

## Reading Horizons: Initial Feedback

### REPORT TEAM:

ERIC MOORE, MAREN HENDERSON, MELODY JACOBS-CASSUTO, ANN MAVIS, LIZZIE MCNAMRA, & JENNIE ZUMBUSCH

**September 2015**

---

The Minneapolis Public Schools (MPS) Teaching and Learning Department, with input from literary specialists and teachers, selected Reading Horizons as the district's new K-3 literacy curriculum, which started in fall of 2015. The MPS Research, Evaluation and Assessment Department (REA) was asked to collect initial feedback during the first few weeks of the school year. Focus groups and interviews were conducted with teachers and literary specialists to gather initial perceptions about Reading Horizons potential impact on students' reading skills and its implementation in the classroom. Initial reactions indicate that Reading Horizons is a unique product that has potential to improve the reading abilities of ALL diverse groups of MPS students. With long-term district commitment and support, the product has strong potential to accelerate learning trajectories of the lowest-performing students in Minneapolis Public Schools.

---

### Overview:

Learning to read is a critical skill students need to master to be successful in school and beyond. Overall, MPS students' reading achievement is low; in 2014-15, 42% of students read at or above grade level. These low literacy levels are also stratified by race. Minneapolis has 50 point gaps in proficiency between students of color and white students in reading on the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment. This huge gap in many ways can be attributed to a lack of foundational literacy skills for students in the

In May 2015, seven literacy specialists agreed to use the Reading Horizons materials with small groups at their school sites to see how students would respond, and as one specialist said, "*Work out the kinks with the teachers.*" The specialists also wanted to gain experience teaching the new curriculum so they could support district-wide implementation in the fall. Specialists received a two-day training in May. Implementation during the trial varied by school site; some specialists taught the curriculum to a whole group, others pulled small groups of students out of regular instruction, and others co-taught Reading Horizons with the lead teacher as a gradual release.

"As a natural skeptic when we were doing the trial, I chose the lowest-academic/highest-behavior-concerned class. Let's really see if this works in a high-priority school. I was blown away, as was the teacher I was working with, by the engagement and progress of the students."

MPS Literary Specialist

lower grades. According to the district MAP assessment, approximately 20-24% of district students in grades 1 and 2 are scoring below proficiency in the reading foundational skills area on the MAP. These low foundational skills do not appear to be improving as a student progresses from grade to grade (See Appendix C). Only 22% of 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students of color are proficient or exceeding proficiency in reading on the MCA

## Background:

During the 2014-15 school year, the MPS Teaching and Learning Department examined a number of reading curriculums in an effort to provide better instruction and improve reading proficiency for **ALL** students. A group of MPS literary specialists, teachers, and Teaching and Learning staff chose Reading Horizons over 13 other curriculums because of its unique, multisensory approach.

According to the Reading Horizons website, the program is “a multisensory delivery method that helps activate several areas of the brain by including visual, auditory, and kinesthetic cues that allow students to make the connections needed for meaningful interactions with text. Reading Horizons products are based on the same principles that researchers have found to be the most effective for teaching emerging readers, struggling readers, and English language learners: ORTON GILLINGHAM-BASED reading instruction that is systematic, explicit, and multi-sensory in nature and provides students with phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension instruction.”

In reviewing current literature on the impact of K-3 literacy curriculums for beginning readers, results are inconclusive. Few districts have engaged in rigorous and unbiased program evaluation. Slavin et. al (2009) provided a synthesis of research on the effectiveness of beginning reading programs for the *Best Evidence Encyclopedia*.<sup>1</sup> The paper does not discuss research on Reading Horizons, but their findings offer some insights into what characterizes an effective program.

Of the 63 studies that the authors reviewed, all of the most effective programs shared similar characteristics: extensive professional development on specific teaching methods; cooperative learning, where students teach one another; and a strong focus on teaching phonics and phonemic awareness.<sup>2</sup> The authors found that an emphasis on phonics alone “did not guarantee positive effects,” and that while an emphasis on phonics may be necessary, it is “not sufficient to ensure meaningful reading gains.”<sup>3</sup> Instead, the paper concluded that the research supports “the use of well-developed programs that integrate curriculum, pedagogy, and extensive professional development.”

Of the programs that Slavin et. al mention as proven to be the most effective through rigorous evaluation,<sup>4</sup> all focus on the five factors identified by the National Reading Panel as essential for early success in reading, as does Reading Horizons: phonemic/phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. But none of these other programs utilize the unique instructional methods of Reading Horizons. Reading Horizons stresses the use of multisensory instruction to meet the needs of all students, no matter how they best learn. Reading Horizons also simplifies the rules students need to know when learning to read, and the organization says that the number of decoding rules that students have to learn is significantly lower than in its competitors’ programs. It should be noted that there is limited research on Reading Horizons itself – See Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> Slavin, et. al. “Effective Beginning Reading Programis: A Best-Evidence Synthesis.” *Best Evidence Encyclopedia*. (2009).

<sup>2</sup> pp. 71-72

<sup>3</sup> p. 72

<sup>4</sup> These include “Success for All,” “Direct Instruction,” and “Peer Assisted Learning Strategies (PALS)”

## Methodology

REA staff conducted focus groups and interviews with literacy specialists and teachers to better understand what was happening in their schools and classrooms as they started implementing Reading Horizons in the 2015-16 school year. In the first focus group, six of seven literacy specialists who participated in the trial implementation last spring shared their experience with Reading Horizons last spring and this fall. The second focus group was conducted with a team of six kindergarten teachers.

REA staff also conducted a total of ten in-depth interviews. Seven interviews were conducted with general K-2 teachers who have started using the curriculum in classrooms with general education, special education, and English Learner students, and three interviews were conducted with special education teachers. These participants represented a total of 8 school sites that represent both geographic and demographic diversity across the district. Those interviewed responded to an open request by literacy specialists and principals to share their experiences.

In addition, REA staff directly observed a portion of the Reading Horizons training. All focus groups and interviews were recorded, but names and schools will remain anonymous.

## Results

Each site was unique with broad diversity in students' abilities and backgrounds. From the gathering of initial feedback, common themes regarding successes and challenges emerged.

### **Positive practices and opportunities with Reading Horizons noted by many sites include:**

- Unique, multisensory strategies that engage learners at all levels.
- Academic engagement and active-learning strategies using physical activities and a variety of props including white boards and games.
- Framework for building beginning and fundamental literacy skills (which almost all staff indicated were not previously implemented or unsystematically taught within and across schools).
- Opportunity for curriculum consistency across grades and schools.
- Flexibility to adapt teaching script for ALL students. (Teachers noted that there were opportunities to adapt to teaching style after they became more comfortable with the script. Training also emphasized opportunities to be more flexible with the script.)
- The curriculum was sequenced and scaffolded
- Improvement of teachers' understanding of ability to teach phonics and linguistics (which, according to participants is lacking in most undergraduate pre-service education programs).

### Teachers' initial thoughts

"The value of Reading Horizons in MPS where our kids are so discrepant is really high."

"I'm interested to see if they can carry these skills over to literacy, social studies... I have seen improvements in proper spelling in just the first few weeks."

"I don't want to say desperation, but my kids can't read. Corrective reading isn't working. I'll try anything. If I can get trained, I'll try it. And it's been very positive."

"In my experience, people who were resistant weren't teaching phonics. Part of it was lack of teacher training. They just weren't trained in phonics."

"There is structure to it but also allows flexibility... if [students] get it, we move on."

- The inclusion of the phonics component through the adoption process supports balanced literacy (which is supported by research as effective).

Provided this program moves forward, teachers expressed challenges encountered during implementation. These identified challenges may impact the fidelity of implementation and the overall positive impact of this curriculum on student outcomes.

“[It] followed a lot of the Orton-Gillingham philosophy with the multisensory approach. I saw that right away, and I liked that ... Reading Mastery has been fine, but it does not have multisensory. So I was excited to see with this new program that it was visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile.”

MPS Elementary Teacher

“K-2 teachers were able to all observe me teaching the program last year in the class as I was doing the trial. I don’t have resistance at my school because they thought it was phenomenal... what they saw in the short time that they were able to come and observe. Everyone at my school is fully on board and excited to jump right in.” MPS Literacy Specialist

“Especially with people who may not have experience teaching Reading Horizons, I can see how teachers might feel overwhelmed if they don’t have coaching support.”

MPS Elementary Teacher

**Expressed challenges include:**

- Teachers expressed concern the district will no longer support the curriculum and are apprehensive about learning how to teach Reading Horizons until a final adoption decision is made.
- Different literacy teaching philosophies on the value of phonics could impact implementation.
- There were differing opinions on the ability of Reading Horizons to differentiate for different student levels and learners. For example, two schools wanted permission to differentiate the curriculum for advanced learners.
- There were reported issues using the assessment and teachers noted that extracting the data was time-consuming, confusing, and reports weren’t user-friendly. Several teachers asked for additional training, more user-friendly reports, and a more seamless interface with the system.

resources around technology that would support implementation (e.g., the online tools for iPads and the spelling curriculum).

- There was mixed feedback on the training. Teachers wanted more hands-on practice and the ability to observe students being engaged with the curriculum before implementation. Teachers who had the opportunity to pilot the curriculum in May 2015 indicated that their comfort level was significantly higher while implementing the program this fall.
- Some teachers perceived that Reading Horizons is a scripted curriculum with a lack of teacher autonomy.

## Recommendations

The initial information provided by the interviews and focus groups informed the following recommendations:

- If deciding to continue to support Reading Horizons, commit to implementing Reading Horizons for three years. Teachers who participated in these initial conversations were clear that a long-term commitment to Reading Horizons was necessary to allow the program time to realize its potential in improving student reading skills.
- Provide ongoing, embedded professional development with coaching and modeling. Almost all participants mentioned they would appreciate ongoing training, that includes more hands-on experiences. This is consistent with teachers' requests for additional coaching and training in other new programs.
- Work with Reading Horizons to improve the usability of the assessment. Participants who had used the assessments noted they are not currently user friendly. Teachers do not know how to find the data needed to support each student.
- Align Reading Horizons with other district literacy programs, including spelling curriculum and online platform. Teachers talked about the benefits of aligning Reading Horizons with other programs to ensure there is consistency and time to fit all the pieces together.
- Conduct a rigorous program evaluation that monitors implementation and measures outcomes. To fully understand the impact of any program, a rigorous and quality evaluation is needed. Without an understanding of implementation across sites, it is impossible to know why programs work or don't work. Correlating implementation with outcome data will provide the district with a better understanding of what is working and where improvements can be made.
- Develop a communications plan regarding Reading Horizons. This will allow teachers and community members to understand the process of the adoption, what the curriculum intends to address, and clear expectations for implementation and regarding impact. It is critical to incorporate lessons learned from the focused instruction evaluation that clearly delineated the need for clear communication about the what, why and how.

"I hope that we don't keep changing things. We need to try Reading Horizons for more than two years or we'll never know where Reading Horizons can take them. I really hope we can just keep something." MPS Literacy Specialist

"A decision and a commitment. That's the only fear I've heard from the teachers I've worked with. They are concerned it's going to be pulled at the end of the year. It will just be one more thing." MPS Literacy Specialist

“The major inequity would be not to implement Reading Horizons right now, to give them a year without it. It’s an injustice to our students to not expose them to this phonics program...People make mistakes and we learn from our mistakes. And moving forward, our kids need this program and it would be so sad if this went away... As part of the literacy training, we looked at other literacy programs and nothing incorporated the technology, and the hands-on, and the movement. It’s the best one we’ve seen and I feel it’s exactly what our kids need.” MPS Kindergarten Literacy Teacher

Reading Horizons is a unique product that appears to show potential for improving reading skills and the academic achievement of **ALL** MPS students with the right support and time commitment. Despite the controversial and publicly difficult start, the feedback from all but one user indicate strong teacher and literacy specialist support for moving forward with the program at MPS. During interviews, teachers were particularly animated when expressing the positive potential of the Reading Horizons product to close academic achievement gaps in Reading. Given the positive responses from teachers,

the district’s lack of phonics based support for teachers in an area of high student need and an initial review of current, available research, the district Research, Evaluation and Assessment Department recommends the district commits to using the curriculum. District implementation should occur during the current academic year and two subsequent years, provided the schools implement the curriculum with fidelity, and the district provides data literacy training for users of the assessment, a clear communication plan, and a rigorous program evaluation to accompany curriculum implementation. REA acknowledges the challenges of implementation given identified equity issues, but if these issues can be addressed, the curriculum will provide teachers a needed tool to improve academic outcomes for students. The department would like to offer its sincere appreciation for all of those who contributed data to this report.

---

“I’ve been in the district for [a number] of years. I started in 6th grade, where you wouldn’t necessarily have a phonics curriculum. But as I moved down, I never was given a phonics curriculum until Words Their Way. I taught 3rd grade at that time and felt like it wasn’t meeting the true needs of a phonics program. When I finally got this experience and this training and this curriculum, I was like, ah finally! Finally we have something that is really going to strengthen the beginning foundational skills.”

MPS Literacy Specialist

---

## **Appendix A: Summary of Evaluations of *Reading Horizons*:**

The Reading Horizons website provides summaries of several studies<sup>5</sup> performed to analyze the impact of the Reading Horizons Discovery curriculum on student academic achievement. One study was done on an entire district that implemented the curriculum, two studies focused on just one school, and two other studies focused on just one or two classrooms. All of the studies cited positive outcomes for students on standardized exams (compared to pre-test scores, control schools or classrooms, or statewide or district-wide averages). Many of the studies cite very positive responses from teachers and administrators about the perceived impact of the curriculum on students and teachers. However, most of the studies were done in the late 1990s and lack substantial sample sizes. All of the studies fail to attribute increases in test scores directly to the Reading Horizons curriculum. The total research studies that could be confidently considered represent thirteen schools.

The most rigorous and recent study<sup>6</sup> was conducted at an elementary school in Utah from 2007 to 2009. It found students who participated early (1<sup>st</sup> grade) in the curriculum exceeded the state-average and out-performed students at the control school. The students who started early and continued with the curriculum through third grade showed the greatest improvement over time. The study also showed dosage matters and there are positive long-term effects associated with ongoing instruction. Students who received three years of instruction scored better than the control school, the district, and state averages on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. Additionally, students who were enrolled in the program in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade out-performed students at the control school on the ITBS when they reached 5<sup>th</sup> grade. While the study used a control school, the schools were only matched on socio-economic status of students and location in similar suburbs.

---

<sup>5</sup> "Scientifically Based Research Underpinning the Rationales of the *Discover Intensive Phonics for Yourself* Reading System." *Reading Horizons*. <<http://www.readinghorizons.com/documents/research/dip-research-packet2010.pdf>>

<sup>6</sup> Nelson, David. E, David G. Fox, and Mara Haslam. "An Evaluation of the Intensive Phonics Program at Iron Springs Elementary School: Year Three Report." (2009) <<http://www.readinghorizons.com/documents/research/intensive-phonics-year-three-report.pdf>>

## Appendix B: Additional Teacher and Literacy Specialist Quotes

“I was looking at the data [and] stacked higher scores to lower. Some of the 1<sup>st</sup> graders scored as high as the 3<sup>rd</sup> graders who took the assessment.”

MPS Literacy Specialist

“Right away this year, I have been teaching b and d. There were kids who would constantly flip around. My principal was wondering why we were teaching this to these kids... they are readers. It’s amazing how quickly some of the lower students have caught up to the ... they are thinking about that b and d. Those higher kids are now starting to form their letters correctly who didn’t seem like they needed the program. Within 2-3 weeks, you’re seeing kids who are active are like [know b and d]. If you talk to any teacher, that’s the hardest thing. The dang b and d.”

MPS Literacy Specialist

“The Reading Horizons assessment has been really helpful. [It] lists consonants and vowels skill by skill, then [it] lists syllables, onset, medial, and ending sounds – [it] highlights where they are having a hard time. So, I knew exactly right away what we were dealing with.”

MPS Elementary Teacher

“I remember something from the training stuck with me. This program not only makes students better readers, but it makes teachers better teachers of reading. Now I know when to use ‘c’ and when to use a ‘k.’ There’s a reason behind that. I can tell you why. Kids can learn that and prove it and justify it.”

MPS Literacy Specialist

“One thing that stuck with me was that if teachers could just give it 6 weeks, they will see enough change that they will want to stick with it.”

MPS Literacy Specialist

“The biggest struggle is learning how to do this over the year and putting time in, and then it turns out 2<sup>nd</sup> grade team won’t use it, and then ‘forget it, we won’t use it anymore.’”

MPS Elementary Teacher

“I didn’t start it right away because I was going to hear if they were going to take it back. That’s where a lot of my hesitation comes from.”

MPS Elementary Teacher

“They feel more confident. That’s a huge piece for my kids. They have a sense of mastery right away....The Little Books were horrible, but the actual teaching book with the lessons has nothing to do with any of that. Based on my background and training, it seems totally appropriate otherwise. It’s just the reading materials.”

MPS Elementary Teacher



“One of the challenges, at least with the teachers I’m currently working with, is finding the time. I think there is so much demand of so many different programs that they are expected to teach. That to them feels like one more thing.”

MPS Literacy Specialist

**Appendix C: Foundational Skills Data**

**Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) for Primary Grades (MPG)**

The MAP for Primary Grades (MPG) is a computerized adaptive test with an audio component aligned with the Minnesota Common Core standards and administered to grade one students in the fall and spring.

The reading portion of the MAP is comprised of four strands: Foundational Skills, Language and Writing, Literature and Informational Texts, and Vocabulary Use and Functions. Within Foundational Skills, there are three sub-strands: Phonics and Word Recognition, Phonological Awareness, and Print Concepts.

Tables 1 – 4 summarize performance of MPS students across seasons and years on the Foundational Skills Strand of the MPG, which includes phonics and phonological awareness. The mean, median, and count are listed for the scale score and a median percent rank by ethnicity.

Table 1					
Fall 2013 Grade 1 MPG	Foundational Skills Scale Score			Foundational Skills Percentile Rank	
	Mean	Median	Count	Median	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	153	150	127	21	127
2 AFRICAN AMER	155	155	1115	34	1115
3 ASIAN	158	158	222	43	222
4 HISPANIC	151	151	622	23	622
5 WHITE	169	170	1165	77	1165

Table 2					
Spring 2014 Grade 1 MPG	Foundational Skills Scale Score			Foundational Skills Percentile Rank	
	Mean	Median	Count	Median	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	165	164	122	19	122
2 AFRICAN AMER	165	165	1151	21	1151
3 ASIAN	170	170	218	32	218
4 HISPANIC	161	160	589	12	589
5 WHITE	184	184	1106	69	1106

Across seasons, the mean increases for all ethnic groups. This is to be expected; as students learn more material, they should increase their scale scores. At the same time, however, students’ percentile ranks

should remain approximately the same if they are making expected growth. We see in 2013-2014, the median percentile rank drops in all groups, but more so for African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics. The same pattern is true for the 2014-2015 cohort.

Across years, the mean scale score and median percentile rank for fall and spring are fairly stable. There are more discrepancies in the fall for African American and Hispanic children than there are in the spring. Fall 2013 was the first time MPS administered the MPG, so some variation could be due to test administration.

<b>Table 3</b>					
<b>Fall 2014 Grade 1 MPG</b>	Foundational Skills Scale Score			Foundational Skills Percentile Rank	
	Mean	Median	Count	Median	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	149	150	107	21	107
2 AFRICAN AMER	153	153	1026	28	1026
3 ASIAN	157	157	177	40	177
4 HISPANIC	148	148	611	17	611
5 WHITE	168	168	1186	73	1186

<b>Table 4</b>					
<b>Spring 2015 Grade 1 MPG</b>	Foundational Skills Scale Score			Foundational Skills Percentile Rank	
	Mean	Median	Count	Median	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	164	163	100	17	100
2 AFRICAN AMER	164	164	1072	19	1072
3 ASIAN	170	169	178	29	178
4 HISPANIC	160	159	596	11	596
5 WHITE	184	184	1173	69	1173

### **Measure of Academic Progress (MAP)**

MAP is administered to grade 2 students in fall and spring. It is similar to the MPG and measured on the same scale except that there isn't an audio assist component. Students must be able to read on their own. The test is adaptive so very beginner readers have much less text in both subjects than advanced readers. Like the MPG, it is aligned to the Minnesota Common Core standards. The strand and sub-strand structure is a little different. There are three strands: Literature, Informational Text and Foundational Skills, and Vocabulary Acquisition and Use. Within Foundational Skills and Vocabulary Acquisition and Use are three sub-strands: Print Concepts, Phonics, and Word Recognition; Context Clues and Reference; and Word Relationships and Nuance. Again, since Phonics is within the Foundational Skills and Vocabulary Acquisition and Use strand, we focus on this strand. Tables 5-8 summarize performance at grade 2.

There is a mean and median for the scale score. Instead of examining median percentile rank, the MAP and MCA have been linked and performance can be projected to MCA at the categorical level. The

percent of students at each category (does not meet, partially meets and meets/exceeds) are listed. As expected, the mean scale increases from fall to spring in both the 2013-14 cohort and the 2014-15 cohort. For students of color, the majority of students are projected to be in the “does not meet” category in grade 3 across seasons and years while the opposite is true of white students. The majority of white students are projected to be in the “meet” or “exceeds” categories. Among students of color, American Indian and Hispanic students have the greatest proportion of students of in the “does not meet” category. Asian students have the greatest proportion of “meets” or “exceeds” among students of color.

		<b>Table 5</b>						
<b>Fall 2013 Grade 2 MAP</b>	Foundational Skills & Vocabulary SS		Foundational Skills & Vocabulary Projected MCA Level					
	Mean	Count	Does not meet		Partially Meets		Meets/Exceeds	
			Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	161	133	75.0%	96	5.5%	7	19.5%	25
2 AFRICAN AMER	163	1076	64.4%	680	11.6%	122	24.1%	254
3 ASIAN	169	194	50.8%	97	12.6%	24	36.6%	70
4 HISPANIC	160	596	70.8%	415	10.1%	59	19.1%	112
5 WHITE	183	1132	23.0%	258	8.6%	97	68.4%	768

		<b>Table 6</b>						
<b>Spring 2014 Grade 2 MAP</b>	Foundational Skills & Vocabulary SS		Foundational Skills & Vocabulary Projected MCA Level					
	Mean	Count	Does not meet		Partially Meets		Meets/Exceeds	
			Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	173	133	77.9%	102	7.6%	10	14.5%	19
2 AFRICAN AMER	175	1048	71.8%	733	8.7%	89	19.5%	199
3 ASIAN	182	184	63.2%	115	9.3%	17	27.5%	50
4 HISPANIC	173	548	78.1%	421	7.1%	38	14.8%	80
5 WHITE	197	1068	23.8%	249	7.7%	81	68.5%	718

Table 7								
Fall 2014 Grade 2 MAP	Foundational Skills & Vocabulary SS		Foundational Skills & Vocabulary Projected MCA Level					
	Mean	Count	Does not meet		Partially Meets		Meets/Exceeds	
			Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	161	116	69.8%	81	9.5%	11	20.7%	24
2 AFRICAN AMER	164	1082	61.8%	669	10.1%	109	28.1%	304
3 ASIAN	171	201	50.7%	102	10.9%	22	38.3%	77
4 HISPANIC	160	592	71.1%	421	8.6%	51	20.3%	120
5 WHITE	184	1103	22.0%	243	5.8%	64	72.2%	796

Table 8								
Spring 2015 Grade 2 MAP	Foundational Skills & Vocabulary SS		Foundational Skills & Vocabulary Projected MCA Level					
	Mean	Count	Does not meet		Partially Meets		Meets/Exceeds	
			Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count	Row Valid N %	Count
1 AMER INDIAN	175	117	77.9%	88	5.3%	6	16.8%	19
2 AFRICAN AMER	175	1125	71.1%	769	9.1%	99	19.8%	214
3 ASIAN	182	197	57.5%	111	10.9%	21	31.6%	61
4 HISPANIC	173	599	76.0%	444	7.9%	46	16.1%	94
5 WHITE	197	1099	23.3%	244	7.8%	82	68.8%	719