

1-1-1980

Remedial reading program of short-range objectives for students in grades one through four

Gary R. Ganser

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.stritch.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ganser, Gary R., "Remedial reading program of short-range objectives for students in grades one through four" (1980). *Master's Theses, Capstones, and Projects*. 806.

<https://digitalcommons.stritch.edu/etd/806>

This Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by Stritch Shares. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses, Capstones, and Projects by an authorized administrator of Stritch Shares. For more information, please contact smbagley@stritch.edu.

A REMEDIAL READING PROGRAM OF SHORT-RANGE OBJECTIVES
FOR STUDENTS IN GRADES ONE THROUGH FOUR

by
GARY R. GANSER

A RESEARCH PAPER
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS IN EDUCATION (READING SPECIALIST)
AT CARDINAL STRITCH COLLEGE

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

1980

This research paper has been
approved for the Graduate Committee
of Cardinal Stritch College by

Sister Marie Colette
(Adviser)

May 1, 1979
(date)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I--INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Justification of the Problem	2
Chapter II--REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	4
Location	4
Time and Frequency	5
Itinerant Programs	7
Referral Programs	10
Contracting Programs	11
Chapter III--DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM.....	15
The School Setting	15
Time and Scheduling	17
Location of Remediation	17
A Referral Program	18
A Short-Range Objectives Program	19
Eligibility	22
Implementation	22
Evaluation	23
Chapter IV--EVALUATION.....	24
One Reading Program	24
Maintainance in the Regular Reading Program	25
Larger Number of Students	27
Cooperation	31
Significant Problem Areas	32
Summary of Conclusions	33
Appendix A--TEACHER SURVEY.....	36
REFERENCES.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Student Population by School and Grade	16
2. Number of Students Referred in Each Skill Area by School	28
3. Number of Students Referred in Each Skill Area by Grade	30
4. Time Spent in Remediation by Skill Area	34

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The small school district with multiple schools presents the reading teacher with problems that are not discussed in many classrooms and textbooks. These problems are the broader responsibilities and less flexible use of time that the person in this situation has when compared to counterparts in larger school districts.

The International Reading Association has identified the separate responsibilities of the reading teacher, the reading clinician, the reading consultant, and the reading supervisor (1968). In schools with large faculties such divisions of responsibility are possible. In a small district one person may have to assume some aspects of all four positions. That person may have to conduct regular classes, remediate on a referral basis, serve as a resource person for other teachers, conduct inservice programs, and oversee the district reading program. Under these circumstances the reading teacher must evaluate the district's needs and priorities and determine how much of the time must be spent working with students, working with other teachers, and managing programs.

Once the teacher has identified the responsibilities of

the position, it becomes necessary to utilize the available time in the most effective way. The time must be divided among a number of responsibilities and the relative importance of each responsibility will determine the percentage of time spent in carrying out that duty.

This is the problem that confronted the reading teacher in the Mayville Public School System. Mayville is a small district with several elementary schools located throughout the area. The reading teacher must travel among the schools to serve the students and teachers in the primary grades as well as teaching regular classes of intermediate and junior high reading. In the fall of 1978 a new program was developed to meet the needs of this particular kind of situation.

Statement of the Problem

The problem presented here is to develop a possible program to meet a specific set of criteria. The program must serve approximately 326 students and 14 teachers in the first, second, third, and fourth grades at four separate schools. The schools are from one mile to eleven miles apart. The amount of time available is 215 minutes per week. The challenge is to put this time to its best possible use in working with the students, the teachers, and the program.

Justification of the Problem

This type of situation is not unique. There are many small school districts that cannot field a complete staff of reading personnel. There are many reading teachers whose duties cover a large range of responsibilities with a mini-

mum amount of time with which to discharge them. The development of a program for this situation may be of benefit to other teachers in similar circumstances.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To develop a program that would incorporate the strengths of traditional remedial reading programs and eliminate some of the disadvantages, a review of the research was undertaken to determine where the remediation should take place, when it should be scheduled, and what type of program should be used.

Location

Research is not available to determine whether remediation done within the classroom is superior to remediation done outside the classroom. However, the current trend would appear to favor classroom remediation from a psychological point of view if not from a practical one.

Remediation generally means taking the student out of the classroom and into a room that is set aside for this specific purpose. This room might be called the remedial reading room, the resource center, or the learning center. No matter what title is given to it, this room is identified with students who have problems. Such rooms have come under attack for this very reason. Gutknecht (1976) says that the association of the student with the room labels the student in a negative manner. This label indicates that the student

is deficient and affects his self-image. He further states that remediation is made more difficult when begun with a negative association.

The trend in legislation is toward mainstreaming of exceptional students and away from segregated classrooms. The underlying theme appears to be that the regular classroom is a more desirable learning environment. According to Dunn (1973) the courts are deciding that only the most seriously disabled students can be removed from the regular classroom for special education. While Dunn is referring to students who are diagnosed as exceptional need students, the impact of this trend can be extended to remedial reading. If learning disabled and mentally retarded students cannot be removed from the regular classroom for help from learning disabilities teachers and teachers for the mentally retarded, it would be illogical that disabled readers should be removed for remedial reading instruction. Dunn further predicts that LD and EMR teachers will be going into the regular classroom to work with students who need their services. It is likely that remedial reading teachers will be doing more remediation within the classroom in the years to come.

Time and Frequency

The questions to be considered here are how long the individual sessions should be and how often they should occur.

The earliest studies concerning the frequency and length of remedial sessions were in the area of speech therapy.

Ervin (1965) conducted a study of second and third grade stu-

dents. The progress of students receiving daily therapy was compared to the progress of students receiving less-than-daily instruction. The results showed that students learned better with daily instruction. These results substantiated the results of an earlier study done by Van Hatten (1959).

The first study comparing daily and less-than-daily instruction among children receiving reading instruction was conducted by Sabatino (1971). Sabatino compared the progress of students aged 7 to 12 who received instruction in a resource room on a daily basis with those who received instruction only twice a week. He concluded that daily instruction was more productive than less-than-daily instruction. However, Sabatino's results may have been influenced more by the length of time spent in the resource room rather than the frequency of instruction because the students who attended for $\frac{1}{2}$ hour twice a week received only $\frac{1}{4}$ as much instruction as those who attended four times a week for one hour at a time.

The most recent study by Mayhall and Jenkins (1977) suggests that the frequency of remediation is more important than the length of the sessions. They found that four sessions of 10 minutes each week was more effective with second, third, and fourth grade students than two sessions of 20 minutes in length. The length of instruction was kept constant at 40 minutes per week. Therefore, the better results of one group can be attributed to the increased frequency of instruction.

These results point to the conclusion that the more often the student receives instruction the better his progress will be. H. A. Robinson (1965) recognized the importance of frequent sessions before these last studies were made. He made the following suggestions for scheduling remedial instruction:

Instruction should last from thirty to forty-five minutes, depending on age, concentration ability, and reading weaknesses.

Instruction should take place daily when feasible.

It should rarely be given less than three times a week. The scheduling of remedial cases once a week is difficult to justify. (p. 62)

O'Bruba (1974) makes approximately the same suggestions in his recommendations for remedial instruction within the classroom.

The conclusion can be drawn that short but frequent sessions would be the most desirable for younger students.

Itinerant Programs

An itinerant program is one in which the teacher goes to the student rather than the student coming to the teacher. The remediation may take place in the classroom or in areas set aside for such purposes at each of the schools or buildings the itinerant teacher visits.

Dunn (1973) estimates that the increase in mainstreaming will necessitate an itinerant teacher who spends part of the time working with students and part of the time working

with teachers. This teacher would travel from classroom to classroom helping the student and the teacher adjust to the exceptional child being placed in the classroom. While Dunn refers specifically to LD and MR teachers, he recognizes the need for supportive services such as remedial reading and speech therapy to be performed for these students in the classroom also.

Mayhall and Jenkins (1977) also recognized the need for itinerant teachers and the results of their study indicate that a block system of scheduling is the best system to be used by itinerant teachers who must travel between buildings and cannot get to each building every day. They suggest that the teacher spend a few weeks working at one school and then move to the next school and work there for a few weeks. Their study finds this to be preferable to going to a different school each day.

There are three advantages of an itinerant program over a resource room or remedial room: 1) remediation takes place in a familiar environment, 2) remedial teachers are more visible to all students, and 3) it facilitates communication between the classroom teacher and the remedial teacher.

Familiar environment. Whether the teacher works with the students in the classroom or in some area nearby, it is within the student's normal environment. The students are not required to go to a different building or area of the building to receive services. As a result, they tend to be more relaxed and less suspicious of the experience. This

results in a better learning situation.

Visibility. The remedial teacher should not be that mysterious person in the resource room who is known only to a handful of students. By circulating among the students the remedial teacher becomes familiar to more students. This can result in less apprehension among students working with the remedial teacher and better attitudes toward these students among other students in the school.

Communication. An itinerant teacher must work closely with the classroom teacher if they are working in the same classroom. Even if they are not in the same classroom, the remedial teacher may have to rely on the classroom teacher for space to work, desks, materials, and equipment. The close proximity of classroom and remedial instruction necessitates cooperation and communication.

Disadvantages

There are some disadvantages to an itinerant program as well. Movement of equipment between schools or buildings is difficult and much of an itinerant teacher's time is spent in traveling from one school to another.

Equipment. A resource room or remedial room can be well equipped with everything that may be needed close at hand. In an itinerant program everything that is needed must be transported. This would rule out the use of heavy or built-in equipment. Extra materials are not at the teacher's fingertips when the need arises. Some schools have overcome this problem by using mobile labs that can be driven to the

schools. Such units are in use in Florida and California (Smith, 1970, pp. 33, 41-42).

Travel time. Some of an itinerant teacher's time is spent in traveling from one place to another. Traveling time is lost time. Unless scheduling can minimize traveling time, this can be a serious drawback.

Referral Programs

In a referral program the classroom teacher is responsible for identifying the students with whom the remedial teacher works. The student is tested and the problem areas are diagnosed. If the student is accepted into the program for remediation, a schedule is set up designating when the student is to report to the remedial reading teacher.

Disadvantages

Robinson and Petit (1978) have outlined four disadvantages of most referral programs: 1) it is outside the classroom, 2) students have two reading programs, 3) it shifts responsibility from classroom to remedial teacher, and 4) the emphasis is on correcting failure after it happens rather than preventing it.

Outside the classroom. This first objection is supported by Gutknecht (1976) and recent legislation (Public Law 94-142 and Wisconsin State Statute 115.89). These sources agree that in most cases classroom remediation is more desirable than remediation removed from the classroom.

Two reading programs. In a referral program the student is likely to be continuing his classroom reading program in

addition to the remediation program. This means that a student who is having difficulty with one reading program now has two separate reading programs to contend with. This added responsibility is thought to be undesirable.

Responsibility. In this third objection it is stated that instead of close cooperation between classroom teacher and remedial teacher, there is often complete disassociation. In too many cases the classroom teacher feels that once the child has been diagnosed as a remedial student, that teacher is relieved of any responsibility for the success or failure of that student in reading.

Correcting failure. This problem is inherent to the referral program by its very definition. Students are referred because they have problems. These problems are diagnosed and steps are taken to remediate them. Students are not referred before they have problems, nor is it likely that they could be.

Contracting Programs

Grittner (1975) writes that contract teaching is an outgrowth of the Dalton Plan developed by Helen Parkhurst in 1919. Contracting has been used in some form ever since. Although most documented contracting programs represent the college level, enough examples of elementary programs are available to attest to their success. At least one school uses contracting as its total elementary program (Barbour and Czarnecki, 1973), but usually contracting is employed in a particular area of the curriculum such as the one in elemen-

tary English described by Wilson and Grambell (1973). Both sources met with great success using contracting with elementary students.

Contracting is a method for individualizing instruction. It is a method by which the teacher and the student agree to what will be studied and what tasks will be performed. A contract is drawn up and signed by both parties. In some cases the teacher draws up a series of contracts and the student chooses one of them. In other cases the student draws up the contract and gets the teacher's approval. Sometimes the student and the teacher meet to negotiate a contract together.

A remedial reading program that used contracting with high school students in a resource room is described by Pendrak (1974). Students were released from their English classes one day per week to participate in the program. A choice of contracts was provided by the resource teacher and the students contracted for a certain number of activities. Pendrak concluded that the program was successful because only 5 out of the 258 students involved in the program failed to perform under the contract system.

At the elementary level a remedial program using contracting is described by Wilhoyte (1977). This is a written contract between the student and the remedial teacher. It describes a specific objective and the time and activity necessary to meet the objective. The student then works in the classroom under the supervision of the classroom teacher. Wilhoyte lists the following five advantages to this contract-

ing program:

1. It focuses on students' personal strengths and needs.
2. Children are involved in personal decision making.
3. It facilitates communication between classroom and reading teacher.
4. It provides a written record of the child's program.
5. It extends the time the students can work on prescribed activities because the student is not limited to his allotted time in the remedial room.

In another article, Christen (1976) lists eight advantages of contracting programs. These advantages emphasize that contracting promotes the students' responsibility for their own learning.

Despite these successes contracting does not work with all students. Even Pendrak (1974) admits that while he felt that the program was successful there were five students who would do no work at all. Grittner (1975) cautions that what works in one school will not necessarily be successful when transplanted into another. He lists five points to consider:

1. Not all students want to be individualized;
2. Students do not develop self-discipline merely because a program based on it has been implemented;
3. Isolated task-completion is demotivating to many students;
4. Students appear to need social interaction as well as independent study;

5. There is a question about the wisdom of fragmenting the curriculum into separate, cognitive and affective components for the purpose of individualizing. (p. 333)

Barbour and Czarnecki (1973) also point out that some students at the elementary level are not capable of working independently. Christen (1976) suggests that the period for completing contracts at the elementary level be kept to about one day.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

In the fall of 1978 a rather unique type of remedial reading program was established in the Mayville School District. It was an itinerant program because one teacher was required to travel between the schools involved. It was a referral program because the classroom teachers identified the students who received services. It was not a contracting program although it was felt that contracting could be used successfully with some students under this type of program.

The School Setting

The Mayville School District is located in the southeastern part of Wisconsin. The total school population was about 1200 students in the fall of 1978 when the program was begun. There are five schools in the district--a high school, a middle school, and three elementary schools. Reading programs are available at all grade levels. One full-time reading teacher at the high school teaches elective developmental classes as well as remedial classes. Another full-time reading teacher teaches classes for students reading below grade level in seventh and eighth grades and has classes for remedial students in grades five and six. Two full-time Title I teachers work with grades kindergarten through three.

At the beginning of the 1978-1979 school year the middle school reading teacher was asked to develop a reading program for grades one through four that did not duplicate Title I services. The last part of the school day was allotted to this program. This amounted to a total of 205 minutes per week.

Four schools would be involved in the program. Southview school (SV) is at the southern edge of the school district. There are a first, a second, a third, and two fourth grades at the school. Six miles north of Southview in the city of Mayville is Parkview school (PV). This school has a first, a third, and two second grades. The Mayville Middle School (MS) with two fourth grades is also in the city. Seven miles north of Mayville is Clearview school (CV) in the village of LeRoy. There are a first, a second, and a third grade here. A breakdown of the student population by school and grade is given in Table 1.

Table 1

Student Population by School and Grade

Grade	SV	PV	MS	CV	Total
1	21	24	0	22	67
2	23	45	0	25	93
3	26	24	0	26	76
4	44	0	46	0	90
Total	114	93	46	73	326

Time and Scheduling

The school district had set aside the time between 1:30 and 2:45 p.m. for the remedial teacher to work with these students. Certain other work not related to this program was also to be done during this time. Therefore the total time available for working on this program was 3 hours and 15 minutes per week. During this time the remedial teacher would work with the students, drive to the schools, prepare lessons, and meet with the teachers.

Based on what research showed about the frequency of remediation, it was decided that the best scheduling procedure would be to concentrate on only one or two schools at a time. This seemed more advantageous than trying to serve each school once a week. It appeared that there would be time to schedule two remediation sessions of about 25 minutes each day and the remaining time would be necessary for driving to the schools. It was obvious that some time after school would be necessary for meeting with teachers and preparing lessons.

Location of Remediation

It was impossible to set up a central remedial room because the students were distributed among four schools and it would be impractical to bus them to a central location. Working right in the classrooms was considered but rejected. Students would not be receiving instruction during their reading period. Therefore working in the classroom could be disruptive to the rest of the class. It was decided that

instruction should be given outside of the classroom. A suitable place was found in each school. The locations were a teacher's workroom, an empty office, a gymnasium, and a hallway. Each location had a table and chairs, one had a blackboard, and two had storage area for materials. All of the areas were close to the students' classrooms and were a familiar part of their everyday environment.

A Referral Program

With such limited time the selection of students to receive remediation services was left to the classroom teachers. A referral system was used because it was not practical to test all of the students and the classroom teachers would be in the best position to determine which students should receive additional help. To eliminate some of the disadvantages of a referral system discussed by Robinson and Petit (1978) it was decided that the remediation program was to be related directly to the classroom program. In this way there would be only one reading program for the student instead of two. This would also be a good way to promote communication between the remedial teacher and the classroom teacher because the remedial teacher would need to know what was happening in the classroom reading program. By keeping the classroom program at the center of the remedial program, the classroom teacher and the remedial teacher share the responsibility for the student's success in reading.

The regular reading program used in grades one through four throughout the Mayville district is the Lippencott Basic

Reading Program. Following each section of the reader there is a test of the skills emphasized in that section. These help the teachers to monitor the progress of their students. These tests would also provide the classroom teacher with a basis for determining which children should receive further help and for determining which skills they need to practice with the remedial teacher. Therefore, these tests became the basis of the referral system used in this remedial reading program.

A Short-range Objectives Program

When a referral was made the remedial teacher would meet with the teacher making the referral to discuss the student's program and needs. The specific area of remediation was determined cooperatively and an objective was set up for each student. Because of limited time and a large number of students, it was decided to use only short-range objectives. It was hoped that these objectives could be reached after a few weeks of remediation. Therefore, no students could be referred for such broad areas as comprehension, vowel sounds, or vocabulary. Specific objectives, such as being able to tell a story in sequence, to distinguish between long and short vowels, or to know a certain 25 basic sight words, were used for each student. These objectives could be identified by referring to the Lippencott tests. The students would then work with the remedial teacher until the objective was met. The conclusion that the objective had been met was based on a re-test or observation by the remedial teacher.

Advantages

It was hoped that this type of referral program would have certain advantages over traditional referral programs. These advantages were 1) the students would have only one reading program, 2) the emphasis would be on keeping students in the regular reading program, 3) a larger number of students would be able to receive services, 4) there would be close cooperation between the classroom teachers and the remedial teacher, and 5) significant problem areas in the regular reading program would be identified.

One reading program. In this situation the students have been working on a specific skill in their classrooms. When they were tested on that skill it was found that they had not mastered that skill at a level that the teacher thought was necessary for success in the classroom reading program. At that point the students were referred to the remedial teacher for assistance with that particular skill so that they could proceed with the rest of the class without falling behind. Therefore, the only reading program that the student has to cope with is the classroom reading program. The remedial program is an extension of that program.

Keeping students in the regular reading program. The Lippencott program is a sequence of skills that build on one another. Failing one skill can result in the failure of other skills. Therefore, by remediating that skill as soon as the failure occurs, it is hoped that the students will be

able to successfully continue in the classroom reading program once that skill deficiency is overcome.

Larger number of students. It would be futile to try to remediate the problems of seriously disabled readers by the use of this program. Attempting to remediate all of a student's skill deficiencies would require much longer than a few weeks. One of the goals of this program was to reach as many children as possible. By using short-range objectives that could be reached in only a week or two, it should be possible to include a larger number of students in this program than in a traditional program.

Cooperation. The initial meeting following the referral opens the way for cooperation. The classroom teacher and the remedial teacher agree on the problem and the objective. Often the classroom teacher can provide materials for the remedial teacher to use and sometimes the remedial teacher can offer suggestions that the classroom teacher can use. By working together to overcome a student's problem, it is hoped that the student, the teachers, and the program will benefit.

Significant problem areas. By evaluating the problems for which students were referred it was hoped that any weaknesses of the regular reading program would become apparent. After establishing that a pattern of certain problems existed it would be possible to strengthen the regular reading program in these areas. Hopefully, this would result in diminishing the number of future problems in these areas.

Eligibility

There are some students who would not be served successfully by this program. Slow learners who are already falling behind in new skills while previous skills are being remediated cannot be expected to keep up with the group they are in and arrangements for these students will have to be made within the classroom for putting them in a slower moving group. Some learning disabled students have severe difficulties that cannot be overcome in so short a period of time. Other programs can provide better services for these students.

Even though the program would not be suitable for all students, it was justified on the basis that the district already had special education programs and the Title I program for these students. However, students in special education or Title I programs were also eligible to participate in this program. Therefore, the program was open to all students who were enrolled in a regular classroom reading program regardless of any other services available to them.

Implementation

The first step was to inform the teachers of the new program. During an inservice meeting at the beginning of the school year the remedial teacher met with all of the elementary teachers to explain the new program. Another meeting was held with the teachers of each school prior to working with any students from that school. The purpose of these meetings was to become acquainted with the teachers and answer any questions that they might have. At these meetings

a remediation area was set up and scheduling was discussed.

The program was begun at Clearview school. The remedial teacher worked there exclusively for the first three weeks. After that the remedial teacher began working at Southview school while finishing with students at Clearview. The same procedure was used when switching from Southview to the Middle School and from the Middle School to Parkview. Then the pattern was repeated beginning again with Clearview. At no time was the remedial teacher working with students from more than two schools simultaneously.

Evaluation

It was decided that after the program had run for one semester an evaluation would be made. A survey of the teachers in grades one through four would determine how they viewed the program and how much communication was achieved. An analysis of the number of students involved would determine whether a fair distribution of students was served. An analysis of the problems referred would show whether a pattern of problems was developing.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

At the end of the first semester the program was evaluated to determine whether it had produced the expected results. The questions to be answered were: 1) did the students have only one reading program? 2) did the program help keep students in the regular reading program? 3) did it serve a larger number of students than a more traditional program? 4) was there cooperation between the classroom teachers and the remedial teacher? 5) did this program help to locate significant problem areas in the regular reading program? These had been the advantages that this type of program had been expected to produce.

Two methods of evaluation were chosen. An analysis of the time spent on the program, the number of students referred, and the types of problems referred was made from the daily records that were kept by the remedial teacher. A survey was sent out to all teachers in grades one through four to determine their reactions to the program and to get their suggestions and criticisms. Some data were gathered on the Title I program for comparison.

One Reading Program

One of the expected advantages of this program was that the student would not have two separate reading programs--

a classroom program and a remedial one. There was to be only one program with the remedial program being an extension of the classroom program. Whether this was indeed so depended upon the interpretation of the following information. Since referrals were made based on performance of classroom reading skills, it could be concluded that there was only one program. The objectives were also based on the classroom teacher's expectations for all students in the classroom. Therefore the remedial program was not a different program from what the students were learning in their classrooms.

In reality, however, remediation sometimes fell weeks behind the classroom program and students were working on one skill in the remedial setting and on a new skill in the classroom. As a result, it might be said that the student did have to contend with two different programs at the same time.

While the skills and objectives were the same in the remedial situation and in the classroom, the timetable was not and it is unlikely that it could be since the remediation service provided by this program followed the classroom instruction. However, even though the program was not as integrated as it had been hoped, it was concluded that there was still an advantage to having only one set of skill expectations and objectives for the student to cope with.

Maintainance in the Regular Reading Program

It was hoped that this program could help students to keep up with their classroom work so that the sequence of

skills would not be interrupted. Evaluation of this aspect was difficult. It is impossible to determine whether students who are successfully pursuing the regular reading program can in any way attribute their success even in part to the remedial program. In order to determine whether this program was helping the students to keep up with the class it was decided to see how many students needed to be referred more than once. The rationale for this was that if students had to be referred more than once in a semester, they would probably have trouble keeping up with the class even with remedial help and a slower classroom program would have to be substituted. In these cases the short-range objective program would be judged as ineffective since it did not meet the goal of maintaining the student in his regular reading program. If the student was referred only once in the semester, the short-range objective program could be viewed as a success since the student had not fallen behind again within half of the school year.

The tabulation showed that 17 students were referred only once, 12 were referred twice, and 2 participated in the program three times. Based on the criteria that were established in the previous paragraph, the program was judged effective 55% of the time. The conclusion based on these data would be that the program has helped only half of the children referred to perform successfully in the classroom.

Another way to evaluate this objective would be to determine how many of the referred students were continuing in the

same classroom program at the end of the semester that they were in when they were referred. Of the 31 students referred, 28 are continuing in the same program, two were put into reading readiness programs, and one was assigned to the LD teacher for reading. Using this criterion the program would have a success factor of 91%. This figure could give a false impression because in some cases the students may be continuing in the same program not because they were successful, but because there were no other options available for them.

The actual number of students whose continued success in the regular reading program can be at least partially attributed to the short-range objectives reading program cannot be determined accurately. The percent of students who were helped probably lies somewhere between the 55% of the former evaluation and the 91% of the latter evaluation. The conclusion was reached that some students can be helped by this program to remain successfully in the regular reading program.

Larger Number of Students

One of the goals of this program was to serve a larger number of students than the more traditional types of programs. Table 2 shows that 47 student referrals were made during the first semester. This would account for 14% of the student population in grades one through four. However, this number is deceptive and will not be used to represent the total number of different students served since some of the students were referred more than once. Actually only 31

different students received help from the remedial teacher because 17 were referred once, 12 were referred twice, and 2 were referred three times to arrive at 47 total referrals. These 31 students account for 9.5% of the students in grades one through four.

Table 2

Number of Students Referred in Each Skill Area by School

Skill Area	Total	CV	SV	PV	MS
Silent letters	7		4	3	
<u>Ea</u> sounds	6		3	3	
Letter recognition	2	2			
Letter sounds	2	2			
Consonant digraphs	1			1	
Vowel sounds	2	2			
Blending	5	3		2	
Contractions	4			3	1
Sequencing	3		3		
Basic sight vocabulary	2	2			
Question comprehension	5		5		
Sentence comprehension	8		8		
Totals	<u>47</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>1</u>
Percent of referrals	100	40	32	26	2

For comparison, statistics were gathered about the Title I program which serves approximately the same population in a more traditional manner. The Title I program tests the

students in grades one through three to determine which students are eligible for the program. Then a weekly schedule is set up in which each student sees the reading teacher about twice a week. There are 36 students from the first three grades participating in the program. This amounts to 15% of the student population in these grades. This is higher than the 9.5% figure for the short-range objectives program. However, the Title I program had 315 minutes available per week to work with those three grades compared with the 215 minutes of the short-range objectives program. Therefore, there was 46% more time available. If the 36 students were all receiving the same amount of time from the 315 minutes, the same program would theoretically serve 25 students which is less than the 31 students who received help under the short-range objectives program. The fact should also be considered that there were two teachers working with the students during this time under the Title I program. Therefore it is conceivable to conclude that each Title I teacher was able to serve 12.5 students in 215 minutes per week. This amounts to only 5% of the student population. It can be concluded that the short-range objectives program did serve a larger number of students than the more traditional Title I program.

Table 3 shows that more third and fourth grade students were referred than first and second grade students. This may be attributed to the fact that these upper levels require students to possess more skills and therefore students are

more likely to be deficient in one skills area. Table 3 shows that grades three and four accounted for 64% of the referrals. By comparison grades three and four account for only 51% of the students.

Table 3

Number of Students Referred in Each Skill Area by Grade

Skill Area	Total	1	2	3	4
Silent letters	7			3	4
<u>Ea</u> sounds	6			5	1
Letter recognition	2	2			
Letter sounds	2	2			
Consonant digraphs	1		1		
Vowel sounds	2		2		
Blending	5	5			
Contractions	4			3	1
Sequencing	3			2	1
Basic sight vocabulary	2		2		
Question comprehension	5				5
Sentence comprehension	8		3	5	
Totals	<u>47</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>
Percent of referrals	100	19	17	38	26

Table 2 showed that Clearview school referred the most students. This can be attributed to the fact that the program was begun at Clearview and therefore the teachers and students there were involved in the program longer than the others. Table 2 also shows that the Middle School referred

only one student. This can partially be explained by the fact that the Middle School had only two classes that participated in the short-range objectives program. The 46 students in these two classes made up only 14% of the students in the program. The Middle School population was the smallest of the four participating schools and the number of referrals would be expected to be the smallest also. However, there is still a discrepancy in the fact that while the Middle School had 14% of the students eligible for the program, it had only 2% of the referrals. In her answer to the teacher survey (see Appendix A) one of the two teachers at the Middle School explained that the afternoon times were inconvenient for working with any students either in or outside of the classroom. The time period was one factor of the program that could not be altered. This may be the real reason that there were so few referrals from the Middle School.

Even though the total division of time was not completely equitable throughout the semester, it was felt that all of the grades had been fairly served. It was apparent that three of the schools had received most of the services. More of an effort should have been made to include the students in the Middle School, possibly by developing home or classroom programs. The conclusion was reached that a fairly large number of students had been participants.

Cooperation

Another goal of this program was to facilitate cooperation between the classroom teacher and the remedial teacher.

From Table 4 it can be seen that working with the teachers accounted for 680 minutes of the program or 25% of the total time. This time was used to determine student problems and develop objectives, to report on student progress, and to develop programs for the classroom. The time spent with the teachers appeared to have paid off because all 14 teachers reported on the survey that they understood how the program worked, all the teachers who referred students (10) reported that they knew what was being done in the remediation sessions, and three of the teachers responded that they had received help with their classroom programs. It was concluded that the program successfully met the objective of having close communication and cooperation between the remedial teacher and the classroom teachers.

Significant Problem Areas

The children were referred for problems that came under 12 categories. No pattern of problems developed probably due to the small sample of problems referred. From Table 2 or 3 it can be seen that the problems for which the largest numbers of students were referred were sentence comprehension, silent letters, and ea sounds. The students referred for these problems were mostly from the third and fourth grades. It was pointed out earlier that the third and fourth grades accounted for most of the referrals and that may account for these problems being the ones most often referred. From the information available no significant problems can be identified.

From Table 4 it is apparent that blending problems were the most difficult to remediate. Both the student time and the preparation time were the highest for this problem. The students involved were all first graders. Three of the five students are continuing into second semester. For two of the students failure to be able to blend sounds into words has completely ended their progress in the regular reading program. It might be beneficial to work with the classroom teachers on some techniques for helping first grade students over the obstacle presented by blending.

It is apparent that the sample of problems was too small to identify any significant problems with the regular reading program. However, some patterns may emerge if the program continues over a period of years. The evaluation of time did suggest that blending might be the most difficult skill encountered by first grade students in the regular reading program.

Summary of Conclusions

The short-range objectives program did provide a uniform set of skills and objectives for both the classroom and remedial programs. It did help some students to remain successfully in the regular reading program although three students were unable to continue in their reading program and others may have been able to continue successfully without this help. The program was able to reach a larger number of students than the Title I program. There was good cooperation between the classroom teacher and the remedial teacher. However, the

Table 4

Time Spent in Remediation by Skill Area

Skill Area	Time spent working with			Total Time
	Students	Teachers	Preparations	
Silent letters	230	55	40	325
<u>Ea</u> sounds**	205	15	30	250
Letter recognition	42	20	65	127
Letter sounds*	15	10	0	25
Blending	445	65	95	605
Consonant digraphs	145	5	0	150
Vowel sounds*	45	25	5	75
Contractions	100	35	40	175
Sequencing**	160	5	75	240
Basic Sight vocabulary***115		105	60	280
Question comprehension*	50	55	30	135
Sentence comprehension***	65	60	25	150
Explaining the program	0	225	0	225
Totals in minutes	1617	680	465	2537
Percent of total time	63.7	17.9	18.3	100

*No problem in this area was found to exist with the students who were referred.

**One of the students referred in this area did not complete the program because he was referred to LD.

***A classroom program was designed to meet the needs of the students in this area.

short-range objectives program was unable to identify any significant problem areas in the regular reading program in this short period of time.

APPENDIX A--TEACHER SURVEY

Yes No

- _____ _____ 1. Did you have any students who received help from me in the first semester? If your answer is yes,
- A. How many? _____
 - B. How many of these students benefited from this help? _____
 - C. How many of these students met the objective that was set for them? _____
- _____ _____ 2. Did you have any students who needed this kind of help from me but did not receive it? If your answer is yes,
- A. How many? _____
 - B. Why didn't they receive help?
 - _____ They were not referred to me.
 - _____ They were referred to me but I would not take them.
- _____ _____ 3. Did you receive any help from me regarding your classroom program? If your answer is no,
- A. Why not?
 - _____ There was no need to ask for assistance.
 - _____ You did not know that I would help with the regular reading program.
 - _____ You asked but I would not/could not help you.
- _____ _____ 4. Did you understand how this program operated?
- _____ _____ 5. Did you know what I was working on with your students?
- _____ _____ 6. Were you satisfied with the scheduling of your students? If your answer is no,
- A. Why not?
 - _____ Sessions were too long.
 - _____ Sessions were too short.
 - _____ Sessions were too infrequent.
 - _____ Sessions were too late in the day.
 - _____ Other: _____

REFERENCES

- Barbour, C., and Czarnecki, J. Contract teaching at sunset elementary school. Theory Into Practice, 1973, 12, 234-237.
- Christen, W. Contracting for student learning. Educational Technology, 1976, 16(3), 30-31.
- Dunn, L. M. An overview. In L. M. Dunn (Ed.), Exceptional children in the schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Ervin, J. E. A study of effectiveness of block scheduling versus cycle scheduling for articulation therapy for grades two and three in the public schools, Journal of the Speech and Hearing Association of Virginia, 1965, 6, 17-18.
- Gutknecht, B. Label syndrome. Language Arts, 1976, 53, 419-421.
- Grittner, F. M. Individualized instruction: an historical perspective. Modern Language Journal, 1975, 59, 323-333.
- Harris, A. J. Practical suggestions for remedial teachers. The Reading Teacher, 1978, 31, 916-922.
- Mangieri, J. N., and Readence, J. E. Mainstreaming: implications for the teaching of reading. Reading Improvement, 1977, 14, 165-166.
- Mayhall, W. F., and Jenkins, J. R. Scheduling daily or less-than-daily instruction: implications for resource programs.

- Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1977, 10, 159-163.
- O'Bruba, W. S. Basic principles for teaching remedial reading in the classroom. Reading Improvement, 1974, 11, 9-10.
- Pendrak, M. Performance contracting and the secondary reading lab. Journal of Reading, 1974, 17, 453-456.
- Robinson, H. A., and Rauch, S. J. Guiding the reading program: a reading consultant's handbook. Chicago, Ill.: Science Research Associates, 1965.
- Robinson, R. D., and Petit, N. T. The role of the reading teacher: where do you fit in? The Reading Teacher, 1978, 31, 923-927.
- Sabatino, D. A. An evaluation of resource rooms for children with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 1971, 4, 84-93.
- Smith, C. B. Treating reading difficulties (PREP monograph, Superintendent of Documents catalogue no. HE 5.230: 30026). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Van Hattum, R. J. Evaluating elementary school speech therapy. Exceptional Children, 1959, 25, 411-415.
- Wilhoite, C. H. Contracting: a bridge between the classroom and resource room. The Reading Teacher, 1977, 30, 376-378.
- Wilson, R. M., and Gambrell, L. B. Contracting--one way to individualize. Elementary English, 1973, 50, 427-429; 444.

