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This report features results from the Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura interventions in the United States in the 2020–2021 school year. There were 32% fewer students participating in Reading Recovery this past school year than in 2019–2020, and the percentage of students participating in Descubriendo la Lectura was about 50% lower than in 2019–2020. There are many reasons the numbers were lower this year than last, but difficulties due to the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures in the previous school year significantly contributed to a reduction in participation in Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura.

The data in this report support the conclusion that both Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura continue to work. In 2020–2021, the group of lowest-performing students and the random sample students, which represent typical first graders, started the school year with lower literacy scores than in previous years. However, the thousands of initially low-performing students in the U.S. who participated in Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura ended the school year, on average, with stronger literacy skills than the typical first grader.

Summary of the Reading Recovery Implementation

Characteristics of participants
During the 2020–2021 school year, Reading Recovery was implemented by 12 university training centers responsible for overseeing the intervention in schools located in 41 states (Table 1). About 20,000 first-grade students were selected to participate in the Reading Recovery intervention. These children received the intervention from 2,725 Reading Recovery teachers who were supported by 212 teacher leaders in 170 training sites serving 608 school districts. There were a total of 1,898 schools participating in Reading Recovery, with 26% in urban areas, 33% in suburban areas, and 42% in rural areas.

Demographic information for the participating Reading Recovery students ($n = 19,716$) revealed that 52% were boys and 48% were girls and the students came from different racial and ethnic backgrounds (i.e., 59% White, 17% Hispanic, 16% Black/African American, 2% Asian American, 1% Native American, and 6% either multiple races or other ethnic backgrounds). Of the schools that reported federal lunch status, approximately 75% of Reading Recovery students were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

In the fall of the school year, teachers in each school that participates in Reading Recovery randomly select two students from all first graders in the school to be part of a national random sample of first graders. The students in this national random sample are considered typical first-grade students and serve as a comparison group. The random sample from the 2020–2021 academic year ($n = 1,925$) was comprised of students who came from different racial and ethnic backgrounds (i.e.,

| Table 1. Participation in Reading Recovery in the United States, 2020–2021 |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Entity                      | n     |
| University Training Centers | 12    |
| Teacher Training Sites     | 170   |
| States                      | 41    |
| School Systems              | 608   |
| School Buildings            | 1,898 |
| Teacher Leaders             | 212   |
| Teachers                    | 2,725 |
| Reading Recovery Students   | 19,716|
| Started in Fall             | 10,405|
| Started in Spring           | 8,352 |
| Started at Year-end         | 9,15  |
| Unknown When Started        | 44    |
| Random Sample for RR        | 1,925 |
Research

68% White, 11% Hispanic, 12% Black/African American, 3% Asian American, 1% Native American, and 6% either multiple races or other ethnic backgrounds). About half of the random sample students were boys and half were girls. Of schools reporting federal lunch status, 65% of the random sample students were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Reading Recovery teachers who participated in the 2020–2021 data collection had an average of 21.5 years of teaching experience and 9.1 years teaching Reading Recovery and/or Descubriendo la Lectura. These teachers provided individual literacy instruction to 6.9 Reading Recovery children during the school year. In addition, Reading Recovery teachers worked with an average of 27.6 additional children beyond their Reading Recovery load. Thus, accounting for all teaching roles/assignments during the 2020–2021 academic year, Reading Recovery teachers instructed an average total of 34.5 children.

Assessment and exit status categories
The assessment used in this examination of student performance was An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement (Observation Survey; Clay, 2019). The Observation Survey was administered several times to Reading Recovery students and the random sample of comparison students during the 2020–2021 academic year. As noted above, 2020–2021 was a uniquely challenging year for many Reading Recovery teachers. Only 56% of the students enrolled in Reading Recovery have fall Observation Survey Total Scores, whereas in the 2 previous school years, 77% of Reading Recovery students had fall Observation Survey Total Scores. Anecdotally, we learned that Reading Recovery teachers, due to other responsibilities at their schools, were unable to collect or enter data for their students in the fall. In addition, one of the six Observation Survey tasks that is used to compute the Observation Survey Total Score is difficult to administer online (i.e., Concepts About Print). The percentage of fall Observation Survey Total Scores for the random sample students in 2020–2021 was also lower than in a typical year; in 2019–2020, 96% of the random sample students had fall Observation Survey Total Scores whereas, in 2020–2021, only 85% of the random sample students had fall Observation Survey Total Scores.

A new status category of Progressed: Monitoring and Support Essential for Ongoing Literacy Progress was added in 2020–2021. Students were assigned a status of Progressed if they received a complete series of lessons, made progress, and monitoring and/or support were deemed essential for ongoing literacy progress (Doyle, 2020).

Of the students who received a complete series of Reading Recovery lessons ($n = 12,847$, 65.3% of all served) end-of-intervention outcomes were as follows:

- 49.7% ($n = 6,382$) achieved the intervention goal of reading and writing levels commensurate with the average students in their first-grade cohort. These students were given the outcome status of Accelerated Progress: Achieved Intervention Goal.
- 22.4% ($n = 2,878$) made significant progress in their levels of reading and writing achievement but did not achieve average levels after completing a full series of lessons. These students were given an outcome status of Progressed.
- 27.9% ($n = 3,586$) made some progress during the intervention, but additional evaluation and ongoing intervention was considered essential for literacy progress to continue after completing a full series of lessons. These students were given an outcome status of Recommended: Additional Evaluation and Intervention Essential for Ongoing Literacy Progress.

Of the total group of students selected for Reading Recovery ($n = 19,716$), not all students were able to complete the intervention (34.7%, $n = 6,825$). The following reasons were given for this:

- 27.5% ($n = 5,403$) of students were unable to complete a full series of the 20 weeks of instruction before the end of the school year. These students were given an outcome status of Incomplete.
- 2.9% ($n = 577$) of students moved during the school year while still enrolled in lessons (exit status Moved).
- 4.3% ($n = 845$) of students’ lessons were concluded early due to unusual circumstances based on a decision by someone other than the Reading Recovery teacher (exit status None of the Above).
Comparison of Reading Recovery Outcomes

We used data that was submitted to the International Data Evaluation Center to explore three research questions related to first-grade students’ literacy skills. Our first research question examined the effects of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic in the previous school year on students’ literacy skills as they entered first grade. To answer this question, we compared fall Observation Survey Total Scores from 2020–2021 to fall Observation Survey Total Scores in 2019–2020 and 2018–2019. In order to make comparisons across the 3 years, we used data from schools that had fall Observation Survey Total Scores for all 3 years.

Our second research question examined how students who completed the intervention and were given a status of Accelerated Progress, Progressed, or Recommended compared with each other and with the random sample students on the six individual Observation Survey tasks to examine how the groups compared.

For research question three we were interested in learning the characteristics of the Reading Recovery students who were given an outcome status of Progressed, the new status category added this past school year. The analysis conducted to answer research question two provided part of the answer to this question. We also looked at proportions of Reading Recovery students in the three status groups (i.e., Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and Recommended) and the random sample in 2020–2021 by gender, free or reduced lunch status, ELL and disability status, and racial/ethnic categories. In addition, we compared the proportions of Reading Recovery students in each of the three status groups in 2020–2021 with the proportions of Reading Recovery students in the two status groups in four previous school years, from 2015–2016 through 2018–2019. We did not use the proportions in status groups during the school year when schools closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., 2019–2020) because almost half of the students in Reading Recovery during that school year were given a status of None of the Above and this proportion is typically much lower (e.g., in 2018–2019, the proportion was 3.0%). Counts and frequencies of Reading Recovery students by status group for 2018–19, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 are presented in Table 2.

In summary, we had three research questions:

1. How did the literacy skills of students entering first grade in 2020–2021 compare to the literacy skills of students entering first grade in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020, as measured by fall Observation Survey Total Scores?

2. How did fall, mid-year, and year-end scores of students who completed the Reading Recovery intervention in 2020–2021 compare to each other by outcome status group (i.e., Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and

Table 2. Counts and Percentages of Reading Recovery Students by Status and School Year for 2018–2019, 2019–2020, 2020–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Progress</td>
<td>17,336</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>7,114</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>32,396</td>
<td></td>
<td>28,486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Percentages were calculated on all students who participated in Reading Recovery. The totals included students who were unable to complete the intervention.
3. What were the characteristics of students who were given a status of Progressed in 2020–2021, and how did they compare to Reading Recovery students who were given statuses of Accelerated Progress and Recommended, as well as to the random sample students?

**Research question one**

To answer research question one, we used fall Observation Survey Total Scores for students selected to participate in Reading Recovery in schools that had fall Observation Survey Total Scores for students in 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021. In addition, we used fall Observation Survey Total Scores for random sample students from the same school years as representatives of typical first graders for each of those years.

As seen in Table 3 and Figure 1, both groups started the 2020–2021 school year with fall Observation Survey Total Scores that were much lower than they were in the fall of the 2 previous school years. Fall Observation Survey Total Scores of Reading Recovery students were 19 points lower than in 2018–2019 and 17 points lower than in 2019–2020. Random sample students started the 2020–2021 school year with fall Observation Survey Total Scores 21 points lower than in 2018–2019 and 24 points lower than in 2019–2020.

After observing the drop in fall Observation Survey Total Scores in 2020–2021 compared to the 2 previous years, we wondered how this reduction in overall literacy skills might be reflected in the reading abilities of typical students entering first grade in the fall of 2020 compared to the falls of the two previous years. In other words, how did this drop in literacy scores play out in the typical first-grade classroom? For this comparison, we used distributions of random sample students’ scores because the random sample students were proxies for typical first graders and we used their distributions of fall Observation Survey Text Reading Level (TRL) task scores because fall scores on this task were measures of students’ reading ability as they entered first grade. Examining these distributions before and during the pandemic allowed us to visualize how the range of reading ability in first-grade classrooms of 2020 might have compared to the range of reading ability in first-grade classrooms in the falls of 2018 and 2019.

As seen in Figure 2, the percentages of random sample students reading at each text reading level in fall 2018 were similar to the percentages of random sample students reading at

### Table 3. Fall Observation Survey Total Score Means for Reading Recovery and Random Sample Students for School Years 2018–2019, 2019–2020, 2020–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Reading Recovery</th>
<th></th>
<th>Random Sample</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–2019</td>
<td>383 (44)</td>
<td>14,088</td>
<td>436 (54)</td>
<td>2,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2020</td>
<td>381 (44)</td>
<td>13,383</td>
<td>438(54)</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–2021</td>
<td>365 (46)</td>
<td>11,046</td>
<td>415 (57)</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** In order to make comparisons across the 3 years, data from schools with fall Observation Survey Total Scores for all 3 years were used to calculate means and SD.
each text reading level in fall 2019. For example, in fall 2018 and fall 2019 about the same percentages of students entered first grade with scores on the TRL task < 3 (i.e., 30% and 29%, respectively) and in both school years, the percentages of students with fall TRL scores > 10 were 13% and 15%, respectively. In fall 2020, however, after the school year in which most instruction after mid-March was conducted remotely due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the percentage of random sample students with fall TRL scores < 3 (44%) was higher than it had been in the 2 previous years and the percentage of random sample students with fall TRL scores > 10 was only 9%. These statistics indicate that in the fall of the 2020–2021 school year first-grade classrooms had more students who were not yet able to read and fewer students who had strong literacy skills.

**Research question two**

To answer research question two, we used 2020–2021 scores on all six tasks of the Observation Survey at fall, mid-year, and year-end from students who completed Reading Recovery, by status category (i.e., Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and Recommended), and from random sample students. Means for each group of students and the percentages of data that were available for computing the means are reported in Table 4. The Concepts About Print task had the lowest proportion of scores available for all groups at all time points (i.e., ranged from 59% to 89%) with fall scores for students in the Accelerated Progress group having the lowest percentage of available scores on this task. As indicated above, this task was difficult to administer in a remote setting. For the other five Observation Survey tasks, the percentages of fall data that were available for calculating means was 71% for Accelerated Progress students, 91% for Progressed students, 95% for Recommended students, and 98% for random sample students. At mid-year and year-end, the percentages of available data on the five Observation Survey tasks for Reading Recovery students in all status categories and the random sample ranged from 84% to 100%, with Progressed and Recommended students having at least 96% of data available.

To visualize the differences between the groups, we created a line plot for each of the six Observation Survey tasks using means from the Reading Recovery students, by status group, and the random sample students. Unlike the means that were calculated for Table 4, the means for the plots were calculated only from students who had scores at all three time points (i.e., fall, mid-year, and spring). For the Reading Recovery status groups, about 79% of the students had data available to calculate the means for all tasks, except the Concepts About Print task, which only had 62% of the data available. For random sample students, about 87% of the students had data available for calculating the means for all tasks, except the Concepts About Print task, which only had 75% of data available. Although our sample sizes were reduced because we calculated the means for the plots only from students who had scores at all three time points, doing so allowed the numbers of students in each group to be the same across all time points. Generally, the means presented in Table 4 were similar to the means used to create the plots in Figure 3.

As seen in Table 4 and Figure 3, almost half of the Reading Recovery students (i.e., those given a status of Accelerated Progress) had year-end mean scores on the six individual Observation Survey tasks that exceeded the mean scores of the random sample students despite having Observation Survey mean scores in the fall that were lower than those of the random sample students. Progressed students also started the school year with scores on the Observation Survey tasks that were lower than the random sample.
students, yet they had mean scores on most tasks that mirrored those of the random sample students at mid-year and year-end. Mean scores for Recommended students were the lowest compared to Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and random sample students on the six Observation Survey tasks at the three time points, though their mean scores rose steeply from fall to mid-year on three of the Observation Survey tasks (i.e., Letter Identification, Concepts About Print, and Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words).

**Research question three**
Mean scores on the six Observation Survey tasks from Reading Recovery students, by status group, and random sample students in fall, mid-year, and year-end of the 2020–2021 school year and demographic characteristics of students in these groups were used to answer research question three. Examining the means and plots of the mean scores on the six Observation Survey tasks (Table 4 and Figure 3) allowed us to compare the literacy growth of the Progressed students with students in the Accelerated Progress, Recommended, and random sample groups. At all three time points on the Text Reading Level task, Progressed students had lower means than the Accelerated Progress students (i.e., differences in fall = 0.5, mid-year = 2.3, and year-end = 6.6) and the random sample students (i.e., differences in fall = 3.4, mid-year = 2.6, and year-end = 4.7). Also, at all three time points on the Writing Vocabulary task, Progressed students had lower means than the Accelerated Progress students (i.e., differences in fall = 2.7, mid-year = 2.9, and year-end = 11.3) and the random sample students (i.e.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Accelerated Progress</th>
<th>Reading Recovery Students</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Random Sample Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%Data</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reading Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Word Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts About Print</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing and Recording Sounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The percentage of available data are provided in the table for each task, by status group, and for the random sample students to provide additional information on the sample sizes on which the means were calculated. Full sample sizes for each of the groups were: Accelerated Progress students, n = 6,383; Progressed students, n = 2,878; Recommended students, n = 3,586; random sample students, n = 1,925.
differences in fall = 8.8, mid-year = 0.3, and year-end = 4.9). On the four other Observation Survey tasks, however, at mid-year and year-end, the differences between the Progressed, Accelerated Progress, and random sample students were small, usually within 1 point. For example, on the Letter Identification task, the differences between Progressed students’ means and random sample students’ means were 0.1 at both mid-year and year-end. On the Ohio Word Test, at mid-year and year-end, the differences between Progressed students’ means and random sample students’ means were 0.8 and 0.7, respectively. On the Concepts About Print task, at mid-year Progressed students had a higher mean (18.3) than the random sample students.
(17.9), and at year-end the difference between Progressed students’ mean and random sample students’ mean was only 0.1. On the Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words task at mid-year and year-end, Progressed students had means that were within 0.1 points of the random sample students’ means.

As seen in Table 5, Recommended students have the highest proportion of students for each demographic variable, except for the race categories Other or White. Proportions of Progressed students who were male (52%) were similar to Accelerated Progress (50%) and random sample students (50%) and somewhat lower than Recommended students (55%). The proportion of Progressed students who had a federal lunch status of free or reduced lunch (70%) was somewhat higher than Accelerated Progress and random sample students (66% and 65%, respectively), but lower than Recommended students (80%). Progressed students had a similar proportion of ELL students (14%) compared to Accelerated Progress students (14%) and both had higher proportions than the random sample (9%). Proportions of Progressed students who had been identified with a disability (11%) were somewhat larger than proportions of Accelerated Progress students (9%, difference of 2%) and random sample students (8%, difference of 3%). Regarding race groups, differences in proportions in each race category between Progressed, Accelerated Progress, and random sample students vary from 0–3%. The Recommended students had proportions of Black and Hispanic students that exceeded the next highest group (i.e., students in the Accelerated Progress group) by 4–5% and were 7–9% higher than the lowest group (i.e., students in the random sample group). All four groups have equal proportions of students who were identified as Other.

In addition, the proportions of Reading Recovery students by status in 2020–2021 were compared to the proportions of Reading Recovery students by status for the 2015–2016 through 2018–2019 school years. As indicated above, status group proportions during the school year when schools closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., 2019–2020) were not used for this comparison because a disproportionate number of students were assigned an outcome status of None of the Above in 2019–2020 compared to any other year. As seen in Figure 4, the proportion of students who were Recommended for additional support in 2020–2021 was similar to proportions of Recommended students in 2015–2016 through 2018–2019. And likewise, the sum of the proportions of students in the Progressed and Accelerated Progress status categories of 2020–2021 were similar to the proportions of students in the Accelerated Progress status group in 2015–2016 through 2018–2019.

In the random sample group that is collected every year, at the beginning of first grade there have always been students who have strong literacy skills (e.g., TRL > 20) and students who are not yet reading text (i.e., TRL = 0). On average, from year to year, these differences don’t change much; the number of students who enter first grade with a low TRL stays about the same year to year as does the number of students who score high on the TRL. As stated above, 2020–2021 was not a typical school year. In that school year, fall TRL scores indicated that there were more children reading at lower text levels and fewer children reading at higher text levels than in previ-

Table 5. Demographics of Reading Recovery Students by Status and Random Sample Students, 2020–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Accelerated Progress</th>
<th>Progressed</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Random Sample Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch*</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability**</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: *47.8% of schools did not report federal lunch status. ELL = English language learners. **Some form of disability indicated at entry to intervention. The race/ethnic category Other is a diverse group (e.g., multiracial, Asian, Native American).
ous years. Beyond this trend in the random sample, a similar trend was seen in children selected for Reading Recovery at the beginning of the year who likewise had lower TRL scores than in previous years.

Despite coming in lower than in previous years, an examination of Reading Recovery students’ mean scores by status group (Table 4, Figure 3) allowed us to see the significant growth that happened for these students. This was true especially for students in the Accelerated Progress and Progressed groups. For example, Reading Recovery students in the Accelerated Progress group started the 2020–2021 school year with a mean TRL of 1.3 and ended the school year with a mean TRL of 17.6, which represented a growth of 16.3 levels. Accelerated Progress and Progressed students started the school year with mean scores on the TRL that were lower than the random sample students’ mean TRL but the Accelerated Progress students made more growth in their mean TRL than the random sample students, and the Progressed students made similar growth in their mean TRL to the random sample students.

In the past 2 decades, almost 2 million children in the U.S. have benefited from their participation in Reading Recovery. In the 2020–2021 school year, as in previous years, most first graders who completed the Reading Recovery intervention showed accelerated gains in their literacy skills. Data from this report indicated that children’s literacy development was interrupted due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the ensuing changes in how schooling was delivered because of school closings in the spring of 2020. Additionally, the ways school was delivered throughout the U.S. was atypical across the 2020–2021 school year (e.g., remote learning, hybrid learning, in-person learning with distance and masks required). In light of past and ongoing changes in how school is delivered, effective early literacy intervention is more important than ever. The findings in this report clearly demonstrate the efficacy of Reading Recovery and the impacts such an intervention can have on the literacy development of students who are struggling with learning to read and write.

Summary of the Descubriendo la Lectura Implementation

Characteristics of participants

The Descubriendo la Lectura intervention, a reconstruction of Reading Recovery in Spanish, was designed for first graders who receive their initial literacy instruction in Spanish. Table 6 provides details about participation in Descubriendo la Lectura in the United States during the 2020–2021 academic year. There were 206 children participating in the Descubriendo la Lectura intervention who received instruction from 28 teachers. These students attended 31 schools in 11 school districts that were located in 6 states and the teachers were supported by 13 teacher leaders. Of the 206 Descubriendo la Lectura students served, 54% were boys, 46% were girls, 99% were Hispanic, 97% were eligible for free
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or reduced lunch and English was not the primary language at home for 99% of all Descubriendo la Lectura students. The schools these students attended were located in urban (47%), suburban (47%), and rural (6%) areas.

At the beginning of the school year, in schools that participate in Descubriendo la Lectura, teachers randomly select four students from the first graders in the school. The students in this random sample are considered typical of the first-grade students in their schools. In the random sample from the 2020–2021 academic year (\(n = 59\)): 56% were boys, 44% were girls, 95% identified as Hispanic, and 93% were eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Descubriendo la Lectura teachers had an average of 19.6 years of teaching experience and 8.2 years teaching Descubriendo la Lectura and/or Reading Recovery. These teachers taught 6.7 Descubriendo la Lectura children during the 2020–2021 school year and 14.4 children beyond their Descubriendo la Lectura load. Thus, accounting for all teaching roles/assignments during the 2020–2021 academic year, Descubriendo la Lectura teachers instructed an average total of 21.1 children.

### Assessment and exit status categories

The assessment used in this examination of Descubriendo la Lectura was the *Instrumento de observación de los lecto-escritura inicial* (Instrumento de observación; Escamilla et al., 1996). The *Instrumento de observación* was administered several times to both participating Descubriendo la Lectura students and a random sample of students in their schools during the 2020–2021 academic year. Like the Observation Survey, this assessment is typically administered at several times during the school year (e.g., fall, mid-year, and year-end). As noted above, 2020–2021 was a uniquely challenging year for Descubriendo la Lectura teachers. Only 45% of the students enrolled in Descubriendo la Lectura had fall *Instrumento de observación Total Scores* whereas in the two previous school years about 78% had *Instrumento de observación Total Scores*. One of the six *Instrumento de observación* tasks that is used to calculate the *Instrumento de observación Total Score* is difficult to administer online (i.e., *Conceptos del Texto Impreso*). The percentage of fall *Instrumento de observación Total Scores* for the random sample students in 2020–2021 was also lower than was typical; in 2019–2020, 100% of the random sample students had fall *Instrumento de observación Total Scores* whereas, in 2020–2021, only 76% of the random sample students had fall *Instrumento de observación Total Scores*.

A new status category of Progressed was added in 2020–2021. Students were assigned a status of Progressed if they received a complete series of lessons, made progress, and monitoring and/or support were deemed essential for ongoing literacy progress (Doyle, 2020).

Of students who participated in the Descubriendo la Lectura intervention in the 2020–2021 school year and who completed the intervention (\(n = 120, 58.3\%\) of all served), end-of-intervention outcomes were as follows:

- **34.2%** \((n = 41)\) achieved the intervention goal of reading and writing levels commensurate with the average students in their first-grade cohort. These students were given the outcome status of Accelerated Progress.
- **12.5%** \((n = 15)\) made significant progress in their levels of reading and writing achievement but did not achieve average levels after completing a full series of lessons. These students were given a status of Progressed.
- **53.3%** \((n = 64)\) made some progress during the intervention, but additional evaluation and ongoing intervention were considered essential for literacy progress to continue after completing a full series of lessons. These students were given an outcome status of Recommended.

The statistics reported above are based on students who participated in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Training Centers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training Sites</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Systems</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Buildings</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Leaders</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLL Students</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started in Fall</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started in Spring</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started at Year-end</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown When Started</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Sample for DLL</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Descubriendo la Lectura intervention in the 2020–2021 school year and completed the intervention. Not all students selected for the intervention were able to complete it (41.7%, n = 86). The following reasons were given for this:

- 33.0% (n = 68) of students were unable to complete a full series of the 20 weeks of instruction before the end of the school year. These students were given an outcome status of Incomplete.
- 2.9% (n = 6) of students moved during the school year while still enrolled in lessons (exit status Moved).
- 5.8% (n = 12) of students’ lessons were concluded early due to unusual circumstances based on a decision by someone other than the Reading Recovery teacher (exit status None of the Above).

Comparison of Descubriendo la Lectura Outcomes

We used data that was submitted to the International Data Evaluation Center to explore three research questions related to first-grade students’ literacy skills. Our first research question examined the effects of school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic in the previous school year on students’ literacy skills as they entered first grade. To answer this question, we compared fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores from 2020–2021 to fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020. In order to make comparisons across the 3 years, we used data from schools that had fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores for all 3 years.

Our second research question examined how students who completed the intervention and were given a status of Accelerated Progress, Progressed, or Recommended compared with each other and with the random sample on the six tasks of the Instrumento de observación. Typically, Instrumento de observación Total Scores would be used for a comparison such as this, however, because the previous school year was not a typical year and many students did not have fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores, we used students’ fall, mid-year, and year-end scores on the six individual Instrumento de observación tasks.

For research question three we were interested in learning the characteristics of the Descubriendo la Lectura students who were given an outcome status of Progressed, the new status category that was added this past school year. Although there were only 15 students who were given this status in 2020–2021, learning about students in this group could provide useful information despite the small sample size. The analysis conducted to answer research question two provided part of the answer to this question. We also looked at proportions of Descubriendo la Lectura students in the three status groups (i.e., Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and Recommended) and the random sample in 2020–2021 by gender, free or reduced lunch status, and ELL and disability status. In addition, we compared the proportions of Descubriendo la Lectura students in each of the three status groups in 2020–2021 with the proportions of Descubriendo la Lectura students in the two status groups in 4 previous school years, 2015–2016 through 2018–2019. We did not use proportions by status group during the school year when schools closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., 2019–2020) because about 43% of the students in Descubriendo la Lectura during that year were given a status of None of the Above and this proportion is typically much lower (e.g., in 2018–2019, the proportion was 2.9%). Counts and frequencies of Descubriendo la Lectura students by status group for 2018–19, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 are presented in Table 7.

In summary, we had three research questions:

1. How did the literacy skills of students entering first grade in 2020–2021 compare to the literacy skills of students entering first grade in 2018–2019 and 2019–2020, as measured by fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores?

2. How did fall, mid-year, and year-end scores of students who completed the Descubriendo la Lectura intervention in 2020–2021 compare to each other by outcome status group (i.e., Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and Recommended) and to the random sample students (i.e., typical first graders in their schools) on the six individual tasks of the Instrumento de observación?

3. What were the characteristics of students who were given a status of Progressed in 2020–2021 and how did they compare to Descubriendo la Lectura students who were given statuses of Accelerated
Progress and Recommended, as well as to the random sample students?

**Research question one**
To answer research question one, we used fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores for students selected to participate in Descubriendo la Lectura in schools that had fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores for students in 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021. In addition, we used fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores for random sample students from the same school years as representatives of typical first graders for each of those years.

As seen in Table 8 and Figure 5, both groups started the 2020–2021 school year with fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores that were lower than they were in the fall of the 2 previous school years and the mean scores for both groups declined steadily across the 3 years. The 2020–2021 fall mean scores of the students who participated in Descubriendo la Lectura from schools that had Instrumento de observación Total Scores for all 3 years (i.e., 25 schools) were 23 points lower than in 2018–2019 and 13 points lower than in 2019–2020. Fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores of the random sample students from schools that had fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores for all 3 years (i.e., nine schools) were 19 points lower than in 2018–2019 and 8 points lower than in 2019–2020. The decline in scores for both groups was steady, however differences across the years should be interpreted with caution due to the relatively small sample sizes.

After observing the drop in fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores in 2020–2021 compared to the 2 previous years, we wondered how this reduction in overall literacy skills might be reflected in the reading abilities of typical students entering first grade in the fall of 2020 compared to the falls of the 2 previous years. In other words, how did this drop in literacy scores play out in the typical first-grade classroom of schools that participated in Descubriendo la Lectura? For this comparison, we used distributions of random sample students’ scores because the random sample students were proxies for typical first graders in their schools and we used their distribution of fall Instrumento de observación Análisis Actual del Texto (AAT) scores because scores on this task were measures of students’ reading ability at the beginning of the school year. Examining these

---

**Table 7.** Counts and Percentages of Descubriendo la Lectura Students by Status and School Year for 2018–2019, 2019–2020, 2020–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Progress</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressed</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the Above</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Percentages were calculated on all students who participated in Descubriendo la Lectura. The totals included students who were unable to complete the intervention.

---

**Table 8.** Fall Instrumento de observación Total Score Means for Descubriendo la Lectura and Random Sample Students for School Years 2018–2019, 2019–2020, 2020–2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Descubriendo la Lectura</th>
<th>Random Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018–2019</td>
<td>460 (32)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019–2020</td>
<td>450 (45)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020–2021</td>
<td>437 (40)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** In order to make comparisons across the 3 years, data from schools with fall Instrumento de observación Total Scores for all 3 years were used to calculate means and SDs.
distributions before and during the pandemic allowed us to visualize how the range of reading ability in first-grade students in classrooms of fall 2020 might have compared to the range of reading ability in first-grade classrooms in the falls of 2018 and 2019.

As seen in Figure 6, the percentage of random sample students with a score of 0 on the AAT task in the fall of 2018 was similar to the percentage of random sample students with a score of 0 in the fall of 2019 (i.e., 27% and 29%, respectively). In the fall of 2020, the percentage of random sample students with a score of 0 on the AAT task (36%) was 9% higher than in 2018 and 7% higher than in 2019. The percentage of random sample students with fall AAT scores > 14 was only 2% in 2018 and 2019, but there were no students with AAT scores > 14 in the fall of 2020. These statistics indicate that in the fall of the 2020–2021 school year first-grade classrooms had more students who were not yet able to read and fewer students who had strong literacy skills.

**Research question two**

To answer research question two, we used 2020–2021 scores on all six tasks of the Instrumento de observación at fall, mid-year, and year-end from students who completed Descubriendo la Lectura, by status category (i.e., Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and Recommended), and from the random sample students in schools that participated in Descubriendo la Lectura. Means for each group of students and the percentages of data that were available for computing the means are reported in Table 9. The Conceptos del Texto Impreso task had the lowest proportion of scores available for all groups at all time points (i.e., ranged from 47% to 98%) with fall scores for students in the Recommended group having the lowest percentage of data available. Proportions of students with a status of Accelerated Progress or Progressed, and random sample students were also low for this task in the fall (i.e., 51%, 53%, and 70%, respectively). As indicated above, this task was difficult to administer in a remote setting. For the other five Instrumento de observación tasks, the percentages of fall data that was available for calculating means were 61% for Accelerated Progress students, 73% for Progressed students, 88% for Recommended students, and 92% for random sample students. At mid-year, the percentages of available data on all six Instrumento de observación tasks for Descubriendo la Lectura students in all status categories ranged from 87% to 100% with students in most status categories having at least 92% of data available for calculating means. For random sample students...
at mid-year and year-end, 89% of data were available, except for the Conceptos del Texto Impreso task, which had 77% of data available.

To visualize the differences between the groups, we created a line plot for each of the six Instrumento de observación tasks using means from the Descubriendo la Lectura students, by status group, and the random sample students. Unlike the means that were calculated in Table 9, the means for the plots were calculated only from students who had scores at all three time points (i.e., fall, mid-year, and spring). For the Descubriendo la Lectura status groups combined, about 75% of the data were available to calculate the means for all tasks, except the Conceptos del Texto Impreso task, which only had 47% of the data available. For random sample students, about 98% of the data were available for calculating the means for all tasks, except the Conceptos del Texto Impreso task, which only had 76% of data available. Although our sample sizes were reduced because we calculated the means for the plots only from students who had scores at all three time points, doing so allowed the numbers of students in each group to be the same across all time points. Generally, the means in Table 9 were similar to the means used to create the plots in Figure 7.

As seen in Table 9 and Figure 7, Descubriendo la Lectura students in the Accelerated Progress group had mid-year and year-end mean scores on the six individual Instrumento de observación tasks that exceeded the mean scores of the random sample students despite having Instrumento de observación mean scores in the fall that were lower than those of the random sample students. Progressed students also started the school year with scores on the Instrumento de observación tasks that were lower than the random sample students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Descubriendo la Lectura Students</th>
<th>Random Sample Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accelerated Progress</td>
<td>Progressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>%Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Análisis Actual del Texto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identificación de Letras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prueba de Palabras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptos del Texto Impreso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oir y Anotar los Sonidos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escritura de Vocabulario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-year</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-end</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The percentage of available data are provided in the table for each task, by status group, and for the random sample students to provide additional information on the sample sizes on which the means were calculated. Full sample sizes for each of the groups were Accelerated Progress students, \( n = 41 \); Progressed students, \( n = 15 \); Recommended students, \( n = 64 \); random sample students, \( n = 59 \).
yet they had mean scores that were similar to or exceeded those of the random sample students at mid-year and year-end. Mean scores for Recommended students were the lowest compared to Accelerated Progress, Progressed, and random sample students on the six Instrumento de observación tasks at the three time points, though their mean scores rose steeply from fall to mid-year on the Identificatión de Letras, Prueba de Palabras, Conceptos del Texto Impreso, and the Oir y Anotar los Sonidos de la Palabras tasks.

Research question three
Mean scores on the six Instrumento de observación tasks have ceiling effects due to the limited range of scores for these tasks (i.e., Identificatión de Letras, Prueba de Palabras, Conceptos del Texto Impreso and Oir y Anotar los Sonidos).

NOTE: Means for each of the plots were calculated using data from students who had scores at all three time points. Four of the Instrumento de observación tasks have ceiling effects due to the limited range of scores for these tasks (i.e., Identificatión de Letras, Prueba de Palabras, Conceptos del Texto Impreso and Oir y Anotar los Sonidos).
de observación tasks from Descubriendo la Lectura students, by status group, and random sample students in fall, mid-year, and year-end of the 2020–2021 school year and demographic characteristics of students in these groups were used to answer research question three. Examining the means and plots of the mean scores on the six Instrumento de observación tasks (Table 9 and Figure 7) allowed us to compare the literacy growth of the Progressed students with Accelerated Progress, Recommended, and random sample students. Of the six tasks, the differences in mean scores on the Análisis Actual del Texto task at mid-year and year-end between the Accelerated Progress students and the Progressed students were the greatest (i.e., mid-year = 6.5, and year-end = 5.4) while the mid-year Progressed students’ mean score on this task was 1.8 points higher than the mean score of the random sample students. At year-end, the random sample students mean score was 1.1 points higher than the Progressed students mean score. This pattern of differences was repeated on the Conceptos del Texto Impreso and Escritura de Vocabulario tasks, though the differences were small at year-end on both tasks (i.e., 0.4 and 0.1, respectively). On the other three Instrumento de observación tasks (i.e., Identificación de Letras, Prueba de Palabras, and Oir y Anotar los Sonidos de la Palabra), the Progressed students’ mean scores were higher than the random sample students’ mean scores at mid-year and year-end despite starting the year with fall mean scores on these tasks that were lower than the random sample students’ mean scores.

As seen in Table 10, regarding the gender of the students, compared to the random sample group greater proportions of Descubriendo la Lectura students in all status groups were boys. Recommended students have the highest proportion of boys (i.e., 59%) and the proportions of boys were similar for students in the Accelerated Progress and Progressed groups (i.e., 54% and 53%, respectively). Only about 59% of schools reported federal lunch status, and generally the proportions of students who were reported as being eligible for free or reduced lunch were similar for all groups. Proportions of ELL students in the Progressed and Accelerated Progress groups were 100% for both groups, but proportions of ELL students in the Recommended and random sample groups were also high (i.e., 97% and 95%, respectively). Differences in proportions of Progressed students who had been identified with a disability (14%) were larger than proportions of Accelerated Progress and random sample students (i.e., both had 2%, a difference of 12%). The Recommended students had the highest proportion of students with an identified disability (i.e., 21%).

In addition, the proportions of Descubriendo la Lectura students by status in 2020–2021 were compared to the proportions of Descubriendo la Lectura students by status in the 2015–2016 through 2018–2019 school years. As indicated above, status group proportions during the school year when schools closed due to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., 2019–2020) were not used for this comparison because a disproportionate number of students were assigned an outcome status of None of the Above in 2019–2020 compared to any other year. As seen in Figure 8, the proportions of students who were Recommended for additional support were similar in 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 (i.e., 35% and 34%, respectively) and steadily increased in 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2020–2021, from 40% to 53%. Inversely, the proportions of students who made Accelerated Progress were similar in 2015–2016 and 2016–2017 (i.e., 65% and 66%, respectively) and steadily decreased in 2017–2018, 2018–2019, and 2020–2021, from 60% to 34%. Given this pattern, the small sample sizes in the 2020–2021 school year when the Progressed status category was added, and the comparison of the demographic characteristics of the Progressed students (Table 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10. Demographics of Descubriendo la Lectura Students by Status and Random Sample Students, 2020–2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: *41.5% of schools did not report federal lunch status. ELL = English language learners. **Some form of disability indicated at entry to intervention.
make it difficult to draw conclusions about who the Progressed students of 2020–2021 were. It will be useful to continue to compare the demographic characteristics and proportions of students in each of the status groups in the coming school years.

This past school year has been a challenging one for Descubriendo la Lectura. Participation in 2020–2021 was only about half what it was in the previous school year. Fall Instrumento de observación scores have seen a steady decline since 2018–2019. However, examining Descubriendo la Lectura students’ mean scores by status group (Table 9, Figure 7) allowed us to observe the great progress in literacy skills that Descubriendo la Lectura students made regardless of their status category. Continuing to examine demographic characteristics and Instrumento de observación task means for students by status group will help us better understand the characteristics of the students in these groups and how we can best serve them.

For decades, tens of thousands of children in the U.S. have benefited from participating in the Descubriendo la Lectura intervention. In the 2020–2021 school year, as in previous years, most first-grade students who completed the intervention showed gains in their literacy skills that exceeded the gains made by the typical first graders at their schools. Many children’s literacy skill development was interrupted and/or delayed because of the changes in how school was structured due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Now more than ever, a literacy intervention is needed that works for Spanish-speaking students who are learning to read and write in Spanish. The findings in this report provide support for the efficacy of the Descubriendo la Lectura intervention.
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