



Oregon Reading First Center

Review of Comprehensive Programs

*Completed by the
Curriculum Review Panel*

July 2003

Preface

The following report, the *Review of Comprehensive Reading Programs*, describes the work of the Oregon Curriculum Review Panel and the Oregon Reading First Center, who had responsibility for conducting a critical review of comprehensive curriculum programs in beginning reading for the first cohort of 32 schools participating in Oregon Reading First.

The report consists of a main report and 12 sections which are structured in the following way.

- The main body of the report describes the procedures used to review the nine comprehensive programs that met the criteria used in Oregon for inclusion as a comprehensive beginning reading program. The main body of the report also summarizes the primary results of the review and the reliability of the procedures used in conducting the review.
- Sections 1-9 of the report contain review summaries for each of the nine programs. These sections are arranged in alphabetical order.
- Section 10 is a summary of all nine programs according to “essential components.” Essential components in beginning reading – as defined in the Reading First legislation – are phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.
- Section 11 is a summary of all nine programs by grade level. Grade levels are kindergarten, first, second, and third.
- Section 12 contains the agreement and reliability data for the item-by-item ratings and summary scores for each program.

In releasing this report, we emphasize the following:

The purpose of the report IS:

- To provide a thorough and objective analysis of comprehensive programs in beginning reading for Oregon Reading First schools to use in their selection of a school-wide reading program in Grades K-3.

The report IS NOT:

- An approved or recommended reading textbook or program adoption list for Oregon or any other state;
- An endorsement of any specific program;
- An all-inclusive list of comprehensive reading programs in K-3. Only those publishers who submitted materials for review, and only those programs that met the criteria used in Oregon to define a comprehensive beginning reading program, were reviewed.

Report of the Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel Review of Comprehensive Reading Programs

Rationale for Care in the Selection of a Comprehensive Reading Program

The purpose of Reading First is: “To provide assistance to State educational agencies and local educational agencies in establishing reading programs for students in kindergarten through grade 3 that are based on scientifically based reading research, to ensure that every student can read at grade level or above not later than the end of grade 3.”

NCLB, 2001, Title I, Part B, Sec. 1201

The selection and implementation of scientifically based instructional materials is critical in the Reading First legislation. A strong comprehensive program should provide the instruction on the essential components of reading that enables the majority of students to meet or exceed grade-level standards on all of the essential Reading First components.

Purpose of Oregon Review of Comprehensive Reading Programs

It is extremely complex and time-consuming to analyze the instructional design quality of comprehensive reading programs. Asking local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools to conduct thorough evaluations of comprehensive reading programs is a monumental if not unreasonable request. Analyzing comprehensive reading programs not only requires specialized training but also considerable time commitment. Oregon Reading First schools will rely on this review by the Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel (CRP) to select comprehensive reading materials, which will form the foundation of their beginning reading programs.

Selection of Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel Members

Stan Bunn, former State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Oregon, invited 25 educators from across the state to serve on the Curriculum Review Panel. Five additional members from the University of Oregon, Eugene Research Institute, and Oregon Research Institute, and three members from Oregon Department of Education (ODE) were identified in Oregon’s Reading First grant. Of these 33 potential reviewers, 17 participated in the review of comprehensive reading programs. The final panel of 17 members included two district administrators, two district curriculum specialists, one classroom teacher, four university faculty from three state universities (University of Oregon, Pacific University, University of Portland), two doctoral

students from the University of Oregon, four researchers from Eugene Research Institute, one researcher from Oregon Research Institute, and one educational specialist from ODE.

Tool for Evaluating Comprehensive Reading Programs

The review was conducted using The Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis, which was developed by Drs. Deborah Simmons and Edward Kame'enui from the University of Oregon. This tool was developed as part of the scope of work of the National Center To Improve the Tools of Educators (NCITE), a federally funded national center that worked with publishers and developers of basal programs from 1990-2000. The purpose of the tool is to assist states, districts, and schools in the selection of research-based reading programs. The tool is designed to document and to quantify the design and delivery features of comprehensive reading programs. It is the primary tool being used by many Reading First states (e.g., Arizona, Colorado, Washington) to review and analyze K-3 reading materials, and was also included as part of the Secretary of Education's Leadership Academies (2001-2002).

The Consumer's Guide is structured by grade level (K-3). For each grade, items on the guide are organized around the Reading First five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Reviewers rate each item according to a three-point scale that is represented by a full circle (i.e., 2 points), a partial circle (1 point), or an empty circle (0 points). A full circle indicates that the program consistently met or exceeded the criterion for that item. A partial circle indicates the program partially met the criterion for that item. An empty circle indicates that the program did not satisfy the criterion for that item.

In the Oregon Reading First analysis, a modified version of the original Consumer's Guide was used. In the modification, items were prioritized within each essential component as either High Priority or Discretionary. High-priority items were considered essential in the analysis of the program. These items were determined to be most closely aligned with the purposes of Reading First and the conclusions drawn by the National Reading Panel (2000) review of reading research. Discretionary items were also considered important and they were reviewed and rated, but they did not require the same level of documentation as high priority items.

To gain an adequate representation of each program, the following three different types of analyses were used to review high-priority items.

1. A within-lesson analysis, labeled “(w),” was used to examine the content of individual lessons. Each reviewer identified the first day (lesson) in which a critical skill (e.g., word reading, main idea) was introduced and then tracked how that skill was taught over a sequence of 2-3 days. The reviewer conducted the within-lesson analysis for each (w) item at three points in the program: at the beginning, the middle, and the end.
2. A scope and sequence analysis, labeled “(ss),” was used to analyze how instruction progressed over time. Each reviewer used the scope and sequence to identify the initial instruction of a skill and documented the progression of instruction over time in the column in the Consumer's Guide marked “evidence.”

- The third type of analysis was called a skills trace analysis, labeled “(st).” A skills trace analysis was used to evaluate whether skills were systematically reviewed over time. Reviewers traced a skill over 10 consecutive lessons, documenting new instructional content as well as the review content in each of the lessons.

At the end of each grade level, five overarching items were used as the basis for rating the design, coherence, and systematic nature of instruction across lessons in a program. These design items were intended to provide a big-picture analysis of the program’s construction.

Review Process for Comprehensive Reading Programs

An announcement was posted on the Oregon Reading First website and the Washington, Oregon, Alaska Textbook Representative Association (WOATRA) website inviting publishers to submit comprehensive reading programs for review. Publishers were informed of the purpose of the review and the definition of a “comprehensive program.” To be considered comprehensive, a program had to (a) include materials for all grades from K through 3; and (b) comprehensively address the five essential components of the Reading First legislation. The checked boxes in Table 1 indicate the essential components that a comprehensive program had to address by grade level.

Table 1. Emphasis of Essential Components of Reading Instruction by Grade Level

	Kindergarten	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade
Phonemic Awareness	✓	✓		
Phonics	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reading Fluency		✓	✓	✓
Vocabulary	✓	✓	✓	✓
Comprehension	✓	✓	✓	✓

Publishers were asked to submit teacher editions, student texts including decodable materials, student workbooks and/or blackline masters, assessment materials, and the scientific research base for their comprehensive program(s). Deadline for submissions was February 14, 2003.

Fifteen programs were submitted for review. Of those 15 programs, 9 met the criteria as a comprehensive program. These 9 programs are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. The Nine Comprehensive Programs Reviewed by the Curriculum Review Panel

Publisher	Program Title	Copyright
Harcourt Rigby Education	Rigby Literacy	2000
Harcourt School Publishers	Trophies	2003
Houghton Mifflin	The Nation’s Choice	2003
Macmillan/McGraw-Hill	Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Reading	2003
SRA/McGraw-Hill	Open Court	2002
SRA/McGraw-Hill	Reading Mastery Plus	2002
Scott Foresman Publishing	Scott Foresman Reading	2004
Success For All Foundation	Success for All	K/1 - 2002 2 - 1998 (2002 partially admitted) 3 -1999 (2002, 2003 partially admitted)
Wright Group/McGraw Hill	Wright Group Literacy	2002

Oregon Reading First Curriculum Review Panel (CRP) members received 6 hours of professional development, training, and scoring practice by Oregon Reading First staff on February 21, 2003. CRP members were then randomly assigned to programs for review. Each reviewer was assigned to review either the K/1 or the 2/3 grade levels of their assigned program. Using this procedure, we made sure that no reviewer evaluated all grade levels (i.e., K-3) of the same program. CRP members also were not permitted to review any program for which they were an author, consultant, or advisor. Members signed statements of disclosure prior to program assignment.

After completing their first review, reviewers who were able to continue were randomly assigned to review another program, either K/1 or 2/3. Overall, each member reviewed 1 to 4 programs based on reviewer availability and review time. Comprehensive programs were reviewed from March, 2003 to May of 2003.

Each section of a program (either K/1 or 2/3) was reviewed by two independent reviewers. The same two reviewers were never paired more than once. Thus, each entire program (all 4 grades, K-3) was reviewed by 4 different members of the review panel. Members spent from 8 to 30 hours to complete a review assignment (i.e., either K/1 or 2/3 of a program). All reviews were conducted at the Oregon Reading First Center.

Upon completion of the initial review, scores between the two reviewers were compared item by item. A full circle rating received 2 points, a partial circle rating received 1 point, and an empty circle rating received 0 points. On items in which two reviewers assigned the same rating and on items in which there was a 1-point discrepancy (i.e., one reviewer scored the item as a full circle and the other scored it as a partial circle, or one reviewer scored it as a partial circle and the other scored it as an empty circle), the two reviewers' scores were averaged to arrive at a final score for that item. On items for which there was a 2-point discrepancy between the two reviewers (e.g., one reviewer scored the item as a full circle and the other reviewer scored the item as an empty circle), a third reviewer was asked to resolve the discrepancy. Third reviewers examined the evidence documented by the two primary reviewers, as well as the relevant program materials, and determined which of the reviewers' scores best represented the quality for that particular item. Thus, the third reviewer assigned either the first reviewer's score or the second reviewer's score as the representative rating for that item. The culmination of averaged items and items resolved by a third reviewer would comprise a final report for a given reading program.

Content of the Final Report

Sections 1-9 contain a completed Consumer's Guide for each reading program. Included in each Consumer Guide is a representative rating for each item as well as summary ratings by high priority, discretionary, and design features. Results are also summarized by essential component and by grade. Sections 10 (Summary by Essential Component) and 11 (Summary by Grade) include summary information across all reading programs. Section 12 contains the agreement and reliability data for the item-by-item ratings and summary scores for each program.

The final item-by-item ratings were summarized for each program in the following manner. For each summary category (e.g., kindergarten, high-priority, phonemic awareness), the total number

of points earned by all of the items in that category were summed. The percentage of total points earned was then calculated by dividing the total points earned by the total number of possible points for that category. For example, in kindergarten there are 5 high priority items for phonemic awareness. The total possible points a program could earn in that category is 10 (5 items x 2 points per item = 10 possible points). If a program had 3 full circles and 2 partial circles, the total percentage score would be 8/10 or 80%.

All point totals for each summary category are expressed as a percentage of the total number of points possible in the various reporting formats including the (a) Consumer's Guide for each of the nine comprehensive programs, (b) Summary by Program, (c) Summary by Essential Component, and (d) Summary by Grade.

For each of the nine programs, a total of 38 percentage category scores are reported for High Priority, Discretionary, and Design categories across the five essential components of reading and four grade levels. As such, to determine which programs meet the scientifically based reading research standards as represented in The Consumer's Guide to Evaluating a Core Reading Program Grades K-3: A Critical Elements Analysis, would require examining 342 percentages; that is, percentages for 38 categories x 9 programs. Negotiating 342 percentages to select the most effective comprehensive reading programs would not be a manageable task.

To make this task manageable, we employed a criterion-based, rank-order analysis to summarize the ratings and to evaluate the relative magnitude of the differences between comprehensive programs across essential components and grade levels.

To conduct this analysis, we used a criterion of 75% to examine the 38 percentages in each program. That is, for each summary category (e.g., kindergarten, high-priority, phonemic awareness), if a program earned at least 75% of the total number of points possible, it met the criterion. If a program earned less than 75% of the total number of points possible for that category, it did not meet the criterion. We determined that a criterion of 75% represented a robust and defensible "cut score" for determining the viability of an essential component.

To determine the rank order for programs, we analyzed the Summary by Grade report. This report specifies summary percentages for each of the five essential components of reading (i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) for high priority, discretionary items, and design items at each grade level (K-3) for each of the nine programs. Scores below the 75% criterion were tallied for each essential component for high priority, discretionary, and design items across grade levels (K-3) for each program. Design items are included in the summary tallies with high priority items because of the collective importance of the two categories and to ease interpretation.

To best evaluate the findings of the review process, consider the Rank Order of Programs in Table 3. The number in each parenthesis is the number of items **that were below the 75% criterion**. In other words, the number in parentheses in each cell in Table 3 is the number of items that did not meet our criterion for satisfactory evidence of effectiveness. The summary category reveals that Houghton Mifflin had 4 high priority categories and 4 discretionary categories across K-3 **that were below** the 75% criterion. In contrast, the summary category

reveals that Rigby had 18 high priority categories and 14 discretionary categories across K-3 **that were below** the 75% criterion. In other words, only 8 of the 45 summary categories were below the criterion for Houghton Mifflin, while 32 of the 45 summary categories were below the criterion for Rigby.

Table 3. Rank Order of Programs by High Priority and Discretionary Items

K-3 High Priority (Total # < 75%)	K-3 Discretionary (Total # < 75%)	K-3 Total (Total # < 75%)
1. Houghton Mifflin (4)	1. Houghton Mifflin (4)	1. Houghton Mifflin (8)
2. Open Court (6)	2. Reading Mastery (5)	2. Open Court (12)
3. Reading Mastery (8)	3. Open Court (6)	3. Reading Mastery (13)
4. Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (10)	4. Harcourt (7)	4. Macmillan-McGraw-Hill (17)
4. Scott Foresman (10)	4. Macmillan/McGraw-Hill (7)	5. Harcourt (18)
4. Success For All (10)	6. Success For All (8)	5. Success For All (18)
7. Harcourt (11)	7. Scott Foresman (10)	7. Scott Foresman (20)
8. Rigby (18)	8. Rigby (14)	8. Rigby (32)
9. Wright Group (20)	8. Wright Group (14)	9. Wright Group (34)

For each program, we tallied the number of total categories that were below the 75% criterion, then rank ordered the programs based on a combination of the tallies for high priority items and discretionary items. This information is presented in the final column of Table 3. The table indicates that Houghton Mifflin was ranked first with 8 categories falling below the 75% criterion; Open Court ranked second with 12 categories below the 75% criterion; and Reading Mastery ranked third with 13 categories falling below the 75% criterion.

Reliability of the Program Review

As noted above, each reading program was divided into two units for initial review purposes. One unit included all K-1 materials and the other included all grade 2-3 materials. Each unit was reviewed independently by two members of the Curriculum Review Panel. The reliability of the review process is based on an analysis of these initial, independent reviews, summed across the 18 review units (nine K-3 programs with two units per program). The analysis of inter-rater reliability is represented by two distinct indices: (a) Raw agreement and (b) Pearson correlation coefficients. Each index provides a different way of considering the reliability of the review process. Taken together the two indices provide an overall indication of the reliability of the review process.

Raw Agreement. Raw agreement is the percentage of opportunities that reviewers agreed that an item should be rated as a: (a) full circle (2 points), (b) partial circle (1 point), or (c) empty circle (0 points). Agreement, which we defined in two ways, was based on our procedure for arriving at a single representative score for each item. In one case we defined “agreement” as an exact match between the two reviewers. In other words, an agreement meant that both reviewers rated the item the same (i.e., either a full circle, a partial circle, or an empty circle. This is a strict definition of agreement because the two ratings must match exactly. In the second case, we defined agreement as the two reviewers being within one rating point of each other. For example, an agreement was recorded when one reviewer marked an item as a full circle and the second reviewer marked the same item as a partial circle. This is amore liberal definition of agreement.

Pearson Correlation. The second reliability index is a Pearson correlation coefficient, which we used in summing the point values across items within essential component categories, such as phonemic awareness or phonics, or vocabulary. Pearson correlation values range from 0.0 – 1.0, and can be either positive or negative in value. Within each category, the maximum point value of summary scores ranged from 0 to 20, thus providing a relatively greater range of scores than the restricted range evident on the per item analysis (i.e., 0-2) . For the summary score calculations, Pearson correlations provide an index of reliability that corresponds to the scores used in the 75% cutoff criterion to determine that a program met or did not meet criteria for sufficient evidence of effectiveness in a particular area.

Summary of Coding Reliability

Table 4 presents a summary of item-by-item reliability based on coding agreements and disagreements across all reviewers and all programs. Pearson correlation coefficients are also presented, which indicate the summary score relationship between the two reviewers.

Item-by-item agreements are defined in two ways: exact matches and matches within one rating point of each other. There were three combinations of exact matches: (a) both reviewers rated the item as a full circle (i.e., 2 points) (FF), (b) both reviewers rated the item as a partial circle (i.e., 1 point) (PP) and (c) both reviewers rated the item as an empty circle (i.e., 0 points) (EE).

There were two combinations of agreements possible when the two reviewers’ ratings were within one point of each other: (a) one reviewer rated the item as a full circle and the second reviewer rated the item as a partial circle; and (b) one rated the item as a partial circle and the second reviewer rated the item as an empty circle.

There was one way the two reviewers could have an item categorized as a disagreement, thereby requiring a third independent reviewer to resolve the discrepancy: one reviewer rated the item as a full circle, and the second reviewer rated the item as an empty circle.

Table 4 shows that across all programs for grades K/1, there were 765 combinations of ratings by the two reviewers. Across the total ratings, both reviewers rated 264 items (35%) as a full circle, 55 items as a partial circle (7%), and 57 items (7%) as a empty circle. Thus, there were exact match agreements for 376 of the 765 ratings (49%). Agreement in which reviewers were within one point of each other occurred for 41% of the items. Agreement, then, as defined as exact

matches and matches within one point, occurred for 90% of the 765 items. On 10% of the items, the two reviewers disagreed with each other and a third reviewer was called in to make a determination about that item.

Table 4 also presents information for the program ratings for grades 2/3. There were a total of 801 items rated across all programs. Exact match agreement ratings occurred 314 times (39%) and agreements where two reviewers were within one point of each other occurred 398 times (50%). Thus, overall agreement occurred on 89% of the items. Disagreements occurred on 11% of the items.

A summary of reliability information across programs is displayed in the final column of Table 4 as a Pearson correlation coefficient. The Pearson correlation coefficient represents the strength of the relationship between the summary scores of the two reviewers for a particular program. There were 25 summary scores for each of the K/1 programs. Across programs, the correlation coefficients ranged from .44 - .95, with a median coefficient of .71. For the 2/3 programs, there were 20 summary scores for each program. Across all nine programs, the correlation coefficients ranged from .71-.87, with a median coefficient of .86. The median correlations of .71 and .86 indicate there was a moderately strong correlation overall between the summary scores of all paired reviewers for each K/1 and 2/3 analyses.

Table 4. Summary of Agreement and Reliability Across Programs

Grade	Agreements						Pearson Correlation (range/median)
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point		Disagreements	
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial /Empty		
K/1	35%	7%	7%	31%	11%	10%	.44-.95
	(264)	(55)	(57)	(239)	(77)	(73)	(.71)
2/3	22%	10%	7%	37%	13%	11%	.71-.87
	(178)	(81)	(55)	(294)	(104)	(89)	(.86)

Tables 5 and 6 provide agreement and reliability information specifically for two programs: Houghton-Mifflin (2003) *The Nation’s Choice* and Harcourt *Rigby Literacy* (2000). This program specific information can be compared to the “normative” information presented in Table 4. For instance, in Table 4 we saw that across all programs, both of the K/1 reviewers rated an item as a full circle 35% of the time. Looking specifically at Houghton-Mifflin, Table 5 indicates that both reviewers gave a full circle rating on 47% of the items, which is considerably higher than the average across all programs. By contrast, the two reviewers of the Rigby Literacy Program for grades K/1 both rated an item as a full circle only 5% of the items,

considerably lower than the average across all programs. Agreement and reliability data for the item-by-item ratings and summary scores are presented for each program in Section 12.

Table 4 also shows that across all programs, both reviewers rated as an empty circle only 10% of the items (73 of 765 ratings). Program specific information in Tables 5 and 6 reveals that on no occasion did both reviewers of Houghton-Mifflin rate an item as an empty circle (0%) and on the Rigby Literacy Program, both reviewers rated an item as an empty circle 28% of the time.

Table 5. Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Houghton-Mifflin 2000

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty	Empty/ Full		
K/1	47%	5%	0%	31%	9%	7%	.81	
2/3	41%	7%	0%	42%	4%	4%	.87	

It is also interesting to examine agreements in which the two reviewers were within one point of each other and consider the rating patterns. For example, in Table 5 (Houghton-Mifflin) the majority of rating patterns involving a 1-point discrepancy occurred when one reviewer rated an item as a full circle and the other reviewer rated the item as partial circle (31%). A different pattern can be seen in Table 6 (Rigby), where the majority of 1-point discrepancies occurred when one reviewer rated an item as a partial circle and the other reviewer rated the item as an empty circle (31%). The reliability data for the item-by-item ratings are also presented for each program in Section 12.

Taken together, the information reflected in the item-by-item analysis and the information reflected in summary scores used in 75% criterion analysis are highly aligned (see Table 3). For example, the Houghton-Mifflin program had the greatest percentage of item-by-item ratings where both reviewers awarded a full circle (i.e., 2 points). Houghton-Mifflin also had the highest percentage of summary scores that exceeded the 75% criterion across the essential components of reading. In contrast, the Rigby Literacy Program, had one of the largest percentages of item-by-item ratings in which both reviewers awarded an empty circle (i.e., 0 points). The Rigby Literacy Program was also one of the programs that had the fewest summary scores that met the 75% criterion analysis.

Table 6. Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Rigby 2003

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty	Empty/ Full		
K/1	5%	5%	28%	11%	36%	15%	.44	
2/3	15%	10%	6%	35%	14%	19%	.86	

Sections I-IX
Reviews of Individual
Comprehensive Programs

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Harcourt

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	80%	100%		
Phonics	75%	86%	75%	100%
Fluency		83%	75%	67%
Vocabulary	0%	25%	63%	65%
Comprehension	38%	50%	58%	79%
TOTAL	58%	73%	63%	75%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	88%	80%		
Phonics	88%	79%	73%	66%
Fluency		63%	50%	83%
Vocabulary	75%	83%	68%	83%
Comprehension	25%	58%	79%	81%
TOTAL	71%	75%	70%	75%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	50%	55%	65%	80%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Houghton Mifflin

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	85%	100%		
Phonics	83%	82%	88%	88%
Fluency		75%	92%	67%
Vocabulary	50%	25%	88%	90%
Comprehension	75%	50%	80%	90%
TOTAL	77%	69%	85%	85%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	100%	100%		
Phonics	88%	96%	90%	75%
Fluency		25%	50%	42%
Vocabulary	75%	75%	80%	92%
Comprehension	75%	92%	88%	69%
TOTAL	86%	86%	82%	71%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	90%	85%	80%	75%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Macmillan/McGraw-Hill

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	85%	75%		
Phonics	89%	71%	56%	0%
Fluency		63%	58%	58%
Vocabulary	42%	75%	38%	80%
Comprehension	69%	92%	75%	79%
TOTAL	77%	73%	62%	66%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	75%	90%		
Phonics	100%	71%	40%	50%
Fluency		88%	58%	75%
Vocabulary	92%	83%	53%	58%
Comprehension	58%	100%	88%	81%
TOTAL	82%	84%	56%	63%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	50%	100%	80%	75%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Open Court

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	80%	75%		
Phonics	81%	89%	56%	63%
Fluency		63%	83%	92%
Vocabulary	58%	83%	0%	75%
Comprehension	81%	67%	83%	93%
TOTAL	77%	76%	65%	84%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	100%	90%		
Phonics	100%	83%	55%	84%
Fluency		88%	67%	75%
Vocabulary	83%	83%	48%	67%
Comprehension	50%	50%	92%	81%
TOTAL	86%	80%	61%	79%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	80%	80%	90%	85%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Reading Mastery

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	95%	100%		
Phonics	86%	93%	81%	100%
Fluency		83%	100%	83%
Vocabulary	92%	83%	38%	70%
Comprehension	63%	58%	13%	50%
TOTAL	85%	85%	52%	68%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	94%	100%		
Phonics	75%	96%	90%	84%
Fluency		75%	92%	100%
Vocabulary	92%	50%	65%	42%
Comprehension	75%	50%	13%	81%
TOTAL	84%	80%	66%	79%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	90%	90%	55%	55%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Rigby Literacy

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	40%	50%		
Phonics	28%	14%	50%	75%
Fluency		4%	33%	50%
Vocabulary	33%	25%	38%	65%
Comprehension	56%	42%	79%	86%
TOTAL	37%	20%	57%	72%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	31%	70%		
Phonics	6%	17%	35%	44%
Fluency		0%	8%	50%
Vocabulary	50%	58%	58%	58%
Comprehension	58%	83%	83%	75%
TOTAL	34%	46%	50%	54%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	25%	20%	40%	45%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Scott Foresman

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	75%	75%		
Phonics	72%	79%	81%	75%
Fluency		75%	75%	50%
Vocabulary	33%	50%	75%	60%
Comprehension	50%	75%	75%	71%
TOTAL	63%	73%	77%	65%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	69%	85%		
Phonics	81%	83%	83%	38%
Fluency		75%	67%	25%
Vocabulary	50%	75%	60%	67%
Comprehension	67%	75%	67%	63%
TOTAL	66%	80%	70%	46%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	70%	80%	60%	45%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Success For All

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	65%	75%		
Phonics	97%	93%	0%	0%
Fluency		88%	17%	58%
Vocabulary	92%	83%	13%	55%
Comprehension	88%	83%	38%	86%
TOTAL	87%	87%	20%	62%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	50%	75%		
Phonics	100%	92%	5%	16%
Fluency		100%	8%	42%
Vocabulary	92%	83%	18%	0%
Comprehension	92%	100%	38%	94%
TOTAL	82%	88%	16%	35%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	80%	90%	20%	60%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs

Summary by Program

Wright Group

High Priority Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	15%	88%		
Phonics	17%	71%	63%	63%
Fluency		29%	50%	33%
Vocabulary	33%	17%	25%	45%
Comprehension	38%	42%	42%	50%
TOTAL	23%	49%	47%	47%

Discretionary Items

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
Phonemic Awareness	44%	90%		
Phonics	81%	75%	63%	63%
Fluency		13%	17%	42%
Vocabulary	67%	67%	68%	50%
Comprehension	8%	42%	63%	69%
TOTAL	52%	66%	59%	58%

Design Features

	Kindergarten	First Grade	Second Grade	Third Grade
TOTAL	10%	25%	25%	35%

Section X
Summary by Essential
Component

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs
Summary by Essential Component

Phonemic Awareness

	Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D
Harcourt	80%	88%	100%	80%				
Houghton Mifflin	85%	100%	100%	100%				
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill	85%	75%	75%	90%				
Open Court	80%	100%	75%	90%				
Reading Mastery	95%	94%	100%	100%				
Rigby	40%	31%	50%	70%				
Scott Foresman	75%	69%	75%	85%				
Success for All	65%	50%	75%	75%				
Wright Group	15%	44%	88%	90%				

Phonics

	Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D
Harcourt	75%	88%	86%	79%	75%	73%	100%	66%
Houghton Mifflin	83%	88%	82%	96%	88%	90%	88%	75%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill	89%	100%	71%	71%	56%	40%	0%	50%
Open Court	81%	100%	89%	83%	56%	55%	63%	84%
Reading Mastery	86%	75%	93%	96%	81%	90%	100%	84%
Rigby	28%	6%	14%	17%	50%	35%	75%	44%
Scott Foresman	72%	81%	79%	83%	81%	83%	75%	38%
Success for All	97%	100%	93%	92%	0%	5%	0%	16%
Wright Group	17%	81%	71%	75%	63%	63%	63%	63%

Oregon Reading First
 Review of Comprehensive Programs
 Summary by Essential Component (cont.)

Fluency

	Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D
Harcourt			83%	63%	75%	50%	67%	83%
Houghton Mifflin			75%	25%	92%	50%	67%	42%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill			63%	88%	58%	58%	58%	75%
Open Court			63%	88%	83%	67%	92%	75%
Reading Mastery			83%	75%	100%	92%	83%	100%
Rigby			4%	0%	33%	8%	50%	50%
Scott Foresman			75%	75%	75%	67%	50%	25%
Success for All			88%	100%	17%	8%	58%	42%
Wright Group			29%	13%	50%	17%	33%	42%

Vocabulary

	Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D
Harcourt	0%	75%	25%	83%	63%	68%	65%	83%
Houghton Mifflin	50%	75%	25%	75%	88%	80%	90%	92%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill	42%	92%	75%	83%	38%	53%	80%	58%
Open Court	58%	83%	83%	83%	0%	48%	75%	67%
Reading Mastery	92%	92%	83%	50%	38%	65%	70%	42%
Rigby	33%	50%	25%	58%	38%	58%	65%	58%
Scott Foresman	33%	50%	50%	75%	75%	60%	60%	67%
Success for All	92%	92%	83%	83%	13%	18%	55%	0%
Wright Group	33%	67%	17%	67%	25%	68%	45%	50%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs
Summary by Essential Component (cont.)

Comprehension

	Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D
Harcourt	38%	25%	50%	58%	58%	79%	79%	81%
Houghton Mifflin	75%	75%	50%	92%	79%	88%	89%	69%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill	69%	58%	92%	100%	75%	88%	79%	81%
Open Court	81%	50%	67%	50%	83%	92%	93%	81%
Reading Mastery	63%	75%	58%	50%	13%	13%	50%	81%
Rigby	56%	58%	42%	83%	79%	83%	86%	75%
Scott Foresman	50%	67%	75%	75%	75%	67%	71%	63%
Success for All	88%	92%	83%	100%	38%	38%	86%	94%
Wright Group	38%	8%	42%	42%	42%	63%	50%	69%

Section XI

Summary by Grade

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs
Summary by Grade

KINDERGARTEN - High Priority Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Comprehension	TOTAL
Harcourt	80%	75%		0%	38%	58%
Houghton Mifflin	85%	83%		50%	75%	77%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill	85%	89%		42%	69%	77%
Open Court	80%	81%		58%	81%	77%
Reading Mastery	95%	86%		92%	63%	85%
Rigby	40%	28%		33%	56%	37%
Scott Foresman	75%	72%		33%	50%	63%
Success For All	65%	97%		92%	88%	87%
Wright Group	15%	17%		33%	38%	23%

FIRST GRADE - High Priority Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Comprehension	TOTAL
Harcourt	100%	86%	83%	25%	50%	73%
Houghton Mifflin	100%	82%	75%	25%	50%	69%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill	75%	71%	63%	75%	92%	73%
Open Court	75%	89%	63%	83%	67%	76%
Reading Mastery	100%	93%	83%	83%	58%	85%
Rigby	50%	14%	4%	25%	42%	20%
Scott Foresman	75%	79%	75%	50%	75%	73%
Success For All	75%	93%	88%	83%	83%	87%
Wright Group	88%	71%	29%	17%	42%	49%

Oregon Reading First
 Review of Comprehensive Programs
 Summary by Grade (cont.)

SECOND GRADE - High Priority Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Compre-hension	TOTAL
Harcourt		75%	75%	63%	58%	63%
Houghton Mifflin		88%	92%	88%	79%	85%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill		56%	58%	38%	75%	62%
Open Court		56%	83%	0%	83%	65%
Reading Mastery		81%	100%	38%	13%	52%
Rigby		50%	33%	38%	79%	57%
Scott Foresman		81%	75%	75%	75%	77%
Success For All		0%	17%	13%	38%	20%
Wright Group		63%	50%	25%	42%	47%

THIRD GRADE - High Priority Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Compre-hension	TOTAL
Harcourt		100%	67%	65%	79%	75%
Houghton Mifflin		88%	67%	90%	89%	85%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill		0%	58%	80%	79%	66%
Open Court		63%	92%	75%	93%	84%
Reading Mastery		100%	83%	70%	50%	68%
Rigby		75%	50%	65%	86%	72%
Scott Foresman		75%	50%	60%	71%	65%
Success For All		0%	58%	55%	86%	62%
Wright Group		63%	33%	45%	50%	47%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs
Summary by Grade

KINDERGARTEN - Discretionary Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Comprehension	TOTAL
Harcourt	88%	88%		75%	25%	71%
Houghton Mifflin	100%	88%		75%	75%	86%
Macmillan/McGraw-Hill	75%	100%		92%	58%	82%
Open Court	100%	100%		83%	50%	86%
Reading Mastery	94%	75%		92%	75%	84%
Rigby	31%	6%		50%	58%	34%
Scott Foresman	69%	81%		50%	67%	66%
Success For All	50%	100%		92%	92%	82%
Wright Group	44%	81%		67%	8%	52%

FIRST GRADE - Discretionary Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Comprehension	TOTAL
Harcourt	80%	79%	63%	83%	58%	75%
Houghton Mifflin	100%	96%	25%	75%	92%	86%
Macmillan/McGraw-Hill	90%	71%	88%	83%	100%	84%
Open Court	90%	83%	88%	83%	50%	80%
Reading Mastery	100%	96%	75%	50%	50%	80%
Rigby	70%	17%	0%	58%	83%	46%
Scott Foresman	85%	83%	75%	75%	75%	80%
Success For All	75%	92%	100%	83%	100%	88%
Wright Group	90%	75%	13%	67%	42%	66%

Oregon Reading First
 Review of Comprehensive Programs
 Summary by Grade (cont.)

SECOND GRADE - Discretionary Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Compre-hension	TOTAL
Harcourt		73%	50%	68%	79%	70%
Houghton Mifflin		90%	50%	80%	88%	82%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill		40%	58%	53%	88%	56%
Open Court		55%	67%	48%	92%	61%
Reading Mastery		90%	92%	65%	13%	66%
Rigby		35%	8%	58%	83%	50%
Scott Foresman		83%	67%	60%	67%	70%
Success For All		5%	8%	18%	38%	16%
Wright Group		63%	17%	68%	63%	59%

THIRD GRADE - Discretionary Items

	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Fluency	Vocabulary	Compre-hension	TOTAL
Harcourt		66%	83%	83%	81%	75%
Houghton Mifflin		75%	42%	92%	69%	71%
Macmillan/ McGraw-Hill		50%	75%	58%	81%	63%
Open Court		84%	75%	67%	81%	79%
Reading Mastery		84%	100%	42%	81%	79%
Rigby		44%	50%	58%	75%	54%
Scott Foresman		38%	25%	67%	63%	46%
Success For All		16%	42%	0%	94%	35%
Wright Group		63%	42%	50%	69%	58%

Oregon Reading First
Review of Comprehensive Programs
Summary by Grade

KINDERGARTEN

	Phonemic Awareness		Phonics		Fluency		Vocabulary		Comprehension		Design
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	
Harcourt	80%	88%	75%	88%			0%	75%	38%	25%	50%
Houghton Mifflin	85%	100%	83%	88%			50%	75%	75%	75%	90%
Macmillan-McGraw/Hill	85%	75%	89%	100%			42%	92%	69%	58%	50%
Open Court	80%	100%	81%	100%			58%	83%	81%	50%	80%
Reading Mastery	95%	94%	86%	75%			92%	92%	63%	75%	90%
Rigby	40%	31%	28%	6%			33%	50%	56%	58%	25%
Scott Foresman	75%	69%	72%	81%			33%	50%	50%	67%	70%
Success For All	65%	50%	97%	100%			92%	92%	88%	92%	80%
Wright Group	15%	44%	17%	81%			33%	67%	38%	8%	10%

FIRST GRADE

	Phonemic Awareness		Phonics		Fluency		Vocabulary		Comprehension		Design
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	
Harcourt	100%	80%	86%	79%	83%	63%	25%	83%	50%	58%	55%
Houghton Mifflin	100%	100%	82%	96%	75%	25%	25%	75%	50%	92%	85%
Macmillan-McGraw/Hill	75%	90%	71%	71%	63%	88%	75%	83%	92%	100%	100%
Open Court	75%	90%	89%	83%	63%	88%	83%	83%	67%	50%	80%
Reading Mastery	100%	100%	93%	96%	83%	75%	83%	50%	58%	50%	90%
Rigby	50%	70%	14%	17%	4%	0%	25%	58%	42%	83%	20%
Scott Foresman	75%	85%	79%	83%	75%	75%	50%	75%	75%	75%	80%
Success For All	75%	75%	93%	92%	88%	100%	83%	83%	83%	100%	90%
Wright Group	88%	90%	71%	75%	29%	13%	17%	67%	42%	42%	25%

Oregon Reading First
 Review of Comprehensive Programs
 Summary by Grade (cont.)

SECOND GRADE

	Phonemic Awareness		Phonics		Fluency		Vocabulary		Comprehension		Design
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	
Harcourt			75%	73%	75%	50%	63%	68%	58%	79%	65%
Houghton Mifflin			88%	90%	92%	50%	88%	80%	79%	88%	80%
Macmillan-McGraw/Hill			56%	40%	58%	58%	38%	53%	75%	88%	80%
Open Court			56%	55%	83%	67%	0%	48%	83%	92%	90%
Reading Mastery			81%	90%	100%	92%	38%	65%	13%	13%	55%
Rigby			50%	35%	33%	8%	38%	58%	79%	83%	40%
Scott Foresman			81%	83%	75%	67%	75%	60%	75%	67%	60%
Success For All			0%	5%	17%	8%	13%	18%	38%	38%	20%
Wright Group			63%	63%	50%	17%	25%	68%	42%	63%	25%

THIRD GRADE

	Phonemic Awareness		Phonics		Fluency		Vocabulary		Comprehension		Design
	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	HP	D	
Harcourt			100%	66%	67%	83%	65%	83%	79%	81%	80%
Houghton Mifflin			88%	75%	67%	42%	90%	92%	89%	69%	75%
Macmillan-McGraw/Hill			0%	50%	58%	75%	80%	58%	79%	81%	75%
Open Court			63%	84%	92%	75%	75%	67%	93%	81%	85%
Reading Mastery			100%	84%	83%	100%	70%	42%	50%	81%	55%
Rigby			75%	44%	50%	50%	65%	58%	86%	75%	45%
Scott Foresman			75%	38%	50%	25%	60%	67%	71%	63%	45%
Success For All			0%	16%	58%	42%	55%	0%	86%	94%	60%
Wright Group			63%	63%	33%	42%	45%	50%	50%	69%	35%

Section XII
Reliability and Agreement
Information for Each
Comprehensive Program

Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Harcourt 2003

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	26%	17%	7%	24%	13%	12%	.71	
2/3	19%	20%	0%	53%	3%	3%	.76	

Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Houghton-Mifflin 2000

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	47%	5%	0%	31%	9%	7%	.81	
2/3	41%	7%	0%	42%	4%	4%	.87	

Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Macmillan/McGraw-Hill 2003

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	35%	2%	0%	47%	9%	7%	.71	
2/3	18%	10%	0%	47%	4%	19%	.71	

Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Open Court 2002

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	49%	9%	0%	28%	0%	13%	.74	
2/3	38%	12%	0%	34%	9%	5%	.79	

Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Reading Mastery Plus 2002

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	52%	8%	0%	35%	2%	1%	.95	
2/3	34%	3%	9%	20%	22%	10%	.86	

Table 6. Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Rigby 2003

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	5%	5%	28%	11%	36%	15%	.44	
2/3	15%	10%	6%	35%	14%	19%	.86	

Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Scott Foresman

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	15%	5%	0%	52%	9%	19%	.66	
2/3	9%	11%	6%	56%	8%	10%	.86	

Table 6. Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Success for All

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	60%	6%	2%	29%	3%	0%	.86	
2/3	13%	4%	42%	13%	16%	11%	.87	

Table 6. Agreement and Reliability Information Within Programs: Wright Group

Grade	Agreements						Disagreements	Pearson Correlation
	Exact Rating Matches			Ratings Within 1 Point				
	Full/ Full	Partial/ Partial	Empty/ Empty	Full/ Partial	Partial/ Empty			
K/1	19%	7%	34%	19%	14%	6%	.71	
2/3	10%	12%	2%	23%	34%	17%	.87	