MARY: Hi, everyone. Thank you so much for joining us today. My name is Mary Hyde and I am the Director of the Office of Research and Evaluation at the Corporation for National and Community Service. Our office's objectives are to support our agency's mission by building knowledge on civic engagement, volunteering and national service. We conduct inhouse research, but also fund research through competitive grants to researchers, scholars and dissertators at institutions of higher education.

And we support research and evaluations of our programs and grantees. Our webinar series is one way we share our ongoing research and findings. Today, we are very excited to post another Research and Evidence webinar: The Power of National Service:

Improving Children's Literacy Outcomes. While this particular body of research has not been sponsored by our office, we are very excited to highlight it today because it is an excellent example of how we've been able to replicate the findings that we, your presenters, and really build on an evidence base that

started a number of years ago [inaudible] talk about later on in a good minute.

We are pretty excited to present this topic and this multi-side evaluation that you're gonna hear about today because it's a very good example of how programs can be replicated, and scaled in not only new locations, but also with different populations, which is a little bit about what we're gonna hear today. This webinar is a complement to our June 2018 Using Evidence for Community-Based Interventions That Work webinar. It was recorded and can be heard by going to our webinar section under our Office of Research and Evaluation webpage.

This is the second webinar of what would be a three-webinar series that focuses on how you can use evidence to make decisions about scaling, interventions and community. Before I move into introducing our speakers, we'd like to cover a few housekeeping items because this is a webinar as I just mentioned, and we would like to make sure that everyone knows how to engage with us today. With

that, I'm going to hand it over to Emily who will walk you through a few things.

EMILY: Thank you, Mary. Thanks, everyone for your patience as we get started with Adobe Connect. We want to let you know that this webinar will be recorded and posted online following the presentation. Unlike previous webinars, there is no dial-up phone line.

All audio is broadcast over the internet using your computer speakers. All participants will be in listen only mode until the question and answer session following the presentation.

At that time, you can either ask a question in the chat box at the bottom of the screen or you can use the raise hand feature for the menu above, which will enable your microphone to work. If you experience any technical difficulties, please let us know in the chat box and we'll do our best to address that. And, as we mentioned earlier, this webinar is being recorded. I believe that takes care of all of our housekeeping.

FEMALE: Thank you, Emily. I'd like to introduce our speakers today. We're gonna have an introduction,

then we're gonna have a panel of speakers talking to us about this excellent research and then we're gonna have final comments made by the Deputy Director of AmeriCorps. Let me explain who you're going to be hearing from today. Audrey Suker is gonna introduce and kick us off in a minute here. Audrey joined the Reading Corps Minnesota Organization in 1979 and orchestrated its transition to independent non-profit in 2002.

Her experience in establishing community and corporate partnership, strategic planning and innovate program design has resulted in significant growth for the organization. State support increased from 900,000 annually to eight point one million and property value increased from 75,000 to point five million. Her vision for leveraging the power of AmeriCorps in solving intractable problems led to the of Minnesota Reading Corps, the largest AmeriCorps tutoring program nationally in a statewide initiative to ensure that all children are reading proficiently at the end of third grade.

Audrey's gonna share with us a bit of the history of how they used research over the life of the Reading Corps program, which has sort of led us to this moment today. Following Audrey's introduction, we're gonna hear from Dr. Carrie Markovitz. She is a principal research scientist in the Economics, Criminal Justice, and Society department at NORC at the University of Chicago. Dr. Markovich is a statistician with over 20 years of experience conducting both quantitative and qualitative evaluations of youth and community programs with foundations in government agencies.

In addition to her years of experience as an evaluation expert, Dr. Markovich has spent two decades conducting research on national service and volunteerism, contributing to evaluations of numerous CNCS programs. In addition to Dr. Markovich, you're gonna hear from Dr. Marc Hernandez, who is also from NORC and he is one of the founding directors of the Early Childhood Research and Practice Cooperative at the same organization.

He is an applied Developmental Psychologist with expertise in cognitive development, early childhood and elementary education, both in formal and informal educational settings. We're finally going to hear from Sadie O'Connor, who is the Managing Director of Reading and Math, Inc., which is a national non-profit that incubates evidence-based AmeriCorps programs including Reading Corps. She's been part of Reading Corps' Readership team since 2013. And she has helped grow it from a small, local program with 25 tutors to one that engages 2,000 tutors annually.

Sadie was also the Vice President of Reading for National Replication that served Minnesota and focused on innovating and scaling the program nationally. Sadie is an AmeriCorps alumni and a Minnesota native. She will be commenting, I think, on the replication aspects of this work as well and we will have Jennifer Bastress Tahmasebi talk to us about what she's heard today and facilitate probably a transition into the Q&A. As I mentioned early, she's the Deputy Director of AmeriCorps. With that, I think I will pass this on to Audrey Suker.

AUDREY: Thank you, Mary. As Minnesota's Service

Commission, we know that it is our responsibility to ensure that our programs are continually [inaudible] as well as continually improving. The slide that you see in front of you illustrates a process you use to do this using Reading Corps as an example. The program is 15 years old and in its first few years, you really focus on establishing the promise of the program to achieve its objectives. This included process evaluations, descriptive analysis of pre- and post-outcomes, and then small-scale research projects.

And as it became clear that the Reading Corps was a promising model and we moved into the Refine and Evaluate stage, we conducted a study that found that students served by the Reading Corpse were three times less likely to require Special Education services. And this research really helped us with policy-makers that wanted to understand that our lives are investing in our work it went beyond student goals.

And during this phase, we were also very grateful to CNCS as they contracted with NORC to conduct a three-year impact study on our work in Minnesota. That then served as a foundation for continually refining the model and positioned us to move into the Scale and Improve stage, which included the NORC multi-state evaluation that you'll hear about in this webinar. And then along the way, we have continually shared our results with legislators and the philanthropic community and that has allowed us to raise matching funds from those two sources that now equals about nine million dollars annually.

So besides supporting tutors on the ground, this has allowed us to build an R&D infrastructure within our service commission. In our early years, all of our evaluation and research projects were done through contractors, but I'm happy to say that we know have an R&D unit of ten employees that includes two PhD-level education researchers on our team. And this infrastructure then allows us to have a pipeline of internal R&D projects that are all designed to ensure that we are continually improving the model with an

eye on continuing to improve its effectiveness and its efficiency as we move forward. I'd like to conclude by thanking CNCS for hosting this webinar and I, of course, would welcome any questions or advice from any of you on this webinar later on and after the webinar's over. Thank you.

FEMALE: Thank you, Audrey. With that, I think I'll pass it on to Carrie Markovitz.

CARRIE: Thank you, Mary. Thank you, CNCS for hosting this webinar and giving us this opportunity to present our findings. We have an outline of our presentation. We're going to have an introduction section where we're gonna talk about the Reading Corps program and about the multi-state evaluation of Reading Corps. Stacey O'Connor's going to present on the Reading Corps program and I'm going to present on the evaluation.

Then Marc Hernandez is going to present on the Minnesota Meeting Corps Evaluation Results. I will present after that on the Wisconsin Reading Corps evaluation results, and then Marc and I both will provide a summary of our major takeaways and study

implications. And, of course, we're all available for answer questions at the end. First, the introduction.

I'm going to hand this over to Sadie to present on the program.

SADIE: Thanks, Carrie. Thank you, all for being here. It's really exciting for all of us to be sharing these results with you. I'm going to take just a few minutes to talk about what the Reading Corps program is. And I'll essentially be using what we call a "visual logic model to walk through what our Reading Corps program level is. At a high level, Reading Corps is an AmeriCorps program that places tutors into elementary schools and pre-schools to provide individualized intervention services to children who are at risk. Today I'm going to focus more on our K3 model because that's what our evaluation is focused on. In any given school, as you know there's all kinds of different students who have lots of different needs.

How do we identify who those students are that need extra reading support? What we do in Reading Corps is we conduct a screening. Our AmeriCorps members are

trained to do a screening assessment in the fall.

It's a quick one-minute assessment that they're able to do with students. And that assessment allows us to know that based on that score that students receives if they are at-risk or if they're on track. And so, we're able to identify really pretty quickly those students who are on the trajectory of potentially falling through the cracks, not being a proficient reader at the end of third grade. We're able to identify those students in the fall.

Our AmeriCorps members, who are really the heart and soul of our program, come from all walks of life. We don't require our AmeriCorps members have formal degrees or training in education. We provide fairly robust training and coaching models to help them be successful. All AmeriCorps members go through three days of institute training at the beginning of the year where they learn about the interventions, assessments, how to make decisions using the data that they're collecting so they're very equipped at the beginning of the year. They also receive follow-up coaching throughout the year so every month

they're getting observations and support from two levels of coaching: internally, at their school, they have what we call an "internal coach".

That's an individual that's employed by the school, so usually a literacy specialist, maybe a reading teacher, somebody who has a strong background in reading intervention and assessment, and who is there onsite to provide observations, support and just general direction to the member. And then as a program, we're providing what we call a Content Master Coach, somebody who goes out to the school once a month and checks in with the internal coach and the AmeriCorps member, again, conducting observations to make sure the model is happening with fidelity and also to make instructional decisions for those kids.

What we do, our AmeriCorps members are providing daily one-on-one tutoring using evidence-based interventions to a caseload of students every day. A full-time tutor, so a member that's serving five days a week in a full-time capacity, will be working with

between 15 and 18 students every day. Each of those students receives a 20-minute session where they're receiving that evidence-based intervention. Our interventions are focused, and really guided by, the National Reading Panel's big five areas of instruction: phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension - so really focused on building those foundational reading skills.

The AmeriCorps members are collecting data every week and that data is helping them make decisions with their coaches about whether or not the intervention is working and whether they need to make any changes to that intervention. That data also helps us to see what we are changing and what our AmeriCorps members are changing. In our K-3 model, we're really looking for that accelerated literacy growth, so really looking for students who are making growth at a pace that's higher than their peers because these students are starting behind.

This ultimately leads to students who are proficient in their third grade state reading test and ultimately leads to students who are on track for college and career success. With that, I'm gonna turn it back over to Carrie and Marc to talk about the findings.

CARRIE: Thanks, Sadie. Going back to the study, now I want to provide an overview of the multi-state evaluation of the Reading Corps. Our study was funded by Reading and Math, Incorporated through an Innovative Approaches to Literacy grant that was provided by the U.S. Department of Education. We also based our study on a previous study that we did.

Audrey mentioned that in her presentation. From 2011-2014, we conducted an evaluation of the Minnesota Reading Corps study for CNCS and in that study we found large impact of the program on kindergarten and first grade students.

We found smaller impact in the second and third grade. The only followed students for a single semester for that study. That was all we were able to do, and again we found large impacts of the program

on kindergarten and first grade literacy scores, but we weren't able to see as large an impact in second and third grade, but then we think that mainly is because we weren't able to follow the students for longer, and that experience set into some of our design choices for the new study, which I'll explain in a moment.

There were many people involved in conducting the study, which was conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago, as we mentioned, so there were many individuals who were involved in the study and made it a success. I've been mentioned, and Marc Hernandez, my co-PI, was mentioned. But I also just wanted to acknowledge Dr. Eric Hedberg who is Lead Methodologist who helped come up with our analysis plan and was really instrumental also in the study's success.

Some key features of the Minnesota and Wisconsin study. I mentioned that this was titled "a multi-state evaluation" so we designed the evaluation to evaluate the Minnesota Reading Corps program again,

but also we examined the replication of the Reading Corpse model in Wisconsin and in Florida. This presentation is focused on the results for Minnesota and Wisconsin. We completed those evaluations. We're still working on the final report for Florida, which is focused on the pre-K program.

Both the Minnesota study and Wisconsin study were focused on the K through third program. For the Minnesota program, this, again as you heard, this is the original Reading Corps program that's been around since 2003. For this iteration of the evaluation of the program, we set the second— and third—grade students for the entire school year. So as I mentioned, the 2014 previous study we found smaller impacts on second and third grade, but that was only after a single semester.

And we had evidence that, perhaps, if we followed the students longer, we would see a larger impact for the program, and so we decided we wanted to explore that with this opportunity in this most recent evaluation.

Also, the Reading Corps program had a particular

question around whether students who were furthest from benchmark or in the expected literacy level would also benefit from the program. In a response to intervention model, students are organized into different tiers.

A Tier 1 student would be a student who's performing on benchmark, which is the expected level, or above. That would be a Tier 1 student. Tier 2 students are the students just below benchmark so they're not quite on track. And then Tier 3 students are students that are more likely to be designated as Special Ed, particularly when they get older. They're more likely to require more specialized services. The Reading Corps program focuses mainly on these Tier 2 students that are just below benchmark.

The program was curious as to whether or not the students within that Tier 2 level, the ones that were further from benchmark, were benefitting the program as much as the ones that were closest. Many times, schools are instructed to work with the students who are closest to benchmark first because you can work

with those for a shorter period of time and then get them kind of in the program, on track and out, and then you can serve more students.

But what about the students who are furthest from benchmark and possibly also could benefit from this program, but they'll be in the program potentially for longer to get them on track. That particular question was part of our study also. Then for the kindergarten and first grade students, we pretty much did the same study again. We assessed the kindergarten and first grade students for a single semester and we wanted to see if we would be able to show the same high impacts of the program on the kindergarten and first grade students.

In the Wisconsin study, the Wisconsin program's a replication site of the Reading Corps model. It's only been around for a few years, and so they have enough students for us to be able to assess the kindergarten and the first grade students.

Unfortunately, although we tried very hard, were not able to identify enough eligible second— and third—

grade students to be able to do a study on them. But we were able to assess the kindergarten and first grade students.

And so, again, we assessed them during a single semester because we had evidence that a single semester was enough time in order to show an impact in the program. These are our research questions based on all our understanding, all of the information to feed into this design. Our first research question is: For second— and third—grade Tier 2 students who are farthest from the fall reading proficiency benchmark, what is the impact of a full school year of Minnesota Reading Corps on program participants compared to students who did not receive Reading Corps?

And then, a second question we had involved whether the program impacts varied by participant characteristics such as demographics, program dosage and program attendance. For the purposes of this presentation, we're gonna focus on presenting the findings on how the program impacted certain students

based on demographics. Then our last research question had to do with the kindergarten and first grade students.

For kindergarten and first grade students, what is
the impact of a single semester of the Reading Corps
on program participants compared to similar students
who did not receive Reading Corps? Before we get into
the results, I wanted to provide a little bit of an
overview on the outcomes that we measured. Sadie
mentioned that there is this screening that's done.
We refer to those as "benchmarks". Benchmarks are
taken usually three times per schoolyear so they're
usually taken in the fall, the winter and the spring,
and you can see that in the table below.

Fall is usually taken in September at the beginning of the school year and that's our beginning benchmark or the "screener" that Sadie was referring to. The winter benchmark is taken in January and the spring in May. For second- and third-grade students, there's a one-minute assessment that's conducted on oral reading fluency. What that essentially is, is the

AmeriCorps member is to show the student a paragraph, and they're to read it out loud, and the number of words they read correctly in a minute is their score.

For first grade, that oral fluency assessment is conducted in the second semester. So there's a winter benchmark and spring benchmark that are taken for those students because it's considered too early to do it at the beginning of first grade. But, at the beginning of first grade, what is taken is a test of letter sounds in nonsense words. So they take a made up word and they put sounds together like, "Kep. K-E-P. Kuh-ep [phonetic]" and they ask the student to pronounce the sound. So if they pronounce that correctly, they get a score of three, so the number of sounds they get correctly identifying in a oneminute period, letter sounds in nonsense words as I said.

And then for kindergarten it's quite simple. Students are shown cards of letters and they are to produce the sounds. So: A, uh, B, buh [sic], C, cuh [sic], and the number of sounds that they can correctly

pronounce within a one-minute assessment is their score. So that's explains the types of assessments that both Reading Corps uses and we use to assess effects on the students. To give a little bit of an overview of the evaluation 24 kindergarten through third-grade schools participated during the 2017-2018 school year.

This was a representative standpoint that we hold within Minnesota. It was stratified by urban and rural schools so we had a representative sample. And schools had to meet the IAL eligibility criteria. So this is what we did for the Minnesota Reading Corps evaluations. For the Wisconsin Reading Corps, all of the schools participated. It was a smaller program. There were less schools so we just had all the schools participate so there was no sampling that took place there.

For both Wisconsin and Minnesota we conducted a randomized trial. We randomly assigned program-eligible students to either a program group or control group and that was done within each of the

schools that was selected. And then we tracked reading schools in Minnesota 622 program and control students across the 24 schools that were selected. And then from fall to winter, we assessed the kindergarten and the first grade student.

Fall was their big, blind score and winter was their follow-up school and we looked at the increase and compared them between the program and the control group. And then we did the same thing for second and third, except we did it for the whole year. We did it between the fall and the spring benchmark that takes place in May. Then for the Minnesota Reading Corps, we used a randomization process. We created matched pairs of program-eligible students based on similar fall benchmark scores.

If a student had a score of six in kindergarten and another student had six, we might pair them together and then randomly assigned one of those kids to the program group and one of the kids to the control group, so that's a paired randomization. That was very helpful because then we're able to ensure that

we have a similar distribution of kids by scores in both groups. And we randomly assigned students, as I said, within pairs, and then the program group received the program and the control group was embargoed from receiving Reading Corps services for the study period.

So, for kindergarten and first grade, that would be one semester. For second- and third-graders, that would mean until May until they were assessed in the spring. Next, my college Marc Hernandez is going to present on the findings from the Minnesota Reading Corps study.

MARC: Good afternoon, everyone. Can you hear me okay?

FEMALE: Yes.

MARC: Good. I'm going to present the results of the

Minnesota study from this past year. And so I'm going

to start, we're going to do this by grade, we're

gonna start with the older grades and work our way

younger. And so, first we're gonna look at together

the combination of second- and third-graders. A

little bit about second- and third-graders: we had

190 second-grade and 212 third-grade students who

participated again, to reiterate, in carrying out this year-long study.

For those kids who first started in September and then they concluded their participation in the study after the spring benchmark in May. We had, in terms of the English Language Learner distribution, 23% of both second— and third-graders were designated as English Language Learners, about a quarter. And in terms of free and reduced price lunch eligibility, an indicator of socioeconomic status, about half of the kids — these are schoolwide averages.

We do not have individual student level information on this, but we do have schoolwide average information. About half are free and reduced price lunch eligible. If you look here at the pie charts, you can see very similar distributions by race ethnicity. The majority of these students we tested were white, between 58-62% were third and fourth graders. The most common race ethnicity was African American at around 17%, then Hispanic at around 10-

12. We also have representations of Asians, American Indian, Alaskan Native and multi-racial participants.

The second- and third-graders were very similar.

You'll see something a little bit different for the kindergarteners in a moment. The question again that we were answering with this second and third grade study was: for second- and third-grade Tier 2 students farthest from the fall benchmark, what's the impact of a full year of Minnesota Reading Corps on program participants compared to similar students who did not receive the Reading Corps?

And what we found in summary here, and I'll show you in graphs in a moment more specifically, was a substantial effect for the oral reading fluency measure that was used to assess impact to the secondand third-graders, that a 6.4 word difference - we'll show you what that looks like both in terms of number and in terms of effects of on the next slide. The magnitude of the programs effect on second- and third-graders' oral fluency is equivalent to about 47% or an additional half-year of an average

student's annual growth and reading proficiency per the literature.

Again, it's important to note that this study focused on second- and third-grade children who were furthest from fall benchmark. It was really a question to us whether or not AmeriCorps members in this program would be capable, could with this program produce these types of outcomes in kids who might require professionals who are providing specialized services to those kids. In fact, what we find out is they can provide these services quite effectively.

I'm hoping that you can see a little, maybe this pointer will work. Can you see a pointer on the screen? I'm gonna walk you through these graphs because we're going to use these graphs for all of the outcomes both for Minnesota and for Wisconsin so you know what you're looking at. Here on the left, we'll start with the second grade and take a look here. On the Y axis here, you're gonna see the score, and this is in terms of the outcomes that we measured

so for oral reading fluency, this is the number of words read aloud in the minute period of time.

So we are showing you scale from zero to 120. When you go to third grade, you're gonna see that scale goes higher because the kids were expected to be able to read more words fluently in a minute period of time from zero to 140. On the X axis down here you're going to see a period of time in which we collected data. This will start with the fall data and it ends with the spring data. In terms of the lines that you're seeing here, we have four that you can see.

The first is the solid line. This is the fall benchmark. This is the score at which when Carrie noted that they were program-eligible, you have to score below this score to be eligible for Reading Corps services so you can see here that our two lines representing our participants down here are both below this line. This just confirms that the sample that we selected was eligible and, in fact, these kids are pretty far from their benchmark.

This benchmark is around 62-63 and you can see that kids are performing closer to 40. This is the fall benchmark that shows eligibility. I've noted these two lines. You have two lines here: an orange line and a grey line. These two represent the two groups: the orange line is our program group; these are the kids that were randomly assigned to receive Reading Corps services. The grey line are the children who were randomly assigned to not receive services.

And importantly you see these two groups start at the same place at the beginning of the year, which we would expect, particularly a matched-pair randomization where we used the pre-test score, the fall score, as a way to match them. This is great they were starting at the same point. And int ease results, if you follow the lines up, you see they end up in different places. The children who received the program ended up moving from about 40 to be able to produce 92, read aloud 92 words in a minute period of time, whereas those who did not receive the program grew as well, but they grew to 84.8 words.

And this is that about eight point difference that we mentioned before. The final line that you see here is the dotted line at the top. This is a high-bar spring benchmark where with much work that the Reading Corps has done through data analysis over the years has found that if children can meet or exceed this high-level benchmark that they would be on track for scoring well on the Minnesota state reading proficiency tests.

And so, this is an ultimate goal that we'd like kids to be able to hit this and exceed this. In each of the graphs that we'll show you, you'll see these four lines: the eligibility requirement, the high-level target and then the two lines representing our program and control. You can see over here for third grade that we have, again, the kids starting at about the same place, not surprisingly since these kids are a year older.

They start higher than the second-graders did at about 70 words read aloud. No difference at the start of the year. At the end, we do see a higher score

among those in the third grade. This is 112 words read aloud versus 106, a six point difference here. And because the children were engaging in the same type of activity using the same assessment, we pooled the data and we looked the effects of the program on second— and third—graders combined and we converted these results from the metric that is oral reading fluency, number of words read aloud to in effect size.

Effect size for this particular was .28 and these two stars mean that they were statistically significant. A note about effect size: effect sizes are ways to standardize or to convert the metric that you're measuring into something that can be compared apples to apples so later I'm going to be showing you letter sounds within nonsense words. In kindergarten I'll be showing you letter sounds by themselves.

These are all different types of outcomes. They're all different types of metrics. You can't compare what they score across grades, but what I can do is I can convert those into this effect size unit. And

basically effect sizes, the way you can think about them is zero there is no effect and as you get larger and larger, you get bigger effect. An effect size of one, for example, is a very large effect regardless of who you are and what age you are.

There's a bit of nuance to effect sizes and so it used to be a little bit more straightforward: people just figured if you had a .2 effect size that was small, if you had a .8 effect size or above that was big. But we've learned over time that depending upon the domain that you're operating in, here we're talking about education, and within education depending on how old a child is, where they are in development, what's big and small varies.

Generally, kind of the rule of thumb is the older you get, the harder it is to produce large effect sizes.

And so, in fact, an effect size that's closer to a .2 or a .3 is actually quite large for a child who's later in high school versus a child who's kindergarten. Kindergarteners you can create effects on the scale of .6, .8, 1.0. Those are more

reasonable in a younger age group. And just one last note about the reason for that, particularly with kindergarteners and preschoolers tends to be with respect to exposure.

Some children might come to school not having been in a pre-school, not having experienced a lot of academic instruction either formally or informally from their parents, and so you put them in front of high-quality instruction, let's say around literacy, and you can see huge gains because they just haven't been exposed, they're ready to learn and they learn it. Once you become a third-grader, you don't have these massive effects because of exposure anymore; kids have been exposed for a number of years.

And so now it's something about their ability to take in the information that they're learning, and so the effect sizes - what's big, decreases over time. So the point as it regards this slide is to say that a .28 effect size, not only is it statistically significant, meaning we're really confident that this effect is not a fluke, that it's a real effect, but

that that's actually quite substantial for secondand third-graders who have been learning to read for some time.

Next slide. Back one. Another question that we asked in regard to the second- and third-graders was: does the program impact vary by participant demographics such as gender, race and English language learner status. And in fact, what we found was that there were larger impacts among these key participant demographic groups in the second and third grade, and I just pointed out too for the full sample. Here, just to reiterate, the full sample effect size was .28, but if we look at some of these groups, like in gender we're looking at males, the size of that subgroup was 198 and the effect size for males was .47, much larger than the .28 effect, which was already quite substantial.

For Black or African-American students, there were 66 of those students for this sample. The effect size was even bigger than that. It was .50, again, statistically significant. And then finally, for

English Language Learners, there were 94 of them in our sample. Their effect size was .53. It was the largest effect we saw of the program. Again, the more stars there are, the more significant it is, so that just says that we're really confident in that outcome.

And so the point here is that not only does this program work for everyone, but the groups that we might be most concern about or those that we often consider at-risk are actually benefitting more from the program. We did not, and were unable to conduct these types of analyses - I'm not going to be able to answer this question for kindergartener and first-graders, the sample sizes were much smaller for those two groups by design, and so because the sample sizes were small, we weren't able to slice the dice the data by these different subgroups.

Now I want to present to you the kindergarten and first-grade students as a reminder as Carrie noted the design of this study was it was a semester-long study because the previous studies had shown that we

had conducted that a semester was long enough to detect the effect of the program. These children participated between fall of 2017 and winter of 2018, collected their baseline data in September and their post-test data, if you will, in winter in January.

There were 60 kindergarteners in the study and 160 first-graders. In terms of the demographics of this group: for English Language Learners, there were 37% of the kindergarteners and 31% of first graders, about a third. For free and reduced price lunch eligibility, about two-thirds of kindergarteners, 65.5% and a little bit over half of the first graders. If you look first here at the first graders, the rate ethnicity distribution of the first graders looked quite similar to what you saw earlier for the second and third-graders majority white followed by African-American and Hispanic.

The kindergarten race ethnicity distribution was a bit different than for first graders or the other age groups. Here there was more equal representation across the three primary groups we saw before: White,

Hispanic, African-American and then the Asian population a higher percentage. We can talk a bit more about why we think that is. Some of it has to do with the smaller sample size and the fact that we were randomly selecting a smaller number of kids out of eligible schools we collected data from.

The question here was: for kindergarten and firstgrade students, what was the impact of a single
semester of the Reading Corps on program participants
compared to similar students who did not receive
Reading Corps? I'll give you the summary of the
effects and then I'll show you those graphs for each
of these. For kindergarteners where we assessed
letter sound fluency, we found a large effect: a 10.9
letter sound difference.

For first-grade nonsense word fluency, again, a large effect: 16.3 letter sounds within words. And then we also looked at the first grade oral reading fluency. This is not really a skill that is targeted in the first semester, but the idea, the instructional theory here for the Reading Corps is that what's

learned around the nonsense word fluency should have some transfer to oral reading fluency. And so we assessed and looked at that oral reading fluency for the first graders.

This was the first time they received that assessment, and in fact, we found another large and statistically significant effect for that outcome. Let me show you what that looks like in terms of graphs. I'm gonna do one slide for each of these. I won't go back over since we went over how to read these. What you can see here is the target for this skill is about seven or eight, and the kids here start quite low, less than five.

I'd say there's about two letter sounds upon kindergarten entry. And you can see that they both start, the treatment and control, at the same place so again, the groups started equally and you can see how differently they grew. Again, everyone's in school, they're learning, which is great. The control goes from about two to 16, whereas the kids who

received the Reading Corps program: all the way up to 27.

And it so happens that 27 is that high-level benchmark that was set by the program that suggested these kids would be on track to have third-grade reading comprehension proficiency so this is very exciting. The effect size, when we convert this into effect size units, is .85 and the start says that's statistically significant so as I mentioned before by any way that you think about effect size is .85 is a large effect for any time of intervention.

We're gonna look at first graders. This is nonsense word fluency. Again, the target here for eligibility is let's say about 35. You can see that the kids start, again, at the same place, around 25. Kids who don't receive the Reading Corps grow. They grow to do about 45 letter sounds within nonsense words by winter. The children in the program grow to about 62 and that's within measurement of that target. I think that it is 63 is the target at that time.

When you look at the effect size units again, this is .81, highly significant, all those starts. This is another really great finding. Large effects for both our kindergarteners and first graders. The final slide looks at the oral reading fluency results. This graph look a little different because we did not collect any oral reading fluency data on the first graders at all because it really isn't developmentally appropriate for the average student at that point in time.

Winter is about the time that we can do this and it would be appropriate for most kids. So you're only seeing a point in time picture here and you're seeing the kids who are in the control group scoring 27 or 28. The kids in the program group scoring 41. And there isn't a baseline benchmark here, but there is this target and the initial target here is 52. The important thing to look at is this difference here between the 41 and 27.

On a scale that isn't directly being intervened upon, and the effect size for this is a .61 effect that's

also statistically significant. For those who are interested, particularly those who are experts in literacy instruction or early literacy instruction, about how much does nonsense word fluency instruction potentially transfer to oral reading fluency, which is the more complicated task. There is some evidence here that, in fact, it does given that the kids in the program do perform significantly better on this when they weren't even directly instructed in the skill. Those are the results of Minnesota. Again, that was k-3 and I'm gonna transfer to Carrie who will share similar results from Wisconsin for kindergarten and first graders.

CARRIE: Thanks, Marc. As Marc said, he presented on the findings of the study of the original Reading Corps program in Minnesota. We also did another study on the Wisconsin Reading Corps program, which is a replication of the Minnesota Reading Corps model. It takes place in Milwaukee public schools, 2017-2018, when we conducted the study marks the third year of the Reading Corps program in Wisconsin. You have to keep in mind the program's been around three years in Wisconsin versus 15 years in Minnesota.

And the program has about, as of last school year, 18
AmeriCorps members who served as literacy tutors in
ten schools in Milwaukee. And all of the schools are
located in the city of Milwaukee. For the study, we
replicated the Minnesota Reading Corps evaluation
design. Again, all ten schools participated that met
the IAL eligibility criteria. So we didn't have to
take a sample. There just weren't that many schools
so we just included all of the eligible schools.

And the scope of the study was limited to kindergarten and first grade because as I said we just didn't have enough program-eligible second— and third-grade students for this study to do the study. Again, we did a randomized controlled trial and we tracked reading skills. We had about 176 program and control students in kindergarten and first grade and we looked at the differences between their fall benchmark and their winter benchmarks.

Again, fall is in September; Winter is in January.

The demographics in Wisconsin are quite different

than in Minnesota. We had 64 kindergarten students and 112 first-grade students participated in this study. A very small percentage for English Language Learners: only 6% for kindergarten and maybe about 10% of first-grade students. But what we do see is that the percentage of free and reduced price lunch is quite high: 81-82% in first grade and kindergarten.

And then in terms of demographics, the population's primarily African-American so about 80% in first grade and 90% in kindergarten. And then there are small percentages, around less than 10% Asian, Hispanic and a very small percentage of White students: around 2%. Again, we present a similar research question: for kindergarten and first-grade students, what is the impact of a single semester of the Wisconsin Reading Corps on program participants compared to similar students who did not receive the Reading Corps program?

We did find positive effects: about six and a half letter sound difference for kindergarten students and

a positive effect also in first grade, so about 8.7 letter sounds within nonsense word differences. Showing the graphics for that, here is kindergarten. You can see, as Marc pointed out on the other side, the fall benchmark is the bottom horizontal line and then the winter benchmark is the higher horizontal line.

And as you can see the program group, which is the orange line: they met the benchmark after a single semester. The benchmark was 27 and you can see both groups started out very low, below the fall benchmark. But then the program group achieved the benchmark we would like them to be at after a single semester. Compared to the control group. And again, it's a difference of about six and a half letter sounds. The effect size for this is .55.

As we would expect, it's a little lower than

Minnesota Reading Corps, but it's quite impressive, a

substantial effect. And then for first grade we have

similar findings. It's important to point out the

students started very low in first grade. They're way

below fall benchmark. By the end of the semester, neither group, the control nor the program, had reached the winter benchmark. But you can see a substantial improvement, much more so in the program group.

So the difference in the trajectory for the program group and the control group is pretty obvious from the graph and there's an effect size of .46, so again, a substantial effect for the program group.

Next, we're going to talk about our conclusions based on these findings. Marc is going to present on the major takeaways from the Minnesota study and I will discuss the major takeaways from the Wisconsin study and then some final thoughts.

MARC: In summary, for Minnesota, really we've replicated the 2014 study that we had conducted for the K3 results in 2018. We found statistically significant meaningful effect in all grades k-3. We found that Black and ELL students in particular, often considered at risk, particularly benefitted from the program so the effects of the program were larger for those groups. This is what was different from the

other study: we found that second and third grade students who we selected for the study because they furthest from benchmark in fall did significantly benefit from having the Reading Corps intervention.

And it supports our previous study's hypothesis that more than one semester of tutoring can produce significant and positive effects on second and third grade students' oral reading fluency. As Carrie had noted in the opening slides, our earlier study in 2014 was a one-semester study for all grades, and so the findings from this one were one semester, kindergarten and first, and we found similar, positive effects.

We really felt that we were cutting off the study too early; kids were still receiving intervention in second and third grade. We could model what we thought they might be able to do had we stayed with them longer and had some support from our modeling that these kids would have done quite well. And so, in this study we followed them for the full year and we found, in fact, that they did perform

statistically significantly better than their counterparts that did not receive the Reading Corps when they had access to the services over the full course of the year. I think that was Minnesota.

CARRIE: Yes. And then for Wisconsin, again, we found positive impacts to the program among kindergarten and first-grade students, but I think the important takeaway is that this demonstrates that the Reading Corps program can be successfully replicated in other locations. So now that we've done a study on one of the replication sites. So now we have multiple studies: the 2014 study, the 2018 study of Minnesota and of course the 2018 study of Wisconsin that show that Reading Corpse is an effective and a replicable program that helps accelerate student learning and places them on a trajectory towards grade-level reading proficiency by the end of third grade.

It's important to note that the program builds foundational emergent literacy and early reading skills by using data-informed and evidence-based interventions and this is facilitated through strong organizational support; they have a strong

organizational structure that supports the entire program and its intervention. Just some final thoughts about the study implications: we have positive impacts, but not just on your typical student, but also typically at-risk students.

We found that the program is very effective with Black and African-American students, with English Language Learner students, and this suggests that these students can particularly benefit from Reading Corps. And although we did observe impacts in older grades in the second and third grade, the program did produce its biggest effects most quickly among younger students. And so, that's can have important program implications because more students can be impacted on early grades so that's something for the program to consider.

And then, of course, as a research, I think us researchers think always about the next study, and so I think the only kind of question left is possibly a longitudinal study that could follow students who received Reading Corps early or at different times

even. There's also a pre-K program which we didn't discuss today, but it would be great to follow those students longitudinally and figure out: what are the long-term impacts of the program on student performance? We're happy to answer any questions, but I didn't know if you want to do a wrap-up first.

MARY: I think we'll hand it to Jennifer to give us some final reflections here and then we'll open it up to questions and answers. So thank you, Carrie, Marc, and Sadie and Jennifer.

JENNIFER: Thanks, Mary. On behalf of Chester and all of AmeriCorps State National, we want to appreciate all the amazing work that is being done by all of the presenters. We deeply value the relationship we have with NORC and just listening to all of the findings.

I think it validates for us as funders that if you find a great partner, in this case it was the Minnesota Reading Corpse and the Minnesota

Commission. And if you set the frame, and provide the resources and get out of the way, amazing impactful work occurs.

I also think that Minnesota Reading Corps and its replication is both instructive and reassuring to everybody in the AmeriCorps portfolio in that the thoughtful and measured steps that they took to assess their program model. Before they became the juggernaut that they currently are, they didn't just jump into a randomized controlled trial. They took deliberate small steps to assess their model. And that is something that should be reassuring to all of us regardless of where we are on the evidence continuum and the level of resources that we have is that they are instructive in taking bitable chunks to move ever forward with what they're doing.

I also want to underling that for anyone who's listening who still feels that we are asking you to do evidence for evidence sake, you may have heard at the beginning that Audrey talked about how this process has allowed them to get nine million dollars in match, which is indeed not evidence for evidence sake, so just a loving share. I am told that professional athletes psych themselves up by listening to music; I am told that because I am not

athletic, but I get myself focused and amped up with quotes.

And one of my favorite quotes is a Chinese proverb that says, "A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step." I know this to be true related to my own work. When I work on writing the notice for funding opportunity, my first step is to change the date from the previous year to current year, that is highly satisfying. I am not a researcher, I do not have fancy language, I went to business school and the most fancy we got in business school was we learned to say finance instead of finance.

That was the big fancy thing we learned in business school. So I don't know fancy language, but I think what blows my mind about this presentation is not just the incredible impact of some of the hardest to serve that this program model has done, but to the single step that the AmeriCorps members who served 1200 hours and the single step for the k through two students who participated in the program. The single step is a one-minute assessment that is done that

really sets the stage for the level of success in the model.

To borrow from my stepdaughter, "it helps you know where you at" because right at the beginning with one minute you know through just a minute that really begins to layer on what we're able to see through this. And the good news is for AmeriCorps State and National, and the challenge for many of you is what are the single step that you are taking or what is the single step that you have committed to take in the application that submitted to us related to this,

And specifically in the education space, we're lucky that we have an incredible amount of programs that can take that first single step. More than half of our program grants and budget supports education-related programs, so people working in this space. We have more than 44,000 AmeriCorps members and nearly 45,000 Senior volunteers that are supporting at-risk youth and more than 540,000 students in communities across the country.

So there is incredible opportunity for people both to consider replicating this model, but also really thinking about: what are the lessons they can take from the journey that the Minnesota Commission, and Minnesota Reading Corps and Reading and Math have taken that are germane to the work you are doing. So I really appreciate the Research and Evaluation department for putting this together and offering this to our field, so thank you.

FEMALE: Thank you, Jennifer. With that, I'm gonna turn this over to Andrew who's going to facilitate some questions and answers, so, Andrea.

ANDREA: Thank you so much. This was very exciting.

Just a few things for our in-person audience: please state your name before asking your question. For our online audience, you can ask questions by typing it in the Q&A box, and you can also ask a question using the microphone on your computer by selecting the raise hand feature from the menu above and we will grant you microphone rights in the order questions come in.

But for now we've been getting a couple in the chat box, so here's the first one: Is Reading Corps looking at expanding the study in other states or had any dialogue with other professionals who can conduct this in their state?

SADIE: This is Sadie. I'm happy to answer that question.

Reading Corps is currently being replicated in 12

states and Lindsay Dolce commented I think on that

chat box and just a couple people below you and so

we're always looking to expand our research and our

scope across the country. And she shared her contact

information also and could connect with you offline

about that.

FEMALE: Here's another one: Can you please explain the calculation behind the statistic that second- and third-graders made 47% more growth in half a year?

SADIE: That was the Minnesota finding. Marc, are you able to speak a little bit about how that's translated into the 47%?

MARC: Yes. This Is one instance I wish Eric Hedberg was with us. I will channel him as best as I can. What we did is there's a paper that he loved to share with folks, it's meta-analysis that very nicely lays out

what the expected effect sizes in particular academic outcomes, what the expected amount of growth is in a particular year on particular outcomes. And so we used, for second and third grade students - I don't know if he chose third grade or if he combined the two.

But we used that and given the growth we saw in ours, converted it into how much growth is expected in a year given how much growth we had in ours, and the difference in growth between the two groups: what does that equal in terms of the amount of growth over the course of a year? We can actually give you, and we'd be happy to have Eric send you exactly how we computed that, but that's in the short form where that came from. I don't know, Carrie, if you have any more to add to that.

CARRIE: I think that was a good explanation. It's beyond the typical growth that you would see. Julia Brown asked: Would the Literacy Corps model translate to middle school? I'm thinking it's the Reading Corps.

FEMALE: It's the Reading Corps model. That may be a programmatic question. I don't think there's any plans right now to convert it to middle school, but maybe that would be more a question for Sadie or Audrey.

FEMALE: So the Reading Corpse model currently is kindergarten through third grade and we haven't really expanded beyond third grade. Our interventions in the design of it is really focused on that specific age group. With that said, we do also have a Math Corps model - not focused on literacy, of course, focused on math, but it's a very similar model with intervention and assessment that is focused on the fourth through eight grade. And we'd be happy to talk with you offline if that was something that you'd be interested in learning more about.

FEMALE: I will add to that: in terms of the interventions that would be used that would obviously have to be tailored toward the correct age group, but I think there are a lot of lessons learned about how the program is structured, the training, the coaching that they provide, the relationships they have with

the school where the school provides and onsite coach as a partner in the process, and I think there's a lot to be learned about how they structure the program that I think contribute to the positive results that we see.

But obviously you have to have the right intervention too. Even though Reading Corps is not doing this intervention with middle schools, I think there's a lot to be learned about how you implement a program in schools that works with students one-on-one.

FEMALE: These lessons learned, are they in a paper and how can people follow up with some of the things you just said?

FEMALE: The 2014 study that I mentioned, so the previous study that we did for CNCS, there is an implementation, we did a process evaluation, and in the final chapter and in the executive summary, we describe the things about the program that make it a success. Obviously there's the evidence-based interventions that are important. And Sadie mentioned there's a three-day training with AmeriCorps members, but there are other things about it: there's a multi-

tiered supervision instruction that also includes regular coaching.

So it's not just about training people and placing them in the program; it's also about providing regular coaching and doing regular check-ins to make sure that the intervention is being implemented correctly and consistently. There's the partnership with the schools where they have buy-in also into the process. And there's the data-driven nature of the program so they identify students who need the program through this fall benchmark assessment so that's really critical.

It's not just based on teacher recommendations or what kids are available, but it's based on a data point that has to be taken and determines which students are eligible. And also, in some cases, where they provide intervention, especially to the older students, they do a weekly assessment on the kids and so, sometimes that weekly assessment helps them figure out what's working and what isn't with different students, so it's very data-driven also.

And, of course, I have to add they also do regular evaluations of their program, which I think is also critical and I would say the program has evolved over time and those changes to the program have all been driven by the evidence, the evaluation, the data they've been collecting, too, for program improvement. I don't know Marc, or Sadie or Audrey if you had anything else to add.

MARC: I think that's a great answer and I would say definitely to give a shout-out all of the materials from the 2014 evaluation that were funded by CNCS are on the CNCS website and so you can go there and there's executive summary school reports, it's the impact evaluations, that actually includes the pre-k studies as well. That's all available right now on CNCS's website.

FEMALE: And that's through the evidence exchange. So here we have lots of comments coming in. This is a comment: We love a longer-term study. We have an RSVP tutoring program with a similar program design and see great outcomes, but would love to know the long-term effects of our intervention. That's just a

comment. Here we go: Do you consider matching students in demographics in addition to the fall benchmark scores? Can you talk through that decision?

FEMALE: It's a randomized control trial so the randomization process theoretically takes care of differences in demographics. We should, theoretically, through the randomization process end up with two groups that are similar, but I always recommend that a baseline analysis be done to confirm that that's the case. So after we did the randomization, we then did some statistical comparisons between the groups on demographics.

We looked at gender, we looked at race, we looked at ELL percentage, we looked at free and reduced price lunch. We look at all of these different demographics between the program and the control group and we found that it confirmed for us that the groups were similar, that the randomization process did work, however, I will add that sometimes just because things are random, sometimes randomly you can end up with some demographics that do end up being different between groups. It just happens sometimes.

And if it does, you can take care of that in your statistical model, but you have to do that baseline analysis in order to identify those differences. In our case, like I said, we did the baseline analysis. It confirmed that the randomization process works. We ended up with two groups that weren't similar.

FEMALE: Great.

MARC: I might add to that. A benefit of doing this that can sometimes be a weakness, particularly of randomized control trials or if you're familiar with IES, Institute of Education Sciences What Works Clearinghouse, one of the things that can knock you off having really strong evidence is if there's unequal attrition between groups in a program so kids dropping out, or moving or what have you and we know particularly in authentic education settings and with programs that are serving at-risk kids that that can be a real problem just in general, independent of the program.

And so, one of the benefits of having a matched pair randomization was we knew if a kid dropped out in one

of those conditions who their counterpart was in the other conditions and you could eliminate them from the sample and maintain equal groups and random groups, and so that was a benefit to doing a matched pair randomization. I think it was one of the main reasons we did it. Also, just to speak to what's more important maybe in a way, and the literature clearly shows that the most predictive variable related to later student growth is a child's own pre-test score more than any other demographic or characteristic that we know.

If you don't have pre-test scores, then we do know that some of the other demographic variables like race, ethnicity, ELL status, et cetera. are predictive of later scores, but the most predictive thing is a pre-test score and so that's why we focused on that.

MARY: I actually have a question. This is Mary Hyde. This is actually a question for either Audrey, Sadie or Marc and Carrie: I'm just curious about any lessons learned you'd like to share around the process of actually replication, and taking this to scale in

different states and communities across the country. Clearly, you're data-driven, you're using evidence as once of your lead criteria for making good decisions to replicate in other communities, but I'm just curious maybe from a programmatic or a policy just practical terms, what are some of the most important things you'd want to share with others who are thinking about either maybe replicating your model or some other model to Jennifer's earlier point.

SADIE: This is Sadie, again. I think the first thing that came to mind as you were asking that question, Mary, is just being really clear about what's essential to the model. I think we were pretty clear, even in Minnesota, as we were scaling the program statewide here. And that same principle applied when we started scaling the program nationally, but what are things that are just essential to the model? If you were to go into a school in Minneapolis, if you were to go to a school in [unintelligible], if you were to go to a school in Denver, Colorado, what things would you see consistently being applied in all of those settings?

So having consistency with the interventions, consistency with the assessments, consistency with the implementation of those things and then measures of fidelity to go with it so we could actually have confidence that the interventions, and the assessments and the model was being implemented as it was being designed. I think that's just been a really important component like I said even here in Minnesota, but even more so as we started to replicate outside of Minnesota.

CARRIE: I agree with Sadie about that and I will add:

you should a thorough process evaluation in order to

identify what the essential items are so I definitely

agree with that. Something that I've observed both

with Reading Corps, but also with other programs that

I've seen either success of fail at scaling is that I

think you always need a local champion for your

program. So, in Minnesota there are key individuals

who are responsible for both its success and its

sustainability.

And I think that Reading Corps did a good job of identifying what are the important organizations or

people that they need to have onboard and involved in their other locations in order to be champions for this program. You have to identify who are the key players, and make sure that they're onboard and part of that process. When I've seen scaling not work out, it's because somebody's trying to implement a program and there isn't an advocate there.

There isn't somebody who's spearheading it, or whoever is the big player in that area, in that location they're not part of implementing the program and that's so critical I think to success.

FEMALE: Thank you. Here's just a question which Sadie took up, but I'd like to hear other people, especially those of you listening: Are there any plans to share the three-day training AmeriCorps tutors receive with the foster grandparent volunteers? I don't know if there's someone.

FEMALE: That's an interesting thought.

FEMALE: Yeah, and I commented too we have done some work with foster grandparents in the past, although

it was in our pre-K model so feel free, anybody can feel free to reach out to me, I've plugged in my email if you're interested in learning more. We do replicate our program model nationally as I said earlier so if there is any component of this model that is really seems interesting, we're happy to have conversation and field any questions about that.

Our training, I will say, is really focused on those specific interventions and on those specific assessments so we'd be happy just to share kind of like our philosophy with how we do that training and what that kind of looks like.

FEMALE: Thank you. I see people are typing.

MARC: I might add as an education research, when we first engaged through the CNCS evaluation with the Reading Corps, Carrie, myself and our team attended their training and as part of the process assessment observed some of the ongoing coaching and professional development that is a core component to this program. And even as someone who has a PhD in Child Development it was just incredibly impressive the amount of information that the program had put

together in such a tight package that was highly aligned with the four objectives this program was trying to achieve.

They tried to give as much information to these folks, the coaches, the onsite coaches, the [unintelligible] coaches, the actual AmeriCorps members themselves in a short period of time. And one of the things I'll note that often people said was, "There was so much there. I learned so much, but I was worried, 'How am I gonna do this?" And that that wasn't the end. I think Carrie noted this too, which was unique about this program: that build into this is a wonderful model for ongoing professional development through ongoing trainings, coaching, the materials they produce.

I still have a copy of the huge literacy handbook that's a three-inch ring binder full of materials that they learn about and can reference later, online resources that have videos that show you best practices so you can refresh yourself or improve. It really is a very comprehensive set of resources that

not just an AmeriCorps member, but I think we've also heard from teachers themselves, the researchers are really helpful and so the concept of being able to take some of the what the Reading Corps' doing and maybe transfer it, maybe the material itself couldn't be because it's so highly aligned with what the Reading Corps' trying to do, but this structure that has been put in place about how you train folks who for the most part know nothing about literacy development to be able to sit down with children or produce these types of effects as quickly as they do is something that I think is a real opportunity to learn from in terms of what the Reading Corps has been able to put together.

other thing that Lindsay Dolce adds is: in terms of replication, I would add that having the time to work through planning process prior to start-up is important to long-term success. So, training, the planning process as well. I just want to give all our speakers thirty seconds each to say anything that you'd like to add. Carrie, do you want to begin?

CARRIE: First of all, I just want to thank everyone,

CNCS, Reading Corps, Reading and Math, the state

commission in Minnesota. I just want to thank

everyone for given us the opportunity to be able to

study this program and again, I would just go back to

the fact that there's a lot of evidence that this

program is effective in having an impact with

students, and that it's both effective and highly

replicable. I'm very pleased to have been involved

with this program since 2011 and watch it evolve,

watch it be replicated in 12 states and Washington

D.C., I think, now.

So I do think that there's a lot to learn from this program. It's a good model and now there's a lot of research that I think points to what are the effective practices, what are the key elements that make it replicable, and there's a lot to learn from that so thank you, everyone for giving us this opportunity to study what I think is a very promising program.

FEMALE: Thank you, Carrie. Sadie or Audrey?

AUDREY: I would just say to everybody on the webinar and CNCS and I would extend an invitation to anybody who's listening: if you do have additional continuous improvement ideas or research questions that you'd want to put in to our R&D pipeline, but all means send them our way. We obviously want to and need to keep learning.

MARC: I think Carried covered everything. I'd just say that this is such a great example thinking in the education space: how do you take service, folks who want to provide a year of time to help improve educational system and integrate them in a way that can produce really big impacts above and beyond in collaboration with the schools with which they're working. It's been a pleasure to be able to study this program, learn from it and hopefully in our presentations and our work going forward, share some of the best parts, the active ingredients of this program with others.

FEMALE: Thank you, so much. I'm just going to turn it to Mary Hyde.

MARY: Great. And I believe we're out of time so thank you again to all of our speakers and for those of you in

the audience who joined today for this exciting discussion. I also want to thank ICF, our communications contractor, for their technical support and coordination. Thank you, Emily. We will be sending out a post-webinar survey so please let us know your thoughts on the webinar or ideas for future webinars. And we will be posting this recording in about a month for those of you who weren't able to join live or had to hop off early. Thank you, all, and have a great afternoon or evening depending on your time zone.

END OF FILE