Consideration for ESSA Evidence Levels 1, 2, or 3

Criteria	Directions	Response
Supporting evidence	Provide at least one peer-reviewed article/study or positive evaluation conducted by an external evaluator. The peer-reviewed journal article/study or external evaluation must demonstrate the impact of the intervention implemented by your organization. The evaluation must be rigorous and conducted by a reputable third-party evaluator. Be sure to cite the article/study in APA format, if it is publicly accessible. If not, you must attach the study in the Appendix.	Is this a peer-reviewed article/study or an external evaluation? In support of Lexia's effectiveness, 18 peer-reviewed studies and 5 external evaluations are available that align to ESSA's standards of evidence. For information about all 23 studies, please see: https://www.lexialearning.com/why-lexia/research-proven Below are citations for 2 of the 23 studies. The first citation is for a peer-reviewed study and the second is for an external evaluation. Citation or Appendix: 1. Schechter, R., Macaruso, P., Kazakoff, E.R., & Brooke, E. (2015). Exploration of a blended learning approach to reading instruction for low SES students in early elementary grades. *Computers in the Schools, 32*, 183–200. 2. LEAP Innovations. (2017). personalized learning(s) from the field: A Report for the LEAP Innovations Pilot Network cohort 2. Chicago, IL: Leap Innovations. **NOTE**: Responses to the requirements in this table that ask for specifics (Treatment group, Effect size, etc.) are responded to twice—once for each of the two citations given above. The responses are numbered as #1 or #2 to reference the two citations/studies.

Criteria	Directions	Response
Intervention	Describe the intervention.	Brief description of the intervention:

Lexia is submitting one intervention, **Lexia® Professional Learning Services Powered by Core5® Reading**, that addresses both school leadership development and data informed decision-making. This intervention offers Lexia's professional learning services in combination with Lexia's flagship product, Core5® Reading, for grades PreK-5.

Lexia's professional learning services include a **District Success Plan (DSP)** that ensures that the capacity of district stakeholders is appropriately supported so that long-term achievement can be sustained over time. Based on the specific needs of the District, the Lexia Team will collaborate with district leaders, coordinate onboarding across the District, facilitate professional learning, monitor usage, schedule and facilitate a mid-year progress meeting and an end-of-year review meeting, offer onsite leadership meetings, and much more.

Lexia's professional learning services also include the **Implementation Support Package (ISP)** for schools. The ISP proposed for Nevada includes three days of on-site training in addition to three annual data reviews. An ISP provides teachers, coaches, administrators, and support staff with expert guidance throughout the school year.

The above-mentioned professional learning services and more—such as Lexia® Academy and Training on Demand—have been described in detail in response to requirements #2, #4, and #5 in Section B.

Criteria	Directions	Response
		Along with Lexia's professional learning services, this intervention includes Lexia® **Core5® Reading** for grades PreK-5. Core5® Reading is a technology-based, personalized reading program that provides explicit and systematic learning in six areas of reading instruction and delivers norm-referenced performance data without interrupting the flow of instruction. Designed to meet State Standards, Core5® Reading provides a highly adaptive and individualized learning experience that enables students of all abilities to advance their reading skills. This research-proven approach accelerates reading skill development, predicts students' year-end performance, and provides teachers with data-driven action plans to help differentiate instruction. Lexia's reporting and administrative website for educators, myLexia®, provides detailed reports and access to a comprehensive library of instructional resources for accelerating reading skills development. For more information about Core5® Reading, please see the response to requirement #3 in Section B.
ESSA Evidence Level	Identify the ESSA Evidence Level of the intervention.	ESSA Level 1: Strong (RCT/experimental): <u>8 studies</u> ESSA Level 2: Moderate (quasi-experimental): <u>7 studies</u> ESSA Level 3: Promising (correlational): <u>8 studies</u>
Treatment group	Describe the treatment group (e.g., sample size, any issues regarding attrition or investigator manipulation, etc.).	1. <u>Sample size</u>: $n = 45$ <u>Description</u>: Originally there were 47 students in the treatment group, but two did not take the posttest. 2. <u>Sample size</u>: $N = 443$ <u>Description</u>: Entire schools in the city of Chicago participated. These included public schools, charter schools, and an archdiocese school. Across these schools, 488 students participated in the full intervention, but 45 did not take NWEA/MAP and therefore were not part of analyses.

Criteria	Directions	Response
Control / Comparison group	Describe the control/comparison group (e.g., sample size, any issues regarding attrition or investigator manipulation, etc.).	1. <u>Sample size</u>: n = 38 <u>Description</u>: Originally there were 41 students in the control group, but three did not take the posttest. 2. <u>Sample size</u>: Not stated, although presumably about the same size as the treatment group. <u>Description</u>: Entire schools in the city of Chicago participated. These included public schools, charter schools, and an archdiocese school. Across these schools, 488 students participated in the full intervention, but 45 did not take NWEA/MAP and therefore were not part of analyses
Statistical significance	Describe at least one statistical significance of the intervention. Indicate its p-value. Indicate page number(s) of the statistical significance in the peer-reviewed journal article or evaluation.	1. <u>Describe significance</u> <u>p-value</u>: An independent sample t test showed that the difference in gain scores favoring the treatment group was significant ($t(81)$ = 2.38, p = .02). In addition, an analysis of covariance comparing Total Test scores [on the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE)] at posttest using Total Test pretest scores as covariates confirmed the significant group effect ($F(1, 80)$ = 5.23, p = .03). <u>Page number(s)</u>: 192 2. <u>Describe significance</u> <u>p-value</u>: This report does not provide exact p-values. However, it does note that Lexia Reading Core5 showed statistically significant, positive impact. [...] The use of Lexia resulted in a 2.57 point increase in NWEA reading scores. <u>Page number(s)</u>: 12

Criteria	Directions	Response
Effect Size	Describe at least one positive effect of the intervention. Indicate page number(s) of the effect size(s) in the peer-reviewed journal article or evaluation.	1. Describe positive effect Effect size: Total test score on the Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation (GRADE), which assesses comprehension and vocabulary: $d = 0.53$ Page number(s): 192 2. Describe positive effect Effect size: NWEA/MAP: d = .282 Page number(s): 12, 21
Outcome(s)	Describe the intended outcome(s) of the intervention and how the outcome was met as a result of the intervention.	1. The intervention was intended to promote students' literacy skills—and it succeeded. 2. This intervention program was intended to promote literacy outcomes by providing "high-needs students" with technology-based programs that would deliver personalized instruction. Students who used Core5® Reading saw improved performance on a standardized progress monitoring assessment.
Student population	Geographic (e.g., urban, rural, or suburban)	1. Urban 2. Urban
	Race/Ethnicity of Student Population	1. Treatment group: 89% Hispanic, 9% Black, 2% White Control group: 82% Hispanic, 13% Black, 5% White 2. Not stated, although separate analyses were conducted for Black students.

Criteria	Directions	Response
	Social Economic Status of Student Population	1. Low-income (95% qualify for free or reduced lunch) 2. Not stated, although separate analyses were conducted for low-income students. The stated aim of this study was to specifically support "high-needs students".
	Grade Levels	1. Grades 1 & 2 2. Grades 3-5
	Specific subgroups (e.g., English Learner, special education student, etc.)	1. Limited English Proficiency: Treatment Group: 30% Control Group: 17% Special Education: Treatment Group: 4% Control Group: 0% 2. None stated