

Literacy Success Foundations Teacher Efficacy Study

Introduction

Purpose

Pearson Canada is committed to support effective literacy practices and student learning opportunities in Canadian K–12 classrooms. A teacher efficacy study was conducted to determine if **Literacy Success Foundations (LSF)** is a flexible, skill-building resource, designed for students in grades 4 and up who are not yet proficient in phonics and word-level reading skills, that could improve their decoding and encoding skills. This report provides insights into LSF as an effective resource and tool for driving student literacy and supporting classroom teachers.

Description of this Report

This report summarizes the 2025–26 school-year findings for the Literacy Success Foundations (LSF) resource. It details the research methodologies, research instruments, data collection practices, and overall efficacy outcomes. Additionally, the report outlines the impact that LSF has made on teachers. It concludes with actionable, anecdotal recommendations for all Canadian classrooms and teachers.

Study Objectives and Evaluation Framework

This evaluation framework investigates the instructional efficacy in using LSF as intended by its teacher’s guide, student lessons, and student cards. It focuses on student outcomes, teacher attitudes about their teaching practice, and the practicality of classroom implementation. The objectives of this study were to

- *Improve student literacy skills* including decoding, encoding, reading fluency, and comprehension, while tracking changes in student success
- *Support targeted teaching* by assessing the effectiveness of LSF in helping teachers deliver explicit foundational reading skills to a small group of older students
- *Document* real-classroom implementation challenges and successes

Pearson Participants

Sylvie Webb: Efficacy Consultant

Sandra McTavish: Product Manager/Publisher, Literacy K–12

Angelie Kim: Managing Editor, Literacy

Meredith Oberfrank: Editorial Project Manager, Literacy

Scope

This teacher efficacy study was conducted during the 2025–2026 school year with the participation of the following school districts:

Edmonton Catholic School Division, AB

Peel District School Board, ON

Simcoe County District School Board, ON

Surrey School District, BC

Stoney Education Authority, AB

Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board, ON
Durham District School Board, ON

Participating teachers were provided with LSF resources and supplementary teaching materials (whiteboards, markers, and student notebooks). Teachers were advised that their feedback would be used to inform ongoing resource development and design.

Description of the Literacy Success Foundations Resource

Intended for use with a small group within a larger class, this resource is designed to empower teachers by providing explicit support for teaching reading skills—from phonics to fluency to comprehension. The topics and design aim to engage and support older students with foundational skills.

There are three kits: Kit A, Kit B, and Kit C. None of the kits are linked to a specific grade. The introduction of foundational phonics skills follows a scope and sequence aligned with current research. Graphemes are grouped strategically to enhance instruction for students who did not solidify their learning of phonics in the primary grades. Each kit includes these components:

Pre- and Post-assessments: The pre-assessment includes both decoding and encoding tasks. It can be used to identify students who could benefit from this resource, as well as to indicate which graphemes students recognize and which they do not. The post-assessment can determine growth and mastery after all lessons in the kit are taught.

Introductory Lesson: This lesson ensures all students will gain a common understanding of basic concepts and terminology before moving on to the student cards used in each kit's lessons.

16 Student Cards: Each four-page student card includes a highly decodable reading passage on page 2. On the third page, a shared reading passage is provided that is at a grade 4/5 reading level. The page 3 passage and the related activities can also be used with an entire class.

16 Lesson Cards: Each student card has a corresponding two-page lesson card, which provides information for explicit instruction in phonics and other foundational reading skills and strategies, along with a teacher script.

Teacher's Guide: The teacher's guide provides important, detailed information about the resource. It gives an overview of current research related to phonological awareness, phonics, orthography, morphology, and fluency.

Each LSF kit also comes with a durable box for storing the Teacher's Guide and all print cards and lessons.

Teacher and Student Companion Websites: The teacher website contains digital versions of all student cards and lessons, reproducible line masters, the scope and sequence, and all pre-and post-assessments. Professional development videos that illustrate LSF in action are also found on the teacher's website. The student website contains digital versions of all student cards.

Methodology

Teacher Participants

Seven school boards across Canada participated in the Literacy Success Foundations study. A total of 10 teachers volunteered to participate and were identified by their leadership teams and/or by Pearson Canada's Literacy Product Manager/Publisher. All teachers committed to using the resource for the entire school year. Two educators were only able to partially participate due to classroom timetabling changes. This was a proficient group, with nine of the 10 teachers reporting 15+ years of experience.

Student Demographics and Profiles

Ninety-one students received instruction, with 11 high-needs student groupings. These groups represented a range of diverse learners across multiple grade levels, including elementary (grades 4, 5, and 6) and secondary (grade 9).

The cohorts were comprised of a mix of males and females, with a notable presence of English Language Learners and students who are new to Canada. Also included were students with formal diagnoses (neurodiversity, ADHD, learning disability), those with individual learning plans (IEPs/IPP), and students requiring resource support. Many of the students demonstrated profound literacy gaps, with a discrepancy between decoding and encoding skills. Other students had behavioural and communication challenges that required differentiated teaching practices.

The Role of the Teacher: What We Asked of Our Classroom Testers

What is the role?	What are the tasks?
1. Learn about LSF	Read the LSF Teacher's Guide to understand the program's components and the essentials of phonics instruction
2. Select a group of 4–6 students who might benefit from small-group phonics instruction	Administer the Pre-Assessment and Post-Assessments for each kit
3. Actively implement Pearson's Literacy Success Foundations	Follow the lesson scripts and teach 2–3 lessons per week
4. Collect data	Observe student engagement and track progress by using the data collection tools in LSF
5. Provide feedback	Share experiences, insights, and data with Pearson to create a broader perspective on the effectiveness of the resource

Classroom Testing Timelines

This chart demonstrates the number of times teachers provided feedback or met with Pearson.

Process	Date
Teacher Information Session	March 2025
Teacher Pre-assessment	August 2025
Student Pre-assessment: Kit A	September 2025
Check-in #1	October 2025
Check-in #2	November 2025
Check-in #3	December 2025
Student and Teacher Post-assessment: Kit A	January 2026
Student Pre-assessment: Kit B	January 2026
Check-in #1	February 2026
Check-in #2	April 2026
Student Pre-assessment: Kit C	May 2026
Student and Teacher Post-assessment: Kit C; entire program	June 2026

Note: Teacher check-ins supported the implementation of LSF as intended. The check-ins monitored monthly lesson delivery, collected assessment data, and gathered feedback on resource effectiveness.

Research Instruments

Online surveys were designed to measure teaching and learning impact. Various formats were used to achieve a balance between quantitative metrics and qualitative insights. The primary formats included

1. **The Likert Scale** (4–5 points) asked teachers to rate agreement (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree).
2. **Open-Ended** responses prompted teachers to elaborate with short or long written answers.

Pre-Assessment Survey

The teachers' pre-survey is designed to capture teacher disposition and attitudes towards teaching reading in the classroom, and their perception of student literacy learning.

The students' pre-assessment is designed to measure the foundational skills demonstrated at the beginning of each kit.

Post-Assessment Survey

The teachers' post-survey is designed to capture how LSF improved teaching practice (including disposition and attitudes toward teaching reading), and student reading outcomes.

Methods of measurement of student learning (all in LSF):

1. **Formal Assessments:** Pre-assessment and post-assessment tools to capture reading outcomes; summary pages for determining group average data provided in all three kits
2. **Informal Assessments:** Teacher observations during guided reading, anecdotal records, student self-assessments, retellings, graphic organizers and other reading responses, participation in group discussions
3. **Portfolios/notebooks:** Collections of student work demonstrating growth over time

Efficacy Outcomes

Since this study was able to track the exact same teachers over the course of the school year, we used a formula that accounted for individual variances rather than comparing group averages. **Using Cohen's *d* for paired samples** (which quantifies the standardized effect size of the mean difference between two correlated measurements, such as pre- and post-assessment scores), we were able to measure the effect size to show if the growth is practically meaningful and not just statistically significant. Cohen's *d* measures growth in terms of standard deviation units rather than raw Likert points. This is how the final number can be interpreted:

- 0.2 indicates a small effect (growth is barely noticeable)
- 0.5 indicates a medium effect (growth is visible and moderate)
- 0.8+ indicates a large effect (growth is highly impactful)

Part A: Teacher attitudes about their teaching practice

Participating teachers were asked to rate how much they agree or disagree with the following statements. This group of teachers were asked the same questions in September 2025, before they started LSF, and then again in June 2026, after they finished the final kit. Results are presented in rank order:

1. I know what effective **phonics instruction** looks like. (Effect size: 0.95—represents a highly pronounced and impactful growth trend)
2. I have a strong understanding of using **decodable passages** for literacy instruction. (Effect size: 0.64—represents meaningful improvement across the group rather than a minor fluctuation)
3. I am able to provide students with opportunities to improve **fluency and reading comprehension**. (Effect size: 0.59—reflects observable and meaningful growth)
4. I frequently **personalize my teaching** for different student abilities and interests. (Effect size: 0.59—reflects observable and meaningful improvement)
5. I am able to provide students who require **extra literacy support** with the instructional support they need. (Effect size: 0.59—reflects a positive trend towards teachers' capacity to provide instructional support)
6. I have a **comprehensive reading program**. (Effect size: 0.44—reflects a solid and positive shift in teacher confidence with their reading program)

7. I integrate a variety of **literacy assessment tools**. (Effect size: 0.26—reflects a subtle upward shift in teachers' use of literacy assessments)
8. I am knowledgeable about **orthographic mapping** and how to help students break words into their parts. (Effect size: -0.60—indicates a moderate trend; scores slightly declined or stabilized)

Key Insights: The data shows that LSF successfully cultivated a positive upward shift in teacher confidence across all evaluated domains, with the most profound growth occurring in foundational phonics and the use of decodable texts for instruction. While teaching practices such as differentiation and literacy assessment tools produced steady, moderate improvement, they also exhibited higher individual score differences. Refer to Appendix 1 for the raw data scores.

Part B: Teacher attitudes about student outcomes

Teachers were asked to rate how much they agree or disagree with the following statements. Results are presented in rank order.

1. Most students are able to **decode the reading passages in other subject areas**. (Effect size: 1.46—represents a large positive effect across the group rather than a minor fluctuation)
2. Most students are able to apply their knowledge of **phonics and word level reading** to a variety of literacy-focused tasks without assistance. (Effect size: 1.39—produced a large and positive growth trend)
3. Most students are **engaged in their reading** and are engaged in **meaningful discussions** about a passage. (Effect size: 1.16—represents a highly pronounced and impactful growth trend)
4. Most students have a strong **vocabulary** and recognize how word parts change word meaning and can help decode more complex words. (Effect size: 0.77—represents a medium and steady growth trend)
5. Most students **read at home** with family members/caregivers. (Effect size: 0.64—represents a medium and positive growth trend)
6. Most students are **fluent readers** who can read accurately, at an appropriate pace, and with expression (Effect size: 0.57—produced a medium-positive effect on reading fluency)

Key Insights: The data shows that LSF successfully cultivated a positive upward shift in teacher attitudes about student outcomes across all evaluated domains, with the most profound growth in students' ability to read in other subject areas. This growth is directly related to students' improved ability to apply phonics skills independently, and to engage in meaningful text-based discussions. The data also revealed that some teacher outcomes did not show improvement at the same rate as others. For example, complex student outcomes such as reading fluency and reading at home showed positive growth, but the improvement was moderate. Refer to Appendix 2 for the raw data scores.

Connecting Part A: Teacher attitudes about their teaching practice to Part B: Teacher attitudes about student outcomes

In evaluating the efficacy of LSF, pairing Part A with Part B creates a complete data narrative. Comparing the two data sets reveals a direct, clear relationship between the training teachers received with the Teacher's Guide and Lesson Cards, and the changes they observed in their student reading groups.

The areas where teachers grew the most in their own practice directly match the areas where they saw the biggest jumps in student performance. For example, teachers reported their largest instructional growth in **Phonics Instruction** (Effect size: 0.95) and **Using Decodable Passages** (Effect size: 0.64). In response, they reported highly pronounced improvements in students' ability to decode in other subject areas (Effect size: 1.46) and applying phonics independently (Effect size=1.39).

Conversely, areas where teacher growth was steady but moderate, such as fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary development, corresponded to modest shifts in student outcomes. This illustrates that some complex literacy skills take longer to change and require sustained instructional support over time.

In conclusion, the data revealed that when teacher practice shifts significantly, student outcomes experience an even larger, compounded boost.

Part C: Does LSF increase student decoding and encoding skills?

Teachers were asked to collect data for each group of students and to share the average overall totals **for decoding** and **encoding** across the three kits. To measure overall growth accurately, we calculated the difference between the average student group pre-test scores with the average student group post-test scores. The summary of findings is below. Missing data scores were excluded from the average calculations to maintain accurate results.

	Decoding Pre-test	Decoding Post-test	Decoding Growth	Encoding Pre-test	Encoding Post -test	Encoding Growth
Kit A	62.99%	77.9%	+14.99%	52.81%	62.56%	+9.75%
Kit B	75.94%	84.31%	+8.37%	56.00%	69.63%	+13.63%
Kit C	73.26%	81.56%	+8.30%	52.50%	60.31%	+7.81%

Growth has been successfully demonstrated across all three kits, with Kit A showing the highest growth in decoding scores and Kit B displaying the highest growth in encoding scores.

Considering the data from Parts A, B, and C (above), the growth in student decoding and encoding was a direct result of the teachers' use of LSF along with their increased mastery of phonics instruction, rather than outside factors such as teacher experience, student maturation, or using another intervention program. Refer to Appendix 3 for the raw data scores.

Part D: Teacher Experiences Using LSF

Teachers were asked to rate the following statements about their experience using LSF in the classroom:

- LSF can increase **student decoding/encoding skills**.
- LSF can improve **student reading fluency**.
- LSF can improve **reading comprehension**.
- LSF can improve **student engagement in reading**.
- LSF can support **teachers to explicitly teach** foundational skills to older students.
- Teachers can **implement** LSF within the larger classroom setting.

The teachers in this study strongly endorsed LSF as a highly effective pedagogical tool for improving foundational literacy skills, boosting student engagement, and supporting the explicit instruction of reading for older students:

- **100% Positive Consensus:** Every response was “Strongly Agree” or “Agree.” There were zero instances of disagreement.
- **Peak Conviction:** LSF supporting teachers to explicitly teach foundational skills to older students received 100% consensus.
- **Strong Foundational Literacy Skills:** Boosting decoding and encoding skills followed closely behind the statement above as the second highest-rated benefit.
- **Balanced Positive Sentiment:** Fluency, comprehension, student engagement, and general classroom implementation all showed identical high approval structures, with a split favouring “Strongly Agree” over “Agree.”

Conclusion: The LSF Journey

The Teacher’s Guide

Each teacher’s journey in implementing LSF commenced with the Teacher’s Guide. The overall feedback indicates that the Teacher’s Guide is a thorough, user-friendly, and highly valuable resource that significantly aids in lesson planning and in teaching reading foundational skills for older students. The teachers strongly praised the structured scope and sequence for providing a clear road map of student progression. Background information covering orthographic mapping, morphology, and the science of reading offered valuable professional learning to teachers who are building their capacity alongside their students. However, a few teachers indicated that the volume of information made the guide feel dense. Some teachers requested explicit examples of differentiation strategies when a specific decodable text was too challenging for the reader.

Initial Successes

The post-survey feedback indicated the diagnostic assessment yielded highly insightful data clearly pinpointing what students needed to learn to become successful readers and writers. Some student groups demonstrated high excitement and openness to learning reading with a new methodology, adapting well to technical vocabulary such as phonemes and graphemes.

Students showed strong engagement with tools such as Elkonin boxes. In these instances, accessible reading passages effectively fostered confidence and immediate student success. Teachers also recognized that by providing appropriate and engaging texts for all students, they were able to meet students at their current reading level with varied lessons and multiple points of entry.

Initial Challenges

In some classrooms, significant implementation hurdles emerged regarding student stamina and the need to provide support to maintain focus during small-group lessons. In some classrooms, daily reading group times were difficult to maintain but the weekly frequency goal was maintained. Many student absences due to illness and inconsistent attendance patterns slowed the pace for some teachers.

Final Feedback: The Efficacy Study

This Efficacy Study demonstrates unanimous positive agreement among our surveyed Canadian educators, validating it as a highly effective tool for improving foundational literacy skills, boosting student engagement, and supporting explicit foundational instruction for older students. Kit A allowed the teachers to work through the challenges of initial student assessment, scheduling conflicts, and student absenteeism. It was evident the teachers were learning the teaching of foundational skills alongside their students. LSF proved to be highly scalable as teacher comfort increased. Once established, LSF's consistent framework and engaging, varied content successfully mitigated early student resistance, driving measurable gains, reading fluency, accuracy, word-pattern recognition, and academic confidence in both small-group and larger classroom settings.

The data demonstrates that when teachers fundamentally change their practice, it drives a powerful, compounded surge in student achievement. By simultaneously elevating teacher capacity and dismantling barriers to student learning, LSF delivers a proven skill-building framework that transforms foundational literacy instruction into guaranteed, measurable student success.

Teacher Voices from the Efficacy Study

"I would highly recommend LSF to other teachers, particularly those working with struggling or reluctant intermediate readers. The program strikes an excellent balance between visuals and text, with engaging, contemporary content that appeals to students without sacrificing substance. The lessons are thoughtfully sequenced and build skills in a logical, manageable way throughout each kit. LSF is also exceptionally teacher friendly. The teacher guides are clear and supportive, the line masters are practical and easy to use, and the assessment tools provide meaningful information to guide instruction. It is a comprehensive resource that has everything a teacher needs to deliver effective, engaging literacy intervention with confidence." (Harman Pandher, BC)

"LSF are age-appropriate resources and are completely accessible for students who struggle with basic literacy foundations. As someone who is usually frustrated by reading intervention

programs, this program was a stark contrast for all the right reasons. The lessons are designed to take only a short period of time, and while they tend to build off one another, students who are absent or miss one class here or there are still able to engage with the program in a meaningful way. I have already mentioned to my admin team that I think this is a resource we need to purchase moving forward!” (Candice Kok, ON)

“I have told many different JH (Junior High) schools about the experience with this. I have had conversations with our LA consultants about how to effectively implement this in other JH classrooms. One of the ideas is to have it as a FLEX session, where the same small group of students attend it on a regular basis, during the same time of the week.” (Katrina Ballek, AB)

“Our school is actively considering this kit based on my testing of it. It is fairly easy to apply and use, especially the worksheets that go with it, and it fits well within a short time block. The graphics, images, and passages are also fairly engaging.” (Coralía Sevilla, AB)

“I would recommend LSF to a first-year teacher or a seasoned vet. The program gives you a baseline to build on and a clear direction from the first lesson to the last. There was a time when educators had to make up all the materials that were learned in class, which makes teaching exhausting. Having a script to follow allows teachers to do whole class teaching and also to target those struggling students. It has made my daily practice infinitely easier. I do enjoy the practical application of the program and the real-world connections students can make. The program also allows for collaboration with same-grade teachers in my school, which is a must with such diverse learning needs in modern classrooms.” (Gary Williams, ON)

“LSF allows me to provide a higher level of guidance for my students within my group who require more support, while the group members who are growing at a faster rate are able to work with a level of independence and confidence.” (Dave Johnson, ON)

“I have been working with one group who needs small-group instruction, and I can see that they are starting to bring these learned skills into the mainstream lessons.” (Megan Venditti, ON)

Appendix 1: Raw Data for Teacher Attitudes about Teaching Literacy

Teachers were asked to rate how much they agree or disagree with the following statements using a five-point rating scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The formula used is Cohen’s *d* for paired samples and measures the effect size to show if the growth is meaningful and not just statistically significant.

Formula:

$$d = \frac{\bar{X}_{\text{Post}} - \bar{X}_{\text{Pre}}}{s_D}$$

- I know what effective phonics instruction looks like.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of the statistics
Teacher 1	2	4	2	Mean difference: 0.86 Standard deviation: 0.90 Cohen’s <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.95 Effect magnitude: Large
Teacher 2	2	4	2	
Teacher 3	4	4	0	
Teacher 4	5	5	0	
Teacher 5	4	4	0	This data demonstrates a highly successful upward shift in teachers’ understanding of phonics instruction.
Teacher 6	4	5	1	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	4	5	1	

- I have a strong understanding of using decodable passages for literacy instruction.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of the statistics
Teacher 1	2	4	2	Mean difference: 0.71 Standard deviation: 1.11 Cohen’s <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.64 Effect magnitude: medium
Teacher 2	2	4	2	
Teacher 3	4	4	0	
Teacher 4	5	5	0	
Teacher 5	5	4	-1	This data demonstrates a positive upward shift in teacher confidence and understanding of decodable passages for literacy instruction.
Teacher 6	4	5	1	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	4	5	1	

- I am knowledgeable about orthographic mapping and how to help students break words into their parts.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of the Statistics
Teacher 1	5	4	-1	Mean difference: -0.29 Standard deviation: 0.47 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: -0.60 Effect magnitude: medium/negative Data indicates a moderate trend where scores slightly declined or stabilized.
Teacher 2	4	4	0	
Teacher 3	4	4	0	
Teacher 4	5	5	0	
Teacher 5	5	4	-1	
Teacher 6	4	4	0	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	5	5	0	

- I am able to provide students with opportunities to improve fluency and reading comprehension.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of the statistics
Teacher 1	4	4	0	Mean difference: 0.29 Standard deviation: 0.49 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.59 Effect magnitude: medium Data indicates an observable and meaningful growth.
Teacher 2	4	4	0	
Teacher 3	4	5	1	
Teacher 4	5	5	0	
Teacher 5	5	5	0	
Teacher 6	4	5	1	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	5	5	0	

- I frequently personalize my teaching for different student abilities and interests.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference	Summary of the statistics
Teacher 1	4	5	1	Mean difference: 0.29 Standard deviation: 0.49 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.59 Effect magnitude: medium Data illustrates a medium-sized meaningful improvement across the group.
Teacher 2	4	4	0	
Teacher 3	4	5	1	
Teacher 4	5	5	0	
Teacher 5	5	5	0	
Teacher 6	4	4	0	
Teacher 7	5	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	5	5	0	

- I am able to provide students who require extra literacy support with the instructional support they need.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference	Summary of the statistics
Teacher 1	3	3	0	Mean difference: 0.29 Standard deviation: 0.49 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.59 Effect magnitude: medium
Teacher 2	4	4	0	
Teacher 3	4	5	1	
Teacher 4	4	5	1	
Teacher 5	5	5	0	
Teacher 6	4	4	0	Data demonstrates a positive trend towards teachers' capacity to provide instructional support.
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	5	5	0	

- I integrate a variety of literacy assessment tools.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference	Summary of the Statistics
Teacher 1	4	3	-1	Mean difference: 0.29 Standard deviation: 1.11 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.26 Effect magnitude: small
Teacher 2	4	4	0	
Teacher 3	3	5	2	
Teacher 4	4	5	1	
Teacher 5	5	5	0	
Teacher 6	5	4	-1	Data demonstrates a subtle upward shift in teachers' use of literacy assessments with mixed variation across the group.
Teacher 7	5	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	4	5	1	

- I have a comprehensive reading program.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Difference	Summary of the Statistics
Teacher 1	3	4	1	Mean difference: 0.43 Standard deviation: 0.98 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.44 Effect magnitude: small and approaching medium
Teacher 2	4	3	-1	
Teacher 3	4	4	0	
Teacher 4	3	5	2	
Teacher 5	5	5	0	
Teacher 6	4	4	0	Data showing a solid and positive shift in their confidence with their reading program.
Teacher 7	3	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	4	5	1	

Appendix 2: Raw Data for Teacher Attitudes About Student Literacy

Teachers were asked to rate how much they agree or disagree with the following statements using a five-point rating scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” The formula used is Cohen’s *d* for paired samples and measures the effect size to show if the growth is meaningful and not just statistically significant.

Formula:

$$d = \frac{\bar{X}_{\text{Post}} - \bar{X}_{\text{Pre}}}{s_D}$$

- Most students are able to apply their knowledge of phonics and word level reading to a variety of literacy focused tasks without assistance.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of Statistics
Teacher 1	3	3	0	Mean difference: 1.57 Standard deviation: 1.13 Cohen’s <i>d</i> Effect size: 1.39 Effect magnitude: Large LSF produced a large positive effect.
Teacher 2	2	4	+2	
Teacher 3	2	4	+2	
Teacher 4	2	4	+2	
Teacher 5	4	4	0	
Teacher 6	1	4	+3	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	2	4	+2	

- Most students are able to decode the reading passages in other subject areas.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of Statistics
Teacher 1	4	4	0	Mean difference: 1.43 Standard deviation: .98 Cohen’s <i>d</i> Effect size: 1.46 Effect magnitude: Large LSF produced a large positive effect.
Teacher 2	2	4	+2	
Teacher 3	2	4	+2	
Teacher 4	2	4	+2	
Teacher 5	4	4	0	
Teacher 6	1	3	+2	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	2	4	+2	

- Most students are fluent readers that can read accurately, at an appropriate pace, and with expression.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of Statistics
Teacher 1	2	3	+1	Mean difference: 0.71 Standard deviation: 1.25 Cohen’s <i>d</i> Effect size: .57 Effect magnitude: Medium LSF produced a medium positive effect.
Teacher 2	2	2	0	
Teacher 3	2	3	+1	
Teacher 4	2	5	+3	
Teacher 5	4	3	-1	
Teacher 6	1	2	+1	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	2	2	0	

- Most students have a strong vocabulary, and recognize how word parts change word meaning and can help decode more complex words.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of Statistics
Teacher 1	3	3	0	Mean difference: 1.00 Standard deviation: 1.29 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.77 Effect magnitude: Medium to large
Teacher 2	2	4	+2	
Teacher 3	2	3	+1	
Teacher 4	2	5	+3	
Teacher 5	4	3	-1	
Teacher 6	1	2	+1	
Teacher 7	4	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	2	3	+1	

- Most students are engaged in their reading and are engaged in meaningful discussions about a passage.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of Statistics
Teacher 1	4	4	0	Mean difference: 1.29 Standard deviation: 1.11 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 1.16 Effect magnitude: Large LSF produced a large positive effect with improved teacher's student engagement rating.
Teacher 2	2	4	+2	
Teacher 3	2	3	+1	
Teacher 4	4	5	+1	
Teacher 5	4	4	0	
Teacher 6	2	4	+2	
Teacher 7	5	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	2	5	+3	

- Most students read at home with family members/caregivers.

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change Score	Summary of Statistics
Teacher 1	2	2	0	Mean difference: 0.71 Standard deviation: 1.11 Cohen's <i>d</i> Effect size: 0.64 Effect magnitude: Medium
Teacher 2	2	2	0	
Teacher 3	2	1	-1	
Teacher 4	2	4	+2	
Teacher 5	2	3	+1	
Teacher 6	1	2	+1	
Teacher 7	2	No data available	No data available	
Teacher 8	2	4	+2	

Appendix 3: Raw Data for Decoding and Encoding Scores

Kit A	Pre-test percentage for decoding	Post-test percentage for decoding	Pre-test percentage for encoding	Post-test percentage for encoding
Teacher 1	74.78	71.00	90.20	79.5
Teacher 2	85.00	90.00	65.00	80.00
Teacher 3	54.50	71.00	36.25	30.00
Teacher 4	No data available	87.50	No data available	60.00
Teacher 5	71.25	93.50	30.00	No data available
Teacher 6 (Group 1)	69.00	68.00	73.00	67.50
(Group 2)	69.00	85.00	73.00	67.50
Teacher 7	44.00	90.75	30.00	81.00
Teacher 8	36.40	45.00	25.00	35.00

Kit B	Pre-test percentage for decoding	Post-test percentage for decoding	Pre-test percentage for encoding	Post-test percentage for encoding
Teacher 1	81.25	83.75	55.0	90.0
Teacher 2	70.0	92.5	65.0	85.0
Teacher 3	88.75	91.25	70.0	80.0
Teacher 4	65.0	75.5	40.0	69.0
Teacher 5	92.5	95.0	70.0	75.0
Teacher 6 (Group 1)	93.75	95.0	70.0	78.0
(Group 2)	70.0	82.5	40.0	68.0
Teacher 7	46.25	83.25	38.0	51.65
Teacher 8	No data available	60.0	No data available	30.00

Kit C	Pre-test percentage for decoding	Post-test percentage for decoding	Pre-test percentage for encoding	Post-test percentage for encoding
Teacher 1	76.25	85	80.00	50.0
Teacher 2	80.00	88.75	65.00	80.0
Teacher 3	81.24	88.75	55.00	60.0
Teacher 4	70.00	76.25	57.00	60.0
Teacher 5	85.00	91.25	50.00	85.0
Teacher 6 (Group 1)	92.5	87.5	70.00	65.0
(Group 2)	76.25	77.5	45.00	65.0
Teacher 7	38.12	No data available	33.00	No data available
Teacher 8	60.00	57.5	17.5	17.5