



North Central Regional  
Educational Laboratory

# ADOLESCENT LITERACY INTERVENTION PROGRAMS: *Chart and Program Review Guide*





# Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs: Chart and Program Review Guide

**Cynthia Shanahan, Ed.D.**  
*University of Illinois at Chicago*



1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800-356-2735 630-649-6500  
[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

Copyright © 2005 Learning Point Associates, sponsored under government contract number ED-01-CO-0011. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory<sup>®</sup> (NCREL<sup>®</sup>) with funds from the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), U.S. Department of Education, under contract number ED-01-CO-0011. The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of IES or the Department of Education, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the federal government.

NCREL remains one of the 10 regional educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education and its work is conducted by Learning Point Associates.

Learning Point Associates, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, and NCREL are trademarks or registered trademarks of Learning Point Associates.

# Contents

	Page
Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs: Chart and Program Review Guide	
Why Is it Important to Develop Programs for Adolescents Who Struggle With Literacy?.....	1
What Is an Adolescent Literacy Intervention Program? .....	3
Adolescent Literacy Intervention Chart .....	4
Observations.....	5
How Does One Use the Chart? .....	6
Adolescent Literacy Intervention Program Review Guide.....	6
Elements of the Review Guide.....	6
Conclusion .....	9
References.....	10
Appendixes	
Appendix A. Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs Chart.....	12
Academy of Reading.....	13
Accelerated Reader (AR).....	16
Amp Reading System.....	19
Be a Better Reader, 8th Edition .....	21
Caught Reading.....	23
Comprehension Upgrade .....	25
Corrective Reading (CR).....	28
IndiVisual Reading.....	32
Jamestown Education .....	34
Language! Third Edition .....	38
Lindamood-Bell .....	42
Merit Software .....	45
Project CRISS—Creating Independence Through Student-Owned Strategies .....	48
QuickReads—Secondary.....	51
Read 180 .....	53
Reading in the Content Areas .....	56
Reading Is Fame.....	59
Rosetta Stone Literacy.....	62
Second Chance at Literacy Learning.....	65

SIM (Strategic Instruction Model) .....	69
Strategic Literacy Initiative .....	74
Supported Literacy Approach .....	77
Talent Development High Schools (TDHS) Literacy Program .....	79
Talent Development Middle Schools Literacy Program .....	83
Wilson Reading System .....	86
References .....	89
Appendix B. Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs Review Guide .....	93
Adolescent Literacy Intervention Program Review Guide .....	94
Definition .....	94
Scoring Sheet .....	96

*In this paper, I describe characteristics of programs developed for adolescents who are struggling with literacy. The paper references both a chart I developed to compare and contrast those characteristics and a review guide I created to help schools make principled decisions when choosing programs for use with their students.*

## **Why Is it Important to Develop Programs for Adolescents Who Struggle With Literacy?**

It is increasingly clear that targeting beginning readers is not enough to ensure that students will have access to advanced education and will become economically successful citizens who fulfill their obligations for social and civic participation (Venezky, Kaestle, & Sum, 1987). According to the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 37 percent of fourth graders and 26 percent of eighth graders cannot read at the basic level, and 48 percent of fourth graders and 58 percent of eighth graders will fail to reach proficiency (Donahue, Daane, & Grigg, 2003). The 2002 NAEP data show similar results for 12th graders (Grigg, Daane, Jin, & Campbell, 2003). That is, when reading grade-level text, students reading below basic levels cannot understand the text at the literal level, cannot make obvious connections between the text and their own experiences, and cannot make simple inferences from the text. Writing skills are similarly weak. According to the 2002 NAEP writing assessment (available at [nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/writing/results2002/](http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/writing/results2002/)), 14 percent of fourth graders, 15 percent of eighth graders, and 26 percent of 12th graders cannot write at the basic level. NAEP data suggest that students who experience significant reading and writing difficulties tend to be students from low-income families, particularly African-American and Latino students; only about 13 percent of African-American students reach proficiency at these grade levels, and Hispanics do only slightly better, at 15 percent (Donahue et al., 2003).

Failure to successfully teach these students to read is a failure of our promise of democracy, given the role that literacy plays in civic participation and social and economic life. A number of national and state organizations in the United States, including the National Governor's Association, have identified reading proficiency as a minimum standard for success in today's labor market (Sum, Kirsch, & Taggart, 2002). Yet, findings from the International Adult Literacy Survey indicate that only half of the U.S. adult population ages 16–65 years reach the level of proficiency (Kirsch et al., 2000).

For more than a decade, federal and state governments, private agencies, and universities have taken many important steps to improve reading achievement in the preschool and primary grades. These initiatives have focused on several points, including the following:

- The use of research for making instructional decisions (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development [NICHD], 2000; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998).
- Early intervention programs such as Reading Recovery (Shanahan & Barr, 1995).
- Increased funding of preschool and primary grade reading programs such as Reading First and Early Reading First.
- Enhanced Head Start literacy curricula.
- Attention to family literacy (in particular by the National Center for Family Literacy).

- A plethora of statewide initiatives to teach all students to read by Grade 3.
- Increased certification requirements in literacy for elementary teachers.

Although NAEP results during the past five years are somewhat promising with regard to improvements in Grade 4 performance, literacy levels have not improved significantly beyond Grade 4.

To address the problem, the U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences (IES) has made the development and implementation of instruction and intervention programs in literacy for adolescents a research funding priority. IES has drawn in part on the recommendations of the Rand Report concerning research in reading comprehension for struggling adolescents (IES, n.d.). MDRC, a nonprofit, nonpartisan social policy research organization, is funding studies of adolescent literacy interventions as well, in partnership with the U.S. Department of Education and the American Institute for Research. MDRC's Adolescent Literacy Evaluation project entails "a rigorous random assignment test of promising 'catch-up' literacy programs aimed at students who enter the ninth grade reading two to four years behind grade level" (MDRC, n.d.). Organizations such as the International Reading Association, the National Reading Conference, and the Alliance for Excellent Education have called for increased funding and visibility for adolescent literacy (Alvermann, 2001; Moore, Bean, Birdyshaw, & Rycik, 1999; Alliance for Excellent Education, 2005). The Carnegie Corporation of New York recently launched an initiative titled *Advancing Literacy* to support the extension of early-grade literacy improvements into high school and has supported the Rand Corporation report on the adolescent literacy problem. In addition, President Bush budgeted \$200 million in his federal budget proposal for his Striving Readers initiative, which focuses on improving the reading skills of high school students who read below grade level. All of these various efforts signal not only a growing concern about reading and writing in the upper grades but also an increasing will to act on that concern.

For that reason, I can safely assume that authors and publishers are already in the process of contributing to what appears to be a burgeoning array of adolescent literacy intervention programs. In the latter part of the 20th century, few such programs were in existence. At present, there are more than 30, and each of the major publishers is in the development phase of even more.

The number and range of programs existing or about to appear on the market can make it difficult for a district or a school to choose one that is appropriate for its particular context and needs. Hence, in this paper, I describe a project that is intended to provide assistance for those who are serious about improving the reading achievement of their struggling/striving adolescent readers and writers.

## What Is an Adolescent Literacy Intervention Program?

Before proceeding with the development of a comparison/contrast chart of the various programs, I needed to be clear about what kind of program constitutes a “literacy intervention.” In reading about the various initiatives, I realized that “intervention” meant different things to different constituencies. For example, some agencies adopt a research meaning of the term. To them, a literacy intervention is a program used in place of traditional literacy instruction, and it is not necessary that the target population of such a program be struggling. For instance, if a program was developed for use in regular elementary classrooms and an agency wanted to study its extension into regular middle school classrooms, it would call the new program the “intervention” and traditional instruction the “control.” Because the focus of most initiatives, however, is on those students who are *behind* in reading, I chose to limit the programs I placed on the chart to those designed or adapted specifically for struggling readers and intended to catch them up.

I also needed to be clear about the meaning of the term “adolescent.” Because programs serve grade levels more often than ages, I looked at programs targeted for particular grade levels. Although 12th grade seemed a common upper limit, the lower limit was somewhat confusing. The reason for the confusion, I think, is that there are a couple of different models for schools serving young adolescents, depending on whether adolescents attend a middle school or stay in elementary school until they transfer to high school. Some elementary schools extend to Grades 8 or 9 and become departmentalized at either Grade 5 or 6; and some schools serve middle grade students only beginning with Grade 4 or 5. Thus, “adolescent” programs can be aimed at students as early as fourth grade. This lower level also was in line with the definition of “adolescent” offered in much of the writing about adolescent literacy (e.g., Kamil, n.d.), and is consistent with Reading First legislation, which targets students in Grades K–3 and does not extend to Grade 4.

My criterion was that the program had to be one that extended beyond Grade 4. That is, I didn’t look at programs limited to serving elementary students in Grades K–4; I looked only at programs that serve students at least through all of the middle school grades. I did not look at programs aimed at students in postsecondary levels.

Finally, I needed a clear definition of “program.” Some programs, even though their intent is to raise the literacy achievement of struggling adolescents, focus on the professional development of teachers rather than the literacy instruction of students. I decided to include these programs as well as those focused on students. In addition, some programs might be considered core—intended to be *the* central reading program students experience—whereas others might be considered supplemental—intended to be used in conjunction with a core program. A core program must, by its nature, teach a comprehensive combination of literacy elements, whereas a supplemental program might teach only one element or focus on a narrower combination of reading elements. Reading First legislation (targeting Grades K–3) requires funded schools to choose a core program, analyze the program for areas of weakness, and choose supplements that address those weaknesses; at the same time, schools are cautioned not to use several programs that all address the same elements. Those guidelines made sense to me, so I included both core and supplemental programs in my chart.

Based upon these considerations and after studying a number of adolescent literacy programs, I developed the following definition:

“Adolescent literacy intervention programs” are those programs that (1) specifically target teachers of and/or students in middle and high school grades (Grades 4–12) who are reading significantly below grade level and (2) provide literacy instruction that is intended to increase achievement at a rate faster than average, allowing students to decrease or close the achievement gap between themselves and their normally achieving peers. Programs may be intended as core or supplemental for an entire class, an individual, or a small group and may include laboratory or computer-based instruction (or any combination of the various kinds of instruction). The instruction may be in reading or content-based venues. However, the intention of the program must be to help students who are struggling with literacy, and the focus of the program must be on at least one aspect of literacy instruction.

## **Adolescent Literacy Intervention Chart**

This section describes the chart of adolescent literacy programs that accompanies this document. I discuss the way in which I created the chart, my thoughts about the data on it, and how to use it.

Before constructing the chart, I read reviews of programs in existence (e.g., Alvermann & Rush, 2004), reviewed presentations about literacy programs (e.g., National Institute for Literacy [NIFL], n.d.), read policy statements regarding adolescent literacy (e.g., Moore et al., 1999; Alvermann, 2001), and reviewed other reports about adolescent literacy (e.g., Kamil, n.d.). I used the ideas in these documents and the guidance of Learning Point Associates, which sponsored the project, to develop the categories for the chart. A graduate assistant and I then searched the Web, the various documents above, and publishers’ materials for existing programs. We wrote to program authors for materials and downloaded materials when available. I also visited publishers’ booths at national conferences (such as the annual conference of the International Reading Association) and talked with the sales staff about their programs. Once I received information about the program and samples of program materials, I determined whether it met the criteria for an adolescent literacy intervention. Although the chart is fairly comprehensive, I cannot guarantee that all of the programs fitting the criteria are represented on this chart. It was a matter of judgment whether the criteria were met. However, the chart can be extended as programs become available or more information about them is acquired. Also, at times the information belonging in one of the fields was simply not available, and I indicated that the information was unknown.

Each identified program has a chart (See Appendix A) showing the following: publisher/author, foci/goals, targeted population, theoretical premise and embedded assumptions, main components, required training to implement, program length, date created or published, assessment components, research basis, and effectiveness data.

## Observations

After constructing the chart, I reviewed it for insights. One aspect of the chart information that struck me was the lack of research that rigorously addresses program effectiveness. The What Works Clearinghouse, created in 2002 by the Institute of Education Sciences ([www.whatworks.ed.gov](http://www.whatworks.ed.gov)), recommends evidence standards for effectiveness research. It says that to have confidence in the results of a research study about effectiveness, an experimental (or at least a quasi-experimental) study comparing the program in question with both other programs and a control is necessary.

It makes sense that if your aim is to increase literacy achievement, you want a program that will work better than the one you are already using. The best way to measure this is to engage in a study that compares the two programs under similar conditions so results are not biased. Rarely does this level of evidence exist. More often, a program will report data showing a larger achievement increase after implementation than prior to implementation. Or perhaps students in the program will be compared to students who are not in the program; but students not in the program are not part of *any* study so there is no control for the similarity of conditions.

Often, however, these programs simply have not been evaluated either because the program is new or because it has been around for some time and has enjoyed popularity without the benefit of research evidence, such as in the case of Nila Banton Smith's *Be A Better Reader* series. Authors and publishers often will cite evidence that individual components used in the program have been shown to be effective elsewhere. For example, they may cite the National Reading Panel's finding that strategy instruction is effective. Alternately, they will argue that the premises underlying the program are theoretically sound. Such evidence is useful and makes sense for programs that are new as long as more rigorous research evidence is being gathered or research is in the planning stage.

Another insight gained from reviewing the chart is that many of the earlier programs targeting struggling readers are supplemental in nature, with the exception of those originally developed for special education students (e.g., Wilson Reading Systems). These programs target particular narrow areas of literacy. However, there are several newer programs being implemented widely that are considered core programs. These are designed to be used in place of the traditional core reading program (e.g., The Amp Reading program, published by Pearson Learning Group), or they call for structural changes in the school program (such as the Talent Development High School model or CRISS). These newer, comprehensive programs also are more likely to rely on research evidence or to be planning rigorously controlled studies of program efficacy. Also, some of the newer, comprehensive programs have elaborate professional development components.

Most new programs and revisions of older ones have Internet or other computerized options for professional development, student instruction, assessment, and/or management. In addition, they make notable efforts to use materials that are current and, presumably, engaging to adolescents. However, rarely do programs focus on teaching students to negotiate "multiliteracies," as suggested by adolescent literacy experts such as Alvermann and Rush (2004).

## **How Does One Use the Chart?**

I suggest that before administrators and teachers think about purchasing a program for use with struggling readers, they first engage in an assessment of their needs. This assessment would include a review of current instructional materials, programs, and practices, to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the existing approach, level of professional expertise, commitment to improving reading achievement, budget, contextual and structural elements that inhibit student performance, and so on. Does the school merely need a change in materials, or are problems more systemic (such as a lack of professional development)? One caveat, however: When schools have students who are poor readers, it is tempting to look at all of the contextual factors and either use these to excuse poor achievement or try programs that focus on these contextual factors, forgoing programs that focus on teaching students how to read. One of the best-documented understandings we have about education is that teaching students how to do something improves their ability to do it. Time spent learning matters. Thus, for schools in which adolescents have low reading achievement, the focus of any change should be on improving reading achievement by teaching students how to read.

Once the school team has conducted a needs assessment, it should have an idea about the kinds of core programs they will review; and, once it has chosen a list of core programs, it should review them to determine whether supplemental programs are necessary. The chart should be used to make an initial list of programs that need to be reviewed more carefully and to make a list of supplemental programs to fill the gaps in the core program.

## **Adolescent Literacy Intervention Program Review Guide**

After the programs that will be reviewed have been chosen, schools might then work with publishers to gather all of the information available about them and to get a set of materials for review. Use the checklist to review the various materials and eliminate some of the programs initially chosen for a resulting “short list” of two or three programs. The publishers or authors of these programs could then be invited to present the materials to the review team, or perhaps the entire school, before a final decision is made. Whether this procedure is followed, schools should have some principled, strategic way to select programs.

### **Elements of the Review Guide**

The first item in the review guide is a definition of adolescent literacy intervention programs considered appropriate for this review.

#### **Program Information**

Following the definition, the first part of the guide asks for program information (type of program, types of materials and support, characteristics of the program reading materials, and assessment and record-keeping). This section can be used to eliminate or keep programs based upon a school’s more systemic needs. For example, if professional development of teachers is a priority, then a program not having a professional development component could be eliminated at this stage.

## **Instructional Focus**

The next part of the guide looks at specific literacy components to determine if they are present and if they are taught in a theoretically sound, research-based way. This part of the review guide should take the most time to complete because it requires knowledge of what reading research has to say about reading instruction. The National Reading Panel Report (NICHD, 2000) and other resources can help determine whether a program has an appropriate balance of instruction in literacy components. All of the components (word identification/decoding, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, and writing) are necessary elements of reading. However, depending on the age and prior schooling of students, some components might be emphasized more than others.

For example, decoding using phonetic analysis should be de-emphasized as students get older and vocabulary should gain in importance. This recommendation is based upon the report of the National Reading Panel (NICHD, 2000); in the studies it reviewed, teaching phonics to struggling readers continued to have a positive effect on reading achievement up to sixth grade but not beyond. The National Reading Panel has validated the importance of vocabulary, comprehension, and strategy instruction. The importance of fluency instruction as students get older is somewhat unclear because of the paucity of studies of adolescent fluency. In other words, the jury is still out. However, the advantage for younger students seems clear (NICHD, 2000).

One comment about the components listed: There are various ways to divide up reading into components. I parceled out critical reading and “multiliteracies,” although these are considered to be part of comprehension. There are very few programs that emphasize multiliteracies, but Alvermann and Rush (2004) as well as others have called for programs that do have such an emphasis. More programs, however, focus on critical reading. Even though it is less clear that these elements of comprehension are crucial to the improvement of reading achievement (“crucial” meaning that a student could not improve without instruction in them), critical reading does seem to be important. NAEP data (Donahue et al., 2003) show that students fail to engage in higher level comprehension processes on their own, thus suggesting that these processes must be taught.

## **Other Program Elements**

The next part of the guide looks at other program elements. The first element, Integration of Instructional Foci, is used to rate the appropriateness of the way the component parts of reading are integrated. For core programs, are there crucial components missing such as fluency instruction and practice for nonfluent readers? This rating, in conjunction with the Instructional Focus section, should help to determine whether supplemental materials will be needed. If a supplemental program is being rated, consider what its focus is and how well it is being taught. The guide should help to determine whether the supplemental program will appropriately fill a gap in the core program.

More comprehensive programs also include assessment plans and student monitoring systems, although this is not always the case. If these are included, then the way in which information is assessed is important. If they are not, then the school will want to supplement the program

with an assessment system. An assessment system should provide teachers with the ability to determine student strengths and weaknesses and make placement decisions, monitor student progress at frequently occurring intervals, and determine whether achievement targets have been reached. Ideally, schools would allot time for teachers to reflect on and discuss their students' progress at various points in the year and make instructional decisions based upon those assessments. These characteristics of assessment systems are requirements in Reading First schools, and it makes sense to extend those requirements beyond third grade.

Motivation to engage in literacy instruction is an important element in the success of a particular program. The criteria used in this element are taken partially from Guthrie's theory of engagement (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2000) and Paris, Lipson, and Wixson's (1983) work on motivating contexts for literacy instruction. Determining whether materials are motivating means more than looking for attractiveness. Students are motivated when they have opportunities to interact with others, make decisions, make connections, and work at an appropriate level of difficulty. Determining whether materials will be motivating perhaps means looking at the way the instruction is structured for students more than it means looking at topics and how information is visually displayed.

Professional development and support also are crucial components of literacy instruction. If teachers do not have the appropriate pedagogical content knowledge, they will be less likely to be able to use materials sensitively, to make adjustments when necessary, or to support student learning. Thus, especially in schools where teachers lack knowledge of reading and writing pedagogy and have difficulty managing literacy instruction, it is important that a program provides professional development and ongoing support. If it does not, then some provisions will need to be made to provide them. Professional development is also a central requirement in Reading First schools, and, as with assessment, it makes sense to extend those requirements beyond third grade.

Technology inclusion, as stated earlier, is part of most of the new programs. Technology is helpful if its unique features are capitalized on in the right context. For example, a programmer can set up lessons so that the next task a student is asked to complete on a computer is based upon the student's previous work. Alternately, a text could provide vocabulary help, background information, or other reading aids when prompted. Computers can utilize the Internet to provide instruction in reading multiple documents or multimedia use. The idea is that computers should not be babysitters nor should they fulfill the same function as paper-and-pencil tasks. Sometimes technology provides record-keeping assistance, calculates scores on assessments, and provides other services to teachers. These technological features can save time and help teachers utilize assessment data to plan instruction.

### **Overall Program Considerations**

This part of the review guide is intended to ensure that, as a whole, the program's goals and instruction are sound. The three parts of this section—research base, theoretical premise, and objectives/purposes—can help indicate to a reviewer whether there is sufficient theory and research evidence that the program will be successful (i.e., that it will do what a school intends it to do). Unlike the Instructional Focus section, the research base rating here refers not to research

previously conducted on the specific components of reading but to research done with the actual program that is being reviewed. This information, if it is available, is typically found in research briefs that accompany a program or on designated website sections. The rubrics designed to measure the research base and theoretical premise are included below the scoring section, and they were developed, in part, using the What Works Clearinghouse as a guide.

### **Total Score and Local Context**

The final section of the guide is intended for use when comparing one program with another. It requires raters to come up with an overall quality rating and to add that score to the other ratings from previous sections. Average percentages are used to accommodate the possibility that there will be a number of areas to rate that are *not applicable* for a particular program. Users should be cautioned to compare a core program to a core program (rather than comparing a core program to a supplemental program), and to compare supplemental programs that target the same component (rather than comparing a fluency program to a vocabulary program, for instance).

Finally, the guide asks reviewers to make judgments regarding the feasibility of implementation and the level of involvement needed to ensure that the program will be implemented to its fullest. It does little good to invest in a wonderful program if it is going to be used haphazardly. It also does little good to choose a program that is too expensive to buy. This section also asks reviewers to consider the match between targeted students and materials. These decisions are made using a reviewer's knowledge of the context in conjunction with his or her knowledge of the program.

## **Conclusion**

The chart and the review guide should help schools make good decisions regarding the programs in which they invest. Once decisions are made, the difficult work begins—the work of implementation. Perhaps the most important consideration in implementation is providing the time for it. Increasing the time spent teaching students how to read can make a big difference. Chicago Public Schools saw significant gains in reading achievement during their first year of implementation of the Chicago Reading Initiative (Shanahan, in press; Shanahan, 2004; Shanahan, 2001; Shanahan & Teale, 2001). These gains came about even though professional development had just begun and materials were still being developed. The Chicago Reading Initiative required that all schools devote two full hours a day to literacy instruction. Providing necessary time to teach will give students an advantage even while teachers are getting used to the program, gaining insights into the effective use of it, and learning to make adjustments when necessary. As time goes on, teachers will participate in professional development, engage in problem solving, and make decisions about students based upon assessment data. With a well-chosen program and a dedicated group of teachers who have time to learn, reflect, and plan, it is likely that achievement in literacy will continue to rise.

## References

- Alvermann, D. (2001). *Effective literacy instruction for adolescents: Executive summary and paper commissioned by the National Reading Conference*. Retrieved November 15, 2005, from <http://www.nrconline.org/publications/alverwhite2.pdf>
- Alvermann, D., & Rush, L. (2004). Literacy intervention programs at the middle and high school levels. In T. L. Jetton & J. A. Dole (Eds.), *Adolescent literacy research and practice* (pp. 210–227). New York: Guilford Press.
- Alliance for Excellent Education (2005). *Issue brief: Adolescent literacy policy update*. Retrieved November 15, 2005, from <http://www.all4ed.org/publications/Adolescent%20Literacy%20Policy%20Update.pdf>
- Donahue, P., Daane, M., & Grigg, W. (2003). *The nation's report card: Reading highlights 2003*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Retrieved November 15, 2005, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2004452> (NCES Publication No. 2004-452)
- Grigg, W. S., Daane, M. C., Jin, Y., & Campbell, J. R. (2003). *The nation's report card: Reading 2002*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Retrieved November 15, 2005, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003521> (NCES Publication No. 2003-521)
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 402–422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Institute of for Education Sciences (n.d.). *New funding opportunities*. Retrieved November 15, 2005, from <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ies/index.html>
- Kamil, M. (n.d.). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Kirsch, I., Yamamoto, K., Norris, N., Rock, D., Jungeblut, A., O'Reilly, A., et al. (2000). *Technical report and user's manual for the 1992 national adult literacy survey* (Publication No. 2001-457). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., & Rycik, J. A. (1999). *Adolescent literacy: A position statement for the Commission on Adolescent Literacy of the International Reading Association*. International Reading Association.
- MDRC (n.d.) Evaluation of Adolescent Literacy Intervention Strategies. Retrieved November 15, 2005, from [http://www.mdrc.org/project\\_29\\_70.html](http://www.mdrc.org/project_29_70.html)

- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups* [NIH Publication No. 00-4754]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved November 15, 2005, from <http://www.nichd.nih.gov/publications/nrp/report.htm>.
- National Institute for Literacy (n.d.). *Literacy fact sheets: Workforce education*. Retrieved July 1, 2005, from [www.nifl.gov/nifl/facts/facts\\_overview.html](http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/facts/facts_overview.html)
- Paris, S. G., Lipson, M. Y., & Wixson, K. K. (1983). Becoming a strategic reader. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, 293–316.
- Shanahan, T. (in press). Teaching fluency in the context of effective literacy instruction. In T. Rasinski, C. Bachowicz, & K. Lems (Eds.), *Fluency theory, fluency research* (pp. 21–38). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Shanahan, T. (2004). Improving reading achievement in high school and middle school: Structures and reforms. In D. Alvermann & D. S. Strickland (Eds.), *Bridging the achievement gap: Improving literacy for pre-adolescent & adolescent learners grades 4–12* (pp. 43–55). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Shanahan, T. (2001). Improving reading education for low-income children. In G. Shiel & U. N. Dhálaigh (Eds.), *Reading matters: A fresh start* (pp. 157–165). Dublin, Ireland: Reading Association of Ireland/National Reading Initiative.
- Shanahan, T., & Barr, R. (1995). Reading Recovery: An independent evaluation of the effects of an early instructional intervention for at-risk learners. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 958–996.
- Shanahan, T., & Teale, W. (2001). *Final report: Framework for school improvement research*. Interagency Educational Research Initiative (National Science Foundation, U. S. Department of Education, National Institute of Child Health and Development).
- Snow, C., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Sum, A., Kirsch, I., & Taggart, R. (2002). *The twin challenges of mediocrity and inequality: Literacy in the U.S. from an international perspective* (PDF file). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Venezky, R. L, Kaestle, C. F., & Sum, A. M. (1987). *The subtle danger: Reflections on the literacy abilities of America's young adults*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

# **Appendix A**

## **Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs Chart**

# Academy of Reading

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Auto-Skill: A helping hand for literacy

## Target Population

Elementary, middle, and high schools

## Foci/Goals

- Phonemic awareness
- Sound symbol association
- Phonics and decoding
- Comprehension
- Reading proficiency
- Training to automaticity—measures accuracy and speed on each dimension

## Theoretical Premise

- Individualized approach, with emphasis on data-driven decisions using automated comprehension assessment; browser based.
- Uses a three-step process: prescribe, monitor, and intervene.
- No assistance is needed from the teacher for students to begin using the system.
- Based on NCLB legislation and National Reading Panel report.

## Embedded Assumptions

Students need sequential skill instruction that leads to automaticity.

## Main Components

Web-based program including lessons, assessment, tracking, and reporting

## **Intervention Length**

Average of 11 hours of on-task work; 16–30 hours of time in program

## **Existence Length**

Unknown

## **Required Training Time**

Nonmandatory:

- One-day introductory training
- On-site consultations
- Best-practices workshops
- Customer support program

## **Assessment Component**

Assessments a part of the program—not described

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test; Cloze paragraph reading test
- Unknown
- Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)
- Unknown

## **Research Basis**

- Eric Michael, Connie Strunk—nonrefereed publication (2004)
- Unknown

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- Eighth-grade students in Chambersburg (Pennsylvania) Area School District, 2001–02, two years below grade level in reading proficiency; 26 students, 11.5 hours in program
- 600 students in Grades 2–9; 28 schools; nonrandomized control group study
- Grades 6–7 in Jackson, Mississippi
- Grades 2–9 at nine Chapter 1 schools in Santa Fe, New Mexico

## **Effectiveness**

- 2.4 grade level gains on SDRT
- Gains of 68 percent and 50 percent over control group
- 18.2 percentile to 40.1 percentile on ITBS after five weeks
- Equivalent gain of 14.8 percentile points

## **Accelerated Reader (AR)**

### **Program Type**

Supplemental (not recommended as comprehensive, although some schools use it as such)

### **Publisher/Developer**

Renaissance Learning ([www.renlearn.com/ar/](http://www.renlearn.com/ar/))

### **Target Population**

Grades PK–12

### **Foci/Goals**

- Careful reading of books
- Intrinsic reading motivation
- Objective testing of reading
- Rise in reading achievement as measured by state tests
- Better classroom management
- Providing students with challenge (zone of proximal development)

### **Theoretical Premise**

Independent reading increases reading achievement and motivation to read.

### **Embedded Assumptions**

- If students read independently, their reading will improve.
- The more books students read, the better their reading will be.
- Teaching students to read does not have to be emphasized

### **Main Components**

- Management software
- Practice quizzes
- Management and reporting access
- Implementation consulting and support
- Automatic software upgrades
- Online help/manuals

## **Intervention Length**

Yearlong

## **Existence Length**

Since 1986

## **Required Training Time**

None required. Teachers can participate in four three-hour workshops, train by themselves with six conference calls and materials, or have a consultant come out.

## **Assessment Component**

Five kinds of quizzes:

- Reading practice
- Textbook series
- Recorded voice
- Literacy skills
- Vocabulary

Teachers receive several kinds of reports:

- TOPS report (individual quiz)
- Diagnostic report (class)
- Student record report
- Literacy skills report (student/class average)
- Customizable status report

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- California Achievement Test (CAT)
- Star (AR measure; pre only); GRADE (AR measure; pre/post)
- Number of books checked out

## **Research Basis**

- Peak & Dewalt (1993)
- Samuels & Wu (2004)
- Lawson (2000)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- Retrospective, nonrandom
- Experiment (randomized assignment of students to class and class to treatment), 15 minutes of reading, AR quiz versus book report. Grade level not reported.
- Retrospective, nonrandom

## **Effectiveness**

- On CAT, AR group gained 14.4 points per year for five years, compared to 8.4 points per year for Grade 8.
- Significantly higher gains for AR on passage comprehension and total comprehension, but not on vocabulary, sentence comprehension, or reading speed.
- Number of books checked out after one year for sixth to eighth graders was four times higher.

# **Amp Reading System**

## **Program Type**

Comprehensive

## **Publisher/Developer**

Pearson Learning Group: Globe Fearon, Timothy Shanahan

## **Target Population**

Interest level 6–12; reading level 3–5

## **Foci/Goals**

This system provides three years of reading intervention instruction. The focus is on explicit instructional routines, one strategy at a time, for comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency. Eighty-five percent of the texts are nonfiction.

## **Theoretical Premise**

Based upon the work of the National Reading Panel, and aligned with Reading Next.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

- Good reading is active reading.
- Vocabulary needs to be carefully introduced and controlled.
- Only research-validated strategies should be taught.
- Fluency is an important element in reading achievement.

## **Main Components**

- Levels 1, 2, and 3 (reading levels 3–4, 4–5, and 5–6)
  - ⊙ Kits
  - ⊙ Student guides
  - ⊙ Library books
  - ⊙ Teacher's edition
  - ⊙ Assessment masters
  - ⊙ Print and audio library
- Professional Development DVD

- Customized Reading Strategies
  - ⊙ Social studies
  - ⊙ Mathematics
  - ⊙ Science

### **Intervention Length**

Yearlong

### **Existence Length**

2005

### **Required Training Time**

None specified

### **Assessment Component**

Assessment is a part of each level. Online system asks interspersed questions and tracks student responses, level, and progress in reading. Online version allows for individual customization based upon level of support needed.

### **Pre/Post Measures**

Amp Reading will be the focus of an experimental study, but the study is not completed.

### **Research Basis**

None yet

### **Type of Research Conducted**

None yet

### **Effectiveness**

None yet

# Be a Better Reader, 8th Edition

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Globe Fearon; Pearson Learning Group

## Target Population

Grades 6–12; Reading levels 3–10; English as a second language (ESL)

## Foci/Goals

- Improvement in content area reading using direct instruction in skills related to literature, science, social studies, and mathematics
- Help for ESL students using Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach and ([www.gwu.edu/~calla/](http://www.gwu.edu/~calla/))
- Focus on comprehension, reading/writing connections, understanding charts and graphs, critical thinking, ESL support

## Theoretical Premise

Cognitive and meta-cognitive strategy instruction; sheltered ESL instruction; content area reading

## Embedded Assumptions

- An approach based on explicit teaching of learning strategies
- Based on the premise that active learners are better learners
- Assumes that academic learning strategies transfer to new and different tasks
- Focuses on the development of cognitive academic language proficiency

## Main Components

- Eight leveled workbook/texts for content area reading
- Four core reading selections for each theme-based unit
- Brief skill lessons
- Real-life skill at end of each unit
- Be a Better Reader Starting Out—two readers for practicing nonfiction reading

**Intervention Length**

Unstated

**Existence Length**

Unstated

**Required Training Time**

Unstated

**Assessment Component**

Unstated

**Pre/Post Measures**

None

**Research Basis**

None

**Type of Research Conducted**

None

**Effectiveness**

None

# Caught Reading

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

Globe Fearon Publishers (division of Pearson Learning)

## Target Population

Interest level Grades 6–12, Reading level Grades PK–4 for adult basic education (ABE)/Basic Skills/ESL

## Foci/Goals

Focus is on reading skills and practice, with two vocabulary-controlled novels per level.

- Getting Ready: phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle, phonics
- Levels 1–4 focus on vocabulary, word attack, and comprehension

## Theoretical Premise

The publishers advertise:

- A balanced approach to reading, including skill- and literature-based instruction
- Cross-curricular connections
- A comprehensive program that integrates all four language skills
- Age-appropriate content for middle and high school

No other information available.

## Embedded Assumptions

Balanced approach assumes that literature and skills are both emphasized.

## **Main Components**

- Getting Ready
- Beginning Reading Level
- Levels 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, and 4.0
- Diagnostic and Placement Guide
- Teachers' Manual

## **Intervention Length**

Variable

## **Existence Length**

Unknown

## **Required Training Time**

Not specified

## **Assessment Component**

Diagnostic and Placement Guide; two assessments per unit

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Unknown

## **Research Basis**

Unknown

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Unknown

## **Effectiveness**

Unknown

# Comprehension Upgrade

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Learning Upgrade

## Target Population

Grades 5–12; adult

## Foci/Goals

- Understanding of textbooks, literature, and functional texts
- Analysis
- Critical reading
- Vocabulary

## Theoretical Premise

Unstated (Self-paced lessons featuring pop music, video, and games will be motivational for adolescents.)

## Embedded Assumptions

- Reading single decontextualized passages for 30–60 minutes each day to level 50 will increase reading achievement.
- One program fits the needs of all kinds of readers in every context.

## Main Components

- Set of 50 Internet lessons, about 10 minutes each
- Focus on discrete skills such as “understanding author’s purpose” and strategies such as performing a Web search
- Analogies
- Compare and contrast
- KWL
- Internet search
- Expository organizer

- Preview, skim, scan
- Flow charts
- Following directions
- Fluency
- Prediction
- Fact and opinion
- Forms and applications
- Story maps
- Idioms

### **Intervention Length**

3–8 weeks of 30 60-minute lessons; with self-pacing, instruction could last as long as one year

### **Existence Length**

Unknown

### **Required Training Time**

None required. This is a Web-based program.

### **Assessment Component**

Students pass a quiz, and that takes them automatically to the next level.

### **Pre/Post Measures**

None

### **Research Basis**

None

### **Type of Research Conducted**

None

## **Effectiveness**

Claims are made that students will make “measurable gains” in just 6–10 weeks.

# **Corrective Reading (CR)**

## **Program Type**

Comprehensive

## **Publisher/Developer**

Science Research Associates (SRA); McGraw-Hill Companies

## **Target Population**

Grades 4–12

## **Foci/Goals**

- Intensive intervention for students reading one or more years below grade level
- Tightly sequenced, carefully planned lessons that give struggling students the structure and practice necessary to become skilled, fluent readers and better learners
- Four levels for decoding plus four for comprehension
- Addresses deficits and skill levels found among older students
- Point system based on realistic goals to motivate students who are often expected to fail

## **Theoretical Premise**

Students need daily practice and feedback, with sequences of lessons that move students in small steps.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

- Struggling readers struggle with decoding and comprehension.
- Practice, feedback, and movement through small sequential steps are necessary for improvement.

## **Main Components**

- Decoding workbooks
- Comprehension workbooks
- Decoding student books
- Comprehension of student books
- Decoding teacher presentation books
- Comprehension of teacher presentation books

- Teacher guides
- Black-line masters
- Mastery test packages
- Series guide

## **Intervention Length**

Unstated

## **Existence Length**

1998

## **Required Training Time**

Teachers, coaches, and administrators are trained. A coach has to have taught the reading program for at least one year. Administrators go through awareness training. Program provides for in-class coaching.

## **Assessment Component**

Placement tests for decoding and comprehension. Mastery tests A, B, and C for both decoding and comprehension. Ongoing monthly project monitoring. Goal is student mastery. If student does not reach mastery, intervention takes place based upon school team.

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- Acer Test of Learning Ability
- Daniels and Diack Test of Reading Experience
- Rutter's Behavioral Questionnaire
- Woodcock Johnson
- Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests
- Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests
- Gates-MacGinitie
- Neale Analysis
- Iowa Test of Basic Skills
- Unknown

## **Research Basis**

- Clunies-Ross (1990)
- Gregory, Hackney, & Gregory (1982)
- Ross (1998)
- Campbell (1984)
- Kasendorf & McQuade (1987);
- Sommers (1991)
- Sommers (1995)
- Maggs & Murdoch (1979)
- Vitali, Medland, Romance, & Weaver (1993)
- Holdsworth (1984)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- Comparison class versus CR class, Grade 6 for eight months
- Comparison class versus CR, five months, 26 lessons in Grade 6
- Eclectic remedial readers use decoding part of corrective reading; tested three times over two months on decoding/comprehension
- Grades 7–8 remedial reading pull-out program versus comparison group who remained in class
- Retrospective, randomly selected poor readers; seven months in program
- Gain scores of sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade poor readers/month of instruction
- Gain scores for 14 remedial readers
- Title I students, Grades 4–6, compared to equivalent Title I students taught one hour/day for four months
- 15 students with mild learning difficulties, at two different levels of decoding, taught for four months

## **Effectiveness**

- Mean score (overall intelligence as a construct of general reasoning, verbal comprehension, and syllogistic reasoning) significantly higher (68th versus 50th percentile)
- Grade equivalent gains: 3.3 to 5.1 for CR; 2.8 to 3.08 for control; CR had better attendance, better behavior
- Significant gains in decoding and comprehension; decoding growth above expected norm
- Pullouts gained 2.2 grade levels versus 0.4 (significantly higher on every subscale); students reading at higher levels made most gains

- Significant gains in word attack over previous instruction
- 1.1, 1.35, 2.35 month-to-month gains, respectively
- .Significant change in gain scores
- CR students showed 1.6 month-to-month gain versus 0.8 month-to-month gain on total reading; and 2.1 month-to-month gain versus 0.6 month-to-month gain on vocabulary
- Almost at grade level; effect on comprehension greater than effect on decoding

# IndiVisual Reading

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Rocky Mountain Learning Systems

## Target Population

Students who read at grade levels 4–8 and who are remedial readers; advertised as a remedial and supplemental program

## Foci/Goals

- Vocabulary (3,000 words across the program)—student listens to word and definition, types word, matches word with synonym, fills appropriate word in blank
- Fluency—models fluency by reading the text to student first then student reads
- Comprehension—embedded in comprehension idea units
- Focus on reading informational text

## Theoretical Premise

Purports to “work with all major educational philosophies.” Says they provide “coached practice.”

## Embedded Assumptions

Fluency modeling in meaning units and vocabulary instruction build fluency. Interspersed questions increase comprehension.

## Main Components

Six levels of 20 lessons each. Starting with 4th grade 6 months and ending at 7th grade. Progressively more difficult vocabulary and longer interval between presentation and testing of comprehension element.

## Intervention Length

Variable

## **Existence Length**

IndiVisual Learning, LLC, is a Minnesota-based organization formed in 1998, derived from the vision of Howard Casmey, former Commissioner of Education for Minnesota (1969–81).

## **Required Training Time**

Not specified

## **Assessment Component**

Not specified

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- SAT9, Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Exam
- Minnesota Basic Skills Test, Gates-MacGinitie
- Slosson Oral Reading Test

## **Research Basis**

- Rocky Mountain Learning Systems
- Rocky Mountain Learning Systems (2002)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- Houston, Texas: students reading below grade level at Crispus Attucks (34 seventh graders) and Dowling middle schools (25 sixth, seventh, and eighth graders); pre/post, no control design; treatment time approximately six months
- St. Paul, Minnesota, schools: remedial readers (lowest 50 students) in eighth grade; 60 hours of instruction; pre/post, no control design
- High Island (Texas) School, Grades K–12, 285 students, 12 weeks, 25 lessons; pre/post, no control design

## **Effectiveness**

- Increase of 14.7 points on Texas Learning Index
- 26 of the 50 passed basic skills exam in reading
- Average 1.2 grade-level increase on the Slosson Oral Reading Test

# Jamestown Education

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Glencoe McGraw Hill: Jamestown Publishers

## Target Population

Different for each workbook; students reading below grade level:

- Reading levels 2–12 (interest levels 4–12)
- Reading levels 4–10 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 4–10 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 3–9 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 4–13 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 4–13+ (interest levels 6–12+)
- Reading levels 4–13+ (interest levels 6–12+)
- Reading levels 4–6 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 6–8 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 4–12 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 2½–5 (interest levels 4–12+)
- Reading levels 1–10 (interest levels 4–12)
- Reading levels 1–8 (interest levels 4–12)
- Reading levels 6–8 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 4–12 (interest levels 6–12)
- Reading levels 5–8 (interest levels 5–8)
- Reading levels 5–8 (interest levels 7–9);
- Reading levels 1.6–12.9 (interest levels 6–12+).

## Foci/Goals

Series of workbooks, each with a specific focus:

- Signature Reading—comprehension, vocabulary, content-area reading, metacognitive strategies
- Skimming and Scanning—reading rate, fluency, vocabulary drills
- Reading Drills—reading rate and fluency, vocabulary
- Reading Fluency—paired oral reading; smooth, accurate, and expressive reading; vocabulary, comprehension
- Timed Readings Plus—reading stamina, rate, and fluency on content-area topics
- Timed Reading—reading rate and fluency with nonfiction; comprehension
- Timed Readings in Literature—reading rate and fluency with fiction, comprehension
- English, YES!—English learning through literature, comprehension, vocabulary, idioms, grammar; listening, speaking, and writing in English
- The Wild Side—comprehension with nonfiction: author’s purpose, personal response, self-assessment, cross-text comparisons
- Critical Reading Series—nonfiction comprehension instruction: author’s purpose, personal response, self-assessment, cross-text comparisons
- The Outer Edge—nonfiction; critical thinking
- The Contemporary Reader—theme, scope, and sequence
- Goodman’s Five-Star Stories—comprehension with fiction; critical thinking, literary elements
- Goodman’s Five-Star Activity Books—comprehension, mechanics, writing, and study skills; standardized test prep
- Goodman’s Five-Star Spelling—reading comprehension, 320 words, main idea, cause and effect, inference, vocabulary
- Reading in the Content Areas—improve reading in one content area; main idea, subject matter, supporting details, conclusion, clarifying devices, vocabulary in context
- Jamestown American Portraits—reading historical fiction
- Breakthroughs—analysis, evaluation, synthesis, application with subject matter topics
- Passkey—individualized, computerized diagnosis and prescription

## **Theoretical Premise**

Jamestown draws heavily on the results of the National Reading Panel report showing effectiveness of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension strategies. Also relies on motivation research, referencing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, praise, and evaluation.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

Literacy can be taught using workbook materials that focus on a few individual skills.

## **Main Components**

Workbooks at various levels on each of the components listed previously

## **Intervention Length**

Yearlong

## **Existence Length**

Not stated

## **Required Training Time**

All are optional, including the book *Teaching Reading with Jamestown*. Workshops specifically tailored to individual schools are also provided, titled:

- *Smoothly, Accurately, Expressively*
- *Reading Language Learners with Foldables*
- *How to Carry on a Conversation with Yourself and Not be Labeled a Lunatic* (Think-alouds)
- *Becoming a Reading Mechanic* (monitoring and repairing comprehension)
- *It's Not Quite Origami* (using manipulatives)
- *A Volkswagen Approach to Teaching Reading* (prereading instruction)

## **Assessment Component**

Some books come with some self-diagnostic instruments and charts for graphing progress.

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Stanford Diagnostic Test; various

## **Research Basis**

Publishers

## **Type of Research Conducted**

The evidence consists of testimonials and data showing that students who use Jamestown materials (along with other materials) either gain in reading achievement or are already above the national or district average. No experimental, quasi-experimental, baseline comparison, or other studies are reported.

## **Effectiveness**

Students in all of the schools reported are either above average in reading achievement or improve in reading achievement over a period of approximately three years.

## **Language! Third Edition**

No discussion of who collected data; no random assignment. No indication that any studies were published (www.teachlanguage.com)

### **Program Type**

Comprehensive

### **Publisher/Developer**

Sopris West Educational Services

### **Target Population**

Grades 3–12 general education, English as a second language (ESL)/English language learner (ELL), special education, remedial reading, clinical settings—below 35th percentile

### **Foci/Goals**

- Structured language approach
- Instruction in phonemic awareness/phonics, word recognition/spelling, vocabulary/morphology, grammar/usage, listening/reading comprehension, speaking/writing

### **Theoretical Premise**

Reading is more than a sensory, perceptual, and cognitive skill. It depends on accurate, fluent, integrated use of several language systems and processes. These include:

- The phonological system that recognizes, remembers, and produces speech sounds and speech sound sequences
- The orthographic processor that recognizes, remembers, and produces graphemes and letter sequences in written words
- The semantic system that registers meanings of words, phrases, and sentences, and constructs networks among them
- The syntactic system that produces and interprets the order of words in sentences between various parts of the text, as well as between the reader's world knowledge; consequently, the text is perceived and represented in memory as a coherent structure.

Each of these language systems and processes must be taught if students are to read, write, comprehend, and express themselves verbally. Automaticity and accuracy are needed.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

- Students have difficulty reading because they lack critical foundations in phonology. Even high school students benefit from instruction in Level 1 phonology.
- Phoneme isolation, phoneme segmentation and counting, rhyming, blending, and substitution are necessary building blocks to reading.
- Students also need to read connected text from decodable books.

## **Main Components**

- Instructional resource kit for teachers
- Teacher edition
- Student text
- Interactive text
- Assessment materials
- Technology tools: online assessment; planning; word database; e-reader; sortagories

## **Intervention Length**

Unstated (assumed until students reach grade level)

## **Existence Length**

Unstated

## **Required Training Time**

- Initial training with course credit at accredited universities
- Three-day training, priced per day
- Advanced training for administrators and reading coaches, priced per day
- Half- or full-day follow-up training, priced per day
- Site visits

## **Assessment Component**

- Placement based on Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) test comprehension, test of silent word reading fluency, spelling inventory; enter in book A or book C
- Progress monitoring through content mastery and fluency tasks, summative tests; progress indicators
- Online assessment system organizes and analyzes student data

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- Multilevel Academic Survey Test (MAST), long form comprehension; Woodcock letter-word identification; word attack.
- STAR (comprehension)
- Gray Oral Reading Test Comprehension (Gort 3)
- STAR (comprehension)
- MAST reading comprehension
- MAST; SAT9
- Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP); Test of Word Reading Efficiency (TOWRE); DRP
- Johns Basic Reading Inventory
- Gray Silent Reading Tests

### **Research Basis**

- 1999–2000
- 1999–2000
- No date listed
- 2001–02
- 2000–01, 2002
- 2001–02
- 2000–01
- No date listed

### **Type of Research Conducted**

- Sacramento, California: 6th- to 10th-grade students, Sept–May, 90 minutes/day, pre/post
- Twin Falls, Idaho: Grades 7, 8, and 9, four months of instruction
- Elk Grove (California) Unified School District: seventh, eighth, and ninth graders
- Los Angeles County: Grades 7–12, average of 51 hours of instruction
- California middle school special ed or at-risk students in, Grades 6, 7, and 8 for one year
- Perris and Paloma (California) high schools: poor readers; one third of curriculum completed
- Rochester, Michigan: sixth-, eighth-, and 10th-grade special education students

- Friedell (Rochester, Minnesota) Middle School readers two or more grades below grade level on Gates-MacGinitie
- Utica (Michigan) Community Schools: , Grades 7 and 8 learning disabled students; different times in treatment

## **Effectiveness**

- Significant percentile rank gains
- Six months gain compared to two months for nonparticipants
- Percentile rank gains: seventh and eighth grades = 15.6 to 42.8; ninth = 12 to 30
- Seven months gain
- Sixth grade: 10-point gain in normal curve equivalent (NCE); seventh grade: 7-pt gain; eighth grade: 3-pt gain
- Gains of 10 and 12 NCE points; gains on SAT9 only after two years
- Significant gains in relative standing on two of three subtests of phonological processing at each grade level. On TOWRE, only sixth- and eighth-grade groups improved in phonemic decoding efficiency. On DRP, students gained 5.9 percentile points at Grades 6 and 8, 1.4 points at Grade 10.
- Average gain of 0.95 year after three months of instruction
- Average percentile rank increase from 3.2 to 16

# Lindamood-Bell

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

Gander Publishing Co.

## Target Population

Ages 6 to adult

## Foci/Goals

Several computer programs:

- *Lips* focuses on practicing consonant sounds, symbols and labels, tracking sounds, and phonemic awareness.
- *Seeing Stars* focuses on instant word recognition for 300 commonly used words.
- *Visualizing and Verbalizing* focuses on visualizing and verbalizing stories read or heard, building vocabulary, sentence and paragraph practice, and comprehension and critical thinking.

## Theoretical Premise

- Decoding—students have difficulty with whole/part relationships. Students need multisensory feedback and language to overcome the difficulty.
- Comprehension—students have difficulty with gestalt processing. They only process the parts, and have difficulty putting information together across words, sentences, and paragraphs. Imaging and verbalizing helps students to overcome these problems.
- Draws on dual-coding theory to hypothesize sensory-cognitive deficits.

## Embedded Assumptions

Some students need more structured approaches to phonemic awareness, phonics, and comprehension. Students are categorized into four groups, according to need:

1. Decoding only
2. Comprehension only
3. Comprehension with decoding support
4. Decoding with comprehension support

## **Main Components**

Computer programs: *Lips*, *Seeing Stars*, and *Visualizing and Verbalizing (V/V)*

## **Intervention Length**

108–147 hours; variable depending on profile of individual student

## **Existence Length**

- 1975: Auditory Discrimination in Depth, a precursor for younger students.
- Others unknown

## **Required Training Time**

- Nonmandatory workshops run from 1 to 12 days.
- Courses offered:
  1. *Lips*—3-day workshop
  2. *Seeing Stars*—2-day workshop
  3. *V/V*—2-day workshop

## **Assessment Component**

- Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test (for phonemic awareness)
- Gray Oral Reading Test (GORT)
- Detroit Test of Learning Aptitudes

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
- GORT
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT)

## **Research Basis**

Cynthia Burke; Lisbeth Howard, Tina Evangelou—partially supported by Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes—only experiment with adolescents.

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Juvenile delinquents in a randomly assigned study participated in Lindamood-Bell program or not; treatment time varied across individuals, and not all students in treatment completed the program

## **Effectiveness**

No statistical comparisons were made between treatment and control conditions. Significant pre/post gains were found in treatment group on word attack, WRAT reading and spelling, GORT rate and accuracy, fluency, oral directions and comprehension, PPVT vocabulary. Controls gained on GORT accuracy and fluency.

# Merit Software

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

Merit Software Company ([www.meritsoftware.com](http://www.meritsoftware.com))

## Target Population

Elementary, middle school, high school, special education/learning disabled (LD), college prep, workplace, English as a second language (ESL), adult (this chart focuses on middle and high school)

## Foci/Goals

### Middle School

- Reading comprehension basic
- Reading comprehension intermediate
- Vocabulary
- Process writing
- Writing mechanics–grammar

### High School

- Reading comprehension, college prep
- Reading comprehension, intermediate
- Vocabulary
- Process writing
- Writing mechanics–grammar
- Business communication

## Theoretical Premise

Draws on diverse scholars such as Skinner, Bloom, Vygotsky (and other “constructivists”), and Thorndike. They claim the software is motivational and interactive, provides “context-sensitive” tips for learning, and is research based. Comprehension skills focus uses Bloom’s taxonomy.

## Embedded Assumptions

Unknown

## Main Components

Software products include:

- Reading Comprehension, Basic: Reading Comprehension Booster; Early Reading Booster; Reading Shape-Up, Set 1; Read and Respond Punch; Real World Reading Skills
- Reading Comprehension, Intermediate: Developing Critical Thinking Skills for Effective Reading; Accu-Reading, Set 1; Literature-Based Reading, Set 1; Reading Critically: Nonfiction; Reading Shape-Up, Set 2
- Reading Comprehension, College Prep: Developing Critical Thinking Skills for Upper Grades; Accu-Reading, Set 2; Reading Critically: Nonfiction for College Prep; Literature-Based Reading, Set 2; Science Reading for College Prep; Social Studies Reading for College Prep
- Vocabulary: Vocabulary Fitness; Vocabulary Stretch; Vocabulary Super Stretch
- Process Writing: Essay Punch; Paragraph Punch; Starter Paragraph Punch
- ESL Grammar: ESL Fitness; Idiom Fitness
- Writing Mechanics—Grammar: Grammar Fitness; Grammar Fitness for Upper Grades; Grammar Shape-Up; Write It Right
- Bundles
  - ⊙ *Basic Skills Pack*: reading/vocabulary curriculum; mathematics curriculum; writing/grammar curriculum
  - ⊙ *Intermediate Skills Pack*: reading/vocabulary curriculum; mathematics curriculum; writing/grammar curriculum
  - ⊙ *Language Arts Bundle for College Prep*: reading comprehension curriculum; vocabulary curriculum; grammar curriculum
  - ⊙ *General Educational Development (GED) Prep Bundle*

## Intervention Length

Variable

## Existence Length

More than 15 years

## **Required Training Time**

None

## **Assessment Component**

Not specified. Informal assessment built into system. Students may not progress until they have answered questions accurately.

## **Pre/Post Measures**

SAT9

## **Research Basis**

Publishers in collaboration with Marshall University—nonrefereed publication

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Control versus research group study of Calhoun County (West Virginia) middle and high schools, Grades 6–8; no description of treatment duration, assignment to treatment, or other research methods

## **Effectiveness**

Treatment group scored “better than the control group in several subtests,” but there is no indication of statistical significance. Treatment group students increased their SAT9 reading vocabulary score by 13.1 percent of the total sample mean, and their reading comprehension score by 10.5 percent. Membership in the experimental group also yielded an average gain of 11.1 percent for the SAT9 language expression subtest, and an average gain of 8.3 percent for spelling.

# **Project CRISS—Creating Independence Through Student-Owned Strategies**

## **Program Type**

Comprehensive

## **Publisher/Developer**

Carol Santa and her colleagues in Kalispell, Montana

## **Target Population**

Grades 4–12

## **Foci/Goals**

Focused on helping students better organize, understand and retain course information. Students receiving the CRISS method of instruction will purportedly “learn how to learn.” Training focuses on the following:

- Philosophy
- Textbook analysis and teaching the author’s craft
- Discussion strategies
- Active strategies for learning and organizing
- Writing strategies
- Vocabulary assessment

## **Theoretical Premise**

- Concepts are drawn from cognitive psychology.
- First, students must be able to integrate new information with prior knowledge.
- Second, students need to be actively involved in their own learning by discussing, writing, and organizing.
- Third, students must self-monitor to identify which strategies are the most effective for a given set of learning materials.
- These behaviors need to be taught by content teachers to maximize the acquisition of course information.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

CRISS is Creating Independence through Student-Owned Strategies

## **Main Components**

- Training manuals for Level I and Level II training
- Materials for one-semester course (Grades 6–9)
  - ⊙ 31 books in classroom set
  - ⊙ teacher’s manual
  - ⊙ DVD: *Tough Terminators*
  - ⊙ student workbooks
- Parent’s booklet
- Promotional items
- CRISS strategy prompts for students

## **Intervention Length**

One-semester course for Grades 6–9

## **Existence Length**

- Since 1979
- In 1982; State validated demonstration site
- In 1985: Nationally validated project for Grades 10–12
- In 1993: Validation expanded to Grades 4–12

## **Required Training Time**

- Level I training: a 12- to 18-hour workshop for teachers
- Level II training: an 18- to 24-hour workshop for CRISS experienced teachers to become certified “District CRISS Trainers,” qualified to train other teachers in their own districts to use CRISS in the classroom

## **Assessment Component**

Training shows teachers how to use CRISS strategies for assessment in three areas:

- By helping students assess their own progress in learning;
- By helping teachers evaluate student learning; and
- The project addresses the strategies needed for evaluating the effectiveness of CRISS districtwide.

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Free-recall task

## **Research Basis**

- O'Neal & Associates—-independent source, 2001–03
- CRISS Staff (1993)
- CRISS Staff (1995)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- Two large Utah school districts: Grades 4 and 7, and high school classes in biology, social studies, English, and earth science; control and experimental conditions; pre- and posttests; 7–8 months of instruction; nonrandom. Teachers were volunteers with more than five years of teaching experience; two teachers per subject area. Students took free-recall test on grade-level reading passages and completed a Learning Strategies survey.
- Middle schools in Aurora, Colorado, and high schools in Spokane, Washington: Same design as above
- Grades 4, 6, 8, and 11: 16 teachers assigned to treatment or control conditions

## **Effectiveness**

- Consistently significant differences between experimental and control conditions, in favor of controls, on free recall. Surveys showed students used most strategies independently.
- Gains of one grade level in both vocabulary and comprehension

## QuickReads—Secondary

### Program Type

Supplemental

### Publisher/Developer

Pearson Learning Group; Modern Curriculum Press—Elfrieda Heibert

### Target Population

Interest level, Grades 2–10; reading level, Grades 2–5

### Foci/Goals

Focuses on increasing reading fluency, comprehension, and critical background knowledge.

### Theoretical Premise

Draws upon National Reading Panel report that fluency practice increases reading comprehension. Also references direct teaching of strategies.

### Embedded Assumptions

- Silent reading for one minute will increase reading fluency (the National Reading Panel found that *oral* reading fluency increased reading achievement).
- Hiebert (2003) uses a definition of fluency that includes accuracy and speed, but not prosody. Words are repeated up to four times in each passage.
- Belief that informational texts are motivational and will help students learn.

### Instructional Routine

1. Say to students, “Before you read, think about what you already know about the topic. Also, look for two words that might be new and challenging. Underline these words.”
2. Then, ask students to read the passage aloud or silently. They may take as much time as they need.
3. After they read, tell students to write on a graphic organizer a few words or phrases that will help them remember what is important about the topic. A graphic organizer is located at the beginning of each review section in the student editions.

## **Main Components**

Five levels of books; each has nine social studies and nine science lessons, vocabulary reinforcements, and reinforcement of high-frequency words and word patterns. *QuickReads Technology Edition* classroom packages include, for each level:

- Six copies each of Student Edition Books 1, 2, and 3
- One Teacher's Resource Manual
- Three read-along audio CDs
- One Technology Edition installation CD-ROM
- One Technology Teacher's Resource Manual
- Three Library Content CD-ROMs and three headsets

## **Intervention Length**

Not stated

## **Existence Length**

2004

## **Required Training Time**

Not specified

## **Assessment Component**

Comprehension questions related to each reading

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Not applicable (the only research on QuickReads is with second graders)

## **Research Basis**

Not applicable

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Not applicable

## **Effectiveness**

Not applicable

## **Read 180**

No indication that any studies were published (thus peer reviewed); most done by Scholastic (see reference list)

### **Program Type**

Comprehensive

### **Publisher/Developer**

Scholastic

### **Target Population**

Elementary (Stage A); Middle School (Stage B); High School (Stage C)

### **Foci/Goals**

- Intensive individualized instruction addressing students' unique reading problems through Read 180 software
- Teacher-directed explicit instruction in reading comprehension, vocabulary, word study, and writing
- Independent reading and audio books

### **Theoretical Premise**

Purports to follow No Child Left Behind (NCLB) guidelines for research-based reading instruction that includes technology and assessment (as well as scientifically based reading research). Uses reading coach model at points.

### **Embedded Assumptions**

- Students have difficulty reading because of gaps in “foundational skills.”
- Students have difficulty because they do not understand reading processes.

### **Main Components**

- Software that addresses specific reading problems
- Teacher-directed instructional materials for instruction in comprehension, vocabulary, word study, and writing
- Audio books for modeled reading

- Paperbacks for independent reading
- Assessment system

## **Intervention Length**

Yearlong

## **Existence Length**

Since 1994 (developed at Vanderbilt University)

## **Required Training Time**

- One-day leadership training; two days of inservice training at implementation
- Online course
- Eight half-day seminars
- Reading courses; teacher scholarships provided in package

## **Assessment Component**

Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) used for placement and progress monitoring using Lexile framework. In addition, assessments are embedded in a software program that makes instructional decisions on the basis of assessment data.

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- SRI using Lexile Framework for Reading
- Stanford Achievement Test, 9th ed (SAT9)
- SAT9
- DRP

## **Research Basis**

- Scholastic impact studies (various dates)
- Papalewis (2002, 2004) (educational consultant)
- Interactive, Inc. (2002)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- School studies in 10 middle and 3 high schools, including ELL and special ed students
- Efficacy study of Los Angeles Unified School District
- Great cities (Boston, Dallas, Houston, Columbus) efficacy study
- Orange County (California?) study in middle schools—districtwide implementation

## **Effectiveness**

- Each showed Lexile gain scores higher than expected.
- Significant gains(significantly different from non-Read 180 students of similar achievement)
- Significant gains in achievement(significant difference from controls)
- Significantly larger gains than the national norming group

# Reading in the Content Areas

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Globe Fearon Publishers (division of Pearson Learning)—Kate Kinsella, Program Consultant; San Francisco State University

## Target Population

Interest level Grades 6–12, Reading level Grades 4–7; basic skills, ESL. Each content area has four levels of workbooks—A, B, C, D—for reading levels of fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades.

## Foci/Goals

Focus is on applying reading strategies to content-area reading. Four major content areas: language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics. In addition, students learn how to understand nonfiction through reading comprehension clues and visuals, such as maps, charts, and graphs. The program contains activities for use before, during, and after reading.

## Theoretical Premise

The publishers advertise these features:

- Includes explanations and models of each strategy; lesson plans; suggestions for building content concepts with ESL/limited English proficiency students; reproducible idea organizers; complete answer keys
- High-interest readings in language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics
- Model lessons show students how strategies can work for them, and walk them through the process of learning a strategy
- Real-life readings include news articles, charts, graphs, maps, and magazines, to show students how reading strategies can help them in their daily lives
- Graphic organizers for reading and study strategies are presented as tools for prereading, reading, and postreading: Know, Want, Learn (KWL); Cornell note taking; survey, question, read, recite, review; outlining
- Strategies for dealing with content-area vocabulary
- Test-taking tips help students learn how to answer content-related questions
- Program draws on McKenna and Robinson's (2002) definition of content literacy.

- Uses a direct instruction strategy teaching model of: (1) introducing the strategy; (2) modeling the strategy; (3) using a think-aloud lesson plan; (4) reviewing the strategy; (5) using the workbook for guided practice.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

Students need instruction in how to read content-area materials. This instruction can be delivered in a stand-alone course. Uses a direct instruction strategy teaching model of: (1) introducing the strategy; (2) modeling the strategy; (3) using a think-aloud lesson plan; (4) reviewing the strategy; and (5) using the workbook for guided practice.

## **Main Components**

- Social Studies Reading Strategies, Levels A–D
- Science Reading Strategies, Levels A–D
- Mathematics Strategies, Levels A–D
- English strategies, Levels A–D
- Annotated Teacher’s Edition
- Tips for helping students read to learn
- Placement guide

## **Intervention Length**

One course

## **Existence Length**

Not stated

## **Required Training Time**

Not specified

## **Assessment Component**

Placement tests

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Not applicable

**Research Basis**

Not applicable

**Type of Research Conducted**

Not applicable

**Effectiveness**

Not applicable

# Reading Is Fame

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

Girls and Boys Town ([www.girlsandboystown.org/pros/training/education/FAME\\_program.asp](http://www.girlsandboystown.org/pros/training/education/FAME_program.asp))  
Mary Beth Curtis and Anne Marie Longo

## Target Population

Grades 7–12 who read at grade levels 4–6

## Foci/Goals

Developmental reading program for adolescents reading below grade level. The program incorporates a series of four courses designed for students in Grades 7–12. This curriculum helps students by addressing problems at each stage of reading development. Students learn to identify words in print, build fluency, acquire new concepts, and analyze what is read.

## Theoretical Premise

Based on Chall's (1983) stages of reading development; students in different stages of reading development are offered four courses:

- Foundations of Reading, for students in fourth-grade reading with decoding problems—learn letter combinations and their sounds
- Adventures in Reading, for students in fourth- to sixth-grade reading—focus on fluency, word recognition, and vocabulary
- Mastery of Meaning, for students in sixth- to eighth-grade reading—focus on building comprehension through word meaning
- Explorations, for students in 9th- to 12th-grade reading below grade level—focus on integration and content-area reading/study strategies

## Embedded Assumptions

- Students at different stages of reading development need different kinds of instruction. The sequence of instruction moves from decoding to fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, and integration of skills.
- Teachers should focus on causes, not consequences, of reading difficulty.
- Teaching materials need to be challenging and age appropriate.
- Students should be encouraged to be risk-takers.

- Instruction should be comforting and comfortable.
- Assessment needs to drive instruction.
- Students are encouraged to be persistent.

## **Main Components**

- Foundations of Reading: computer software, activities, homework assignments
- Adventures in Reading: computer software, young adult novels, activities, homework assignments
- Mastery of Meaning: computer software, informational texts, vocabulary games, word activities, homework
- Explorations: study skill lessons, computer software, research activities

## **Intervention Length**

16 weeks per course

## **Existence Length**

Unstated

## **Required Training Time**

One-day training and follow-up consultation visit for each of the four courses is a prerequisite.

## **Assessment Component**

- Pretests and posttests for units
- Unit grade report checklist
- Scoring guidelines
- Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Stanford Diagnostic Test

## **Research Basis**

Curtis & Longo, 2001

## **Type of Research Conducted**

39 students participating in a 16-week vocabulary course

## **Effectiveness**

Gains of one grade level in both vocabulary and comprehension.

# Rosetta Stone Literacy

## Program Type

Supplemental

## Publisher/Developer

Rosetta Stone Language Learning Success ([www.rosettastone.com](http://www.rosettastone.com))

## Target Population

English language learner (ELL) students who need remedial reading

## Foci/Goals

- Reading comprehension
- Listening comprehension
- Speaking
- Writing

## Theoretical Premise

Focus is on communication in the targeted language rather than grammar and vocabulary. They say that studies of grammar approaches show only limited success. They call their approach “dynamic immersion.” It is based upon the idea that students acquire language in a natural order despite instruction, and that students who are instructed with a grammar approach learn new languages in the same order that learners would learn the language naturally. Draws on Krashen and Terrell’s writing. Also refers to the “comprehension approach to foreign language teaching” of Asher.

## Embedded Assumptions

- Associating new language directly with the actions of people, places or things (Asher, 1981, *The Extinction of Second Language*, p. 52)
- Beginning with one-word expressions and short phrases (Nord, 1981, p. 73)
- Associating the sound of the new language with pictures and written language (Nord, 1981, p. 75)
- Creating “low anxiety” environments that inspire self-confidence in the learner (Krashen & Terrell 1993, *The Natural Approach: Language Acquisition in the Classroom*, p. 19)
- Challenging the learner to deduce meaning from the clues given, verifying the learner’s comprehension (Postovsky, 1981, p. 176)
- Using visuals such as photos and drawings to “anchor” the input in “real-world

meaning.” (Lee & VanPatten, 1995, p. 50)

- Using simple pictorial illustrations as “advance organizers” of comprehension (Omaggio, *Pictures*, p. 115)
- Introducing short isolated sentences to give learners “processing time” (Lee & VanPatten, 1995, p. 107)
- Providing both oral and written input to serve differing learning styles (Lee & VanPatten, 1995, p. 107)

## **Main Components**

Computer program includes lessons on listening and reading comprehension, speaking, and writing. Also has a management system built into it.

## **Intervention Length**

Variable; at least three lessons per week

## **Existence Length**

1992

## **Required Training Time**

Not specified

## **Assessment Component**

None specified

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS)

## **Research Basis**

Unknown (2002–03)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Montwood (Texas) High School: 188 ESL students, Grades 9–12, 225 minutes per week for the year. Compared means to state ESL means on TAKS test. No test of statistical significance.

## **Effectiveness**

Ninth graders performed “better” in mathematics, reading, and all tests (reading score = 36, compared to 30.9); 10th graders performed “better” in English, science, mathematics, social studies, and all tests (English = 25, compared to 22.8; all tests = 24, compared to 11).

# **Second Chance at Literacy Learning**

## **Program Type**

Comprehensive

## **Publisher/Developer**

Foundation for Comprehensive Early Literacy Learning; Project of California State University at San Bernardino—Stanley L. Swartz, Director

## **Target Population**

Professional development for teachers in secondary schools to provide support for struggling readers

## **Foci/Goals**

Emphasis on the needs of the struggling reader and the importance of balancing phonological skills with the direct instruction of comprehension. The framework elements are adjusted to focus on the needs in secondary content classrooms. Reading aloud and shared reading are used to expand concept development and model language structure.

Direct reading instruction includes successful methods modified for the secondary level including small group reading, reciprocal teaching and literature circles/book clubs. Independent reading is incorporated for extended practice and increased attention is given to comprehension, fluency, higher-order thinking skills, and motivation. Direct instruction in writing is focused on the accurate construction of text and effective spelling for on-demand writing tasks. Independent writing encourages creativity and expression and the ability to write for different genres and purposes. The framework also incorporates oral presentation which formalizes the process of sharing ideas and reporting information.”

## **Theoretical Premise**

They believe that professional development is a necessary component of growth in reading achievement, and they focus on improvement of instruction, assessment, leadership, and parental involvement. Includes instruction in teaching the “Second Chance at Literacy Learning Teaching Cycle.” The research that backs the components of this cycle is cited.

The framework includes text selection, reading aloud, shared and independent reading, book discussion groups, reciprocal teaching, interactive editing and writing, content investigations, independent writing, oral presentation, format testing, and quizzes. Draws on the concept of a “balanced” reading and writing approach.

“The programs are based on a high level of confidence in the ability of teachers.” It reports that it is important to:

- Use teaching methods supported by scientific research.
- Focus on the professional development of teachers.
- Support school reform and school restructuring.
- Support continued literacy learning in the content areas.
- Increase the emphasis on reading and writing in the curriculum.
- Align teaching methods within and across grade levels.
- Support ELL students.
- Facilitate inclusion of special-needs students.
- Use a capacity-building model.
- Use student data to inform teaching.
- Measure success by student performance.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

A balanced approach may assume a belief in literature-based teaching with an infusion of direct instruction. The philosophies grounding these two elements are very different.

## **Main Components**

### **School-Based Planning Team**

- Five one-day training sessions
- Monthly guided meetings
- West Coast (or other regional) literacy conference

### **Literacy Coordinator/Site Facilitator Training**

- Five weeklong training seminars
- Five school-based planning team training days
- Three advanced training days
- Monthly guided meetings
- Monthly colleague meetings
- West Coast (or other regional) literacy conference

### **Schoolwide Training**

- 30 hours staff training
- Biweekly guided meetings
- West Coast (or regional) literacy conference

### **Intervention Length**

Ongoing

### **Existence Length**

Began in 1994 as a project of the California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), College of Education and the Foundation for CSUSB, with intent to respond to professional development needs in literacy learning in primary grades; extended in 1999 for secondary students

### **Required Training Time**

The program's focus is professional development. The project trains a planning team, a literacy coordinator, and school staff as well as the administrator. The foundation also makes a site visit and implementation visits, which are full-day visits.

### **Assessment Component**

A specialized training session helps teachers prepare for assessment and test-taking requirements. This one-day session emphasizes integration of assessment and test-taking into classroom activities. This session is open to all members of the school staff.

### **Pre/Post Measures**

- Academic Performance Index (API) adopted in California
- SAT9
- API

### **Research Basis**

Unstated—no significance testing. Most of the studies have focused on Cell and Exll, the programs for younger students.

## **Type of Research Conducted**

- Growth on API in two years for three middle schools that trained a literacy coordinator
- SAT9 growth in one year for six schools who had school-based planning team training
- One Second Chance school compared to two schools matched on ethnic makeup after one year of training and one year of implementation

## **Effectiveness**

- All schools exceeded API targets.
- Five of six schools showed improvement on SAT9 after one year with school-based planning team training.
- Second Chance school gained 70 points on API, compared to 21 and 34 points for matched schools.

# **SIM (Strategic Instruction Model)**

## **Program Type**

Comprehensive (although schools can teach one aspect of the program)

## **Publisher/Developer**

University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning

## **Target Population**

Elementary through adult; a comprehensive adolescent intervention program

## **Foci/Goals**

Student-focused interventions: Learning strategies curriculum in requiring information, organizing and memorizing information, expressing information in writing.

Teacher-focused interventions: Content enhancement routines to help teachers “organize and present critical information in such a way that students identify, organize, comprehend, and recall it.”

## **Theoretical Premise**

Four philosophical principles:

- “Most low-achieving adolescents can learn to function independently in mainstream settings.”
- “The role of the support-class teacher is to teach low-achieving adolescents strategies that will enable them to be independent learners and performers.”
- “The role of the content teacher is to promote strategic behavior and to deliver subject-matter information in a manner that can be understood and remembered by low-achieving adolescents.”
- “Adolescents should have a major voice in decisions about what strategies they are to learn and how fast they are to learn these strategies.”

## **Embedded Assumptions**

- Students should be in partnership with educators and other students (drawing on Friere [1970]).
- General literacy strategies can be applied across content areas to enhance content learning.

## **Main Components**

### **Learning Strategies Curriculum**

- Strategies for reading: word identification strategy; self-questioning strategy; visual imagery strategy; and paraphrasing strategy
- Strategies for studying and remembering information: FIRST-letter mnemonic strategy; paired associates; and Literacy Information and Communication System (LINCS) vocabulary strategy
- Strategies for writing: sentence writing strategy (fundamentals); sentence writing strategy (proficiency); paragraph writing strategy; theme writing (fundamentals); error monitoring strategy; and InSPECT strategy (for word-processing spellcheckers)
- Strategies for improving assignment and test performance: assignment completion strategy; strategic tutoring; test-taking strategy; and essay test-taking strategy
- Strategies for effectively interacting with others: SLANT classroom participation strategy; cooperative thinking strategies: think, learn, build, score; teamwork; and the community-building series (following instructions together, organizing together, taking notes together, talking together)
- Strategies for motivation: self-advocacy strategy; possible selves

### **Content Enhancement Teaching Routine**

- Teaching routines for planning and leading learning: course organizer routine; unit organizer routine; and lesson organizer routine
- Teaching routines for exploring text, topics, and details: clarifying routine; framing routine; survey routine; and vocabulary LINCing routine
- Teaching routines for teaching concepts: concept mastery routine; concept anchoring routine; and concept comparison routine
- Teaching routines for increasing student performance: recall enhancement routine; question exploration routine; quality assignment routine; and ORDER routine (higher order thinking)

### **Intervention Length**

Yearlong

### **Existence Length**

Not stated

## **Required Training Time**

Variety of teacher development opportunities:

- SIM Learning Strategies Institute for preservice educators
- Instructional coaching
- Teaching content to all: effective college teaching
- SIM Institute: Writing strategies
- SIM reading and writing strategies
- SIM Institute: Introduction to content enhancement (Level 1)
- SIM Institute: More content enhancement (Level 2)
- Potential SIM professional development institutes for learning strategies and content enhancement

## **Assessment Component**

Informal assessments are a part of each instructor's manual.

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- Slosson Diagnostic Screening Test for Reading, Word Identification Subtest
- Metropolitan Achievement Test
- Paraphrasing test in Paraphrasing Strategy Instructor's Manual
- Textbook quiz in science
- Paragraph writing (as described in Sentence Writing Strategy Instructor's Manual)
- Paragraph writing (as described in Paragraph Writing Strategy Instructor's Manual)
- Gates-McGinitie reading comprehension test; Slosson Diagnostic Screening Test
- State test: Michigan Educational Assessment Program

## **Research Basis**

- University of Kansas (UK) Center for Research and Learning (1998)
- UK Center for Research and Learning (2000)
- UK Center for Research and Learning (2001)
- UK Center for Research and Learning (n.d.)

## Type of Research Conducted

- Pre and post results of decoding test for LD experimental and control students, matched by grade, sex, pretest score, and race; three to eight weeks of instruction for 50 min/day.
- Pre and post scores of 78 sixth-grade students reading below the 37th percentile; 47 min/day of word identification strategy training for 7–9 weeks, then monthly review
- 188 students in reading classes at two middle schools received paraphrasing instruction for five to eight weeks.
- Pre and post scores of 133 students in six (three experimental and three control) science classes; experimental students learned self-questioning strategy and applied it to a chapter.
- Pre and post scores of 341 middle school students in three participating inner-city schools in Kansas; five to nine weeks of instruction in regular classes
- Pre and post scores of 147 seventh-grade students in an English class; six weeks of instruction
- Students scoring 2 or more years below grade level on Gates-McGinitie were randomly enrolled in targeted classes. Three volunteer teachers taught experimental classes; there were three control classes. Experimental classes received daily instruction in phonics and word identification strategy for six weeks, 30 min/day, four days/week, then received follow-up fluency drill training. Controls received instruction in *Language!* Program.
- Learning-disabled students in a Michigan inner-city high school learned reading (11 students) and writing (9 students) strategies.

## Effectiveness

- Experimental group gained about three grade levels; control group made little or no gains.
- 71 percent of students decoded 98 percent of words correctly, compared to 14 percent at pretest; 79 percent answered comprehension questions at the mean, compared to 47 percent on pretest .
- 60 percent of points earned on paraphrasing posttest, compared to 19 percent earned on pretest; 72 percent answered mean number of comprehension questions on posttest, compared to 61 percent at pretest
- Experimental group gained an average of 60 percent from pretest; controls gained an average of 40 percent from pretest.
- Students wrote 88 percent complete sentences in posttest paragraph, compared to 65 percent complete sentences in pretest paragraph.
- On a measure of paragraph organization, sentence construction, and use of transitions, verb tense, point of view, main ideas, and details, students earned 71 percent of points available on posttest compared to 40 percent of points on pretest.

- 117 experimental students made greater gains between pretest and posttest than comparison students on comfort level and phonics level, but not on instructional level or sight word level on Slosson.
- 46 percent passed reading assessment, 27 percent with merit; 89 percent passed writing assessment, 67 percent with merit

# Strategic Literacy Initiative

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

WestEd ([www.wested.org](http://www.wested.org)); authors: Cynthia Greenleaf, Ruth Schoenbach, Christine Cziko, Faye Mueller

## Target Population

Adolescents who are two or more years below reading level

## Foci/Goals

“WestEd’s Strategic Literacy Initiative (SLI) helps students become more motivated and successful readers and writers. Using the research-based instructional framework, Reading Apprenticeship, SLI offers intensive hands-on training to improve the teaching effectiveness of content-area middle and high school teachers, literacy coaches, and teacher educators nationwide.” The focus is on *metacognitive conversations* around four dimensions: social, personal, cognitive, and knowledge building.

## Theoretical Premise

SLI uses the Reading Apprenticeship Framework, which they say is a research-based approach. They seek to engage students in more reading (for recreation, subject-area learning, and self-challenge), making the teacher’s discipline-based reading processes and knowledge visible to students, and making students’ reading processes, motivations, strategies, knowledge, and understandings visible to teachers and each other, helping students gain insight into their own reading process and helping them develop problem-solving strategies for comprehension in various academic disciplines.

## Embedded Assumptions

An “apprenticeship” draws on Vygotskian notions of teaching and learning, implying that guidance from more knowledgeable experts is a part of the program. There is also a reliance on metacognition and explicit teaching of strategies. The program focuses on teaching strategies embedded in content-area course work, such as a ninth-grade biology class as well as an academic literacy course.

## **Main Components**

Materials to support teachers' and students' learning:

- Text-based and videotaped literacy cases of adolescent readers
- Books (four books to date)
- Curriculum for a ninth-grade academic literacy course
- Other materials for use in teacher education, professional development, and classrooms.
- Fee-for-service contracts for professional development to schools, districts, county offices of education, and school reform networks

## **Intervention Length**

Variable. The academic literacy course is designed for one year (ninth grade).

## **Existence Length**

Since 1995, the date that Cynthia Greenleaf began conducting studies of the Reading Apprenticeship Framework. SLI's first book, *Reading for Understanding: A Guide to Improving Reading in Middle and High School Classrooms*, was published in 1999.

## **Required Training Time**

SLI conducts:

- Site-based professional development for cross-disciplinary middle and high school teachers
- National Institute in Reading Apprenticeship: a trainer-of-trainers program to prepare leadership teams to engage in their own professional development
- Teacher Education Consortium—SLI staff and higher education colleagues use Reading Apprenticeship to prepare preservice teachers in content-area literacy
- Professional Development Series (qualifies as “high-quality professional development” for NCLB funds)—school teams of three to eight members meet in a network of 30 teachers for seven days of professional development (three-day summer institute and four days throughout the year) in the San Francisco Bay area.

## **Assessment Component**

None specified

## **Pre/Post Measures**

- DRP; surveys, interviews; sample course work, case studies
- SLI has been chosen as an intervention to be studied by MDRC and AIR (American Institute for Research) with federal funds.

## **Research Basis**

Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenburg, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. L. (2001)

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Ninth graders in academic literacy courses—pre/post design, no control

## **Effectiveness**

Students made significant gains on DRP from fall to spring (two-year gain in seven months); gains continued into 10th-grade year, and surveys showed improvement in attitudes and that number of books read increased.

# Supported Literacy Approach

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

Educational Development Center, Inc.

## Target Population

Adolescents with disabilities

## Foci/Goals

“Supported literacy” engages students in thematic units involving shared reading of age-appropriate texts. Using trade books with dilemmas for young adolescents, teachers guide students through cycles of reading, writing, peer discussion, and whole-class discussion. Each cycle begins with a whole-class activity to establish a context for reading. During this phase, teachers provide relevant background knowledge and stimulate conversation about a question or issue to activate students’ related knowledge and experience. In the next phase, students read the text individually, with peers, or orally as a whole class, with some combination of teacher and student oral reading. Students respond to the reading with an individual written or oral response (or a combination of the two) in a small group of peers.

## Theoretical Premise

- Comprehension and writing are social processes, since a full interpretation of written text draws on the responses of many readers, with multiple perspectives.
- Students should be engaged in working together across several classrooms, to understand culturally diverse texts by culturally diverse authors.
- Culturally relevant learning activities legitimize the students’ diverse, real-life experiences and bring those experiences into the interpretive process through writing and discussion.
- Activities provide teachers opportunities to learn about individual students’ ways of understanding and their learning strengths.
- All students should have opportunities to become intellectual leaders in these activities.

## Embedded Assumptions

Unknown

## Main Components

Unknown

**Intervention Length**

Unknown

**Existence Length**

Unknown

**Required Training Time**

Unknown

**Assessment Component**

Unknown

**Pre/Post Measures**

Unknown

**Research Basis**

Unknown

**Type of Research Conducted**

Unknown

**Effectiveness**

Unknown

# Talent Development High Schools (TDHS) Literacy Program

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

James McPartland, Talent Development High School, Johns Hopkins University  
([www.csos.jhu.edu/tdhs](http://www.csos.jhu.edu/tdhs))

## Target Population

Adolescents who are two or more years below grade level in reading

## Foci/Goals

The overall program includes a reorganization of the high school into career academies, with four-period schedules, special classes in reading, mathematics, and career development, and opportunities after school and on Saturday to make up credits for failed classes. There are three literacy courses: ninth grade Strategic Reading and Literacy Lab, 10th grade Reading and Writing in Your Career, and 11th grade College Prep Reading and Writing.

1. Strategic Reading and Literacy Lab: predicting, visualizing, listening to good reading, reading independently on their own levels, analyzing style as a way of conveying meaning, recognizing unidentified vocabulary through context, increasing their knowledge of frequently used words in upper-level texts, answering critical thinking questions about what they have read, and applying what they have read to other readings, knowledge, or real-world situations. Periods are arranged as follows:
  - Reading Showcase (20 minutes)—teacher reads with “think-aloud.”
  - Focus Lesson (20 minutes)—direct instruction
  - Student Team Literature (50 minutes)—work with one of five core literature texts
  - Self-Selected Reading & Writing Learning Center (20 minutes):
    - ⊙ Composer’s Square—creative writing and publishing
    - ⊙ Self-Selected Reading—silent reading
    - ⊙ Data Central—info retrieval and application
    - ⊙ Word Play—creative use and categorization of words

- Lab has five components:
  - ⊙ Whole class instruction – build background knowledge, vocabulary, knowledge of literary devices
  - ⊙ Computer Station—use websites related to unit’s theme
  - ⊙ Writing Station—writing topics relevant to unit
  - ⊙ Listening Station—listen to texts read by good readers, then read and record their own reading
  - ⊙ Self-selected reading
- 2. Reading and Writing in Your Career (10th grade): In addition to continuing instruction listed above, this course involves working with college and career research material and applying reading to other readings, knowledge, or real-world situations. Each day includes Reading Showcase, Focus Lesson, Student Team Literature, and Self-Selected Reading and Writing Learning Center.
- 3. College Prep Reading and Writing: In addition to continuing instruction listed above, this course involves learning and practicing specific writing and speaking techniques and formats in literature-based research assignments, completing a common college application, and using an entry-level college text. The specific parts of the lesson are:
  - Reading Colloquy (20 minutes)—read a brief current events article, partner, and engage in structured analytical discussion
  - Focus Lesson (20 minutes)—receive direct instruction on a skill or concept that applies to Literature Exploration or Project-Based Application
  - Literature Exploration (30 minutes)—students read anthology or novel and provide written responses
  - Project-Based Applications (20 minutes)—persuasive speech, debate, college application, research paper, reading an upper-level novel, finding current-events articles, developing a performance portfolio

## **Theoretical Premise**

They purport to use a “balanced literacy approach.” Their research base comes mainly from the school reform literature. They address issues of motivation, professional development, school organization, cooperative learning, and learning support systems as being necessary for gains in literacy achievement.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

The literacy coursework has a “literature-based” framework rather than a content-area literacy framework.

## **Main Components**

- Strategic Reading: Five texts of different reading levels, with fully developed lesson plans and student materials. The texts range from fourth- to ninth-grade reading levels.
- Reading and Writing in Your Career: Three thematically linked texts with age-appropriate themes
- College Prep Reading and Writing: An anthology of 75 thematic readings and three novels
- Talent Development Guidebooks

## **Intervention Length**

Yearlong courses and interventions, one each for Grades 9, 10, and 11

## **Existence Length**

Introduced in schools in 1994

## **Required Training Time**

During planning and implementation, TDHS use the services of facilitators who are trained by the developer to help schools organize and plan their implementation approach. One facilitator is assigned to each school. Facilitators and other program staff also provide ongoing, curriculum-specific professional development that includes summer training and monthly sessions during the academic year. In addition, weekly, nonevaluative, in-classroom coaching is provided by trained and respected peer and lead teachers.

## **Assessment Component**

- Strategic Reading: End of semester posttest and other unspecified assessment materials
- Reading and Writing in Your Career: Diagnostic test for beginning of year; also posttest
- College Prep Reading and Writing: Diagnostic test for the beginning of the year; also posttest

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Unknown

## **Research Basis**

Unknown

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Unknown

## **Effectiveness**

Unknown

# **Talent Development Middle Schools Literacy Program**

## **Program Type**

Comprehensive

## **Publisher/Developer**

Kathy Nelson, Talent Development Middle Schools, Johns Hopkins University  
([www.csos.jhu.edu/tdms](http://www.csos.jhu.edu/tdms))

## **Target Population**

Middle school students who are at least two years behind in achievement; disadvantaged students

## **Foci/Goals**

The overall program touts “sustained, high quality, standards-based learning opportunities” with all students taking the same curriculum; materials, training, and in-classroom support for teachers; and supportive, culturally relevant learning environments. Literacy components consist of:

- Computer and team-assisted reading acceleration—a 10-week “extra dose” class using cooperative groups and computers
- Student team literature and talent development writing—focus on reading strategies, extending reading comprehension skills, and developing fluency in reading and writing using high-interest books (in a number of literature genres and nonfiction) and partner discussion guides

## **Theoretical Premise**

They purport to use a “balanced literacy approach.” Their research base comes mainly from the school reform literature. They address issues of motivation, professional development, school organization, cooperative learning, and learning support systems as being necessary for gains in literacy achievement.

## **Embedded Assumptions**

The literacy coursework has a “literature-based” framework rather than a content-area literacy framework.

## **Main Components**

- 22 nonfiction and 127 fiction titles of various genres
- 11 challenging novels
- Four Spanish translations of novels
- Partner discussion guides for each of the above
- Mastery-focused activities
- Assignment record forms
- Talent development guidebooks

## **Intervention Length**

Yearlong literacy courses

## **Existence Length**

First cohort of students in 1997

## **Required Training Time**

Several days of summer training, monthly three-hour workshops, and weekly coaching (36 hours per year)

Talent Development Middle Grade (TDMG) schools receive four layers of sustained professional development, technical assistance, and implementation support.

1. The first layer of support is ongoing subject- and grade-specific staff development explicitly linked to the curriculum. Every month, professional development sessions model upcoming instructional activities, provide content knowledge, and demonstrate effective instructional approaches. The sessions also provide opportunities for teachers to network and learn from each other.
2. The second layer of support consists of nonevaluative, in-classroom implementation assistance. A curriculum coach performs a wide range of support functions, including modeling, troubleshooting, helping each teacher customize the curriculum to his or her classroom, and ensuring that the teacher has all the necessary materials.
3. Lead teachers provide the third layer of support. These teachers receive intensive training in the instructional programs and provide on-site peer support.
4. TDMS instructional facilitators employed by Johns Hopkins University provide the fourth layer of support. Facilitators work closely with curriculum coaches, lead teachers, and principals to design ongoing staff development, customize instructional programs to ensure alignment with district standards and local initiatives, and keep the instructional support on track.

## **Assessment Component**

Diagnostic and posttest

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Unknown

## **Research Basis**

Unknown

## **Type of Research Conducted**

Unknown

## **Effectiveness**

Unknown

# Wilson Reading System

## Program Type

Comprehensive

## Publisher/Developer

Wilson Language ([www.wilsonlanguage.com](http://www.wilsonlanguage.com))

## Target Population

Upper elementary through adult—remedial, at risk, special education, adult education, bilingual

## Foci/Goals

- Phonemic segmentation
- Alphabetic principle: sound/symbol relationships
- Decoding
- Encoding (spelling)
- Advanced word analysis
- Vocabulary development
- Sight word instruction
- Fluency
- Comprehension with visualization
- Metacognition

## Theoretical Premise

10 critical points:

- Teach sounds to automaticity
- Teach total word structure
- Present concepts within context of controlled, written text
- Present the structure of language in a systematic, cumulative manner
- Teach all principles of English language structure directly and thoroughly
- Teach/reinforce concepts with visual, auditory, kinesthetic, tactile methods
- Teach phonemic and syllabic segmentation
- Include constant review and repetition

- Use questioning techniques for reinforcement and student error correction
- Use diagnostic teaching within the scope and sequence of the program

### **Embedded Assumptions**

- Students have difficulty reading because they lack critical foundations in phonology. Even high school students benefit from instruction in Level 1 phonology.
- Students also need to read connected text and receive instruction in other reading components.
- Kinesthetic mode enhances learning; some students need a multisensory approach.

### **Main Components**

- Instructor's manual
- Rules notebook
- Dictation book (Steps 1–6)
- Dictation book (Steps 7–12)
- WADE
- WRS sound cards
- Word cards (Steps 1–12, 1–3 AB, and 4–6 AB)
- Syllable cards (Steps 3–6, 7–12)
- Magnetic journal with phoneme tiles
- WRS overview video series (6 tapes)
- Group lesson for WRS Step 6
- Magnetic strips (5 feet)
- Wilson tote bag
- WRS student readers 1–12
- WRS student workbooks 1–12 Level A and B
- Stories for Older Students (Steps 1–3 B, 4–6 B, 7–9 B)
- Travels With Ted (Steps 1–6 B)

### **Intervention Length**

Unstated

## **Existence Length**

Since 1988

## **Required Training Time**

- 10-hour workshop required to join Wilson Academy, an online support system and resource center
- 15-hour intervention workshop required to join Wilson Academy
- Level I certification involves a seminar and practicum with a below-level reader (Steps 1–6)
- Level II certification involves two classes: Group Mastery and Upper Steps 7–12. Each course includes a seminar and a practicum.

## **Assessment Component**

Wilson Reading Test

## **Pre/Post Measures**

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests

## **Research Basis**

O'Connor & Wilson, 1995

## **Type of Research Conducted**

220 LD students in Grades 3–12, in several states, working one on one with a trained teacher for one year.

## **Effectiveness**

Pre/post significant gains in word attack, comprehension, overall reading, and spelling. Word attack average gain: over four years.

## References

- Admon, N. (2003a). *READ 180 stages A and B: Iredell-Statesville schools, North Carolina* [Impact study, final report]. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/IS\\_R180\\_Iredell-Statesville.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/IS_R180_Iredell-Statesville.pdf)
- Admon, N. (2003b). *A study of READ 180 in partnership with Guajome Park Academy/School for Integrated Academic and Technologies and Job Corps*. New York, NY: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/read180/research/pdfs/JobCorpsStudyRevised.pdf>
- Asher, J. J. (1981). The extinction of second language learning in American schools: An intervention model. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *The comprehension approach to foreign language teaching* (pp. 49–68). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Campbell, M. L. (1984). Corrective Reading Program evaluated with secondary students in San Diego. *ADI News*, 7, 15–17.
- Clunies-Ross, G. (1990). Some effects of direct instruction in comprehension skills with sixth-grade students. *Behaviour Change*, 7, 84–89.
- CRISS Staff. (1993). *Evidence of effectiveness: Program abstract*. Kalispell, MT: Author. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://projectcriss.com/prc/pdf\\_research/3-Evidence-1993.pdf](http://projectcriss.com/prc/pdf_research/3-Evidence-1993.pdf)
- CRISS Staff. (1995). *Evidence of effectiveness*. Kalispell, MT: Author. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://projectcriss.com/prc/pdf\\_research/2-Evidence-1995.pdf](http://projectcriss.com/prc/pdf_research/2-Evidence-1995.pdf)
- Curtis, M. E., & Longo, A. M. (2001). Teaching vocabulary to adolescents to improve comprehension. *Reading Online*. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.readingonline.org/articles/curtis/>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenburg, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. L. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy, *Harvard Educational Review*, 71(1), 79–129.
- Gregory, R. P., Hackney, C., & Gregory, N. M. (1982). Corrective Reading program: An evaluation. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 52, 33–50.
- Goin, L., Hasselbring, T., & McAfee, I. (2004). *Executive summary: DoDEA/Scholastic READ 180 Project: An evaluation of the READ 180 intervention program for struggling readers*. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department.

- Hiebert, E. H. (2003). *Text, fluency, & QuickReads* [Web video]. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.quickreads.org/video/>
- Holdsworth, P. (1984). Corrective reading tested in U.K. *ADI News*, 4(2), 1–4.
- Interactive, Inc. (2002). *An efficacy study of READ 180: A print and electronic adaptive intervention program, grades 4 and above: Council of Great City Schools* [Final report]. New York: Scholastic, Inc. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/ER\\_Council\\_Great\\_Schools.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/ER_Council_Great_Schools.pdf)
- Kasendorf, S. J., & McQuaid, P. (1987). Corrective reading evaluation study. *ADI News*, 7(1), 9.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1993). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. New York: Pergamon.
- Lawson, S. (2000). Accelerated reader boosts student achievement at Portola Middle School in Orange, California. *California School Library Association Journal*, 23(2), 11–12.
- Lee, J. F. & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Maggs, A., & Murdoch, R. (1979). Teaching low performers in upper-primary and lower-secondary to read by direct instruction methods. *Reading Education*, 4(1), 35–39.
- McKenna, M. C., & Robinson, R. D. (2002). *Teaching through text: Reading and writing in the content areas*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Nord, J. R. (1981). Three steps leading to listening fluency: A beginning. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *The comprehension approach to foreign language teaching* (pp. 69–100). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- O'Connor, J. R., & Wilson, B. A. (1995). Effectiveness of the Wilson Reading System used in public school training. In C. McIntyre & J. Pickering (Eds.), *Clinical studies of multisensory structured language education* (pp. 247–254). Salem, OR: International Multisensory Structured Language Education Council. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.wilsonlanguage.com/PDF/Effectiveness%20of%20WRS%20in%20Public%20Schools.pdf>
- Palmer, N. (2003). *READ 180 middle school study: Des Moines, Iowa, 2000–2002: An evaluation of READ 180 with special education students* [Effectiveness report]. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/DesMoines\\_Study.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/DesMoines_Study.pdf)

- Papalewis, R. (2002). *An efficacy study of READ 180: A print and electronic adaptive intervention program, grades 4 and above: Los Angeles Unified School District* [Final report]. New York: Scholastic, Inc. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/ER\\_R180LosAngeles\\_USD.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/ER_R180LosAngeles_USD.pdf)
- Papalewis, R. (2003). *A study of READ 180 in middle schools in Clark County School District, Las Vegas, Nevada* [Final report]. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/IS\\_R180\\_Clark\\_County.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/IS_R180_Clark_County.pdf)
- Papalewis, R. (2004). Struggling middle school readers: Successful, accelerating intervention. *Reading Improvement*, 41(1), 24–37.
- Peak, J., & Dewalt, M. W. (1993, February). *Effects of computerized accelerated reader program on reading achievement*. Paper presented at annual meeting of Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL. (ERIC Document No. ED363269)
- Pearson, L. M., & White, R. N. (2004). *Study of the impact of READ 180 on student performance in Fairfax County Public Schools*. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department.
- Postovsky, V. A. (1981). The priority of aural comprehension in the language acquisition process. In H. Winitz (Ed.), *The comprehension approach to foreign language* (pp. 170–187). Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Ross, D. (1998). *Competing theories: Teach comprehension or teach decoding to improve reading comprehension in older poor readers*. St Kitts, West Indies: Berne University.
- Samuels, S. J., & Wu, Y. C., (2004). *The effects of immediate feedback on reading achievement*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Scholastic, Inc. (2004). *READ 180 Shiprock High School, Central Consolidated School District, New Mexico* [Impact study, final report]. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/IS\\_R180\\_Shiprock.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/research/pdfs/IS_R180_Shiprock.pdf)
- Scholastic, Inc. (in press). *READ 180 Stage B: St. Paul School District, Minnesota*. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from [http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/read180/research/pdfs/St\\_Paul\\_Final.pdf](http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/read180/research/pdfs/St_Paul_Final.pdf)
- Scholastic, Inc. (in press). *READ 180 Stage C: Santa Rosa County School District, Florida*. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department.
- Scholastic, Inc. (in press). *READ 180 Stage C: Juarez-Lincoln High School, Texas*. New York: Scholastic Research and Evaluation Department.

- Sommers, J. (1991). Direct instruction programs produce significant gains with at-risk middle school students. *Direct Instruction News*, 5, 7–13.
- Sommers, J. (1995). Seven-year overview of Direct Instruction programs used in basic skills classes at Big Piney Middle School. *Effective School Practices*, 14(4), 29–32.
- Vitale, M., Medland, M., Romance, N., & Weaver, H. P. (1993). Accelerating reading and thinking skills of low-achieving elementary students: Implications for curricular change. *Effective School Practices*, 12(1), 26–31.
- University of Kansas Center for Research and Learning. (1998–2001). *University of Kansas Center for Research on Learning*. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.kucrl.org>

**Appendix B**

**Adolescent Literacy  
Intervention Programs  
Review Guide**

# Adolescent Literacy Intervention Program Review Guide

## Definition

Adolescent literacy intervention programs are those programs that: (a) specifically target teachers of and students in middle and high school Grades 4–12 who are reading significantly below grade level; and (b) provide literacy instruction intended to increase achievement at a rate faster than average, allowing students to decrease or close the achievement gap between themselves and their normally achieving peers. Programs may be intended as either core or supplemental, for an entire class, an individual, or a small group, and may include laboratory or computer-based instruction (or any combination of the various kinds of instruction). The instruction may be in reading or content-based venues. However, the intention of the program must be to help students who are struggling with literacy, and the focus of the program must be on at least one aspect of literacy instruction.

**Program Name** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date of Review** \_\_\_\_\_

**Publisher/Author** \_\_\_\_\_ **Reviewed by** \_\_\_\_\_

**Targeted Students** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Program** (check all that apply):

- \_\_\_\_\_ Core program
- \_\_\_\_\_ Supplemental program
- \_\_\_\_\_ Whole-class
- \_\_\_\_\_ Individual
- \_\_\_\_\_ Small-group
- \_\_\_\_\_ Laboratory
- \_\_\_\_\_ Computer-based
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other; explain \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Materials/Support** (check all that apply):

- \_\_\_\_\_ School restructuring materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Professional development materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Student program materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Teachers' guides
- \_\_\_\_\_ Online student materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Online professional development materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Supplemental materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Assessment materials
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other; explain \_\_\_\_\_

**Reading Materials Used in the Program** (check all that apply):

- Word lists
- Sentences or short paragraphs/passages
- Thematic readings (a variety of narrative and informational/expository readings focused on particular themes or topics)
- General informational/expository (topics are varied in nature and not aligned with one particular discipline)
- Literature/narrative
- Content-based informational/expository (readings focused on a particular discipline, such as social studies, mathematics, science)
- Content-based literature/narrative
- Variety of genres (news articles, lab reports, expository, narrative)
- Multimedia
- Other; describe \_\_\_\_\_

**Assessment Plan Includes** (check all that apply):

- Diagnostic tests (provide information to be used in program placement and/or to determine focus of instruction)
- Progress monitoring (short-term measures of learning in targeted areas to determine whether an individual is on track during the intervention)
- Achievement tests (end of year)
- Record keeping/management system
  - Computer/online
  - Paper & pencil
  - Other; explain \_\_\_\_\_
- N.A. (no assessment plan is available)

## Scoring Sheet

**Directions:** Assign each of the following program characteristics a score from **1** to **6**, with **1** (the lowest score) being **not evident** and **6** (the highest score) being **very evident**. If the element is not part of the program, write **NA** in the space.

**Table 1. Instructional Focus: Word Identification/Decoding\***

Program Features	Score	Comments
Before instruction begins, students' word identification difficulties are assessed.		
Word identification instruction is targeted to meet student needs identified in assessment.		
Skills and words taught are practiced in continuous text as well as in isolation.		
Word identification includes attention to vocabulary meaning.		
Student progress is periodically monitored.		
Students are taught to identify common structural elements such as prefixes, suffixes, and roots.		
<b>Composite Score (average score = total points / 6)</b>		

**Table 2. Instructional Focus: Vocabulary**

Program Features	Score	Comments
Instruction provides clear explanations, with examples of word meanings.		
Instruction encourages/supports use of students' personal examples of word meanings.		
Instruction supports learning of different forms of a word (e.g., philosophy, philosopher, philosophical).		
Instruction makes connections among word meanings (using semantic maps, semantic feature analysis, word maps).		
Program provides lists of words to be taught.		
Program offers opportunities for students to supplement word lists with their own choices.		
Instruction emphasizes the meanings of common prefixes, suffixes, and combining forms.		
Target words are used in texts, are important to text interpretation, and can be defined in context.		
Instruction guides students to use context to make sense of unknown words.		
Program provides assessment tools to monitor vocabulary learning.		
Program provides frequent review of words taught earlier.		
Program encourages the use of targeted words in reading, writing, speaking, and listening.		
Program encourages/supports student use of target vocabulary beyond classroom lessons.		
<b>Composite Score (average score = total points / 13)</b>		

**Table 3. Instructional Focus: Fluency**

<b>Program Features</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Instruction provides multiple opportunities for each student to read text orally.		
Instruction emphasizes appropriate speed, accuracy, and expression during oral reading.		
Instruction models reading at appropriate speed, accuracy, and expression.		
Instruction requires students to engage in three or four rereadings of texts.		
Program provides a system for evaluating speed, accuracy, and expression and providing specific feedback to students.		
Texts used for fluency practice vary in topic, genre, and organization.		
Texts used for fluency practice are on students' instructional level or higher.		
<b>Composite Score (average score = total points / 7)</b>		

**Table 4. Instructional Focus: Comprehension**

<b>Program Features</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Instruction includes comprehension strategies (i.e., independent actions students can take to better remember or understand text).		
Instruction includes the major strategies —summarization, student questioning, use of prior knowledge, metacognition/comprehension monitoring, use of text structure/organization, graphic organizers, and visualization.		
Instruction includes modeling the use of the strategy.		
Instruction includes clear explanations of the strategy: what it is, when it should be used, and how to do it.		
Instruction provides multiple opportunities for students to use the strategy with teacher guidance and support.		
Instruction provides opportunities for students to use the strategies independently or with less teacher support.		
Texts used for comprehension instruction are well written, coherent, and representative of the genre they are drawn from (in other words, expository text must be expository rather than hybrid).		
Text reading assignments and activities should include outcomes in which deep interpretation of the text meaning is required (writing or discussion that involves more than just providing brief answers).		
Instruction includes student reading of text.		
Instruction should emphasize both memory (literal recall of information stated by authors) and inferencing or interpretation (going beyond what the author says explicitly).		
<b>Composite Score (average score = total points /10)</b>		

**Table 5. Instructional Focus: Critical Reading/Multiliteracies\*\***

<b>Program Features</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Instruction includes evaluation of text for authorial intent, perspective, source, context, corroboration, authority, and/or other elements of critique.		
Instruction includes how to provide informed defense of students' text interpretations.		
Instruction provides opportunities to engage in critique/critical interpretation in a variety of formats (e.g., debates, writing, discussions).		
Instruction provides students with models of critique/critical interpretation.		
Instruction teaches students to interpret power relations in text-reader relationships.		
“Text” is defined broadly to include multiple types such as Internet presentations, visual texts, speech acts, etc. Students have opportunities to interpret these various types of text.		
Students are taught to make cross-textual interpretations—to assess multiple texts on particular topics that vary in perspective, focus, intent, source, context, and authority as well as to make informed decisions based upon their interpretations.		
<b>Composite Score (average score = total points / 7)</b>		

**Table 6. Instructional Focus: Writing**

<b>Program Features</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Students are provided with explicit, direct instruction in how to write effectively (such as how to write an effective conclusion, introduction, or description).		
Instruction provides students with frequent opportunities to write.		
Instruction teaches students how to prepare for writing (how to plan).		
Instruction teaches students how to revise writing.		
Instruction provides opportunities for students to develop multiple drafts of what they write.		
Instruction supports providing students with feedback on their writing.		
Instruction teaches students how to write for various purposes (e.g., narration, exposition, persuasion).		
Instruction teaches students how to write for various audiences, ranging from personal (writing for oneself) to formal (writing for an informed, large audience).		
Instruction teaches students how to create writing that has appropriate focus, support, organization, and use of grammar and conventions, given the purpose of the writing and the audience.		
Instruction provides students with text models of effective writing and clear explanations of why these texts are effective.		
<b>Composite Score (average score = total points / 10)</b>		

**Table 7. Instructional Focus Totals**

<b>Instructional Focus</b>	<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>Appropriate for Targeted Students</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Table 1. Word Identification/ Decoding			
Table 2. Vocabulary			
Table 3. Fluency			
Table 4. Comprehension			
Table 5. Critical reading/ Multiliteracies			
Table 6. Writing			
<b>Average Total (Average = total/6)</b>			

**Table 8. Other Program Elements**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score/ Total Possible</b>
<b>A. Integration of Instructional Foci</b>	Different aspects of reading instruction are integrated in a way that will increase overall achievement.	Critical aspects are present.	Integration has a sound rationale.	____/____
<b>Score</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				
<b>B. Assessment Plan</b>	Plan assesses all stated goals using content that is appropriate given the content of instruction.	There is evidence that results are stable (e.g., from reliability studies).	Results compare favorably with other assessment data, neither overestimating nor underestimating performance.	____/____
<b>Score</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				
<b>C. Motivational Elements</b>	Developmentally and academically appropriate for targeted students (students would be interested in content/design, and materials are neither too challenging nor too easy).	Goals and consequences are clear. Students are taught in a way that makes reaching a goal possible.	Motivating influences such as choice, control, and collaboration are present; students are likely to be actively engaged and connections to the material are likely.	____/____
<b>Score</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				

**Table 8. Other Program Elements (Continued)**

<b>Element</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Score/Total Possible</b>
<b>D. Professional Development and Support</b>	Intensity and quality of professional development and follow-up support are likely to ensure intervention is used with fidelity.	Quality of professional development materials is high.	Program has qualified staff and capacity to schedule and manage professional development and follow-up support.	____/____
<b>Score</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				
<b>E. Use of Technology</b>	Computer use capitalizes on the unique features of the technology rather than just providing a traditional lesson on a screen.	Lessons provide appropriate help. Students are taught how to negotiate among different aspects of the program.	Technology is easy to monitor and integrate with other instruction.	____/____
<b>Score</b>				
<b>Comments</b>				
<b>Total</b> (total of all scores/total of all possible points)				____/____
<b>Percentage</b>				_____ %

**Table 9. Overall Program Considerations**

Criteria	Score*	Comments
<b>A. Research Base:</b> There is evidence to support the effectiveness of the intervention.		
<b>B. Theoretical Premise:</b> The instructional approach is supported through well-documented theory.		
<b>C. Objectives/ Purposes:</b> The objectives of the intervention, including description of teaching practices and skills, are appropriate.		
<b>Total</b>	____/18	
<b>Percent</b>	_____ %	

\* See rubrics below for research base and theoretical premise. Otherwise, follow previous directions for scoring.

**Research Base Rubric**

- 6 This is the highest standard of evidence. Effectiveness is shown through a statistical comparison of the intervention to regular instruction and perhaps to another intervention (or other interventions). Students and teachers are assigned to participate in the intervention or other instruction in a completely random way. The intervention and comparison instructions are of similar and sufficient length, intensity, and magnitude to mirror real instructional contexts. Alternatively, a meta-analysis of a number of studies results in a moderate to strong effect size for the intervention when compared to regular instruction and/or another intervention (or other interventions).
- 5 Intervention is compared statistically to regular instruction and/or another intervention(s), but teachers and/or students are assigned to treatment groups by some criteria rather than randomly. Thus, a positive outcome *might* be because of the teachers or students and not because of the intervention. Some attempt is made to counteract that possibility. For example, the students and teachers who participate in regular or alternate instruction are matched based upon key variables such as achievement and socioeconomic level (students) or years of experience (teachers). The intervention and comparison instruction are of similar and sufficient length, intensity, and magnitude to mirror real instructional contexts.
- 4/3 Intervention is compared statistically to regular instruction and/or another intervention(s), but teachers and/or students are assigned to treatment groups by some criteria rather than randomly. Thus, a positive outcome *might* be because of the teachers or students and not because of the intervention. *No attempt is made to counteract that possibility.* The intervention and comparison instruction are of similar and sufficient length, intensity, and magnitude to mirror real instructional contexts. (Use 4 for higher quality studies using this design and 3 for studies of lesser quality.)

- 4/3 Progress after participating in an intervention is compared to progress prior to participating in an intervention, and researchers can show that the rate of progress during the intervention period is higher than the rate of progress prior to participation, using baseline data and the same students. The intervention instruction and the comparison instruction are sufficient in length, intensity, and magnitude to mirror real instructional contexts. (Use 4 for higher quality studies using this design and 3 for studies of lesser quality.)
- 2 Progress after participating in an intervention is compared to progress of other students who have not participated in the intervention, with the comparison data being gathered after the fact (e.g., student achievement levels in prior years are compared to achievement levels in the intervention year, or achievement data from another school with similar characteristics are compared to achievement levels of the intervention school).
- 1 Achievement levels after participating in an intervention are compared to achievement levels prior to participating in the intervention (pre/post design, with no baseline data).
- 0 Intervention has been in existence for a number of years but never tested.
- NA Intervention is new and testing is not yet available.

### **Theoretical Premise Rubric**

- 6 The theoretical premises underlying the intervention are backed up by documented, high-quality research results.
- 5 The theoretical premises underlying the intervention are based upon sound reasoning and are supported by a wide range of research findings.
- 4 The theoretical premises underlying the intervention are based upon sound reasoning, and some evidence exists to support them.
- 3 The theoretical premises underlying the intervention are based upon sound reasoning, but there is scant evidence to support them at this time.
- 2 The theoretical premises underlying the intervention are based upon some faulty reasoning, and there is scant evidence to support them at this time.
- 1 The theoretical premises underlying the intervention are faulty and not supported by evidence.
- 0 The theoretical premises have major flaws and there is evidence contradicting them or no theoretical premise is discussed. The intervention seems atheoretical.

**Table 10. Total Score**

<b>Quality:</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Overall quality of training and support materials, quality of classroom activity materials, and quality of any intervention-specific assessments are high (score 1–6)		
Percent of Quality points (____/6)	<b>A</b>	
Percent of Instructional Focus points (from Table 7)	<b>B</b>	
Percent of Other Program Elements points (from Table 8)	<b>C</b>	
Percent of Overall Program Consideration points (from Table 9)	<b>D</b>	
<b>Average % of Quality</b> <b>([A+B+C+D]/4)</b>		

### **Local Context**

Programs will be most effective if they are not only excellent programs but also appropriate for a given context. In deciding which program to use, schools should consider the following:

- **Feasibility.** Is the program likely to be implemented fully, given administrative support and a school’s commitment? What changes would need to take place? What supplementary services need to be utilized?
- **Involvement.** How involved are teachers who utilize the program? Is there a reasonable assumption of responsibility and involvement by teachers? (At the extremes would be programs that require no teacher input and programs that are completely reliant on a teacher, with no materials or outside support.)
- **Program/Student Match.** Are the materials targeted for students like the ones at the school considering their use? Is there evidence that the program is successful with those kinds of students?



1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200  
Naperville, IL 60563-1486  
800-252-0283 > 630-649-6500  
[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

Naperville > Chicago > Washington, D.C.

938\_12/05