of some kind.

Participant 2: Licenses to where if there was a kid in my class that wants to read it, and there's a kid in her class that wants to read it, they should be able to rather than "Oh, it's already checked out." That defeats the purpose of them reading, whether it's something like that Overdrive website or something. Also a little more time. I felt – honestly, I felt like we were just given a list last year. "Here. Pick from this." We're like "What?"

Participant 1: It was kind of rushed last year.

Participant 4: It was just one meeting when we did it, right? One PLC meeting. They just gave us the website, and we had to quickly choose what it was we wanted, without being able to fully investigate what was on there. Maybe do more research on specific titles to see if they would fit within what our students would want to read.

Participant 1: Also ask for the kids to suggest titles too.

Participant 4: Yes, have their input as well.

Participant 2: And an easier way to check out the books or whatever they take the form of this year.

Moderator: Mm-hm, okay. Do you think that this grant will impact, maybe not at the high school level, but students' scoring on the standardized testing, with related to reading?

Participant 1: We don't know about the high school level. So you're saying that all class levels have been given the book cards and all of?

Moderator: Actually, a few more things have been done in the earlier grades. So just for high school, what do you – do you think it would have any impact in the high school grades?

Participant 4: I think the only thing is it would give them more of a well to pull from as far as ideas and that sort of thing. Some of the things that I would usually do is SSR for the first ten minutes of class as a warmup. Sometimes they would get a book. Sometimes they would just read the non-fiction information books, but the hope was that they would, like I said, have a bigger resource of things to pull ideas from when they had to write on their tests.

Participant 1: I think it's going to take time. Partly why we were so excited is that we wanted to try to install a culture where reading is something that's okay to do. Maybe not cool, maybe that's overstepping what we can do, but at least to where it's something that isn't – kids are afraid of, or don't want to –

Participant 2: Stigma.

Participant 1: Stigma. Right. I think after one year, it's totally new for them. With this group's freshman, to see how they get used to it as we go up, it'll be more interesting.

Participant 2: Just like anything else, it takes a focus from all the teachers, and success depends on that focus. If one grade level's not as focused, it's the other one that's going to suffer. So we're speculating. We're pure speculation based on what little we know. If they come up here and they've read, for instance, *Call of the Wild*, or something similar or whatever, they have that base of knowledge to apply to whatever appears on that STAR test.

Participant 1: I don't think it could hurt. It could only help. It can't be a negative impact.

Participant 3: It's always going to be up to the teacher to implement it in a way that's going to allow them to comprehend, but it's not –

Participant 1: It's not a panacea.

Participant 3: Yeah. You don't know whether they're actually always reading unless you go and talk to them and see what page they're on and what's going on in the novel. For all you know, they're just sitting there staring at the words, and don't even care. So it's – that's just good teacher practice. It's up to teachers. It's not – it's good to have the tools, but you have to use it properly.

Participant 4: Yeah, it's like another tool.

Participant 3: Yeah, just another tool.

Moderator: Okay. Since the grant's become in place, do you find that you use the library resources more often in your regular classroom activities, or?

Participant 1: As far as these books? You don't mean going to the library? We don't do that more often?

Moderator: Well, both really.

Participant 2: I would say no.

Participant 3: "It's time to go to the library."

Participant 2: Our classes are 47 minutes.

Participant 3: It is kind of like – I've taken my kids to the library twice now to check out their own books from there, because we don't let them take those books home that are checked out to us. The ones that actually wanted to take a book home, we went. You use your whole class period, and some of them didn't even finish getting what they needed. It's kind of not logical to actually go down to the library. So I don't know. Almost –

Participant 6: I'd say we use the books more in classroom than we _____. Maybe an answer to your question is it's hard to get down to the library in 47 minutes. So we're definitely using the books that we have in our classroom more, and I think that if we weren't here, we wouldn't be going to the library much more. Does that answer the question?

Moderator: Mm-hm.

Participant 3: To me, this might be completely not what the question – but, to me, it would make more sense that if they liked a book that they saw on the cart, and started doing it during independent reading time, to be able to go on the iPad and put it on there, and then go home and continue to read it. That would make more sense, because what kid – especially my pre-AP kids are going to sit there and read for 10 minutes, and then be able to put it down. Then [*crosstalk*].

Participant 6: They wouldn't have it in the library. So there's no way that the kid could check it out if they liked something on the cart.

Participant 3: I've had a kid who really liked a book on the cart, and I bought it on Amazon, because she really, really, really wanted it and there were other kids using it other periods.

Participant 2: That's to say nothing about the kids that struggle. It reduces the stigma of them having a book on them.

Moderator: Mm-hm. So having the book carts in your classroom has been good. Do the books rotate or are those the books that you have?

Participant 6: We talked about rotating them but after we got the new cart and this, we just figured it was a big pain in the butt, because they're all individually checked out to us. We'd have to check them back in and then check them out to other teachers, and that just takes forever. So we ended up just keeping them when we got new ones. But I'd say next year, I'd want to switch them out.

Participant 4: Possibly have a way to check them out to a student. You know which students you have that are going to be reliable and bring those books back.

Participant 6: If there's a way we could have in our own classroom to the kid, like take them off of our account, and put them on the kid's account but from the library, that would be awesome.

Participant 2: Something easy though, because I don't want to spend [crosstalk]

Participant 6: No, just a computer login, quick thing.

Participant 3: They have iPhone apps that you can literally just go and scan it. [crosstalk]

Participant 4: I have my _____ sourced, and I have my own books catalogued in there. My kids could check out – my personal library, I have a scanner or I use my iPad.

Participant 6: All you need is a library login, but I don't know if it would _____ clearance.

Moderator: So basically a system that would allow you to check out the books from your classroom to the students to where they didn't – to where you weren't liable for them. Also, as far

as rotating them, an easier way to do that because the process right now would be really burdensome.

Participant 4: If we had that checkout system within our classroom, it would be very easy. We could just check them back in and then the next person could check them out on their own. We'd just need our iPads to do it.

Moderator: Okay, makes sense. Other than the questions I've asked, are there any concerns or suggestions for this grant? If the school district were to do it again?

Participant 2: I'd say to focus more on the individual aspect of it.

Participant 3: Since we already have the iPads, use what we can use with them. Yeah.

Participant 4: Maybe give us a little bit more time to choose subtitles before the deadline, and let us choose titles _____.

Participant 5: If there are more resources that we aren't aware of in the library that you want us to be using, we just need some more training and awareness of them.

Moderator: Okay, anything else? Okay. I'm going to stop recording.

[End of Audio]