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PROJECT OVERVIEW AND RATIONALE FOR THE WORKSHOP

“Following the data capacity assessment carried out by RTI International (RTI) under the auspices of the Education Data for Decision Making (EdData II) Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA), USAID/Philippines is pursuing additional assistance to help build the capacity of the Philippine Department of Education (DepEd) in several key technical areas. Highest priority is accorded to helping DepEd make better use of existing data; generate and extract maximum value from new data; and build capacity for ongoing data generation, management, and analysis. In consultation with education sector stakeholders, DepEd and USAID/Philippines identified four specific opportunities to make greater use of existing data while enriching the information available to DepEd for policy and strategy development and sector planning: (1) analyzing the existing databases of assessment results from the National Achievement Test (NAT) and the National Career Assessment Examination (NCAE); (2) piloting and analyzing the results of an Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA); (3) developing reporting formats for national assessment results; and (4) supporting the development of new national assessments aligned with the curricular reforms being implemented under the kindergarten to 12 grade (K to 12) initiative.”

Under Component 2, the EGRA was adapted, piloted, and administered to selected Filipino public elementary school children. Data were analyzed and the results were the focus of the workshop conducted on the 25th of July 2013 held at the LB Soriano Hall, SEAMEO INNOTECH, Quezon City, Philippines. Brief summary of minutes of this workshop follows.

PARTICIPANTS

The “Workshop on EGRA Results was attended by fifty-two (52) participants from the Department of Education, USAID, RTI International and its partner organizations, various higher education institutions, and international/local non-government organizations. Annex 1 lists the names of the participants.

WORKSHOP SESSIONS

The objectives of the workshop were to: (1) share the results of the EGRA research conducted in February 2013; (2) gather feedback, interpretations, and reflections on the EGRA methodology and results; (3) determine the implication of the EGRA results on crafting benchmarks for early literacy; and (4) provide programmatic recommendations for early grade literacy and its assessment. (See Annex 2 for the workshop agenda distributed to the participants).

The workshop started with welcome messages from Dr. Ramon C. Bacani, Centre Director of SEAMEO INNOTECH and Ms. Marie Antoinette Reyes-Hayles, Project Management Specialist at the Office of Education, USAID/Philippines. This was followed by the keynote address of Dr. Dina S. Ocampo, Undersecretary for Programs and Projects at the Department of Education. In the latter half of the morning session, Ms. Sarah Pouzezvara, Mr. Joseph DeStefano, and Dr. Nancy Clark-Chiarelli of RTI International, Ms. Yazmin Tolentino of TNS Philippines, and Ms. Dinah Bonao of DepEd Region I shared the EGRA methodology, results, and experience from the field.

In the afternoon, the participants were grouped according to the three language groups which EGRA focused on namely, Filipino, English, and Ilokano. Each group discussed the EGRA results and later on presented their outputs.

The workshop was closed by Dr. Marilyn Dimaano, Director of the Bureau of Elementary Education.

Below is the summary/excerpts of the different presentations of the workshop.

Prayer and Introduction

Ms. Jocelyn Tuguinayo
Senior Education Program Specialist, Staff Development Division (SDD)
Department Of Education

Ms. Jocelyn S. Tuguinayo, Senior Education Program Specialist at the Bureau of Elementary Education was the Master of Ceremonies. She prayed for a fruitful workshop through active listening/participation of the attendees. She hoped that the outputs of the workshop would be put into action to serve better the school children, teachers, school administrators, supervisors, policy makers and other partners in education.

She mentioned that school year 2013-2014 is a significant milestone for DepEd because this marks the first year of implementation of the K to 12 basic education curriculum. She said that the K to 12 reforms have implications to student learning assessment and DepEd and a number of its partner organization are taking various initiatives to align assessment with the K to 12 curriculum. One such initiative, she said, was the EGRA funded by USAID and spearheaded by RTI International whose results would be shared in the workshop.
Dr. Ramon C. Bacani, Centre Director, SEAMEO INNOTECH, formally welcomed the participants to the workshop.

He shared that having worked at the Department of Education, he recognized the importance of having reliable data for education policy making. He said that assessment is an important area in education, however, this is one of the weakest areas within the Department. He mentioned that there had been efforts over the years to upgrade the capacity of DepEd on assessment and that the Department is also in the process of formulating the National Assessment Framework to align it with the K to 12 curriculum. He recognized and hoped that the PhilEd Data Project and the workshop could contribute to the formulation of this national assessment framework as well as enrich information for education policy making within Department of Education.

Ms. Marie Antoinette Reyes-Hayles
Project Management Specialist, Office of Education, USAID/Philippines

Ma. Marie Antoinette Reyes-Hayles, Project Management Specialist at the USAID/Philippines Office of Education, also gave a welcome message. Below is an excerpt of her message.

“… We are honored to be with you today as we share and discuss the results of the early grade reading assessment 2013 research. In 2011, the United States Agency for International Development launched a new global education strategy aimed at improving learning outcomes and institutional sustainability in our partner countries.

One of the pillars of the USAID’s education strategy is to improve the reading skills of 100,000,000 children in the primary grades by 2015. USAID believes the most strategic impact it can make on basic education is to address early grade reading as an outcome that is critical to sustain and ensure learning for children.

Today, we are presenting to you the results of the national sample based assessment of student acquisition of basic reading skills in the early grades. This research is a component of the PhilEd Data Project, ‘Strengthening Information for Education Policy, Planning and Management in the Philippines’, as implemented by our partner, RTI International.

The results on the state of reading abilities of early graders in the Philippines provide valuable information to allow a better understanding of the needs of Filipino children. Since our driving concern is on learning outcomes, assessment is essential. Assessment provides and guides both on-going and long-term decision making. But as Usec. Dina Ocampo has
reminded us in another workshop, we have to earn that right to assess. At the end of the day, children who would be lifelong readers should be our main goal. …”

---

**Keynote Address**

**“Language, Reading and Assessment within the Current Philippine Education Context: State of MTB MLE Implementation and DepEd Efforts to Improve Reading”**

**Dr. Dina S. Ocampo**  
*Undersecretary for Programs and Projects*  
*Department Of Education*

Dr. Dina S. Ocampo, Undersecretary for Programs and Projects, welcomed the participants on behalf of Bro. Armin Luistro. Usec Dina said that we need to make sure that what we’re doing is important and it is relevant to the educational system and must benefit the child. She said that in listening to the EGRA results, we need to think what they mean for education for young children and not to evaluate education policy yet but instead look at how things are moving along.

She shared the different DepEd efforts towards improving reading of the Filipino children. She started with the MTB MLE implementation. She mentioned the following points:

- Implementation of MTB MLE in grade 1 started last year. However, English is being used in kindergarten. She said that the shift from English kindergarten to MTB MLE grade 1 does not make sense. She shared that there are now efforts to connect or bridge these two together.

- In 2011-2012, MTB MLE was implemented in pioneer schools. 136 trainers helped DepEd train about 2,000 people from eight regions. Teacher’s guide, learning materials, reading materials, and big books were developed and these materials are the ones being downloaded or sent to schools for the nationwide implementation of MTB MLE. The pioneer schools are one-year ahead of everybody else.

- The pioneer schools started with 12 languages – Pangasinense, Iloko, Kapampangan, Tagalog, Bicol, Sinugbuanon, Bisaya, Waray, Hiligaynon, Maranao, BahasaSug, Maguindanaon, and Chavacano and in 2013, they have added seven more languages namely Ivatan, Ibanag, Sambal, Kinaray-a, Aklanon, Surigaonon, and Yakan.

- DepEd also developed a source book for teachers on what orthography is. The book contains examples of words and their sounds, keywords, spelling rules, grammar rules, among others.

Usec. Dina also shared the observations from the field on the MTB MLE implementation as follows:

- Classes are noisier because children are speaking out, participating, engaged. However, when classes are noisier, teachers should have better classroom management skills so that they could better interact and direct children. There is a need to look at the pedagogy and make sure that what children say actually make
sense towards the lesson they need to learn. The first step is happy children. The next step is smart ones.

- Teachers are having a hard time teaching in the mother tongue because they are not used to doing it. They are not used to speaking in these languages. The teachers are probably code switching or mixing languages.
- There are issues on contextualization or localization. This has impact on the assessment process. If localization prospers, assessment can’t be nationalized. There should be a creative and an appropriate response to assessment.
- There is a tendency for some DepEd supervisors to implement DepEd memos, orders or guidelines to the letter without considering actual reality. There have been reports that children who do not speak Cebuano are being made to learn Cebuano in first grade. Usec. Dina said that there’s a problem with this because the main point of it is for children to engage and to read immediately. At the end of grade one, they should be reading in their language. If children are forced to learn or use languages that they don’t really speak, this violates the very first premise of the MTB MLE program. She reminded that there is a need to implement more appropriately and judiciously. When we are able to match language, child and teacher, then there is a greater chance for the children to learn better.

Usec. Dina also shared DepEd reading iniatives. She said that the flagship reading program of DepEd is the Every Child a Reader Program (ECARP), which was launched in 2004. The overall goal of the program was to enable children to communicate well and access a variety of information in written or oral forms through effective reading instruction. The ECARP is being supported by other initiatives namely the Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI), the Reading Recovery Program from New Zealand, Reading Models based on a research conducted by UP, Search for Outstanding Reading Teacher, and Read-A-Thon. She shared that there are also reading intervention programs developed from the field. Some of these initiatives are on remediation, developing reading interest, and improvement of reading instruction.

She mentioned that for the current school year, DepEd is trying to come up with standardized reading and numeracy tools through the EGRA and the EGMA in partnership with USAID, World Bank and RTI. There are also other interventions by different organizations like the Whole School Reading Program. With all these interventions, there is a need to make them coherent and congruent with each other.

Usec. Dina said at the moment, she sees EGRA and EGMA (Early Grade Mathematics Assessment) as monitoring tools for the MTB MLE program. She said that Phil-IRI is an initiative of DepEd and a lot of ownership goes along with it and so all other efforts should be towards improving it and making it better. She is not yet sure what DepEd wants, but EGRA could be used to monitor children’s learning, whether they are actually learning better in their mother tongue like Ilokano. She finds the importance of establishing these baseline data.

She ended by saying that we need to think about what information EGRA is going to give and think whether there is a need to continue using it. (See Annex 3 for Usec Dina Ocampo’s powerpoint presentation.)
Ms. Sarah Pouezevera, Education Advisor, RTI International, discussed the methodology used in the EGRA research. She said that EGRA attempted to measure the following reading fundamental skills of children:

1. Phonemic awareness – the ability to focus on, manipulate, and break apart sounds (or phonemes) in words;
2. Phonics (or alphabetic principle) – the ability to understand and apply the knowledge of how letters are linked to sounds (phonemes) to form letter-sound (grapheme-phoneme) correspondences and spelling patterns;
3. Fluency – the ability to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression;
4. Vocabulary – is the oral and print knowledge of word meaning which is a critical component of comprehension and reading; and
5. Comprehension – the ability to actively engage with and derive meaning from the texts they read.

Ms. Pouezevera mentioned that EGRA was first developed in 2009 and it has been used in about 70 countries. She shared that EGRA could provide a reliable and efficient diagnosis of how well children are doing on certain skills. It could also provide instructional improvements. EGRA is meant to be given in the early years so that deficiencies could be identified and addressed early on. She added that EGRA covers skills such as receptive oral language, phonological awareness, alphabet knowledge, word recognition, fluency, spelling through dictation task, and reading comprehension. She then explained the technical details of how EGRA was used in the Philippines.

Ms. Yazmin Tolentino, Associate Manager, TNS Philippines, explained the sampling technique used in the EGRA research and how data were collected.

She said that for the face-to-face tablet-assisted EGRA administration, the targeted random sample sizes were 2,400 third grade students and 500 first grade students for the English/Filipino and Ilokano components, respectively.

She explained that for the 3rd grade sample size, they divided the Philippines into six (6) super regions namely North Luzon, South Luzon, Metro Manila, Visayas, Mindanao, and ARMM. Per super region, the targeted sample size was 400 thus making the total targeted sample size for the English/Filipino component to be 2,400, that is, 400 x 6 = 2,400. The grade 3 children came from 240 randomly selected schools. From each school, ten (10) grade 3 students were randomly selected.
Ms. Tolentino also shared RTI International trained the EGRA supervisors and assessors from TNS and DepEd. The training session for the English/Filipino EGRA assessors was conducted in Quezon City while the training for the Ilokano EGRA assessors was held in San Fernando, La Union. She added that TNS supervised and coordinated the logistics of the fieldwork. During the administration, assessors from TNS were paired with assessors from DepEd with EGRA supervisors from TNS overseeing the selection of students and administration of the EGRA tool. The supervisors made sure that the students were selected properly, the assessors administered the tests correctly, and data were uploaded to the server daily. The real time data upload was a great help because it allowed RTI to monitor progress of fieldwork, identify cases that needed to be dropped and replaced due to errors in administering the assessment, and identify assessors who needed to be reminded of the rules for administering the assessment.

The final sample sizes were 2,463 grade 3 students (for English/Filipino EGRA) and 494 grade 1 students (for Ilokano EGRA).

(See Annex 4 for the joint powerpoint presentation of Ms. Pouzevara and Ms. Tolentiono.)

**Ms. Dinah Bonao**  
*Education Program Supervisor II, Department of Education – Region I*

Ms. Dina Bonao, Education Program Supervisor at DepEd - Region I, shared her experience as an EGRA assessor. She said that the EGRA administration in her region was generally successful. The school administrators were accommodating and the students, not only the ten (10), were very excited to participate in the gathering of data.

She added that the technical knowhow of assessors on using the tablet was important. She admitted that it was her first time to administer a test using a gadget. There were instances that the tablet did not respond immediately when she pressed the stop button. She hoped that the results of the assessment would lead to development of appropriate interventions that could improve the literacy acquisition of early graders.
Mr. Joe De Stefano, Senior Technical Advisor, RTI International, presented the results of the EGRA research. Some of the findings he shared were:

1. Third grader students performed well in both the Filipino and English tests, however in English, reading was inaccurate and comprehension was very limited.
2. Girls received higher scores than boys.
3. Students demonstrated the ability to read text at a reasonable rate of correct words per minute and on average, students in Metro Manila perform the best in both languages, those in ARMM have the lowest performance.
4. For Ilokano, grade 1 students from "pioneer" schools performed slightly better than those from non-pioneer schools on non-word reading and on oral reading.
5. Children who had higher performance (30 words per minute or more) tended to report being less frequently absent.
6. 38% of children were absent 2 or 3 days during the week prior to data collection.

(See Annex 5 for the powerpoint presentation of Mr. Joe DeStefano.)

Setting the Stage for Consideration of National Standards and Benchmarks

Dr. Nancy Clark-Chiarelli, Reading Standards and Assessment Expert from the Education Development Center, Inc. (EDC), talked about setting the stage for consideration of national standards and benchmarks. She mentioned the underlying assumptions about standards but she emphasized one major assumption and that is, the curriculum and standards are mutually supportive – you can’t have standards without a curriculum. If curriculum and standards are aligned, we could define what students and teachers are expected to do. What should teachers do to help students learn based on the curriculum? She said that national standards become the basis for what teachers teach, the way teachers are trained, and how students are assessed.

(See Annex 6 for the powerpoint presentation of Dr. Nancy Clark-Chiarelli.)
There were three language groups formed for the small group discussions namely the English group, the Filipino group, and the Ilokano group. The participants selected which group they wanted to join. The groups were given about one hour and a half to review the EGRA results and to discuss the implications of these results to Philippine education. There was an appointed facilitator for each group. Mr. Joe DeStefano and Ms. Sarah Pouezevara assisted.

The groups were specifically instructed to do the following:

### 1. Review and discussion of EGRA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Scan the additional data provided for the EGRA results and discuss what they show.</td>
<td>➢ List your 5 to 7 key findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Discuss and identify what you think are the most pertinent/key findings (such as areas of strength or weakness, differences between sub-groups, etc.).</td>
<td>➢ For each finding, indicate the groups suggested explanations for that finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ For each key finding your group identifies, provide your best hypotheses as to what explains or for how to interpret that finding.</td>
<td>➢ List any additional analyses your group suggests would better provide insight into student performance in the areas assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Identify any additional analyses you think would help further explain the key findings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Implications of the EGRA Results (Discussion Questions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ The 2013 EGRA assessed 7 of the 14 domains of early literacy in the MTB-MLE curriculum. What do you think are the implications of the assessment results for setting expectations and benchmarks for those competency domains?</td>
<td>➢ 7 domains assessed: Alphabet knowledge; Alphabetic principle; Word recognition; Fluency; Reading comprehension; Oral language; Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ What do the assessment results suggest to you about what may be happening instructionally in early grades relative to the assessed domains? What therefore are the implications for teacher training?</td>
<td>➢ Write down what your group determines is suggested by the findings for curricular expectations and benchmarks in each domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ How do you see EGRA being applied within DepEd’s assessment framework? For example, can it best be used to monitor system progress, to track individual student progress, to inform curriculum and instruction, other?</td>
<td>➢ Identify 5 to 10 areas of instruction that your group decides need to be addressed and prioritize among them. Prioritize based on what the group agrees is most important, should come first, or potentially could have the most impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ What do you think could be a useful application of another EGRA in the current school year?</td>
<td>➢ Identify ways that EGRA can be used in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outputs of the English Group

The English group was facilitated by Dr. Paraluman Giron and the members were: (1) Merry Ruth Gutierrez, (2) Ricky Aguirre, (3) Leah Bautista, (4) Efren Dela Cruz, (5) Norma Salcedo, (6) Lea Estuye, (7) Dinah Bonao, (8) Elmer Castro, (9) Erma Bagalacsa, and (10) Joy Tuguinayo.

The group’s outputs were as follows:

Part I – Review and Discussion of EGRA Results
A. Analysis on the Correlation of the Subtests
1. Rank the subtests according to the results
2. Establish correlation and relationship among the subtests building on higher reading skills
3. Establish relationship between oral reading fluency (cwpm) and prosody.
4. Identify the implications EGRA data to classroom situations.
5. Identify the use of EGRA in DepEd.

B. Ranking of Subtests according to Overall Mean
1. Oral reading fluency 67
2. Initial-sound segmentation 55
3. Dictation 55
4. Familiar word reading 51
5. Listening comprehension 33
6. Reading comprehension 32
7. Non-word reading 26
8. Letter-sound identification 22

C. Weaknesses (50% and below)
5. Listening comprehension 33
6. Reading comprehension 32
7. Non-word reading 26
8. Letter-sound identification 22

D. Strengths (51% and above)
1. Oral reading fluency 67
2. Initial-sound segmentation 55
3. Dictation 55
4. Familiar word reading 51

E. Findings
1. There seems to be over emphasis on ISS than NWR.
2. **There is a need for specific data to analyze the correlation between ISS to NWR.**
3. Lack of mastery of the reading building blocks.
4. Oral reading fluency does not support reading comprehension.
5. Apparently there is no strong relationship between ORF and RC.
6. There is a need for specific data to establish the correlation between NWR and D.

Part II – Implication of the EGRA Results

A. Implications

1. Instruction may be lacking in word-attack skills and there is a need for thorough instruction on phonological awareness (sound, syllable, word, sentence)
2. RTI provide additional data to appropriately analyze the correlation (positive or negative) between ISS to NWR.
3. Improve instruction on reading building blocks (oral language ➔ phonological awareness ➔ phonemic awareness ➔ vocabulary ➔ comprehension)
4. ORF is necessary but not sufficient in developing RC.
5. Consider other factors that contribute to RC such as vocabulary, prior knowledge and others.
6. RTI provide additional data to appropriately establish the correlation (positive or negative) between NWR and D.

B. Use of EGRA at DepEd

1. 10 literacy domains of k-12 curriculum addressed.
2. Use for early specific intervention program.
3. Use as diagnostic tracking tool for early literacy.
4. Input for teacher capability building both for in-service and pre-service.
5. Need for assessment tool for identifying early grade teachers’ pedagogical and content knowledge in early literacy instruction.
Outputs of the Filipino Group

The Filipino group was facilitated by Dr. Felicitas Pado and the members were: (1) Angelika Jabines, (2) Marilyn Balagtas, (3) Saada Tubing, (4) Nemah Hermosa, (5) Heidi Macahilig, (6) Rachael Fermin, (7) Hazel Preclaro, and (8) Maribelle Reyno.

The group’s outputs were as follows:

Part I – Review and Discussion of EGRA Results
1. Letter-sound identification
   - instruction, assessment procedure, tool format, borrowed letters/sounds are more difficult/less exposed
2. Listening Comprehension
   - Less items compared with reading comprehension, not taught and assessed in classroom
3. Reading Rate
   - Longer words (polysyllabic) and sentences
4. Performance of over-aged students
   - Needs a deep look into these kids: late starter? Repeater? Intervention for these kids?
5. Data presented on family literacy must be more extensive
6. SES indicators
   - Not all are valid indicators
7. Contextualization
   - Variance among and within languages must be considered
   - Agreement on forms/orthography
   - Assessors should be speakers of the language

Part II – Implication of the EGRA Results
A. Implications/Questions
1. Kindergarten curriculum does not complement MTB-MLE instruction in Grade 1
2. Are all the skills mastered in grade one?
3. When do we shift to the second language?
B. Suggestions
1. Pre-service and in-service training based on the need
2. Capacity-building for teacher in using assessment data (Assessment should aid/inform instruction)
3. Word recognition in Filipino in Grade 1 second semester
4. Look at the curriculum in terms of language
5. EGRA must be used as a formative assessment

Outputs of the Ilokano Group

The Filipino group was facilitated by Ms. Marie Christine N. Reyes. The members were: (1) Firth MacKenzie McEachern, (2) Philip Purnell, (3) Galileo Go, (4) Paul Adolfo, (5) Marcial Salvatierra, (6) Renato Umipig, (7) Nikki Tenazas, (8) Marilyn Dimaano, (9) Maya Nayo, and (10) Rose Villaneza.

The group’s outputs were as follows:

Part I – Review and Discussion of EGRA Results
A. Findings
1. Kids who report greater absences scored lower on oral reading and comprehension
2. Significant difference in cwpm for kids whose teachers read out aloud
3. Multigrade classrooms are struggling (half as good in oral reading and also poor results in other sub-tests!)
4. Hi numbers of zero responses.

B. Suggested Explanations
1. Performance may have been dragged down by those pupils in the study which did not share Ilokano as a mother tongue (children who identified Pangasinan as their MT did not perform as well)
2. Results may have also been complicated by the fact that the Grade 1 students went through Kindergarten and day care without MT. Question of what language their previous teachers used was not asked.
3. Teachers may not be teaching letter sound explicitly. Mismatch between EGRA subtest and classroom instruction. But the poor scores in this subtest don’t necessarily mean poor reading (the correlation between the letter sound and reading familiar/non-familiar words)
4. Some teachers are not using Ilokano as much as others, even if the policy is in place. This would result to different amount of exposure and oral language development.
5. With regards to the above points, the 5 day mass training for Grade 1 teachers may have not been enough. Can all the foundational skills be covered in such a short time? How to strengthen in-service training?

6. Absences = lost opportunity for learning and mastering the domains.

7. It is difficult to do differentiated instruction in multigrade, and Grade 1 students are getting less targeted instruction of reading than kids in pure Grade 1 classrooms.

8. Some MT Learning Materials did not even show up at the start of the year. And there is a question of whether or not the style of language is too advanced.

9. Certain mechanisms have not been put in place like
   a. including MTBMLE in Teacher Ed,
   b. Ensuring teachers speak the local language

C. Additional Analysis
   1. Is the EGRA environment conducive to getting results that reflect the true literacy skills / reading abilities of children at such a young age? Issue of child nervousness, aversion of strangers, etc. Would Grade 2 be a better time to conduct it?

   2. To what extent is EGRA reading/listening comprehension questions testing ability instead of memory?

Part II – Implication of the EGRA Results

A. Expectations and Benchmarks
   1. Current benchmark might be unrealistic. Why would 60 cwpm be the expectation of Grade 1 Ilokano kids, the same as English Grade 3 kids?

   2. Probably not. Why?

   3. The test is Grade 1. What is the rationalization of expecting the same oral reading fluency in the MT in Grade 1 as a student reading English in Grade 3? The trajectory of reading ability varies in different languages.

   4. Ilokano is agglutinative, and has longer words than not only English but Tagalog/Filipino too. Ex. “Paggadagagusanyon” vs. “Saan na kayo nakatira”

   5. Standards should be lowered/changed/rationalized based on field tests (pilot schools could perhaps be used to establish standards thru assessment at various grades – whatever grades future assessments are to be taken)

B. Areas of Instruction to be Improved
   1. Should be determined in a proper Teacher Needs Assessment.
      a. Language use of teachers should be tracked.
b. How teachers are teaching reading should also be tracked. e.g. Teaching of letter sounds.
c. Also gaps can be identified by assessment e.g. EGRA

C. How EGRA could be used?
1. If EGRA is used in future, it would be prudent to get a large enough sample size to be able to make significant comparisons between sub-regions (provinces). There is some indication that Pangasinan schools, which has a more linguistically complex situation than Ilocos provinces, performed worse, but we cannot make absolute conclusions because sample size was not large enough.

2. With larger sample size, we could have school or district level disaggregation. We could see what schools are fairing well and which are not, and couple that with the classroom practices.

3. While the tool was vetted to use language as universal as possible among the variants of Ilokano in Region 1, it should be noted that this universality should be checked if the tool is applied to other Ilokano areas (e.g. In Cagayan, etc)

4. Before conducting EGRA, language mapping is important to make the right choices at the local level of what medium of instruction to use, and that will guide what language (or variety of language) the EGRA should be formulated in, and where to use it.

5. Edits to EGRA:
   a. Future EGRAs should probably ask whether the children are read stories at home or even told stories. Parents may be illiterate but the telling of stories also helps.
   b. Should EGRA in future include testing of syllables since the languages are syllabic?

6. If EGRA is to be used as baseline for MTBMLE and assess the effectiveness of the program, perhaps it should be done twice, for example once in Grade 1 and Grade 3.

7. In addition to tracking MTBMLE, EGRA results can be used to formulate a Teachers’ Needs Assessment. Where are the gaps in the students and how can the teachers fill those gaps?
D. Conclusions
1. Results are not surprising given the conditions
2. Poor results are more interesting than perfect results, and give more room for improvement.

Closing Message

Way Forward: The Future of EGRA in the Philippine Education Context”

Dr. Marilyn Dimaano
Director IV, Bureau of Elementary Education, Department of Education

Dr. Marilyn Dimaano, Director of the Bureau of Elementary Education, DepEd, gave the closing message on behalf of Usec. Dina Ocampo. Excerpts of her message follows.

“The DepEd is very fortunate for the presentation of RTI International regarding the results of EGRA. EGRA as a tool will be conceptualized in the 12 mother tongues. … We will be looking at the K to 3 curriculum, then 4 to 6, then 7 to 10, and then 11 to 12.

From the presentations of the three groups, we could say that the Early Grade Reading Assessment is a diagnostic and assessment tool to determine the early reading skills … We want to measure the level where the children are at certain stages. … EGRA could be a classroom-based assessment tool, perhaps teachers could provide interventions to students at risk. In using EGRA as a diagnostic and assessment tool … we have to reconcile EGRA with the MTB MLE, Filipino, and English curricula. … We want to see every child to be a reader and a writer. …

In EGRA English, it was said that EGRA captures the ten literacy domains of the K-12 curriculum. EGRA results could also be used to develop specific early intervention programs. It could also be a diagnostic tool in tracking early literacy of children.

In EGRA Filipino, we have to look at the curriculum in terms of language. This brings us to the bridging or transition from one language to the next. We already realized mother tongue itself is already heavy and one implication is that there is a need for massive teacher training. We have to see that teachers are able to understand and appreciate the curricula of mother tongue, Filipino, and English and how these are connected to one another thereby making the child a reader and a writer. …

In closing, children learn how to read, write, and count best in the language they already know well. …
## WORKSHOP EVALUATION RESULTS

On a scale from 1 to 5 (1 = needs improvement, 2 = fair, 3 = satisfactory, 4 = very satisfactory, and 5 = excellent), the participants (n=32) evaluated the workshop and it received excellent ratings in all the areas of evaluation as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Evaluation</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I - Workshop Organization and Delivery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attainment of workshop objectives</td>
<td>4.59 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Schedule and flow of the workshop</td>
<td>4.44 (Very Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adequacy of time allotment</td>
<td>4.22 (Very Satisfactory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relevance of workshop to my work</td>
<td>4.72 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of workshop materials and handouts</td>
<td>4.66 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-mean</td>
<td>4.53 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part II - Administrative Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Equipment</td>
<td>4.78 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Venue (LB Soriano Hall)</td>
<td>4.88 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Food</td>
<td>4.60 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean</td>
<td>4.75 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part III - Workshop Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Professionalism in attitude</td>
<td>4.84 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Attentiveness/Helfulness</td>
<td>4.84 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Mean</td>
<td>4.84 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part IV – Overall Rating of the Workshop</strong></td>
<td>4.72 (Excellent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments of the participants on strengths and areas for improvement were:

1. Please describe the strengths of the workshop.
   - The workshop provided us the whole picture of the readers of Grade 3 pupils that would help us a lot.
   - The workshop provided information on assessment and it generated suggestions for future use.
   - The expertise of the resource speakers and facilitators was the strength of the workshop.
   - The free flowing discussion and inputs of RTI experts was the strength of the workshop.
   - All participants were guided well on what outputs they were expected to arrive at.
   - The venue was conducive, the food was good, and the lectures were informative.
   - The strength of the workshop was the participation of various stakeholders.
   - The activities were well-planned. The flow of the activities was smooth.
   - The food, speakers, and the support staff were great.
   - There was varied representation of participants.
   - The workshop was well-planned. Excellent!
   - It was informative, concise, and timely.
   - There was active participation of all.
   - Very organized. Keep it up.
   - The food was great.
   - Well done!
   - Kudos!
   - Good!
2. What areas could be further improved?

- More time.
- Longer time.
- Time allotment. One day is not enough.
- Time specially during the small group discussions were not enough.
- More time should be allotted in making outputs.
- Give more time and data for deeper analysis.
- Appropriate longer time for each session.
- Graph in handouts should be colored.
- Come up with concrete agreements.
- More handouts should be provided.
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DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Management Level
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# ANNEX 2 – WORKSHOP AGENDA

**WORKSHOP ON EARLY GRADE READING ASSESSMENT (EGRA) RESULTS**

PhilEd Data Project: Strengthening Information for Education Policy, Planning and Management in the Philippines  
25 July 2013 • L.B. Soriano Hall, SEAMEO INNOTECH

## Objectives:
1. Share the results of the EGRA research conducted in February 2013.  
2. Gather feedback, interpretations, and reflections on the EGRA methodology and results.  
3. Determine the implications of the EGRA results on crafting benchmarks for early literacy.  
4. Provide programmatic recommendations for early grade literacy and its assessment.

## AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORNING SESSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 – 8:30</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8:30 – 9:30 | Opening Program                                | Dr. Ramon C. Bacani  
**Philippine National Anthem and Prayer**  
Welcome Messages  
**Keynote Address**  
"Language, Reading and Assessment within the Current Philippine Education Context: State of MTB MLE Implementation and DepEd Efforts to Improve Reading"  
Group Photo Session and Coffee Break  
Ms. Marie Antoinette Reyes-Hayles  
Project Management Specialist  
Office of Education, USAID/Philippines  
Usec. Dina S. Ocampo  
Undersecretary for Programs and Projects  
Department of Education |
| 9:30 – 10:45 | 2013 EGRA Methodology                         | Ms. Sarah Pouzevarra  
Education Advisor, RTI International  
Ms. Yazmin Tolentino  
Associate Manager, TNS Philippines  
Ms. Dinah Bonao  
Education Program Supervisor II  
Department of Education, Region I |
| 10:45 – 11:45 | 2013 EGRA Results: Setting the Stage for National Benchmarks and Standards | Mr. Joseph DeStefano  
Senior Technical Advisor, RTI International  
Dr. Nancy Clark-Chiarelli  
Reading Standards and Assessment Expert EDC |
<p>| 11:45 – 12:00 | Open Forum                                    |                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SESSION ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>SPEAKERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFTERNOON SESSIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 1:15</td>
<td>Mechanics of the Small Group Discussions</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph DeStefano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Technical Advisor, RTI International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 2:15</td>
<td>Workshop 1: Small Group Discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: Filipino EGRA Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> L.B. Soriano Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Felcitas E. Pado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor, College of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of the Philippines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: English EGRA Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> Conference Room 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Paraluman R. Giron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultant, K to 12 Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3: Ilokano EGRA Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> Conference Room 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Marie Christine N. Reyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education Program Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education, Vigan City Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 3:15</td>
<td>Sharing of Group Outputs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Venue:</strong> L.B. Soriano Hall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 – 4:00</td>
<td>Workshop 2: Plenary Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Transition/Bridging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Rosalina J. Vilaneza</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head, National English Proficiency Program and MTB MLE Program, Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 4:30</td>
<td>Sharing of Reflections/Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30 – 5:00</td>
<td>Closing Messages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“Way Forward: The Future of EGRA in the</strong></td>
<td>Mr. Joseph DeStefano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Philippine Education Context”</strong></td>
<td>Senior Technical Advisor, RTI International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usec. Dina S. Ocampo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undersecretary for Programs and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Master of Ceremonies:**

**Ms. Jocelyn S. Tuguiayao**
Senior Education Program Specialist
Bureau of Elementary Education
Department of Education
State of Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE) Implementation

In 2011-2012

- Capacitated 136 Trainers @ 8 per region who in turn trained 2,312 Grade 1 teachers of the pioneer schools
- Produced Teacher’s Guide (TG), Learner’s Materials (LM) and other reading materials for different learning areas from local initiatives (big books, small books, lesson plans)
In 2011-2012

- Pioneered the 12 languages in 921 schools all over the 17 regions

12 Languages
- Ilocano: Pangasinanese, Ilocano, Kapampangan, Tagalog, Bicol,
- Visayan: Sinugbian, Bisaya, Waray, Hiligaynon
- Mindanao: Maranao, Bahasa Sug, Maguindanaon, Chavacano

In SY 2012-2013

- Pioneered in Grade 2
- Implemented in Grade 1 in all public schools the K+12 Basic Education Program nationwide
- Working orthography of the 12 languages made possible in partnership with the Komisyon ng Wikang Filipino (KWF)
- Contextualized TGs and LMs in all learning areas in 12 languages
Current SY 2013-2014

- Pioneered in Grade 3
- Implemented in Grade 2 in all public schools the K+12 Basic Education Program nationwide
- Added 7 more Languages
  - Region II – Ivatan, Ibanag
  - Region III - Sambal
  - Region VI - Kinaray-a, Akanon
  - CARAGA – Surigaonon
  - ARMM - Yakan
- Working orthography of the 7 additional languages made available in partnership with KWF
- Contextualized TGs and LMs in all learning areas for Grade 1 in the additional 7 languages
Reading Program

- Every Child a Reader Program (ECARP)
  - ECARP is a national program that aims to make every Filipino child a reader at his/her own level. The overall goal of the program is to enable elementary grade pupils to communicate and access a variety of information in written or oral forms through effective reading instruction.
  - Supporting ECARP are the following:
    1. Philippine Informal Reading Inventory (Phil-IRI)
      - It was launched in SY 2004-2005. Phil-IRI is a form of oral, speed and comprehension assessment used for pre and post testing every school year to gauge the reading proficiency level of pupils.
      - To date, the tools are undergoing levelling process to ensure the appropriateness of assessment tools for its specific level.

2. Reading Recovery Program
   - This program operates under New Zealand trademark. It is an early intervention program designed to reduce reading and writing difficulties of children. It helps hardest-to-teach six-year-old children catch up with the average performance of their peers.
   - The pilot implementation started in SY 2010-2011 in regions V, VI, XI, and NCR.
   - It also provides training for Reading Recovery teachers.
   - Expansion regions of the program are regions I, III, IV-Calabarzon, V and CAR.

3. Reading Models
   - In 2010, BEE in partnership with the research team of UP visited the schools and observed how the teachers implement each intervention.
   - UP research team was able to document the best reading practices and reading intervention projects in 30 schools in 17 regions from February 15 to March 6, 2010.
   • The Search for Outstanding Reading Teacher (SORT)
     • It aims to recognize reading teachers with outstanding contributions.
   • Read-A-Thon
     • It aims to make all children in Grades 1-6 read at least 3 books in a year through a nationwide reading contest.

Region/Division Reading Initiatives
   • Drop Everything and Read (DEAR)
   • Project Big Books, Small Books
   • Catch Them Early (CTE)
   • 2CIA – Cognitive, Constructive, Interactive, Integrative, Affective
   • Big Brother/Big Sister/Kaklase Ko, Sagot Ko/Shared Reading
   • Pull-Out Remedial Class/Reading Assistance Program/Remediation Classes/Intensified Remedial Reading
   • Five Words a Week (FWAW)/A Paragraph A Day (APAD)/Library Hour a Week
   • Literary Competitions (Academic Skills Camp, Reading Camp, Search for Best Readers)
   • Home School Partnership (Class Home Partnership, Nanay/Tatay Ko, Guro Ko)
   • English Garden/Garden of Knowledge
   • Reading Center/Nook for Every School
Current SY 2013-2014

- Working on coming up with standardized reading and numeracy tools (Early Grades Reading Assessment [EGRA] and Early Grades Mathematics Assessment [EGMA]) with the USAID and World Bank
- A Multiliteracy and Numeracy program in support to ECARP is in progress

Components of the program:
- Benchmarking and Profiling (Pupils, Teachers and School)
- Materials Development, Production and Reproduction (for Pupils and Teachers)
- Professional Development (for Teachers and School Heads)
- Sustainability

Foreign Assisted Programs

- Beginning Reading Program
  - Its funding support is from AusAID under EQuALLS2 project on Basic Education Assistance for Mindanao (BEAM).
  - It was launched in 2007.
  - The program included a summer in-service training on teaching beginning reading across nine divisions in ARMM.
- Whole School Reading Program (WSRP)
  - The program is funded by USAID.
  - It was developed in 2010 based from the previous EQuALLS2 BEAM reading activities.
- Reading Standard and Assessment Tool (RSAT)
  - Under Government of Spain – Improve Quality of Primary Education (GoS- IQPE)
  - Developed in 2009 and used by 3 divisions each in CARAGA and Bicol region
**NGOs**

- **Sa Aklat Sisikat (SAS) Foundation**
  - It runs a 31-day in-classroom Reading Program for all Grade 4 students in partner public schools.
  - Its school beneficiaries are 866 public elementary schools across the country (1999-2011).
  - Program includes: Read-A-Thon, teacher training, reading carts, storybooks and Celebrate Reading events.

- **Bright Minds Read (BMR)**
  - This is a program sponsored by the Ronald McDonald House Charities (RMHC) in cooperation with Adarna House and top educators from UP to develop 32 illustrated books in large format.
  - The program was launched in 2003 and was pilot ed in 14 schools in NCR.
  - To date, it has covered 2,000 schools all over the country.
ANNEX 4 – PRESENTATION OF MS. SARAH POUEZEVARA AND MS. YAZMIN TOLENTINO

Education Data for Decision Making Project:
Strengthening Information for Education, Policy, Planning and Management in the Philippines

Literacy Policy Dialogue
Presentation of EGRA results

25 July 2013
Prepared by Sarah Pouezevara
RTI International

EGRA in the Philippines: Purpose and methodology

- About the reading acquisition and assessment process
- How EGRA supports the K-12 domains of literacy
- Overview of the subtests and scoring methods
- Fieldwork procedures
How do children learn to read? **Word recognition:**

![Diagram of word recognition process]

- Importance of mother tongue/oral language ability
- Dependence upon level of complexity of the language
- Importance of automaticity

*Figure 3: Diagrammatic representation of the word recognition system © 2011 UK Department for Education*

How do children learn to read? **Comprehension**

![Diagram of comprehension processes]

- Importance of rate + accuracy

*Figure 4: The components of the comprehension system © 2011 UK Department for Education*
How the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) measures reading acquisition

- Assesses students’ skills in 5 key components of reading:
  - **Phonemic awareness** – the ability to focus on, manipulate, and break apart the sounds (or phonemes) in words;
  - **Phonics** (or alphabetic principle) – understand and apply the knowledge of how letters are linked to sounds (phonemes) to form letter-sound (grapheme-phoneme) correspondences and spelling patterns;
  - **Fluency** – the ability to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression;
  - **Vocabulary** – both oral and print knowledge of word meaning, a critical component of comprehension and reading; and
  - **Comprehension** – actively engaging with, and deriving meaning from, the texts they read.

- An oral measure of early reading that is administered individually with timed subtasks

*EGRA administration – Tablet (Tangerine®)*
Where has EGRA been used?

What EGRA Offers as a Methodology

- EGRA provides an reliable and efficient diagnostic measurement of how well students have acquired these skills
- Provides a research-based measure of how basic skills (i.e., letter-sound knowledge) are related to more advanced skills (i.e., reading connected-text passages)
- These sub-tests provide not just measures of student performance, but point also to the instructional improvements that may be needed
- Can be used very early, because child doesn’t need to read to be evaluated in foundational areas of literacy (concepts of print, letters, letter sounds)
- Can be used independently of curriculum and methods
The domains of literacy in the K to 12 curriculum

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Phonological Awareness ✓</td>
<td>11. Vocabulary ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Book and Print Orientation ✓</td>
<td>12. Reading Comprehension ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alphabet Knowledge ✓</td>
<td>a. Activating Schema/Prior Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Word Recognition ✓</td>
<td>b. Comprehension of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fluency ✓</td>
<td>Literary Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Spelling ✓</td>
<td>c. Comprehension of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Handwriting ✓</td>
<td>Informational Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Study Skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PhilEdData EGRA and the domains of literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>K-12 Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Initial sound identification (E/F) or Different initial sounds (l)</td>
<td>Phonemic / phonological awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Letter-sound identification</td>
<td>Alphabet knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Familiar word reading</td>
<td>Word recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Invented word reading</td>
<td>Alphabet knowledge / alphabetic principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Listening comprehension</td>
<td>Oral language (receptive), (vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reading (connected text passage)</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>Reading comprehension, (vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dictation (E/F)</td>
<td>Alphabetic principle, Spelling, Oral language (handwriting, grammar, vocabulary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Initial sound identification subtest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>/n/</th>
<th>Correct</th>
<th>Incorrect</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. nanday</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. bahay</td>
<td>/b/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. repaya</td>
<td>/r/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ilaw</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. latik</td>
<td>/l/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. cotik</td>
<td>/c/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. walis</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. holaman</td>
<td>/h/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. umung</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. patola</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average percent correct
- Percent of zero scores
- Item-level analysis

## Letter sound identification - TIMED

**Halimbawa: O V L**

- Average correct letters per minute
- Distributions (highs and lows)
- Item-level analysis
### Familiar word reading - TIMED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halimbawa:</th>
<th>haloi</th>
<th>kanil</th>
<th>perc</th>
<th>gowa</th>
<th>mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rawag</td>
<td>sagat</td>
<td>mabilis</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>lamang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kailangan</td>
<td>arow</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>maori</td>
<td>saltse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hanggang</td>
<td>aabi</td>
<td>lahoi</td>
<td>ang</td>
<td>tanong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gusto</td>
<td>huwag</td>
<td>hindi</td>
<td>iyon</td>
<td>din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anak</td>
<td>sila</td>
<td>ito</td>
<td>bigay</td>
<td>dahil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngayon</td>
<td>tao</td>
<td>wala</td>
<td>sapogket</td>
<td>babaek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>panahon</td>
<td>nang</td>
<td>hayop</td>
<td>tubig</td>
<td>kawanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ngurit</td>
<td>slya</td>
<td>mula</td>
<td>alli</td>
<td>buthay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lakad</td>
<td>namon</td>
<td>dopat</td>
<td>kung</td>
<td>isa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Average correct words per minute**
- **Distributions (highs and lows)**
- **Item-level analysis**

### Invented word reading - TIMED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Halimbawa:</th>
<th>paw</th>
<th>sibus</th>
<th>pla</th>
<th>nomil</th>
<th>goong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>talis</td>
<td>lat</td>
<td>tahumu</td>
<td>panwa</td>
<td>ayt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pluti</td>
<td>ayga</td>
<td>kibas</td>
<td>kra</td>
<td>guyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bopo</td>
<td>broay</td>
<td>talubik</td>
<td>hinlux</td>
<td>pilk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ep</td>
<td>midahin</td>
<td>laig</td>
<td>sonlo</td>
<td>dalata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trulo</td>
<td>walsik</td>
<td>paoka</td>
<td>pras</td>
<td>kanhit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wonoe</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>damin</td>
<td>bru</td>
<td>ngar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bup</td>
<td>kisigan</td>
<td>paningan</td>
<td>gtsa</td>
<td>syon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dobup</td>
<td>namros</td>
<td>buob</td>
<td>kworabi</td>
<td>fras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>katahay</td>
<td>kispo</td>
<td>ngusiron</td>
<td>toag</td>
<td>kritay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Filipino reading example

Nasa palengke sina nanay at Perla. Bibili sila ng isda at gulay.
Pumili si nanay ng bangus para isigang. Pumili naman si Perla ng kangkong, labanos, at petsay.

“Naku! Naiwan ko ang pitaka ko sa bahay,” ang sabi ni nanay sa tindera. “Pwede ko bang balikan na lang ang bayad?
Kukunin ko lang ang pitaka sa bahay.”
Filipino reading example – 57 words

Nasa palengke sina nanay at Perla. Bibili sila ng isda at gulay.
Pumili si nanay ng bangus para isigang. Pumili naman si Perla ng kangkong, labanos, at petsay.

“Naku! Naiwan ko ang pitaka ko sa bahay,” ang sabi ni nanay sa tindera. “Puwede ko bang balikan na lang ang bayad?
Kukunin ko lang ang pitaka sa bahay.”

English reading example – 59 words

Dana and her sister are walking. They are going to the park to play with friends. Suddenly it begins to rain.

“Where is your umbrella?” asks Dana’s sister. Dana opens her bag, but she finds no umbrella.

“I’m sorry. It’s not in my bag,” The two run back home so wet and sad. Now they have to stay home.
Dana and her sister are walking. They are going to the park to play with friends. Suddenly it begins to rain.

“Where is your umbrella?” asks Dana’s sister. Dana opens her bag, but she finds no umbrella.

“I’m sorry. It’s not in my bag.” The two run back home so wet and sad. Now they have to stay home.
Reading comprehension

**Nasaan sina nanay at Perla?** (as palengke)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

**Ano ang isdang pinili ni nanay?** (bangus)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

**Ano ano ang mga gulay na pinili ni Perla?** (at least one: kangkong, isda, peba)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

**Ano ang naging problema ni Nanay?** (na ikaw ang plaka niya)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

**Paano mababayaran ni nanay ang kanyang pinamili?** (kumitin niya ang plaka sa bahay, balikitan niya ang linya)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

- Percent correct out of total possible
- Percent correct out of total attempted

Listening comprehension

I am going to read you another story aloud ONCE and then ask you some questions about the story. Is that okay?

Nilo had a birthday party. The kids ate lots of candies. That night, Nilo did not brush his teeth. The next day, he had a toothache. His brother brought him to the dentist who told him, “It is important to keep your teeth clean.”

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about the story you just heard.

**Who had a toothache?** (Nilo)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

**Why did he have a toothache?** (he ate candy, he did not brush his teeth)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

**What did his brother do?** (take him to the dentist)
- [ ] Correct
- [ ] Incorrect
- [ ] No Response

Thank you! One more exercise.
Dictation

Task 7. Dictation reference page


Read the following sentence ONCE, at about one word per second:

- Niligpit namin ang mga nagkalat na laruan at nagwalis kami sa kwarto.

Then, give the child a pencil and paper. Read the sentence a second time, pausing 5 seconds between words.


Wait 15 seconds and read the whole sentence.

- Niligpit namin ang mga nagkalat na laruan at nagwalis kami sa kwarto.

Limitations

- Different assessor abilities – technical and linguistic
- Language interference (assessor and student)
- Testing conditions (noise, student inhibitions)
Technical Details of the Study

- Randomly selected face-to-face tablet-assisted assessments using a standardized instrument

- Respondent specifications:
  - 3rd grade students for the English and Filipino component
  - 1st grade students for the Ilokano component

- Target sample size:
  - 2,400 3rd grade students nationwide
  - 500 1st grade students in Region 1

How did we divide the sample?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL GROUPING / SUPER REGION</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th># OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS PER SCHOOL</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH LUZON</td>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO MANILA</td>
<td>NCR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4b</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH LUZON</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISayas</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINDANAO</td>
<td>R10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>ARMM</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
<td>2410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How did we divide the sample?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGIONAL GROUPING / SUPER REGION</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th># OF SCHOOLS</th>
<th># OF STUDENTS PER SCHOOL</th>
<th>SAMPLE SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER TONGUE</td>
<td>REGION 1</td>
<td>10 pioneer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40 non-pioneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Schools were randomly selected from a master list of schools
- Students were randomly selected from the Form 1 provided by school administrators to the assessors during the school visit

Who participated in the assessment?

- Partnership between the Department of Education and TNS Philippines
  - Assessors were paired (1 from DepEd, 1 from TNS)
  - TNS supervised and coordinated the logistics for fieldwork

- Training of assessors & supervisors was done by RTI
  - January 7 – 15, 2013 for English and Filipino
  - January 21 – 25, 2013 for Ilokano
What did the training cover?

- Introduction and Overview of EGRA
- Discussion and review of subtests for English / Filipino / Ilokano Instruments
- Practice reading instructions / administering instrument using pen and paper
- Introduction to tablet data collection
- Practice tests in schools
- Inter-rater reliability tests among assessors
- Review of additional instruments / forms
- Deployment logistics for pilot test and fieldwork

How was the fieldwork managed?

- Data collection team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT TEAM</th>
<th>ENGLISH / FILIPINO</th>
<th>ILOKANO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Supervisors and Supervisors</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fieldwork Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>TOTAL SAMPLE</th>
<th>TARGET FIELDWORK DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English / Filipino</td>
<td>2419</td>
<td>February 4 – 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilokano</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>February 11 – 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each team of assessors covered 10 schools each throughout the fieldwork period
How was data controlled?

• On-field, supervisors made sure that...
  – students were selected properly
  – assessors administered the tests correctly
  – data was uploaded to the server on a daily basis

• Real time data upload allowed RTI to...
  – monitor progress of fieldwork
  – identify cases that needed to be dropped and replaced due to errors in administering the assessment
  – identify assessors who needed to be reminded of the rules for administering the assessment
Results of the 2013 National Early Grade Reading Assessment

A Collaboration Between
The Department of Education and
USAID’s PhilED Data Project

Purpose of the 2013 EGRA Survey

- **National Baseline:**
  - How well are children in grade 3 learning to read in Filipino and English?
  - How does performance in reading vary across the country?
  - What non-school and in-school factors correlate with reading performance?

- **Mother Tongue in One Region:**
  - How well are children in grade 1 learning to read in Ilokano after almost one year of instruction under the new MTB-MLE curriculum?
# Mean Performance in Filipino and English on All Subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% zero scores</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter sound identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiar word reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invented word reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral reading of text</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57/59 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial sound identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 items - % correct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(% questions - % correct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 questions - % correct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Correct Words Per Minute (connected text) in Filipino and English

![Correct Words Per Minute Graph](image)
### MTB – MLE Benchmarks for 3rd Grade Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>Fluency Benchmark</th>
<th>Meeting Fluency</th>
<th>Accuracy* Benchmark</th>
<th>Meeting Accuracy</th>
<th>Meeting Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade Filipino</td>
<td>80 cwpm</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade English</td>
<td>60 cwpm</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Filipino &amp; English</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Accuracy = # of words read correctly / total # of words attempted

---

### English Fluency, Comprehension and Accuracy

#### Comprehension Score

% of students

- Average: 47 67 77 83 89 100 cwpm

#### Correct Words Per Minute (of text)

Correct Words Per Minute (of text)

- Reading Accuracy

---
Dictation Results

Niligoit namin ang mga nagkalat na laruan at nagwalis kami sa kuwarto.

We throw our garbage in the trash can to keep our school clean.

- 27% of students able to write the dictated sentence in Filipino correctly or nearly correctly; 30% in English.
- About 1/3 of students in both languages wrote unintelligibly or didn’t write anything
- The errors most commonly noted include:
  Missing syllables/phonemes
  Incorrect word
  Incorrect spelling

- Words on which most errors occurred were:
  niligpit, nagkalat, laruan, kuwarto -- in Filipino
  throw, trash, our, garbage -- in English
Age, Gender, Fluency and Comprehension

Individual Student Performance across Languages

Best and Worst Performers in Filipino Passage Reading: Scores on other subtasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Filipino cwpm of text</th>
<th>Filipino Letter Sounds</th>
<th>Filipino Non word reading</th>
<th>Filipino Word Reading</th>
<th>Filipino Reading comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom 20%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 20%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-School Factors Associated with Reading Comprehension

- More than 1 hour to get to school: 2% English, 2% Filipino
- Living outside Metro Manila: 64% English, 32% Filipino
- Being over age: 27% English, 32% Filipino
- Missing 2 days of school last week: 50% English, 45% Filipino
- Is female: 3% English, 10% Filipino
- Has reading books at home: 45% English
- Mother or father literate: 3% English
- Is in the highest SES proxy: 10% English, 0% Filipino

In-School Factors Associated with ORF

- Assigns no reading homework: 4% English, 11% Filipino
- Classroom is multigrade: 49% English, 20% Filipino
- Participates in ECARP: 49% English, 18% Filipino
- English is LOI of school: 79% English, 19% Filipino
- Participates in Read-a-thon: 65% English, 19% Filipino
- Students have reading book: 81% English, 81% Filipino
- Participates in 4 reading events: 81% English, 81% Filipino
- Student asked to read aloud - sometimes: 81% English, 81% Filipino
- Student attended kindergarten: 81% English, 81% Filipino
Grade 1 Results for Ilokano (494 students in Region 1)

Average text reading = 18 cwpm. Girls = 22, Boys = 15.

- 43% of students at < 10 cwpm
- 49% of students at < 10 letter sounds/minute
- 13% at 40 or more cwpm

Ilokano Reading Fluency, Accuracy and Comprehension

Correct Words per Minute (text)

Average: 6, 18, 31, 37, 44, 48 cwpm

Comprehension Score

Accuracy
Conclusions: Filipino and English Grade 3 Findings

- Girls are achieving higher scores than boys
- Overage students are the lowest performers, especially overage boys
- Students who live furthest from school, who do not have reading books at home, who’s parents are not literate and who’s families are poor struggle the most
- On average, students in Metro Manila perform the best in both languages, those in ARMM have the lowest performance
- Students demonstrate ability to read text at a reasonable rate of correct words per minute for grade 3
- Students who perform well in Filipino, also perform well in English
- However, in English, reading is inaccurate and comprehension is very limited

Conclusions: Grade 1 Ilokano Findings

- Girls are achieving higher scores than boys.
- There are many over-age children in G1 classrooms and they tend to have lower ORF.
- 38% of children were absent 2 or 3 days during the week prior to data collection,
- Children who had higher performance (30 wpm or more) tended to report being less frequently absent.
- Schools are using the MTB-MLE materials.
- Students in “Pioneer” schools performed slightly better than those in non-pioneer schools on non-word reading and on oral reading.
Thank You

PhilED Data Project

Joe DeStefano
jdestefano@rti.org
Setting the Stage for Consideration of National Standards and Benchmarks

Underlying Assumptions of National Standards

• Curriculum and standards are mutually supportive
• Aligned with curriculum, if clear standards are set that define what pupils should learn and what kind of performance is expected, then teachers will teach to those standards
• Based on curriculum, national standards become the basis for what teachers teach, the way teachers are trained and how students are assessed.
Content Standards and Performance Standards in the National K to 12 Curriculum

• Content standards define the specific component skills students should learn to by end of grade levels

• Performance standards, or benchmarks, articulate performance levels necessary to achieve the content standards

• How does EGRA provide a context for consideration of content and performance standards in the Philippines?

Contextual Factors

• Complexity of multi-lingual classrooms—learning new languages and to read in 3 languages in 3 years

• Agglutinative nature of Mother Tongues
### Mean Performance in Filipino and English on All Subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% zero scores</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter sound identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Familiar word reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Invented word reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oral reading fluency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57/59 items - # correct per minute)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial sound identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 items - % correct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 questions - % correct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening comprehension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 questions - % correct)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MTB – MLE Benchmarks for 3rd Grade Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National</th>
<th>ORF Benchmark</th>
<th>Meeting ORF</th>
<th>Accuracy Benchmark</th>
<th>Meeting Accuracy</th>
<th>Meeting Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade Filipino</td>
<td>80 cwpm</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Grade English</td>
<td>60 cwpm</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>95-100%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Filipino &amp; English</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English Comprehension

- Less than 20% are successfully comprehending (80%) what they are reading in English.
- Around 37% could not answer a single answer correctly.

Ilokano Reading Fluency, Accuracy and Comprehension

- Many students meet 1st grade benchmark for accuracy (90-95%).
- Few meet benchmark for fluency (60 cwpm).
- Less than 1% meet both benchmarks.
- 46% of students are not able to answer one comprehension question.
- Less than 10% read with 80% comprehension.
Final Questions

- Which content standards?

- Which performance standards (benchmarks)?
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