


Summer 2003

Model Title I Reading Program in Allignment with the Essential Academic Learning Requiriements

Jeanne O'Hara Maxwell

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/graduate_projects

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Elementary Education Commons](#), and the [Language and Literacy Education Commons](#)

ABSTRACT

MODEL TITLE I READING PROGRAM
IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE
ESSENTIAL ACADEMIC LEARNING REQUIREMENTS

by

Jeanne O'Hara Maxwell

May, 2003

The purpose of the project was to design and develop a model Title I reading program for John Campbell Elementary School, Selah, Washington, in alignment with the state Essential Learning Requirements. To accomplish this purpose, current research and literature related to the fundamentals of reading/literacy and instructional strategies related to student mastery of this essential academic skill were reviewed. Additionally, related information/materials from selected sources were obtained and analyzed. The model consists of a number of separately usable components, organized into four units: Student-Centered Classroom, Homogeneous Grouping, Building Fluency, and Phonics & Whole Language. Each unit contains its own assessment piece. The effectiveness of this model program is in part reflected by the author's own success with the model in the classroom.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project is dedicated to my children, Joshua, Joseph, Jacob, and Carrie, and to my family and friends for their continued support and belief in my ability to complete this Master's Degree program.

The writer would also like to express her appreciation to Dr. Jack McPherson for his friendship, support, assistance, and invaluable advice in preparing this paper and during my complete course of study. In addition, I would also like to thank Dr. Lee Chapman and Dr. Frank Carlson for their instruction and their participation as members of my committee.

Finally, the writer would like to pay tribute to her son Jason who encouraged her to become a teacher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of the Project	2
Limitations of the Project	2
Definitions of Terms	3
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM SELECTED SOURCES	6
Introduction	6
Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements	7
Background of Title I	9
Characteristics of an Effective Reading Classroom	11
The Relationship Between Fluency and Reading Development	14
Phonemic Awareness	18
Whole Language	24
Balanced Approach to Reading	26
Homogeneous Reading Groups	27
An Analysis of Information Obtained from Selected Sources	30
Summary	31
CHAPTER THREE: PROCEDURES	33
Need for the Project	34
Development of Support for the Project	35
Procedures of the Project	37
Planned Implementation and Assessment of the Project	38
CHAPTER FOUR: THE PROJECT	40
Introduction	P1
Unit One: Student-Centered Classroom	P22
Unit Two: Homogeneous Grouping for Instruction	P39
Unit Three: Building Fluency	P49
Unit Four: Phonemic Awareness & Whole Language Activities	P76

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	41
Summary	41
Conclusions	41
Recommendations	42
References	45

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

Introduction

When children learn to read, they unlock the door to the world. Reading is a key that allows children to begin an exciting journey that lasts a lifetime. It is a foundation skill from which other learning springs. A child first *learns to read*. Then, the *child reads to learn*. The ability to read allows us to understand, to reflect, to connect our lives to others, and to become lifelong learners (OSPI, 1995).

The above quotation cited in the OSPI, (1995) Commission on Student Learning, affirmed the necessity of implementing an effective reading program at the primary level that addresses the reading needs of all students. Since the foundation of all learning begins with reading, it sets the standard by which all learning takes place. When children learn to read, to develop the ability to analyze, and to think critically, they are better able to make connections to life situations. When a child learns to read, the skill from which other learning takes place is acquired and students become life-long learners.

Juel (1988) contended that reading is the most essential academic skill and the ability to read is fundamental to success in our rapidly changing and complex society. McGuinness and McGuinness (1998) concurred that reading is the most significant skill any child can acquire; reading is the foundation of education; and, reading opens the door to options and opportunities throughout life.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to develop a model Title I Reading program for John Campbell Elementary School. The focus was on implementing a balanced reading curriculum using the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR's) (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2001). The project addressed classroom environment as a foundational tool to effective learning, intrinsic motivation of students, and specific activities that teach children to read. Two reading philosophies will be the focus of the model program; phonemic awareness and whole language. The project will review pertinent research literature to determine appropriate instructional grouping components that will improve reading abilities of students. To accomplish this purpose, a review of related literature was conducted. Additionally, related information and materials was obtained and analyzed.

Limitations of the Project

For the purpose of this project, it was necessary to establish the following limitations:

1. Research: The literature was essentially limited to research within the last five (5) years. Additionally, selected school districts were contacted and invited to submit information regarding specific reading strategies unique to their individual Title I reading programs.
2. Scope: The model Title I program was designed for use by reading specialist teachers to maximize student improvement in fundamental reading skills and strategies.
3. Target Population: The model program was designed to serve grades K-4 at John Campbell Elementary School, Selah, WA.

Definition of Terms

Significant terms used in the context of this project have been defined as follows:

Accelerated Reader: A computerized reading management program. Provides motivation and accountability for student reading while giving teachers a tool to assess individual achievement. A student self selects an A.R. book at the appropriate reading level. After reading the book, the student then takes a simple, computerized quiz containing objective questions on incidents from the book (The Institute for Academic Excellence, 1996).

Assisted Repeated Reading: Rereading with a live or audio taped model of the passage or story (Dowhower, 1989).

At-Risk Reader: A student experiencing reading problems in the areas of phonemic awareness, vocabulary development, reading fluency, comprehension, and word analysis that may result in reading failure unless appropriate interventions are used to help the student resolve the problems and achieve reading success (The Washington Institute for Academic Excellence, 1996).

Blending: The ability to combine individual sounds to form a word (Reutzel & Cooter, Jr., 1996).

Control Charts: Teacher created graphs students use to monitor and communicate about their learning (Jenkins, 1998).

Decoding: Reading by using the sound-to-sound picture code of the language (McGuinness & McGuinness, 1998).

Emergent Reader: The beginning reader. The period from birth until a child begins conventional reading (Saint-Laurent, Giasson & Couture, 1997).

Essential Academic Learning Requirements EALR's: Clear learning targets for students

be required to master and demonstrate in the classroom (Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2001).

Fluency: Is specifically reading rate, word recognition accuracy, and reading in meaningful phrases (Rasinski, 1990).

Guided Reading: A context in which a teacher supports each reader's development of effective strategies for processing texts at challenging levels of difficulty (Pinnell & Fountas, 1998).

Homogeneous Groups: Instructional groups comprised of similar ability students (Kulik, 1992).

Intrinsic Motivation: The desire to reach academic goals that comes from within a student (Burgard, 2000).

Language Experiences: Helping children explore, record, consider, read about, and share their experiences, feelings, and ideas through talking, reading, and writing (Mooney, 1990).

Letter-Sound Correspondence: The understanding that each of the 26 symbols of the alphabet has a corresponding sound (McGuinness, 1997).

Phonemic Awareness: The ability to hear and remember the order of phonemes in words (McGuinness, 1997).

Phonemes: The specific unit sound associated with each letter of the alphabet (Bursuck, Munk, Nelson, and Curran, 2002).

Regrouping: The practice of grouping students in homogeneous groups for instruction during the block of time allotted to a curricular subject such as reading (Slavin, 1988).

Repeated Reading: Readers practice rereading one text until some predetermined level of

Repeated Reading: Readers practice rereading one text until some predetermined level of fluency is achieved (Samuels, 1997).

Subword Skills: The identification and sound of alphabetic letter skills a prereader needs to master with fluency in order to become a reader (Speece, Mills, Ritchey, and Hillman, 2003).

Whole Language: The philosophy which uses story content and literature to teach children to read. Children use pictures and other context clues to figure out what words mean (Taylor, 1997).

CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM SELECTED SOURCES

Introduction

The review of research and literature summarized in Chapter 2 has been organized to address:

1. Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements
2. Background of Title I
3. Characteristics of an Effective Reading Classroom
4. The Relationship Between Fluency and Reading Development
5. Phonemic Awareness
6. Whole Language
7. Balanced Approach to Reading
8. Homogeneous Reading Groups
9. An Analysis of Information Obtained from Selected Sources
10. Summary

Research current within primarily the past five (5) years was identified through Educational Resources Information Centers (ERIC) and Internet computer searches. Additionally, related information/materials from selected sources was obtained and analyzed.

Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements

As observed by the Washington State Commission on Student Learning (1998), today's students have been pressured to achieve at a higher level. The world that today's children have adapted and adjusted to is much different from the world most Americans grew up learning. Society has become so competitive and there are many factors that children must learn to master, in order for success to prevail. In order for our society to prosper and continue to climb the ladder of the future, we must continue to challenge and force our youth to become more intelligent. Accordingly, the State of Washington has developed an innovative program to improve public education for all.

Children are growing up in a world that has changed drastically since the days of our own youth. Technology and other forces are rapidly transforming the ways we live and work. The forces of change are also re-shaping what it means to have the knowledge and skills necessary to lead a successful life now and in the 21st century.

In 1995, the Washington State Commission on Student Learning adopted higher standards for public education in the areas of reading, writing, communication and mathematics.

According to a report published by the OSPI (2001), growing numbers of citizens interested in education have been collaborating to create changes in the state's educational system that have demanded higher academic standards. In prior years the attempt to establish state standards fell short, therefore leaving individual school districts to develop their own

standards, which resulted in an inconsistent attempt to measure achievement. (p.1)

With the creation of the Commission on Student Learning in 1993, an effort was undertaken to develop an assessment system that assured the State of Washington that school districts and its employees and clients would perform at a higher level. Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs) were developed to establish new standards for educators and students. As noted by the OSPI (2001):

The Essential Academic Learning Requirements are clear targets for students and teachers across the state. Setting higher standards calls for better methods of measuring student and teacher performance. On a parallel course with the Essential Academic Learning Requirements, The Commission on Student Learning is developing an assessment system that holds students, teachers, schools, and districts accountable for better performance and results.

With this vision in mind, The Commission on Student Learning developed the following four learning goals for students to reach their highest potential:

1. Read with comprehension, write with skill, and communicate effectively and responsibly in a variety of ways and settings.
2. Know and apply the core concepts and principles of mathematics; social, physical, and life sciences; civics and history; geography; arts; and health and fitness.
3. Think analytically, logically, and creatively, and to integrate experience and knowledge to form reasoned judgements and solve problems.
4. Understand the importance of work and how performance, effort, and decisions

directly affect career and educational opportunities.

Dr. Terry Bergeson, Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in the field of education, has led an educational reform movement to ensure that learning is occurring.

Therefore, the State of Washington has developed an assessment tool to determine the validity of the EALRs, known as the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). Students in grades four, seven and ten are tested in the areas of reading, writing, listening and mathematics. The WASL requires students to choose right answers and to demonstrate subject content knowledge, but also to explain their thinking, to write essays, and solve complicated problems in mathematics. As stated by Dr. Bergeson: "The great news for 2001 is the hard work of teachers, students, and parents is paying off: Our students, on the whole, are growing in the kinds of skills they will need to succeed later in life as demonstrated by their work on the WASL." (p.1)

Background of Title I

In 1965 the United States Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I of this Act became the largest federal aid program for elementary and secondary schools. Today, Title I allocates over 7 billion dollars and serves over 6 million children, primarily at the elementary level in the areas of reading and math. Its goal was to provide "money to school districts....based on the number of low income families....for extra educational services for children who are behind in school" (Rogers, 1995).

Since 1965 there have been several important changes to the original Title I. The first occurred when congress and the United States Office of Education "took steps to increase state

and local accountability under the program...culminating in the 1978 amendments to Title I” (Birman, et al., 1987). The second change was in 1981 when Title I was renamed Chapter I. Chapter I’s goals were the same as those for Title I, but procedures for showing compliance were simplified (Birman, et al., 1987). The Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988 brought further changes to Chapter I. According to Levin (1993), the law now required that Chapter I programs be of high quality; Chapter I students would not be subjected to lower expectations than other students; programs that did not work would be improved, and parents would play a major role.

The most recent change was in 1994 when Congress reauthorized the law and the name reverted back to Title I. The 1994 reauthorization provided sweeping changes to Title I. The United States Congress recognized that a “sizable gap remains” between disadvantaged children and other children (Congressional Record, 1994). It also stated that the most critical need for improvement in education was in areas that had a large number of low income families. Furthermore, “...programs need to become even more effective in improving schools in order to enable all children to achieve high standards” (Congressional Record, 1994). Finally, in order for students to meet rising national and state standards, more time must be spent learning the core academic subjects (Congressional Record, 1994).

Most significant in the recent changes to Title I was the emphasis on state standards and assessments. According to Rogers (1995), each state receiving money under the Goals 2000 Educate America Act, is mandated to develop challenging content and performance standards for what all students should know and be able to do, assessments, and a state plan for the improvement of primary and secondary education. A 1996 report on Title I stated that Title I

could no longer be an isolated program; it must “serve as a support for states and local school systems as they plan to improve learning and teaching through standards-driven reforms” (United States Department of Education, 1996).

Directly tied to the new requirements for state assessments is an increased level of responsibility and autonomy at the state and local level. LeTendre (1996) stated a major change in the law shifts responsibility for making decisions to the local level, where districts and schools can define the type of Title I program that will best ensure their students meet state standards. Riley (1995) agreed, noting that one of the key components of the reauthorized Title I is flexibility at the local level to change and improve Title I services.

Characteristics of an Effective Reading Classroom

Block, Hurt, and Oakar (2002) found that highly successful teachers of literacy take risks, are energetic, and teach with flexibility and understanding to meet individual needs of students. Maximum effective reading growth has occurred when reading teachers are committed to their students and maintain high expectations of students and themselves. When reading teachers related to students that they care about the whole child first, students were taken into literacy through their modeled readings, interactions with print, and their expressions. These classrooms captured students' interest in learning to read through oral stimuli, sounds, feelings, and voice.

Wray, Medwell, Fox, and Poulson (2000) observed that quality of instruction which students received was the most consistent indicator of effective teaching. They added evidence that student achievement related to effective classroom organization. Teachers of reading were

the facilitators of effective classroom instruction when the organization consisted of small group and individual teaching.

For the child, relationships with other human beings have been seen as the most important aspect of life. Learning relationships form the fabric of the child's existence. It is most important teachers model the behavior they want their students to acquire. The effective literacy teacher models reading strategies they desire children to learn (Layton, 2000).

According to Strong, Silver, and Robinson (1995), when students are engaged, curiosity is stimulated, permitting them to express creativity and foster positive relationships. When the teacher modeled and articulated the criteria for success, students were motivated to perform high quality work. The authors add that students must be shown the skills they need to be successful by the teacher modeling these skills. They further state that the teacher must help students see success as a valuable aspect of their personality.

Sherer (1999) contended that students must come to learn because they have a desire to learn, not because someone is giving them an M&M or an A. Teachers who foster intrinsic motivation are passionate in their teaching. They continually ask how students learn, how they construct knowledge, and how they can participate in the learning experience with their students. Learner-centered classrooms were fostered when less teacher control was used to force students to conform to the will of the teacher (Lasley, 1998). In classrooms where students made choices about learning and had engaging tasks, the need for punishments and rewards were diminished. Both punishments and rewards manipulate behavior that destroys the potential for real learning. Intrinsically motivated classrooms ask what kind of person do I want to be and what kind of classroom do we want to have. What students need is unconditional support and encouragement

student learning. Students graphed their own progress after each and every assessment. Burgard (2000) identified three main areas of student management: Enthusiasm (attitude toward the classroom), information (the facts they need to know), and knowledge (the ability to express and apply what they know). When students had input into the running of the classroom, it is amazing how student enthusiasm improved.

Bursuck, Munk, Nelson, and Curran (2002) contended that a reading program designed to include intense, specific, and comprehensive instruction in phonemic awareness, alphabetic principles that letters represent sounds, and word identification skills, will lead to fluent reading. These authorities observed that the relationship between phonological awareness and the process of learning to read is one of the most important factors in acquiring literacy skills. They further stated that the ability for children to identify phonemes in word is a skill that is essential to the reading process. This process unfolds once the alphabet has been learnt.

According to Massey (2002), reading includes word identification/decoding, comprehension, fluency, and motivation as children progress through the developmental stages of reading. Combining this application to the reading continuum means making knowledgeable decisions about students based on individual needs. Referring to a balanced reading approach, Massey saw a model of instruction that was based on knowledge, explicit instruction, and learner-centered discoveries. He continued that balance employs isolated skill emphasis, planned instruction, trade book, and published teaching materials.

The Relationship Between Fluency and Reading Development

Children with reading problems often evidenced hesitant, slow, and effortful word

recognition that impaired their ability to comprehend text (Adams, 1990; Idol, 1988; Spear & Sternberg, 1986). It has been theorized that this obvious lack of fluency not only impacts word recognition mastery, but can also extensively impair comprehension (Perfetti, 1976).

Evidence indicated that readers who comprehend poorly read more slowly and made significantly more word recognition errors than more successful readers (Perfetti & Lesgold, 1976)). A review of research on students with reading disabilities demonstrated that as a whole, decoding difficulties are not the critical impediment to later reading achievement. Rather, it is the students' inability to automatically recognize words that continues to impair reading (Spear & Sternberg, 1986).

Word recognition, knowledge of syntactic structure and word meaning, and sufficient background knowledge were found necessary to master reading. However, as a requisite component, fluency was an enabling skill that allowed readers to comprehend more effectively. This increased speed and word recognition was an indicator that the child had reached the automatic stage in which the reader was able to focus his attention on comprehension, rather than decoding (Laberge 1973; Perfetti, & Lesgold, 1976; McCormick & Samuels, 1976).

Perfetti and Lesgold (1976) proposed the bottleneck theory that stated that slower coding interfered with a reader's ability to remember large units of text such as clauses and sentences.

Stanovich (1994) hypothesized that reading dysfluency limits the amount of text readers

encounter. This reduced vocabulary development and consequently impeded comprehension. As the child continued to struggle and experience failure, the child's motivation was often negatively effected. Anderson, Wilson, and Fielding's 1988 research illustrated that the amount of engagement with text is a primary indicator of reading achievement. Nonetheless, persistent and prolonged reading dysfluency is likely to deter one's desire and motivation to read, consequently reducing text engagement.

Research illustrated the importance of including fluency development in reading instruction. A primary method used to improve reading fluency was direct reading practice (Adams, 1990). In order to assist novice or struggling readers in achieving fluency, instructional methodologies have been developed. One of the most promising methodologies in fluency development is the method of repeated readings (Dahl, 1974; Samuels, 1979). This method was designed to optimize the benefits of reading practice by pairing repetitive practice of connected text with immediate feedback from an adult, student, or audiotape. In general, repeated reading methods fall into two categories: unassisted and assisted repeated reading. Unassisted repeated reading involves multiple reading of a passage without modeling; while in assisted repeated reading the passage is modeled by a teacher, aide, or audiotape.

Many different successful repeated reading procedures have been reported. For example, unassisted repeated reading (Dowhower, 1987; Herman, 1985; Samuels, 1979) and assisted repeated reading with a live or audiotaped model of the passage (Carbo, 1978; Chomsky, 1976; Gamby, 1983). While methods and terminology differ, all of the procedures share a common goal - to improve the fluency of readers initially and to improve comprehension ultimately. In addition, they share a common strategy - rereading a meaningful passage until mastery is

achieved.

Samuels' (1979) was the most widely researched repeated reading method. The rationale for Samuels' method was derived from the theory of automatic information processing in reading, which was developed by Laberge and Samuels in 1974. This model identified three stages through which a reader moves toward attaining automaticity. At first, the reader is in a non-accurate stage, where his/her attention is focused on decoding, which makes the process of deriving meaning from the text slower and more difficult. Next, the reader moves into the accuracy stage, where he/she is able to read words correctly, but attention is required. Often the reader has a high word recognition rate, but comprehension may be poor. Oral reading is usually slow and halting, without expression. Finally, after sufficient exposure to the words, the reader advances into the automatic stage. At this stage, he/she is a fluent reader able to recognize printed words automatically, read quickly, and comprehend the meaning of the passage.

Based on his research, Samuels created an oral reading technique called the method of repeated readings, with his goal being to increase fluency (i.e., word recognition and speed). This method required the student to read a short, easy, and interesting passage of between 50 to 200 words several times. Then, the student read the passage to the teacher, who recorded the reading speed and the number of word recognition errors on a graph. The student continued to reread the same passage until confident in his/her ability to read it fluently. The student again read the passage to the teacher, then recorded the new data on the graph. If the predetermined criterion for fluency was met, the student moved onto a new passage and the procedure was repeated.

Samuels provided research data to support his theory that repeated reading of a passage

resulted in an increase in reading speed and a decrease in word recognition errors. He also found that the initial reading of successive passages yielded fewer word recognition errors and an increase in speed, therefore fewer rereadings were required to master the reading passages. Consequently, Samuels claimed that fluency is increased through repeated readings.

Research into the use of assisted reading has shown that it is also an effective method of instruction. This method differs from repeated readings in that the reader reads the text while simultaneously listening to a fluent rendition of the same text. Chomsky (1976), Carbo (1978), and van der Leij (1981) have employed variations of the method with poor elementary readers. These researchers reported positive results from the use of the listening while reading approach. This method can be beneficial for children experiencing passive failure in reading (Johnston & Winograd, 1985; Winograd & Smith, 1978) by helping them take personal control of their own reading growth. Plus, it modeled fluent reading, which the students could listen to again and again until they felt ready to read the material on their own.

In 1976 Chomsky designed and implemented a program of repeated reading to assist five poorly skilled third grade readers attain fluency. Chomsky decided that the instruction needed to focus on reading in context, rather than fragmented skills instruction, typical of many remedial programs. She tape recorded short, interesting books selected by the students, which the students read independently along with the tapes until they could read the books fluently without the tapes. Chomsky also created skills lessons and other instructional activities to go along with the books. Chomsky's project was successful. After 15 weeks of practice, the subjects demonstrated reading growth, with a mean gain of 6 months in word recognition skills and a gain of several months to a year in oral reading speed. The subjects also developed positive attitudes and

enthusiasm for reading, and improved self-concepts. She attributed the study's success to the fact that the students were highly motivated because of the novelty of the project, and because it was the first time they had experienced success as readers.

Carbo (1978) used taped stories (i.e., "talking books") to assist eight learning-disabled students, who were struggling readers. Carbo recorded the books emphasizing expression, clarity, and logical phrasing. The students listened and then read along with the taped stories until they could read the passages without error. After the 3 month study, the students had an average word recognition gain of 3 months on an achievement test. This was noteworthy because previously these students had shown severely below average gains on similar tests.

Phonemic Awareness

Phonemic awareness has been shown to be a significant part of learning to read. (National Research Council, 1998). Phonemic awareness introduces children to the relationships between auditory sounds and visual symbols. Letter-sound correspondence, decoding, and segmenting/blending are all sections that are included in the teaching of phonics. Each of these phonemic skills lays the foundation for beginning reading.

Letter-sound correspondence was determined to be a necessary part of teaching a child to read (McGuinness, 1997). It is important that the child has the understanding that each of the 26 symbols of the alphabet has a corresponding sound. The National Research Council (1998) found that beginning readers needed to know that spoken words are made up of smaller units of sounds and become familiar with sound-letter relations. Byrne and Fielding-Barnsley (1990)

in addition to other elements of a literacy program. Students would only succeed in reading if they were aware that each of the 26 symbols of the alphabet has a corresponding sound or sounds (Byrne & Fielding-Barnsley, 1990). Adams, (1990) found that knowledge of letter-sound relationships correlated strongly with early literacy development. A strong base in letter-sound relationships was significant to succeed with reading development (Morrow & Tracey, 1997).

McGuinness (1997) claimed a persistent problem that educators and parents discovered in teaching children letter-sound correspondence was that when teachers relied on teaching children the names of the alphabet letters, it often confused the child on what the corresponding sound would be. For example, the letter 'c' is pronounced *see*, when in fact the sound that beginning readers should identify is /k/, as in *cat*. Students' first reaction was that the letter symbol made the sound that it was saying in its name. McGuinness (1997) maintained that systematic studies showed that knowledge of letter names did not promote good reading skills, whereas the knowledge of phoneme-to-letter correspondences does. McGuinness also claimed that letter name teaching should not form any part of training at the kindergarten or first grade level. Memorizing the alphabet sequence of letter names has had one major purpose, and that purpose was to assist children in looking up words in the dictionary. The most effective method to teach children the sounds of the alphabet was to withhold teaching letter names and focus on teaching only the sound-symbol association.

Once children discovered the fact that letters and spoken sounds connect, they could generalize other connections between letters and sounds from print (Byrne, Freebody, & Gates, 1992). Students were ready for the next move once they knew some letter-sound correspondence. The combinations of several concepts assisted young people in the early stages

correspondence. The combinations of several concepts assisted young people in the early stages of learning to read. Children used many different methods to begin their reading process (Byrne, et al., 1992). Moustafa and Maldonado-Colon (1999) stated that, "Researchers agreed that proficient readers use their knowledge of language, their knowledge of letter-sound correspondences, and their background knowledge to read (i.e., make sense of) alphabetic writing" (p.1). Learning to read required a series of methods and strategies (Byrne, et al., 1992). In a recent study, Byrne and Fielding-Barnsley (1991) found that phonological awareness stringing was more successful when combined with letter-sound correspondence training. Byrne and Fielding-Barnsley suggested that combining phonological awareness with letter-sound correspondence would result in a higher level and faster rate of progress for the students. A connection between letter-sound correspondence and phonological awareness was needed to acquire basic literacy skills. Reutzel and Cooter, Jr. (1996) believed that learning the letter-sound correspondence was essential to reading words and connected text.

Phonics was at the center of debate for a number of years, (Durica, 1996). Many educators viewed this method as the only way to teach reading; other educators saw it as detrimental to literacy acquisition. Recent research suggested that students' abilities to understand phonics were best predictors of the ease of early reading acquisition, including IQ (Stanovich, 1994). Another perspective stated, phonics relationship to reading ability were of little importance. Phonics is not the only way to teach reading, and should not be entirely excluded (Durica, 1996).

Phonics is one part in an entire system of techniques and strategies used to teach effective reading skills (Morrow & Tracey, 1997). Morrow and Tracey (1997) claimed advocates of whole

not be isolated. Phonics is not to be isolated, but integrated into a literacy program. Byrne and Fielding-Barnsley (1990) suggested that educators create activities and lessons that included phonetic activities as well as other strategies. They further maintained that a child should be phonologically aware, but at the same time reflect upon other qualities that are going to promote his/her reading. Wagner et al. (1994) suggested that phonics cannot naturally emerge from phonological awareness, assuming that many other concepts must come into account. Students cannot be taught by one method alone.

Studies have shown that students without phonics do not succeed as well as students with phonemic awareness (Juel, 1988). The author stated that children with little phoneme awareness usually struggled in learning to read and spell words, which developed a wide achievement gap between themselves and peers who are phonemically aware. Byrne and Fielding-Barnsley (1993) claimed that most children who are knowledgeable of phonics and knew letter sounds could decode unfamiliar printed words.

Research indicated a strong correlation between a child's ability to read and the knowledge of phonics (National Research Council, 1998). Phonic skills in young readers were one of the strongest predictors of reading success. The National Research Council (1998) stated that basic knowledge of phonemic structure of words is important for a child to understand the alphabetic principle that written print represents the sounds of our language. This knowledge of phonics is what supported children in learning that each letter has a corresponding sound and makes up part of a whole word. The National Research Council also claimed that the association between reading and phonemic awareness, which is already substantial by the start of school, became stronger during the early grades. Educators should support the children's phonics

learning in the early grades to ensure strong reading skills (National Research Council, 1998).

Yopp (1995) believed training in phonemic awareness should be part of every child's education before formal reading instruction.

Decoding, as stated by McGuinness & McGuinness (1998), is reading by using the sound-to-sound picture code of language. According to Byrne and Fielding-Barnsley (1990), decoding is a basic component of reading. Decoding skills have shown to be a major part in the acquisition of basic literacy skills. McGuinness (1997) found that children who had accurate "phonetic decoding skills" scored the highest on reading tests. The highest predictor of a student's comprehension on a reading test was his/her ability to decode and read one word at a time, sound by sound.

Educators and readers placed belief on an early and strong emphasis on decoding skills and how these skills assist in learning to read (Reutzel & Cooter, Jr., 1996). One of the first stages in developing literacy skills is the decoding stage (Reutzel & Cooter, Jr., 1996). Decoding is also one of the most important skills to be learned in early reading instruction, and a lack of decoding ability or phonics knowledge can be the main cause of reading disability. Some researchers believed that young children learn to read by teaching them how to decode letters to sounds, and sounds to words (Reutzel & Cooter, Jr., 1996).

McCormick (1999) believed that decoding plays a big part in teaching a child to read. She felt that once a child has the ability to connect sounds, he/she will be able to come up with the correct pronunciation of the word. The National Research Council (1998) acknowledged that skilled readers can be compared with non-skilled readers by their accuracy and speed in decoding skills.

skills.

Segmentation is when students are able to separate individual sounds in a spoken word (Reutzel & Cooter, Jr., 1996). The ability to segment is essential to forming an effective identification strategy (Reutzel, Cooter, Jr., 1996). There have been strong correlations in recent studies between literacy in school-age children and segmentation (Wood & Terrell, 1998).

Blending requires that students are able to combine individual sounds to form a word (Reutzel, Cooter, Jr., 1996). There are various activities to use with groups of children which developed effective blending skills, and that will eventually guide students to becoming leaders in assisting their peers in blending activities (Yopp, 1995). A systematic approach to teaching successful reading instruction in blending is necessary (Shefelbine, 1998). Castle, Riach, and Nicholson (1994) found that one of the best benefits that children experienced in learning how to read is how to segment and blend sounds and how to link these sounds to the letters of the alphabet.

A study by Wood and Terrell (1998) involved activities that taught children how to blend and segment sounds, resulting in improvement in their phonological awareness. This same group of children performed better on literacy measures than other children did. Treiman, et al (1998) claimed that children, who knew that the word dig is made up of smaller sounds, were able to understand why dig is spelled with three letters. Children who had this understanding were able to grasp the basis of literacy skills and used these skills in a productive manner to pronounce words. Treiman et al. determined that children who are unable to analyze spoken words into smaller units of sound may experience more difficulty in learning to read. Murray (1998) found that once children have discovered how to combine individual sounds to form a word (blending

advanced stages of reading. Murray (1998) found that students who were taught to blend and segment across a range of phonemes demonstrated marked improvement in phoneme manipulation. According to Troia, Roth, and Graham (1998), isolated segmentation training or combined with blending instruction produced positive effects on reading achievement. Troia et al. also maintained that the most significant perception of literacy development is the ability to recognize that some children find it more difficult to learn how to read because they do not possess an understanding of how speech is segmented into sounds and how these sounds relate to print (Troia, et al., 1998).

Whole Language

Whole language is comprised of a combination of skills and strategies that has helped to advance student's learning in a variety of ways. Within the approach of whole language, students participated in guided reading groups. Students were also engulfed in a wide variety of environmental print. Whole language activities provided great experiences that played a major role in learning to read.

According to Tierney, Readence, and Dishner (1995), guided reading is a teacher-dominated activity with some student support. Mooney (1990) pointed out that the aim of guided reading is to develop independent readers that question, make informed choices as they seek meaning, and who consider alternatives. Guided reading has been designed for the teacher to guide the students through the "steps" of reading. It also allowed the students to see how the teacher walked through the strategies of reading independently (Tierney, et al.).

The purpose of guided reading has been to guide students into valuable experiences with language. Pinnell and Fountas (1998b) maintained that guided reading taught students to use the information they already knew. Guided reading lead to independent reading, which built the process of reading. It is the heart of a balanced literacy program (Pinnell & Fountas, 1998b).

(Pinnell & Fountas (1996) list the following rationales for guided reading:

- * It gives children the opportunity to develop as individual readers while participating in a socially supported activity
- * It gives teachers the opportunity to observe individual students as they process new texts
- * It gives each student the opportunity to develop reading strategies so they can read increasingly difficult texts on an independent level
- * It gives children enjoyable, successful experiences in reading for meaning
- * It develops the strategies needed for independent reading
- * It helps students learn how to choose texts themselves (pp.1-2).

When guided reading was used in the classroom, there were several activities taking place. Mason, Peterman, and Kerr (1989) discussed the before, during, and after activities throughout the guided reading lesson. Prior to a guided reading lesson, the teacher made predictions orally about what the story might be about. The students watched as the teacher talked through the strategies of discovering what the story might be about. The teacher looked at the front cover, asked questions orally to herself to help develop background knowledge, and introduced the characters. The teacher also looked at the pictures to find out who the characters might be as well as what the setting of the story was (Mason et al., 1989; The Story Box, 1990).

The teacher should ask thought-provoking questions to ensure comprehension of the reading is taking place (Tierney et al., 1995; Mason et al., 1989).

Following a guided reading lesson, the teacher reviewed components of the story, assisting students to look back in the reading to find information. The teacher also asked questions of students to promote engaging activities to help promote better understanding of the material (Tierney et al., 1995; Mason et al., 1989).

Balanced Approach to Reading

McGuinness (1997) claimed that the most effective reading program was not limited to teaching phonics or limited to teaching whole language, but embraced a balance of the two. McGuinness also discussed a balanced reading program using a combination of phonics and whole language that worked for every student. Mooney (1990) backed up this belief stating that both approaches should be included in the daily literacy program at every level of elementary education. Pinnell and Fountas (1998b) explained that a child must learn basic reading skills at the same time understanding the skills and strategies taught using the whole language approach. Tompkins (1997) made it clear that a balanced approach to literacy created a community of learners in the classroom, in which students with different learning styles shared one reading program that lead to success for all.

Teaching reading needs to come from a balanced approach (Learning to Read, 1998). According to recent research, it is important to have a balanced instructional program that includes meaningful reading and writing activities along with systematic skill instruction

(Learning to Read, 1998). Within the philosophy of phonemic awareness, the students learn about letter-sound correspondence, phonics, decoding, and segmenting/blending. Within the category of whole language the students learn about guided reading.

According to Reutzel and Cooter, Jr. (1996), teachers who practiced a balanced literacy program knew that children begin by making sense of print and expecting to learn; in the process, they learn to read. The Story Box (1990) stated that by teaching children how to use all the cuing systems in reading, they are provided with the variety of reading strategies they need to know to become successful readers.

The National Research Council (1998) stated that an effective reading program is built on the foundation that reading ability is determined by multiple factors, including the instruction of phonics skills and whole language reading. The National Research Council (1998) explained that reading instruction that will likely prevent reading difficulties in children introduced concepts such as: the alphabetic principle, reading words using decoding skills, segmenting and blending words, and guided reading. For children learning to read, an important component has been phonemic awareness. Findings indicated that the development of phonemic awareness was closely intertwined with growth in basic language proficiency. Research by Castle, Riach, and Nicholson (1994) found that the addition of phonemic awareness instruction combined with a whole language program got children off to a better start in learning to read.

Homogeneous Reading Groups

It has been the perspective of some teachers that homogeneous groups are easier to instruct (Nevie, 1989). Oakes (1985) agreed with this statement. The author related that

grouping was one method of trying to improve the instructional setting for selected students or of searching for a better match between learner and instructional environment. Grouping was a common way of providing for individual differences. An example of a common grouping structure was to determine the reading level of some students to be at the preprimer level while others were considered ready for trade books with chapters.

According to Oakes (1985), grouping has not been applied as a method of creating differences; it has been practiced as a way of accommodating them. Each student enters the learning environment with a variety of ability, aptitude, and interest. Oakes (1985) stated that some students have learning disabilities while others learn more quickly and others possess a broader or deeper range of experience. Schools do not create these differences, but must accommodate them. Oakes writes that schools must concentrate on educational experiences for all students. This implied that pedagogical frameworks for teaching students may need to be altered.

Children placed in low achieving reading classes often experienced positive feelings because they saw it as a program designed to specifically help them (Goodlad & Oakes, 1988). This was especially true of their achievement in reading if students were reassured as skill levels fluctuated. Continuous progress programs in which students completed different course units at personal rates can be used to adapt individual learning styles to the student (Goodlad & Oakes, 1988).

Mixed-ability groups do not allow varied pace or approach according to ability (Anderson & Barr, 1989).

In-class grouping assigned students to homogeneous groups for instruction in reading

within the reading classroom (Grant & Rothenberg, 1986; Davis, 1991). Students were given small group instruction to work on specific reading skills. These groups were flexible, allowing the teacher to determine necessary the amounts of instructional time each group receives.

Pigford (1990) pointed out that the sub-division of students into groups was also the sub-division of instructional time.

One effective practice within grouping plans was the assignment of students to learning environments based upon performance (Marshall & Weinstein, 1984; Grant & Rothenberg, 1986; Hiebert, 1983; Segro, 1995). Davis (1991) reported that educators need to group according to multiple-criterion placement procedures. Davis determined that basal reading tests, standardized reading tests, and Independent Reading Inventory tests were most effective in predicting reading performance levels. The number of placement performance procedures used determined the likelihood of achieving a truly homogeneous group. When students were grouped with other learners who had the same academic needs and capabilities, they gained more knowledge (Lake, 1988).

Another critical instruction practice involved individualizing and adapting the reading curriculum (Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Connell, 1987; Grant & Rothenberg, 1986). Grouping systems that adjusted the curriculum to address student needs were more effective (Gamoran, 1993). Adjustments to curriculum must be made to reflect individual student needs. This strategy was used in special education classes, has been required by law when planning Individual Education Plans (IEPs), and in Title I Reading Programs.

An Analysis of Information Obtained from Selected Sources

An analysis of related information/materials from four selected Washington elementary schools revealed that five (5) characteristics were generally common to all Title I curriculum units, including:

1. Classroom Environment: Classrooms were student-centered; students monitored their own behavior, based on a Code of Cooperation. Students graphed daily data on teacher-generated control charts, using the philosophy of intrinsic motivation.
2. Groups: Each instructional unit utilized small homogeneous grouping of 4-5 students, using a cooperative learning model for learning.
3. Assisted/Unassisted Reading Groups: All units utilized tape-recorded books to build fluency in readers. One-on-one teacher assisted time was provided to individual students for fluency building.
4. Phonemic Awareness/Phonics: All instructional units provided opportunities for students to acquire pre-requisite reading skills.
5. Reading: Emphasis was placed on developmental reading skills. Students read aloud in small groups and time was provided for individual reading.

Summary

The research and literature summarized in Chapter 2 supported the following themes:

1. The Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements provide clear reading targets for students and teachers across the state. They provide a backdrop to the reading teacher that ensures essential reading skills are being learned.
2. Under Title I, Congress addressed the sizable gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students. The recent changes mandate program improvement in order to enable all children to achieve high standards.
3. An effective Title I Reading Program begins with a highly successful teacher who is positive, caring, and willing to be flexible in creating accommodations for student success. Reading growth occurs through the support of students, while communicating high expectations.
4. A correlation exists between reading development and the ability of a child to read with fluency. The lack of a student's ability to read fluently impacts word recognition and prevents comprehension, the goal of successful reading. Research supported the importance of fluency development in a reading program. Through guided reading, students are manipulated through the reading steps. With the teacher to assist them, students are able to practice the reading skills they already know. The teacher's role is to encourage students, question students, and to ensure comprehension is taking place.
5. The building blocks of a successful reading program begins with phonemic awareness; the relationship between sounds and symbols. Decoding is created by using sound-to-

letter picture codes of language. Through phonics, segmenting/blending, and decoding students learn reading skills necessary to be independent readers.

6. The whole language approach to reading allows students to use developed reading skills and strategies in guided reading groups. Students participate in a variety of environmental print, supported by the reading teacher. The reading teacher individualizes a reading program for each student, based on individual need.

7. A model Title I Reading Program is a balance between teaching phonics and whole language. Intentional teaching to identified skills enables students to begin by learning about print, then learning to read.

8. Devising small, homogeneous reading groups to develop skills and practice guided reading, raises the learning standard in a model reading program. Grouping students based on ability allows students to learn more quickly. The reading teacher must be innovative in designing an instructional program for each group. This includes modifying the reading curriculum.

9. An analysis of related information/materials obtained from four selected Washington state elementary schools revealed that five (5) characteristics were generally common to all Title I curriculum units, including: classroom environment, small groups, assisted/unassisted reading groups, phonemic awareness/phonics, reading skills, a balance between teaching phonics and whole language, and homogeneous reading groups.

CHAPTER THREE

PROCEDURES OF THE PROJECT

The purpose of the project was to design and develop a model Title I reading program for John Campbell Elementary School, Selah, Washington, in alignment with the state Essential Learning Requirements. To accomplish this purpose, current research and literature related to the fundamentals of reading/literacy and instructional strategies related to student mastery of this essential academic skill were reviewed. Additionally, related information/materials from selected sources were obtained and analyzed. The model consists of a number of separately usable components, organized into four units: Student-Centered Classroom, Homogeneous Grouping, Building Fluency, and Phonics & Whole Language. Each unit contains its own assessment piece. The effectiveness of this model program is in part reflected by the author's own success with the model in the classroom.

Chapter 3 contains background information describing:

1. Need for the Project
2. Development of Support for the Project
3. Procedures of the Project
4. Planned Implementation and Assessment of the Project

Need for the Project

The need for the project was influenced by the following considerations:

1. The writer, (Jeanne O'Hara Maxwell), a certified elementary teacher, was assigned to the position of reading specialist for the Title I reading program at John Campbell Elementary School in the Selah, Washington, School District. Given this professional responsibility, the writer undertook in-depth research related to state-of-the-art Title I programs and related curricula and instructional strategies.
2. After contacting selected Title I reading teachers throughout Washington regarding the implementation of a model Title I reading program, the writer determined a need existed for establishing:
 - a. Setting a safe, caring learning environment where students are motivated to read.
 - b. Grouping students by homogeneous reading abilities.
 - c. Creating reading centers for development of fluency
 - d. Combining the two philosophies of reading; phonics and whole language.
3. After consulting with the Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction and selected Title I reading specialists throughout the state, the writer discovered a workable Title I reading curriculum, designed specifically for use with special needs students was nonexistent.
4. The assumption was made that a Title I reading program needed to be created to provide eligible students in grades K-4 the necessary skills to become independent

readers.

5. Undertaking this study coincided with the writer's graduate studies in Educational Administration at Central Washington University.

Development of Support for the Project

During the 2000-2001 school year, the writer was assigned the teaching responsibility for the Title I reading program at John Campbell Elementary School. In the absence of an adopted Title I reading program, the writer recognized the need to develop a model reading program designed to serve all students. John Campbell was to serve approximately 100 at-risk reading students eligible for Title I instruction in grades K-4. The student population included English as a Second Language (ESL) learners and students generally demonstrating low oral communication skill levels. The objective of the model program was to improve reading skills and increase achievement scores on assessments of students reading below grade level. The need to provide a learning environment designed to help students succeed and become enthusiastic about reading was determined.

To address this need, a Title I reading team for John Campbell School was organized, consisting of one full-time reading specialist (the writer) and six full-time instructional aides. Using a collaborative consultation model, the following determinations were made:

1. The Selah School District guidelines for curriculum and instruction was criteria for the reading program; and, reading program curriculum and instruction criteria were to be followed.
2. Weekly team meetings would be held to discuss individual student progress, behavioral expectations for students, and collaborative planning for instruction.
3. Each students daily progress was to be effectively monitored; and, feedback, suggestions, and ideas from individual reading team members were to be exchanged.
4. Each meeting opened with an agenda and a secretary was selected to record minutes.

The following Selah School District employees individually and collectively encouraged and influenced the writer to undertake this project while contributing their expertise:

Selah School District Employees:

Mr. Buckley Evans - Office of Curriculum and Instruction
Mrs. Cindy Egan - Director of Special Education
Mrs. Phyllis Newkirk - Superintendent
Mrs. Susan Durr - Title I Specialist
Patricia Pratt - Instructional Aide
Pat Crist - Instructional Aide
Donna Prather - Instructional Aide
Robin Dinsmore - Instructional Aide
Gloria Gonzalez - Instructional Aide
Maria Gallardo - Instructional Aide

Procedures of the Project

To develop a model reading program that would support all students and learning styles, the writer undertook the following procedures to develop a model reading program.

1. The development of the Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALR's) provided a guide to create the reading program. The Selah School District benchmarks for each grade level were followed to match the objectives of EALRs for each grade. The benchmarks were applied in developing the reading program.
2. To create a balanced reading program, a review of related literature and research was conducted. The review included literature related to classroom environment, fluency, reading development, and repeated reading. A correlation between reading fluency and reading growth was determined from the review.
3. The research effort was used to develop strategies to address the beginning skills a student needs to become a successful, independent reader.
4. Grouping of students was researched. Research finds were also used to group students homogeneously for instruction in the Title I reading program.
5. Testing was conducted on the third day of school, using the Analytical Reading Inventory (ARI). Students were identified for placement in the reading program by scoring at 8 or below on the ARI. Reading needs ranged from readiness skills to learning letter sounds and sounding out consonant-vowel-consonant (CVC) words to reading rate.
6. After students were identified for placement in the program, a second Title I reading

assessment, the Classroom Reading Inventory (CRI) was administered to determine student grade level. Data obtained were used for grouping and to show reading growth on a continuum. Both the ARI and CRI were administered three times a year to monitor student reading progress.

7. Four Washington schools were contacted and visited to review their current/best practice regarding Title I reading programs. For purposes of comparison and contrast, the writer (Jeanne O'Hara Maxwell) obtained and analyzed sample reading curriculum units utilized by Title I instructional staff including:

Schools visited included:

Lincoln Elementary
Ellensburg, Washington

Quilleute Valley Elementary
Forks, Washington

Robert Lince Elementary
Selah, Washington

Summitview Elementary
Yakima, Washington

Planned Implementation and Assessment
of the Project

The model Title I reading program for K-4 students developed as a result of this project, in its present form, was fully implemented at John Campbell Elementary School during the 2002-2003 school year. The program has provided a framework for Title I reading program curriculum and instruction to help students acquire reading skills and to develop into independent, capable

readers.

Implementation of the model reading program will be further facilitated by the writer during the 2003-2004 school year through means of the following presentations:

1. Selah School District In-service Day presentation to all first and second grade teachers.
2. Seminar presentations to selected School District grade-level teachers and administrators.
3. Parent-night presentations at John Campbell Elementary School.
4. Selah School District annual Celebration of Learning presentation.
5. Selah School District Board of Directors special presentation.

Project assessment will be based on yearly growth of student reading rate, as determined by the ARI and student's reading grade level, as documented by the CRI.

In addition to the eight Title I skill-level reading centers implemented in the writer's classroom, three other John Campbell Elementary school teachers have also developed similar reading centers, using the research conducted as the model for best practice. Centers include:

Small Reading Group Center
Phonic Skill Center
Accelerated Reading Center
Writing Center

Assisted Reading Center
Unassisted Reading Center
Making Words Center
Reading Skills Center

CHAPTER FOUR

THE PROJECT

The model Title I reading program designed for students at John Campbell Elementary School, which was the subject of this project, has been presented on the following pages in four instructional units. Each unit contains lessons and activities designed to instruct children in different skills, enabling them to read. Lessons and activities were created to include the Essential Academic Learning Requirements (EALRs). The project supports the philosophy of an effective classroom environment, homogeneous grouping, reading fluency, and a balanced reading program that consists of whole language and phonemic awareness. The four instructional units include:

Unit One	Student-Centered Classroom
Unit Two	Homogeneous Grouping of Students
Unit Three	Building Fluency
Unit Four	Phonemic Awareness and Whole Language Activities

A MODEL TITLE I READING PROGRAM
IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE
ESSENTIAL ACADEMIC LEARNING REQUIREMENTS

JOHN CAMPBELL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

SELAH, WASHINGTON

Jeanne O'Hara Maxwell, Reading Specialist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>UNIT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Unit One <u>Student-Centered Classroom</u>	P4
Unit Overview	P5
Student Learning Objectives	P5
Performance Criteria	P6
Learning Activities	P6
Teaching Strategies	P7
Instructional Materials	P7
Assessment	P7
Unit Two <u>Homogeneous Grouping</u>	P8
Unit Overview	P9
Student Learning Objectives	P9
Performance Criteria	P9
Learning Activities	P10
Teaching Strategies	P10
Instructional Materials	P11
Assessment	P11

Unit Three	<u>Building Fluency</u>	P12
	Unit Overview	P13
	Student Learning Objectives	P13
	Performance Criteria	P14
<hr/>		
	Learning Activities	P14
	Teaching Strategies	P15
	Instructional Materials	P15
	Assessment	P16
Unit Four	<u>Phonics & Whole Language</u>	P17
	Unit Overview	P18
	Student Learning Objectives	P18
	Performance Criteria	P19
	Learning Activities	P19
	Teaching Strategies	P20
	Instructional Materials	P20
	Assessment	P20

Unit One

Student-Centered Classroom

Table of Contents

Student-Centered Classroom

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Unit Overview	P5
Student Learning Objectives	P5
Performance Criteria	P6
Learning Activities	P6
Teaching Strategies	P7
Instructional Materials	P7
Assessment	P7

Student-Centered Classroom

Unit Overview

The Student-Centered Classroom Unit introduces the student to a classroom where students take ownership for learning to read. In this unit students will learn more about themselves and will engage in activities to intrinsically motivate them to learn to read. They will establish a framework of ethics to govern their learning and will participate in team-building activities, maximizing learning through setting a safe, caring learning environment. Students will engage in intrinsic motivation activities where they will document reading progress, utilizing positive reinforcement for success.

Student Learning Objectives

Students will be able to:

- Design a Purpose Statement
- Create a Code of Cooperation
- Model positive classroom behavior
- Participate in team-building activities
- Document progress on control charts
- Assess growth in reading on a rubric
- Develop and maintain a portfolio of work consistent with reading needs

Performance Criteria

Students will complete each assignment and evaluate their participation through an individualized scoring guide.

Learning Activities

Activities will be consistent with unit student learning objectives.

Activities include:

- Demonstrate the necessity of reading by completing The Five Why's Chart
- Participate in the development of a Purpose Statement
- Participate in creating a Code of Cooperation
- Team-building activities
- Assess progress on teacher-generated rubrics
- Collect data on weekly control charts to document reading progress

Teaching Strategies

Strategies include:

- Homogeneous learning groups
- Independent work
- Individualized documentation on control charts
- Teacher-centered instruction (Direct instruction and one-on-one instruction)
- Student-centered instruction (Peer coaching)

Instructional Materials

Resources include:

Evans, B., & Fitch, L. (2002). Quality in education, inc.

Assessment

Assessments include:

- Teacher-Generated Control Chart
- Teacher-Generated Rubric
- Quality Corner

Unit Two

Homogeneous Grouping

Table of Contents

Homogeneous Grouping

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Unit Overview	P9
Student Learning Objectives	P9
Performance Criteria	P9
Learning Activities	P10
Teaching Strategies	P10
Instructional Materials	P11
Assessment	P11

Homogeneous Grouping

Unit Overview

This Unit introduces the student to small group instruction, based on alikeness in skills. Students will receive individual instruction in the reading program, through the appropriate grouping placement. Adequate instructional time will be available for each student to help develop successful reading skills designed for each individual student. The learning environment is created to be non-threatening and nurturing.

Student Learning Objectives

Students will be able to:

- Participate in placement assessments
- Participate in small group instruction based on ability level
- Receive accommodations to the curriculum
- Assess their learning

Performance Criteria

Students will complete group assignments with 80 percent or better accuracy before transition to another group, as determined by their individual placement formal assessment..

Learning Activities

Activities will be consistent with Unit student learning objectives.

Activities include:

- Reading assessment on the Analytical Reading Inventory (ARI)
- Reading assessment on the Classroom Reading Inventory (CRI)
- Participation in curricular accommodations
- Conducting individual classroom performance-based assessments

Teaching Strategies

Strategies include:

- Homogeneous grouping
- Cooperative learning groups
- Direct Instruction
- Increasing the amount of time allotted for experience
- Intrinsic Motivation techniques

Instructional Materials

Resources include:

Bigge, J. (1988). Curriculum based instruction for special education students. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company

Kulik, J. A. (1993). An analysis of the research on ability grouping. National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Sprick, M., Sprick, R., & Garrison, M. (1993). Interventions: Collaborative planning for students at risk. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Assessment

Assessment tools include:

-Performance Assessments

-Formal Assessment

-Informal Assessment

-Anecdotal Records

Unit Three

Building Fluency

Table of Contents

Building Fluency

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Unit Overview	P13
Student Learning Objectives	P13
Performance Criteria	P14
Learning Activities	P14
Teaching Strategies	P15
Instructional Materials	P15
Assessment	P16

Building Fluency

Overview

The Fluency Unit introduces the student to fluency strategies to support the development of reading. In this unit, students will learn what fluent reading looks like and sounds like.

Through application of fluency lessons, students will be able to increase reading rate, which increases reading comprehension.

Student Learning Objectives

Students will be able to:

- Identify fluency as smooth, expressive production
- Demonstrate appropriate phrasing or chunking
- Determine where to place emphasis or where to pause to make sense of text
- Demonstrate rapid use of punctuation
- Further develop comprehension
- Share and perform
- Build confidence
- Develop and maintain a portfolio of work consistent with fluency needs

Performance Criteria

Students will complete each assignment with 80 percent or better accuracy on reading assessments and a 3 score on reading rubrics. Students will progress through their individual goals and objectives.

Learning Activities

Activities will be consistent with unit student learning objectives.

Activities include:

- Repeated reading
- Neurological Impress Method (NIM)
- Echo reading
- Reader's Theater
- Building reading rate
- Oral recitation lesson
- Fluency development lesson
- Look for the Signals Lesson

Teaching Strategies

Strategies include:

- Homogeneous learning groups
- Cooperative learning groups
- Modeling and explicit instruction
- Peer tutoring
- Direct instruction

Instructional Materials

Resources include:

- Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, B. (1981). The missing ingredient: Fluent oral reading. *Elementary School Journal*, 81, 173-177.
- Carnine & Silbert (1979).
- Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G. (2001). *Guided readers and writers: Grade 3-6 teaching comprehension, genre and content literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Heckelman, R. (1969). A neurological-impress method of remedial-reading instruction. *Academic Therapy*, 4, 277-282.
- Hoffman, J. (1987). Rethinking the role of oral reading in basal instruction. *The Elementary School Journal*, 87, 367-374.
- Koskinen, P., & Blum, L. (1984). Paired repeated reading: A classroom strategy for developing fluent reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 40, 70-75.
- Opitz, M.F., & Rasinski, T.V. (1998). *Good-bye round robin: 25 effective oral reading strategies*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rasinski, T. (1990). Effects of repeated reading and listening-while-reading on reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research*, 83, 147-150.
- Reutzel, R., & Cooter, R. (2000). *Teaching children to read: Putting the pieces together*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, an imprint of Prentice Hall.

- Searfoss, L. (1975). Radio reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 29, 295-296.
- Sloyer, S. (1982). *Readers theater: Story dramatization in the classroom*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Tompkins, G. (2001). *Literacy for the 21st Century: A Balanced Approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, an imprint of Prentice Hall.
- Walker, B. (1992). *Diagnostic teaching of reading: Techniques of instruction and assessment*. New York: Macmillan.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics. (1995).
-

Assessment

Assessments include:

- Administering oral reading fluency measures
- Fluency probe development
- Oral reading fluency scale
- Rubric for fluency evaluation

Unit Four

Phonics & Whole Language

Table of Contents

Phonics & Whole Language

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Unit Overview	P18
Student Learning Objectives	P18
Performance Criteria	P19
Learning Activities	P19
Teaching Strategies	P20
Instructional Materials	P20
Assessment	P20

Phonics & Whole Language

Unit Overview

This Unit introduces the student to learning objectives designed to teach letter identification and letter sounds. Students will learn reading skills and strategies, while developing the concept of print/sound correlations. In this Unit students will progress through the reading continuum, applying their acquired reading skills in the whole language context of reading.

Student Learning Objectives

Students will be able to:

- Name the 26 letters of the alphabet
- Give the sound for the 26 letters of the alphabet
- Learn word clusters
- Learn consonant letter combinations
- Make words
- Make predictions based on text
- Identify character, setting, problem, and solution of a story
- Respond to comprehension questions from text

Performance Criteria

Students will complete each assignment with 100% accuracy before progressing to the next reading lesson, per objectives on their individualized reading program.

Learning Activities

Activities will be consistent with Unit student learning objectives.

Activities include:

- Write letter sounds to create printed text
- Make words by sound in student pocket charts
- Learn letter sounds
- Create word charts
- Answer comprehension questions
- Participate in whole language activities
- Practice letter sound strategies in the context of learning to read

Teaching Strategies

Strategies include:

- Homogeneous reading groups
- Cooperative learning groups

- Direct instruction
- Modeling

Instructional Materials

Resources include:

- Robert, D. (1985). Rescue the student. Yakima, WA: D & R Enterprises.
- Cappleman, H. (1978). Success in reading and writing. Glenview, IL: Good Year Books, an imprint of Scott Foresman.
- Cunningham, P., & Hall, D. (1995). Making words. Torrance, CA: Good Apple.
- Sprick, M., Howard, L., & Fidanque, A. (1999). Read well. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Assessment

Assessment tools include:

- Performance Assessments
- Formal Assessment
- Informal Assessment
- Portfolio of Student's Work

Market Plan

For

A Model Title I Reading
Program

Caring

Children don't care how much

you KNOW until they

KNOW how much you

CARE.

Trust is only developed

as relationships are

developed.

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

The Quality Teacher

1. Encourages expression of ideas and listens
2. Relates to the students on their level, is comfortable talking with the students.
3. Laughs with the students, has a sense of humor
4. Offers friendship
5. Shows interest in students' lives
6. Shares self
7. Establishes trust
8. Focuses on actions and things that can be changed
9. Involves students in decision making (i.e., spends time each day asking for input on how more can be learned and how to make it more enjoyable
10. Is enthusiastic about the material being taught
11. Discusses what quality is with the students
12. Looks for, encourages, and expects improvement

MOVING THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEARNING FROM THE TEACHER TO THE STUDENTS

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P25

Please note: Content on this page was redacted due to copyright concerns.

FIVE WHY'S

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P26

Purpose Statement

Purpose Statement

(continued)

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P28

Sample Purpose Statement Developed by a Kindergarten Class

"The purpose of Ms. Maxwell's kindergarten reading class is to work hard, listen to each other, learn together, and be friends."

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

Code of Cooperation

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P30

Team Building Activities

The skills learned through team building are just as valuable as the academic lessons learned in the classroom. Team building activities are not just organized games children play, they are intentional learning activities. Debriefing is an essential element of the team building process, providing the foundational understanding.

Bears in the Air

Bears in the Air

(continued)

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P32

Pick a Color, Any Color

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P33

Musical Chairs

Equipment/Materials: You need one less chair than the total number of students on a team.

Suggested Procedure

1. Chairs are placed in a circle.
2. When the music begins the students must walk around the circle of chairs.
3. When the music stops all students must be sitting in a chair.
4. When the music begins, the teacher removes a chair and students must walk around the circle of chairs. Etc.

We Are Unique

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P35

Assessment of Standards

The standard is to treat each other in a way that creates a quality learning environment and ensures that our Purpose Statement and Code of Cooperation become a reality.

Suggested Procedure

Students circle either the smiley face, or the frown face to demonstrate their contribution to a quality learning environment.

1. Was I a good friend today?



2. Was I willing to listen to others read?



3. Did I try my best to help others learn to read?



4. Did I say nice things to make others in my group feel good?



5. Was I a good listener so others could learn?



Quality Corner

(Evans, B., & Fitch, L. 2002)

P37

Control Charts

Control charts are used for student-centered documentation of their performance. The performance can be academic or behavioral. They are used to intrinsically motivate students to perform to the class-generated quality standard. For example, using one inch or one-half inch graphing paper, students graph the number of correct spelling words, on-task behavior, or reading rate. Depending on the concept to be charted, documentation can be daily or once a week.

Suggested Procedure

1. Students keep control charts in their daily folder.
2. Only focus on one-to-two concepts at a time.
3. Hand back corrected work to be charted and have students graph the total correct on their control chart.
4. For charting behavior, decide as a class the most important element of the class code of cooperation. For example it may be being kind to others, or helping others to learn. Have a predetermined rubric of 1-3 (keep it simple) for students to follow. When creating the rubric, include students in defining a one, a two, or a three.
5. Watch the results of student progress grow as they graph their performance on the control chart.

Grouping For Instruction In Reading

Homogeneous grouping for instruction in reading is a method of grouping students to better meet their instructional needs, following the assessment process. It individualizes instruction for students through appropriate grouping placement, adaptation of the reading curriculum, and provision of enhanced curriculum and instruction at the correct level of difficulty. It also allows for adequate instructional time and helps develop successful reading skills. Students are grouped for reading instruction dependent upon individual needs and skill levels.

Why Is Grouping For Instruction Practiced In This Reading Program?

Homogeneous grouping for instruction in reading became a goal for reading teachers after it became apparent reading skill development in the primary grades was becoming increasingly challenging for students.

Informal Reading Assessment

There are formal versions of informal reading assessments used by reading teachers. However, for the purpose of homogeneous grouping of students for the reading classroom, an informal reading assessment strategy has been adapted from a number of strategies researched.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Students are asked to read the first and last pages of the basal selection.
2. If students can perform the reading task with fewer than five miscues, the teacher stops and asks the student questions designed to assess reading comprehension of the text.
3. The teacher keeps anecdotal notes about the student's oral fluency.
4. Students continue to read successive stories until frustration level is achieved.
5. Teachers record miscues and any information regarding a student's reading skills that will assist in instructing the student.

(Bigge, J. 1988)

Anecdotal Records

Reading teachers keep anecdotal records for each student throughout the academic year to maintain homogeneous grouping. Anecdotal records are written observations that can be formal or informal. Observations include reading fluency, informal assessment results, formal assessment results, miscue information, and individual learning objectives.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Record cards are taped to a clipboard for easy portability and for access to a hard surface on which to write.
2. Record cards contain a list of students in the homogeneous group.
3. Information regarding student performance is recorded on the record card.
4. When record cards are full, teachers transfer them to a notebook kept by the team for referral during collaborative planning.
5. Cards remain confidential and personnel not directly responsible for the student in the reading group will not have direct access to the records.

(Kulik, J. 1993)

Curricular Adaptations

If the student needs academic interventions, the following strategies may be considered for adaptation of curriculum.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Retype or summarize portions of the text that provide critical information.
2. Provide study guides with the curriculum to help students identify important information in the text.
3. Require completion of the critical skills in an assignment to be completed, leaving the remainder of skills to be finished as time allows.
4. Reduce the number of questions per page.
5. Allow more time for completion of the activity.
6. Administer tests in more than one session.
7. Read the directions aloud. Rephrase directions until the student demonstrates understanding.
8. Allow students options for relating what they know. Examples include drawing pictures, orally telling, or recorded answers into a tape recorder

(Sprick, M., Sprick, R., & Garrison, M. 1993)

Team Meeting Preparation Checklist

Prior to the Team Meeting:

- Verify meeting date/time with team members
- ~~Gather relevant information~~

During the Team Meeting:

- Introduce and engage members
- Paraphrase explanations; seek verification of key issues
- Prioritize the key issues
- Brainstorm possible interventions/strategies
- Choose the most likely intervention
- Design an intervention plan and record on the anecdotal record card
- Summarize the session
- Retain minutes of the meeting in the team notebook

After the Team Meeting:

- Conduct follow-up activities
- Provide encouragement and support as members implement the plan

Sample Team Intervention Plan

Reading Group _____ Date _____

Presenting Concerns:

Considerations:

Intervention Strategy:

Persons Responsible

Related Follow-Up Activities

JUST A NOTE....

Dear Parents,

In an effort to keep you better informed about your child's progress, this note is being sent home. Please read it, sign at the bottom, and return to class with your child. In this way, we will know you received the information. There is room on the back for comments or questions.

Sincerely,

The Reading Teacher

Name _____

Date _____

Parent Signature

Student Survey

Name _____ Date _____

I feel good when I am reading: Yes No
Why:

I like what I am reading: Yes No
Why:

Reading class is fun: Yes No
Why:

My teacher helps me when I want it: Yes No
Why:

I like the students in reading class: Yes No
Why:

I feel safe in reading class: Yes No
Why:

I like to learn new things Yes No
Why:

Weekly Review

What I did this week:

Three things I learned:

Skills I'm working on:

Books I've been reading:

Goals for next week:

Repeated Reading

This procedure involves rereading text - often self-selected - until it can be read accurately and fluently. It encourages the use of contextual meaning and sentence structure to predict upcoming words and to correct miscues.

Suggested Procedure:

The student chooses the text to be read (selection can be based on "leveled books"), or the teacher assigns a passage.

1. The teacher takes anecdotal notes or keeps a running record of miscues as well as rate of reading during the first reading of text.
2. Progress is tracked on a chart or graph.
3. The student practices rereading the text orally or silently several times.
4. The student rereads the text for the teacher a second time, and the teacher once again takes anecdotal notes and/or running records (Using a different colored pen helps to indicated the student's growth between readings).

NOTE: To support a cooperative learning approach, have students complete their repeated readings with partners.

(Koskinen, P., & Blum, L. 1984)

Repeated Reading (continued)

Variation:

Oral Previewing

Suggested Procedures:

1. Begin by having the student preview the text by first listening to an expert reader.
2. After listening to the expert fluent reader several times, the student reads the passage independently.

NOTE: Rasinski (1990) found that oral previewing and repeated readings are equally effective in improving fluency.

Neurological Impress Method (NIM)

In this approach the teacher and the student read orally in unison. It might be helpful to initiate this approach using short, rhythmic, and repetitive texts, such as poems or song lyrics.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Sit on the side of your student, so that you will be able to read into the student's ear.
2. Begin reading along with your student. Your voice may be a second or two ahead of the student's, especially if the student has a limited sight vocabulary.
3. Model fluent, expressive reading. Do not stop if the student falters.
4. Instruct the student to continue to read along - or slightly behind you--as much as possible.
5. Move your finger along the line of print so that the student can follow along more easily.

(Heckelman, R. 1969)

Echo Reading

This approach is similar to both the neurological impress method and repeated reading procedures; it, too, involves teacher modeling and the student "approximating" or imitating the reading. It is recommended for students who focus too much on the words in a passage rather than on the meaning or for those students who read without expression or attention to punctuation/other cues.

Suggested Procedure:

1. The teacher reads one sentence of text aloud with appropriate intonation and phrasing.
2. The student tries to imitate or repeat the text-and the reading of the text-as modeled.
3. The text reading continues in this manner until the teacher feels the student can imitate more than one sentence at a time.

(Anderson, B. 1981)

Radio Reading

This procedure is for developing oral reading fluency in a group setting with students "acting" or reading texts (e.g., print media, newspapers, magazines or any print source that can be converted into a news story).

Suggested Procedures:

1. Only the reader and the teacher have copies of the script; the other students act as listeners.
2. Students rehearse until they have gained confidence in their reading.
3. Unlike round robin reading where all mistakes are visible to anyone following along, this approach allows students to deviate from the text--and paraphrase--without embarrassment by stressing the idea that their reading should make sense.

(Searfoss, L. 1975)

Reader's Theater

This approach (like other approaches that involve performances or dramatic readings for others, e.g., strategy use performances, chamber theater, Wolf, 1994) provides a realistic opportunity for students to read orally and practice their use of intonation, inflection, and fluency. It is helpful not only for fluency, but also for comprehension because the students must decide how to convey their interpretation of the text-through their oral reading/performance-to an audience.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Students select texts/tasks, or they are assigned parts/roles for a "performance."
2. Students practice reading the text and/or completing the task, getting help from others before the performance with unfamiliar words, phrasing, intonation, and expression.
3. Students read their scripts/texts or perform their tasks orally for an audience.

(Sloyer, S. 1982)

Screen Readings of Captioned Programs

Captions were first developed for hearing-impaired viewers, but they can also be used for fluency instruction. Rereading captioned programs provides opportunities for students to practice reading that is entertaining and self-correcting.

Suggested Procedures:

1. Choose programs related to literature and content-area instruction as a pre-reading activity.
2. Introduce the program, review vocabulary as needed.
3. Plan related activities to use after viewing the program.
4. Allow English language learners to view the program several times.
5. Create a text set of books and other related materials to use with the program.
6. Provide opportunities for students to review the program and read related texts.

(Tompkins, G. 2001)

Building Reading Rate

Some students read accurately, but slowly. Here is one technique for building fluency rate.

1. Select a passage on which the student is at least 90% accurate.
2. Establish a base rate on a one-minute timing (words read per minute).
3. Set a target for the passage that is 20%-40% above the initial rate (e.g., if the student read 60 wpm \times .30, the new target would be $60 + 18 = 78$ wpm).
4. Graph the target in the student's folder and have him/her reread the passage as many times as necessary to reach the target on a one-minute timing.
5. Continue to increase the student's target by 20%-40% (on passages of similar difficulty) until the student's average rate reaches the established criterion for his or her grade level (with accuracy maintained).
6. Once the criterion rate has been reached, the level of difficulty of of the passage may be increased.

(Carnine & Silbert, 1979)

Oral Recitation Lesson

This approach has been recommended as a solid alternative to the traditional, but ineffective practice of round robin reading. It consists of two basic components (i.e., direct instruction and indirect instruction) with a series of subroutines.

Suggested Practice:

I. Direct Instruction

A. Comprehension

1. Introduce a new selection (e.g., activating prior knowledge, predicting, making connections).
2. Read the selection aloud and lead the students in an analysis of the content (e.g., questions/answers, story features, connections, etc.).
3. Record student responses (e.g., chart, board, overhead, etc.).

B. Practice

1. Work with students to improve their oral reading expression by modeling fluent reading with sections of the text.

Oral Recitation Lesson (continued)

2. Have students "estimate" your reading (e.g., use choral reading, unison reading, echo reading, etc.).

C. Performance

1. Have students select a text segment to perform for others in the group/class.
2. Encourage the listeners to comment positively on the performance.

II. Indirect Instruction

A. Fluency practice

1. Have students select a story or other text that they will practice reading until they become fluent or "expert."
2. Observe their reading (e.g., take anecdotal notes, running records, etc.).
3. Help them to decide (self-assess) when they are ready to demonstrate or perform their fluent reading.

B. Demonstrating fluent (expert) reading

1. Have students perform their fluent reading in front of peer or parent audience.

Oral Recitation Lesson (continued)

2. Encourage the listeners to give positive feedback.
-

(Hoffman, J. 1987)

Fluency Development Lesson

The Fluency Development Lesson (FDL) is a combination of read aloud, choral reading, listening to children read, and reading performance. It is meant to supplement other reading experiences and to promote meaningful reading, fluency, and word recognition. During the lesson, students listen to the teacher read a short text (e.g., a poem, a patterned story, or a portion of a text), read the text chorally, pair up and practice, and then perform the reading for an audience.

Suggested Procedures:

1. Prepare two copies of text per child and teacher as well as an overhead transparency or big chart of the text.
2. Read the text several times while the students follow along on their copies.
3. Discuss the meaning of the text. Point out how reading with expression can enhance the meaning as well as entice others to listen.
4. Read the text chorally several times.
5. Pair the students with a partner or buddy. Each student reads the text orally to his/her partner at least three times with the listener giving positive feedback and help when needed. Circulate/observe their reading, noting which pairs appear to be ready to perform.

Fluency Development Lesson (continued)

6. Call the class together as a whole group. Invite some pairs to perform their text for the rest of the class.
7. Have students choose three words from the text that they would like to include in their word banks for future word study.
8. Have students place the copy of the text in a folder or text box for future readings (e.g., to parents at home, with a different partner).
9. To prepare students for another interactive reading experience, begin the next FDL with a quick choral rereading of a previously read text.

(Rasinski, T. 1990)

Look for the Signals

Look for the Signal is a strategy that helps students to see how punctuation and other typographical signals (e.g., punctuation marks, large and bold print, underlining, italics) affect meaning and help readers better understand an author's intended message.

<u>Signal</u>	<u>What it Conveys</u>	<u>Example</u>
Comma	Need to pause Placement affects meaning	Mary, my daughter is as tall as you. Mary, my daughter, is as tall as you.
Period	Need a longer pause	The clouds looked strange.
Question mark	Need to raise intonation at the end of the sentence	Did you sleep well last night?
Exclamation point	Need to read with a certain emotion	It was a wonderful party!
Underlined, enlarged, bold or italicized print	Need for special stress	<u>This</u> is what I said. This is what I said. This is what <i>I</i> said.
Combination	Used to show meaningful units	The coach said, "I am <u>SO</u> proud of how all of you played this game!"

Look for the Signals (continued)

Suggested Procedures:

1. Select specific text excerpts that students have already read or will be reading that correspond to the specific signals you will be teaching or emphasizing.
2. Enlarge the text excerpt on an overhead transparency or chart paper or use bug books that show the specific text.
3. Tell students that you will read the text two times and that you want them to listen to see which reading gives them the best idea about the character or event. Use a monotone voice for the first reading. Reread the text using expression and all typographical signals. Discuss the differences in the readings with the students (e.g., which reading interested you more? Did emphasizing different words and pausing at different times give you a better understanding of the author's message?). Point out the different typographical signals you used and how these helped you to better convey the author's intended meaning.
4. Provide students with meaningful practice, reminding them to look for the signals when reading to themselves.
5. After the practice session, have students read aloud one or more sentences in which they used a typographical signal and explain what the signal indicated they needed to do.

(Opitz, M.F., & Rasinski, T.V. 1998)

Prompts for Supporting Fluency

Teacher Prompts for Supporting Fluency While Reading

- * How do you think your reading sounds?

- * Read the punctuation.
- * Make your voice go down when you see the period.
- * Take a short breath when you see the comma (or the dash).
- * Use emphasis when you see the exclamation point.
- * Make it sound like the characters are talking.
- * Read it like this (model phrasing or chunking).
- * Read this much all together (cover part of print to show only the phrase or chunk).
- * Put your words together so it sounds like the way you talk.
- * Make your voice show what you think the author meant.

(Fountas, I., & Pinnell, G. 2001)

Predictable Language

This method takes advantage of the rhythmic, repetitive language structures in children's literature and nursery rhymes. The assumption is that word identification is facilitated by the predictive nature of the text.

Suggested Procedures:

1. Select text that contains a predictable pattern.
2. Read the text aloud to students completely through so they can hear the whole story. Emphasize the predictable parts using an enthusiastic voice.
3. Read the text again, but this time ask the students to join in whenever they know the pattern.
4. During additional readings, you could use an oral cloze procedure to give students practice in predicting upcoming words.
5. Students can read the text on their own, using the predictable language patterns and picture clues to aid them
6. An extension could be to ask students to write their own predictable pattern story using the pattern from the text read.

(Walker, B. 1992)

Unassisted Fluency Development

It is very easy to develop unassisted fluency reads from basals or texts that are being used by the student in a grade level. Students can work independently using the Unassisted Fluency Development, after the teacher has modeled what fluent readers sound like.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Student selects a book based on independent reading level.
2. Student reads the title of the book, making a prediction about the story.
3. Student reads the book through the first time, using decoding skills to learn the vocabulary.
4. Student decides if the prediction was accurate.
5. Student rereads the book a second time, focusing on characters, setting, if there is a big problem in the story, and how the problem gets solved.
6. Student rereads the book a third or fourth time, emphasizing the use of punctuation, and reading rate.
7. When the student believes he/she has reached fluent reading, he/she reads the story to the teacher or peer tutor (who has been trained in scoring fluent reading using the reading rubric).

Assisted Fluency Development

This approach provides an opportunity for students to read orally and practice their use of intonation, inflection, and fluency, while being supported by a taped version of the text. The teacher can record any book in the classroom, modeling fluent reading to assist the student in acquiring fluency development. Books with tape cassettes can also be purchased.

Suggested Procedure:

1. Students choose a text at their reading level.
2. Students listen to the narrator of the story, simply turning the pages when prompted.
3. Students rewind the tape and listen to the narrator, following the text with their eyes.
4. Students rewind the tape, reading with the narrator in a whisper voice.
5. Students continue to rewind the tape, reading with the narrator, until fluent reading has been mastered.
6. Students read the text to a teacher, or peer tutor, testing off on the fluency rubric.

Administering Oral Reading Fluency Measures

Materials:

- * **Passage for the student to read** (sometimes called a "probe")
If the student is reading for practice, the probe may be used more than once. If the student is reading for assessment purposes, the probe must be secure and unpracticed.
- * **Administrator's Scoring Sheets**
You will need one for each student. You will be recording the rate and accuracy for each student on a separate sheet.
- * **Stopwatch or other timing device to determine one minute**

Note: It is a good idea to administer fluency assessments at a desk or table, rather than having the student just sit and hold the probe. Students are able to do better if their hands are free for guiding or pointing.

Suggested Procedures:

1. Say: "I would like you to read a story out loud to me. Read it as quickly and as carefully as you can. Just skip any words you do not know or cannot read. If you get to a word you do not know and you are stuck, I'll say, 'Go on' and you should go on to the next words. At the end of one minute, I'll ask you to stop. I am going to take some notes while you are reading, so I can remember what you say. Do you understand what I want you to do?"
2. Then say: "The title of this story is _____ . Make a prediction of what you think the story is going to be about. When

Administering Oral Reading Fluency Measures

(continued)

you say your first word, I will start my stopwatch. You can start whenever you're ready."

3. Start the stopwatch when the student says the first word of the passage. If a student does not know a word, wait three seconds and say, "Go on." Do not give the student the word.
4. As the student reads, record any errors using a marking system.
5. At the end of one minute, make double slash marks and tell the student he or she may stop reading. (Another option is to make the double slash marks at the end of one minute and let the student continue to the end of the passage, noting time used.)

Note: Depending on the purpose of the fluency timing (practice or assessment), you may want to discuss the student's errors with him or her when the reading is completed.

Administering Oral Reading Fluency Measures

(continued)

Marking

Using a uniform marking system is important because you want to be able to examine the probes over time and be able to quickly determine the kinds of errors the students are making. Knowing the kinds of errors will inform your instruction.

***Count as Errors: Omissions, mispronunciations, substitutions, insertions**

Circle any words the student omitted or those you told him or her to "skip."

Single slash any words the student read incorrectly (either a mispronunciation or a substitution). Above the error, **write** what the student actually said. (Note: If a student mispronounces the same word in the same way more than one time; the errors are noted, but they count together as only one error.)

Record any inserted words above a caret (^).

*** Do Not Count as Errors: Self-corrections, repeated words**

Write **SC** above a word that was mispronounced, but then self-corrected.

Make a **double underline** beneath repeated words or phrases.

Administering Oral Reading Fluency Measures

(continued)

Scoring

Determine the total number of words read.

Count the number of errors and subtract from the total.

The difference between the number of words read and the number of errors is the Words Correct per Minute (WCPM). This is the score that is recorded and graphed.

(Adams, M.J. 1990)

Fluency Probe Development

It is very useful and easy to develop fluency probes from basals or texts that are being used by the student in a grade level. Make sure the passage selected is at the correct level of difficulty for the student.

1. Select a passage of 110-120 words in length at the student's independent level. This passage should not have been read recently.
2. Type the probe leaving room on the right side to place word count numbers. Comic Sans and Century Gothic are both clear fonts that are easy for students to read. Make sure you record the basal or text you used with the page number at the bottom of the page along with the student name and date. This helps when documenting growth and/or recording student data.
3. Don't forget you will need to run off copies for the student to read from and you to record the student's responses.
4. To start the teacher says:
"I'm going to have you read a passage aloud to me. Read it as best you can. I will not be able to help you, so if you come to a word or words you don't know, try your best and go on. After one minute I will stop you." Start the timer "as" the student reads the first word.
5. Have the student read the passage. As the student reads record mistakes and words read correctly. Stop the student after one minute.
6. One way to calculate a student's fluency is to take the total number of words read in one minute and to subtract the errors.

Total words read in one minute _____
Subtract errors - _____
= Words Correct Per Minute _____ (WCPM)

Oral Reading Fluency Scale

- Level 4** Reads primarily in larger, meaningful phrase groups. Although some regressions, repetitions, and deviations from text may be present, these do not appear to detract from the overall structure of the story. Preservation of the author's syntax is consistent. Some or most of the story is read with expressive interpretation.
- Level 3** Reads primarily in three- or four-word phrase groups. Some smaller groupings may be present. However, the majority of phrasing seems appropriate and preserves the syntax of the author. Little or no expressive interpretation is present.
- Level 2** Reads primarily in two-word phrases with some three- or four-word groupings. Some word-by-word reading may be present. Word groupings may seem awkward and unrelated to larger context of sentence or passage.
- Level 1** Reads primarily word-by-word. Occasional two-word or three-word phrases may occur-but these are infrequent and/or they do not preserve meaningful syntax.

(U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1995)

Rubric for Fluency Evaluation

Nonfluent Reading

- * Word-by-word reading
- * Frequent pauses between words
- * Little recognition of syntax
- * Little response to punctuation
- * Some awkward word groupings

Beginning Fluency

- * Frequent word-by-word reading
- * Some two- and three-word phrasing
- * May reread for problem solving or to clarify
- * Shows some awareness of syntax and punctuation

Transitional Fluency

- * Combination of word-by-word reading and fluent phrase reading
- * Some expressive phrasing
- * Shows attention to punctuation and syntax

Fluent Reading

- * Fluent reading with very few word-by-word interruptions
- * Reads mostly in larger meaningful phrases
- * Reads with expression
- * Attends consistently to punctuation
- * Rereads as necessary to clarify or problem solve

(Reutzel, R., & Cooter, R. 2000)

Sample Reading & Spelling Lesson

Reading and spelling lessons teach students of all ages each letter of the alphabet, in conjunction with learning letter sounds, penmanship, and spelling. Students will practice phrases and sentences, applying each learned skill. Lessons progress on a continuum of letter-sound development.

Suggested Procedure:

1. **Introduce the Letter:** The teacher says, "The name of the letter is /b/. The key word is /ball/. The sound is /b/."
2. **Trace the Letter:** The teacher says, "The starting point is at the hat-line (using hat-line, belt-line, and foot-line for directional cues)."
3. **Words:** bat bad but bug
4. **Reading a Word or Phrase:** The teacher says, "Find the vowel and give its sound. Then start at the beginning. Give each letter its sound. Repeat step three until smooth."
5. **Trace:** Using a plastic protective sheet, students will trace each letter, naming the letter as they trace it. The teacher says, "Say the starting point of each letter. Name the letter as you trace it."
6. **Trace and Write:** Students trace and write the letters on a practice sheet.
7. **Phrase:** pot and pan Students trace and write the phrase.

Sample Reading and Spelling Lesson

(continued)

Suggested Procedure:

1. *Consonant Letter Combination:* The teacher says, "Today we are going to learn the consonant letter combination of /th/. Underline the combination /th/. The sample word is /thimble/. The sound is /th/."
2. The teacher dictates nine words with /th/ sound. Students write each word on lined paper, using hat-line, belt-line, and foot-line.
3. The teacher says, "Spell the word /thin/. Students write the word."
4. Teacher says, "Snap, clap the word."
5. Teacher says, "Dictate the word."
6. Students dictate the word to the teacher, while the teacher writes each letter on a transparency on the overhead.
7. The teacher continues to dictate each of the nine words in the same manner.

thin	thud	cloth	path	bath
with	theft	thump	thrust	

8. The teacher says, "The phrase today is....." The teacher dictates the phrase /a thin man/.

Sample Reading and Spelling Lesson

(continued)

9. Students write the phrase, /a thin man/ using hat-line, belt-line, and foot-line.

10. The teacher says, "Dictate the phrase to me."
11. Students dictate each word of the phrase while the teacher writes each word on the overhead transparency.
12. The teacher says, "Did I use a capital?" The students respond, "No." The teacher says, "Did I use punctuation?" The students respond, "No." The teacher says, "Why not?" The students respond, "Because it's not a complete thought."

(Robert, D. 1985)

Sample Research Lesson

Another way to practice learning the letters of the alphabet, word clusters, and syllables is to have students search for words with the studied letter, using magazines, books, and newspapers. The reading focus of each lesson is letter identification.

Suggested Procedure:

1. The teacher introduces the project idea. "Today students we are going to study the letter /b/ /B/."
2. The teacher distributes newspapers, books, or magazines.
3. Individually, students cut or tear the lesson's letters or words containing the letters from the newspapers, books, or magazines.
4. Students paste or tape their letters or words on their papers.
5. Students discuss their findings with their neighbors.
6. Teacher checks for letter recognition.
7. Papers are dated and filed in students portfolio.

(Cappleman, H. 1978)

Chart Development Lesson

On the chart the teacher writes any words containing the days letter, word cluster, or syllable. The learning objective is to apply the newly learned reading skill.

Suggested Procedure:

1. The teacher says, "Today we studied the letter /b/ /B/." The teacher writes the letters on the top of the chart.
2. The teacher says, "What words have we learned today with the letter /b/ ?"
3. The teacher calls on individual students to add a word to the word chart. Each time a student shares a word, the teacher says the letter sound and writes the word on the chart.
4. On their papers, students write their favorite words from the chart.
5. Papers are dated and students take them home to share with a parent.

Sample Make Words Lesson

Using pocket charts, students manipulate letters of the alphabet to make words. The teacher gives the students clues about how many letters to use and how many letters to change. Each lesson involves students in making two, three, four, and five letter words. As students' skills progress, they make six, seven, and eight letter words. Skills include vowels, blends, endings, compound words, homophones, and plural words.

Suggested Procedure:

The teacher says:

1. Take two letters and make *so*.
2. Change just one letter and you can make the word *no*.
3. Change a letter again and change *no* into *go*.
4. Now we are going to make some three letter words. Add a letter to *go* and make the three-letter word *got*.
5. Change just the first letter and you can change *got* into *rot*.
(The tomatoes will *rot* if they are not picked soon.)
6. Now change the first letter and you can change *rot* into *not*.
7. Don't add any letters and don't take any away. Just change where some of the letters are and you can change *not* into *ton*.
(The box felt like it weighted a *ton*.)

Sample Make Words Lesson

(continued)

8. Change the first letter of *ton* and you can make *son*.
(The father played ball with his *son*.)

9. Now let's make a four-letter word. Add a letter to *son* and make *song*.
10. Take the letters out and start all over to make the word *sort*.
(We will *sort* the words next!)
11. Don't add any letters and don't take any away. Just change where some of the letters are and you can change *sort* into *rots*.
12. The next four-letter word we are going to make is *torn*.
(My new jeans are *torn*.)
13. Take the letters out and start all over to make the word *tons*.
14. Change just the last letter and you can make *tong*.
15. We are now going to make five-letter words. Hold up five fingers!
Add one letter to *tong* and make the word *tongs*.
(They often put *tongs* at the salad bar.)
16. The next five-letter word is *snort*.
17. Take all six of your letters and make the word *strong*.

(Cunningham, P. & Hall, D., 1994)

Sample Alphabet Rhyme Lesson

Students practice the skill of "verbal rehearsing" through good old fashioned rehearsal. Phonemic awareness is built, while at the same time the student is introduced to the letter and sound. The teacher introduces a new letter and sound by reading the alphabet rhyme to students.

Suggested Procedure:

1. The teacher says, "The name of your special letter is the letter S. It says /sss/ as in sssnake."
2. The teacher says, "I'm going to read a poem. Listen for the /sss/ as in sssnake."

"S as in Snake

Small letter s, capital letter S,

What begins with S?

Snazzy snoozing snake,

S ... s ... sss."

3. The teacher says, "You can read the poem with me." "The title is S as in Snake. What's the title?"
4. Students respond, "S as in Snake."

Sample Alphabet Rhyme Lesson

(continued)

5. The teacher says, "The next part says, Small letter s, capital letter S. What begins with S? Say it with me."

6. The students respond, "Small letter s, capital letter S. What begins with S?"
7. The teacher says, "Snazzy, snoozing, sssnake, /s/, /s/, /sss/. Your turn."
8. Students respond, "Sssnazzy, sssnoozing, sssnake, /s/, /s/, /sss/."

(Sprick, M., Howard, L., & Fidanque, A, 1998)

Practicing Letters and Sounds Lesson

Alphabet and picture cards are used to review letter-sound relationships. Phonemic awareness and letter-sound knowledge is built as students say the patterns, and isolate the beginning sounds of words.

Suggested Procedure:

1. The teacher mounts the alphabet on the wall. Each day, the teacher recites and sings the alphabet while pointing to each letter. As a new sound is introduced, the teacher makes a practice of adding the picture card.
2. The students chant all the sounds they have learned.
3. The teacher says, "a as in 'ant,' /a/, /a/, /aaa/, b, c as in 'crocodile,' /c/, /c/, /c/, d, as in 'dinosaur,' /d/, /d/, /d/, e as in 'emu,' /e/, /e/, /eee/.

a	b	c	d	e	f
A	B	C	D	E	F

(Sprick, M., Howard, L., & Fidanque, A. 1998)

Whole Language Reading Activities

The activities are meant to be examples of how students can extend their reading experiences and demonstrate what they know about the story.

Child's Name: _____

Book Title: _____

Author: _____

Who is the main character of the story?

Draw a picture of the main character.

Tell me about the main character in your own words.

Child's Name: _____

Book Title: _____

Author: _____

1. Draw a picture of what happens at the beginning of the story.

2. Draw a picture of what happens in the middle of the story.

3. Draw a picture of what happens at the end of the story.

Child's Name: _____

Book Title: _____

Author: _____

1. Draw a picture of where the story takes place. This is called the setting.

Write about your picture.

Child's Name: _____

Book Title: _____

Author: _____

1. Who is the main character in the story?

2. What problem does the main character have in the story?

3. How does the problem get solved?

Child's Name: _____

Book Title: _____

Author: _____

Read the title of your book. Look at the cover and the pictures.
Write your prediction about the story below.

Read the story. Write what really happened in the story. Was your prediction right?

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of the project was to design and develop a model Title I reading program for John Campbell Elementary School, Selah, Washington, in alignment with the state Essential Learning Requirements. To accomplish this purpose, current research and literature related to the fundamentals of reading/literacy and instructional strategies related to student mastery of this essential academic skill were reviewed. Additionally, related information/materials from selected sources were obtained and analyzed. The model consists of a number of separately usable components, organized into four units: Student-Centered Classroom, Homogeneous Grouping, Building Fluency, and Phonics & Whole Language. Each unit contains its own assessment piece. The effectiveness of this model program is in part reflected by the author's own success with the model in the classroom.

Conclusions

To create a balanced reading program, a review of related literature and research was conducted. The review included literature related to classroom environment, fluency, and reading development. The research effort was used to develop strategies to address the beginning skills a student needs to become a successful, independent reader. Conclusions reached as a result of this project were:

1. The review concluded that the Essential Academic Learning Requirements mandate

the curriculum standard for an effective Title I reading program at the primary level.

2. Research confirmed that setting a safe, caring learning environment motivated students in remedial reading programs to learn to read.
3. Grouping students by homogeneous reading ability proved to be an effective measure that allowed maximum opportunity for reading growth of students.
4. A correlation between reading fluency and reading growth was determined from the review.
5. The review concluded that the most effective reading program includes a balance between teaching phonics and teaching whole language.
6. Ongoing promotion and visibility of the model Title I reading program and its four component units: Student-Centered Classroom, Homogeneous Grouping, Building Fluency, and Phonics & Whole Language can be assured through development and implementation of a specialized marketing plan.
7. An ongoing accountability system should be used to demonstrate student growth and grade level reading ability, incorporating the A.R.I. and the C.R.I. reading skills assessments.

Recommendations

As a result of this project, the following recommendations have been suggested:

1. Washington State Essential Academic Learning Requirements should be used as the

framework to create instructional strategies for teaching students to read at the primary level.

2. Reading teachers should provide a caring, supportive learning environment in the reading classroom, where students are engaged in their own learning.
3. Homogeneous ability groups should be created to provide maximum support for students to acquire necessary skills to become capable, independent readers.
4. To facilitate the relationship between fluency and reading development, fluency strategies should be implemented in the reading classroom.
5. To assure greater reading success, reading teachers should design curricula dedicated to the development of a balanced reading program, combining phonics and whole language.
6. To assure that this model Title I reading program is implemented on a continuing basis in the Selah School District, the following marketing plan has been developed for the 2003-2004 school year.
 - a. Selah School District In-service Day presentation to all first and second grade teachers.
 - b. Seminar presentations to selected School District grade-level teachers and administrators.
 - c. Parent-night presentations at John Campbell Elementary School.
 - d. Selah School District annual Celebration of Learning presentation.
 - e. Selah School District Board of Directors special presentation.
7. The writer, Jeanne O'Hara Maxwell will make herself available for consultation

purposes for all district employees working directly with reading students.

8. Title I reading specialists should plan and implement a marketing plan to assure increased visibility of the component units of the reading program (i.e., Student-Centered Classroom, Homogeneous Grouping, Building Fluency, and Phonics & Whole Language).

9. School Districts seeking to develop a model Title I reading program may wish to adopt and utilize the materials from this project, or undertake further research in the field of Title I reading to meet their unique needs (i.e., Student-Centered Classroom, Homogeneous Grouping, Building Fluency, and Phonics & Whole Language).

10. It is recommended that Title I reading specialists use the A.R.I. and the C.R.I reading assessments to demonstrate accountability measures in student reading growth.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, C.S. & Barr, R. (1989). *Teacher response to proposed changes in grouping. Impact on policy and practice*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Anderson, R.C., Wilson, P.T., & Fielding, L.G. (1988). Growth in reading and how children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 285-3-3.
- Anonymous. (2002). Teaching all children to read: The roles of the reading specialist. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 44(1), 99-104.
- Birman, B.R., Orland, M.E., Jung, R.K., Anson, R.J., & Garcia, G.N. (1987). The current operation of the chapter I program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Block, C., Hurt, N., & Oakar, M. (2002). The expertise of literacy teachers: A continuum from preschool to grade 5. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37(2), 178-206.
- Brandt, R. (1995). Punished by rewards? *Educational Leadership*, 13-16.
- Burgard, J. (2000). A need for continuous improvement in the classroom. *Quality Toolbox*, 10(4), 1-2.
- Bursuck, W.D., Curran, M., Munk, D.D., & Nelson, C. (2002). Research on the prevention of reading problems: Are kindergarten and first grade teachers listening? *Preventing School Failure*, 47, 4-9.
- Byrne, B. & Fielding-Barnsley, R. (1990). Acquiring the alphabetic principle: A case for teaching recognition of phoneme identity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 805-812.
- Byrne, B. & Fielding-Barnsley, R. (1991). Evaluation of a program to teach phonemic awareness to young children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(4), 451-455.

- Byrne, B. & Fielding-Barnsley, R. (1993). Evaluation of a program to teach phonemic awareness to young children: A 1-year follow-up. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 85*(1), 104-111.
- Byrne, B., Freebody, P., & Gates, A. (1992). Longitudinal data on relations between word-reading strategy, comprehension, and reading time. *Reading Research Quarterly, 27*, 141-151.
- Carbo, M. (1978). Teaching reading with talking books. *The Reading Teacher, 32*, 269-272.
- Castle, J.M., Riach, J., & Nicholson, T. (1994). Getting off to a better start in reading and spelling: The effects of phonemic awareness instruction within a whole language program. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 68*(3), 350-359.
- Chomsky, C. (1976). After decoding, what? *Language Arts, 53*, 288-296.
- Connell, D.R. (1987). The first 30 years were the fairest: Notes from the kindergarten and ungraded primary (K-1-2). *Young Children, 30*-39.
- Dahl, P. (1994). An experimental program for teaching high speed word recognition and comprehension skills (Final Report Project #3-1154). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 099 812)
- Davis, S.J. (1991). Three reading groups: An American educational tradition. (Literacy Research Report No. 8). DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University.
- Dowhower, S.L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second grade transitional readers' fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 12*(4), 389-406.
- Durica, K.M. (1996). Literature links to phonics: A balanced approach. Englewood, CO: Teacher Ideas Press.

- Gamby, G. (1983). Talking books and taped books: Materials for instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 366-369.
- Gamoran, A. (1993). Is ability grouping equitable? *Effective School Practices*, 12.
- Goodlad, J. & Oakes, J. (1988). We must offer equal access to knowledge. *Educational Leadership*, 45(5), 1-3.
- Grant, L. & Rothenberg, J. (1986). The social enhancement of ability differences: Teacher student interactions in first and second grade. *Elementary School Journal*, 87(1), 29-49.
- Herman, P.A. (1985). The effect of repeated readings on reading rate, speech pauses, and word recognition accuracy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(5), 553-565.
- Hiebert, E.H. (1983). An examination of ability grouping for reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 18(2), 231-255.
- Idol, L. (1988). Johnny can't read: Does the fault lie with the book, the teacher, or Johnny? *Remedial and Special Education*, 9, 8-35.
- Johnston, P.H., & Winograd, P.N. (1985). Passive failure in reading. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 17, 279-301.
- Juel, C. (1988). Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 437-447.
- Kulik, J.A. (1992). Analysis of the research on ability grouping: Historical and contemporary perspectives. Research-based decision making series. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Kulik, J.A. & Kulik, C.L. (1994). Effects of accelerated instruction on students. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(3), 409-425.

- Laberge, D. (1973). Attention and the measurement of perceptual learning. *Memory and Cognition*, 1, 268-276.
- Lake, S. (1988). *Equal access to education: Alternatives to tracking and ability grouping. Practitioner's monograph #2*. Sacramento, CA: California League of Middle Schools.
- Lasley, T.J. (1998). Paradigm shifts in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84-86.
- Layton, T.G. (2000). Digital learning. (n.d.). Retrieved September 27, 2000, from <http://www.electronic-school.com>
- Learning to read and write: Developmentally appropriate practices for young children: A joint position statement of the International Reading Association and the National Association for the Young Children. (1998). *Young Children*, 53(4), 30-46.
- Lesgold, A.M., & Resnick, L. (1982). How reading difficulties develop: Perspectives from a longitudinal study. In Das, J., Mulcahy, R., & Wall, A. (Eds.), *Theory and Research in Learning Disabilities* (pp. 155-187). New York: Plenum Press.
- LeTendre, M.J. (1996). What's new in...title I? *The Education Digest*, 61(9), 22-24
- Levin, J. (1993). Chapter I advocacy handbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 368 799)
- Maldonado-Colon, E. & Moustafa, M. (1999). Whole-to-parts phonics instruction: Building on what children know to help them know more. *The Reading Teacher*, 52(5), 448-458.
- Marshall, H.H. & Weinstein, R.S. (1984). Classroom factors affecting students' self-evaluation: An interactional model. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 301-325.
- Mason, J.M., Peterman, C.L., & Kerr, B.M. (1989). Reading to kindergarten children. In Strickland, S.S., & Morrow, L.M. (Eds.), *Emerging literacy: Young children learn to read*

- and write. (pp. 52-62). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Massey, D.D. (2002). Personal journeys: Teaching teachers to teach literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 42*, 103-126.
- McCormick, S. (1999). Instructing students who have literacy problems. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- McCormick, C., & Samuels, S. J. (1976). Word Recognition by second graders: The unit of perception and interrelationships among accuracy, latency, and comprehension. (Research Rep. No. 102). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota: Research, Development, and Demonstration Center in Education of Handicapped Children.
- McGuinness, C. & McGuinness, G. (1998). Reading reflex: The foolproof phono-graphix method for teaching your child to read. New York: The Free Press.
- McGuinness, D. (1997). Why our children can't read: And what we can do about it. New York: The Free Press.
- Mooney, M.E. (1990). Reading to, with, and by children. New York: Richard Own Publishers, Inc.
- Morrow, L.M., & Tracey, D.H. (1997). Strategies used for phonics instruction in early childhood classrooms. *The Reading Teacher, 50*(8), 644-651.
- Murray, B.A. (1998). Gaining alphabetic insight: Is phoneme manipulation skill or identity knowledge causal. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(3), 461-475.
- National Research Council. (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Nevi, C. (1989). In defense of tracking. In Noll, J.M., (Ed.), Taking sides: Clashing views on

- controversial educational issues. (5th ed.). (pp. 300-303). Guilford, CT: The Dushkin Pub. Group, Inc.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
-
- Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2001). *Essential academic learning requirements: Technical manual*. Retrieved March 6, from <http://www.k12.wa.us/curriculuminstruct/ealrs.asp>
- Perfetti, C., & Lesgold, A. (1976). *Coding and comprehension in skilled reading*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Pittsburgh.
- Pigford, A.B. (1990). *Instructional grouping: Purposes and consequences*. *The Clearinghouse*, 63,(6), 27-35.
- Pinnell, G.S. & Fountas, I.C. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Pinnell, G.S. & Fountas, I.C. (1998b). *Word matters: Teaching phonics and spelling in the reading/writing classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Rashotte, C.A. & Torgensen, J.K. (1985). *Repeated reading and reading fluency in learning disabled children*. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 180-188.
- Riley, R.W. (1995). *The improving america's schools act of 1994: Reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act* [On-line]. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Available: <http://www.admin@inet.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/brochure/iasa-bro.html>
- Rogers, M. (1995). *Planning for title I programs*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and

- Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 659)
- Samuels, S.J. (1979). The method of repeated readings. *The Reading Teacher*, 32, 403-408.
- Segro, G. (1995). Meeting the needs of all students: Making ability grouping work. *NASSP Bulletin*, 18-25.
-
- Shefelbine, J. (1998). Strategic phonics. *Instructor*, 108(2), 1-4.
- Scherer, M. (1999). The understanding pathway: A conversation with Howard Gardner. *Educational Leadership*, 12-16.
- Spear, L.D., & Sternberg, R.J. (1986). An information processing framework for understanding reading disability. In Cece. S. (Ed.), *Handbook of Cognitive social, and neuropsychological aspects of learning disabilities* (pp. 2-30). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stanovich, K.E., & Cunningham, A.E. (1991). Studying the consequences of literacy within a literate society: The cognitive correlates of print exposure. *Memory & Cognition*, 20, 51-68.
- Strong, R., Silver, H.F., & Robinson, A. (1995). What do students want (And what really motivates them)? *Educational Leadership*, 8-12.
- The story box: Level 1 teacher guide. (1990). Bothell, WA: The Wright Group.
- Tompkins, G.E. (1997). Literacy for the 21st Century: A balanced approach. *Prentice Hall Career & Technology*. Retrieved July 5, from <http://www.phptr.com/allbooks/ect-0024206512.html>
- Tierney, R.J., Readence, J.E., & Dishner, E.K. (1995). *Reading strategies and practices: A compendium*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Treimann, R., Broderick, V., Tincott, R., & Rodriquiz, K. (1998). Children's phonological

- awareness: Confusions between phonemes that differ only in voicing. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 68, 3-12.
- Troia, G.A., Roth, F.P., Graham, S., & (1998). An educator's guide to phonological awareness: Assessment measures and intervention activities for children. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 1-14.
- United States Department of Education. (1996). Mapping out the national assessment of title I: The interim report [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ed.gov/NatAssess/html>
- van der Leij, A. (1981). Remediation of reading-disabled children by presenting text simultaneously to eye and ear. *Bulletin of the Orton Society*, 31, 220-243.
- Wagner, R.K., Torgesen, J.K. & RaShotte, C.A. (1994). Development of reading-related phonological processing abilities: New evidence of bi-directional causality from a latent variable longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 30, 73-87.
- Winograd, P. & Smith, L.A. (1987). Improving the climate for reading instruction. *The Reading Teacher*, 41, 304-310.
- Wood, C. & Terrell, C. (1998). Pre-school phonological awareness and subsequent literacy development. *Educational Psychology*, 18(3), 1-18.
- Wray, D., Medwell, J., Fox, R., & Poulson, L. (2000). The teaching practices of effective teachers of literacy. *Educational Review*, 52(1), 75-84.
- Yopp, H.K. (1995). A test for assessing phonemic awareness in young children. *The Reading Teacher*, 49(1), 1-10.