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PREFACE

This paper has been designed to fit two purposes: first, to meet the research requirements in partial fulfillment of the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership degree; second, to satisfy a contract with the National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Virginia, which purchased the manuscript to be used as an Education U.S.A. Special Report on reading. The purposes of both are similar, since each calls for extensive research in a particular educational area. Both audiences are composed of educators.

Had I researched the materials exclusively for a dissertation, the format of the paper and language would have been somewhat altered; however, the basic design of the paper was determined by the editorial board of the National School Public Relations Association (n.b., The criteria for writing the paper, the contract with NSPRA and other pertinent information are included in Appendix B.). Due to a change in editorial staff following approval of the manuscript outline, the final organization of the published paper will vary from what is included here. However, the basic information should remain the same. The material contained herein is copyrighted by the National School Public Relations Association and cannot be reproduced without their permission.

The information in the paper was obtained from numerous sources, including an extensive review of the literature on reading achievement and innovation, primarily from 1970-1973, since one major objective was to be as current as possible and numerous federal studies
were conducted in a similar area from 1960 through 1970 and are
summarized in the report; personal interviews with leading United
States Office of Education officials; correspondence and interviews
with leading state department of education officials; and surveys of
the 100 largest school districts in the United States, as identified
by NSPRA, and the 50 state departments of education.
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CHAPTER I

OVERVIEW

The critical skill needed to be successful in the American public school system is the ability to read. If a child cannot read, his chances for academic and financial success are significantly lower than for the average or better reader. Yet, thousands of students are now graduating from high school without the ability to read at a functional level, and unprecedented nation-wide pressure is currently being applied by the media, parents and legislators, as well as educators, for measurable progress in school reading programs. For example:

1. In California, an unidentified pupil, using the name "Peter Doe" to protect his identity, is suing the San Francisco United School District and the state for $1,000,000 in damages for having been graduated from high school with the ability to read at only a fifth grade level.¹

2. A 1972 survey² in Maryland, where state law mandates school accountability, showed that the single greatest educational concern of the state's citizens was that their children learn to read. In fact, reading was the only specific learning skill listed among the

¹"Is a Board Liable for Student Outcome?" The American School Board Journal, CLX (August 1973), 13.

²"Maryland Survey Finds Reading Paramount Public Concern." Education Daily, V (December 26, 1972), 3-4.
six most important school goals.

3. The federal Right To Read (R2R) program, initiated in 1969, is required to test constantly for student progress in its reading programs. Ruth Love Holloway,1 R2R Director, said the program is receiving ever-increasing support in its efforts to insure that by 1980, 99 percent of all Americans under 16 will have acquired reading skills to the full limits of their desires and that 90 percent of the population over that age will possess and use literacy skills. However, the key to the continued support is measurable progress.

4. At its 64th annual convention in 1973 the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)2 found the number of youngsters suffering from reading disabilities "astronomical" and directed its National Education Division to launch a campaign to provide local units with information on testing, staffing, teacher qualifications and evaluation methods to monitor school reading programs and to "seek remedial action" where inadequacies are discovered.

5. The 1973 Fifth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education3 dealt directly with accountability and a parent's right to sue a school district "if a student of normal intelligence and with-
out physical disabilities reaches the sixth grade without being able to read." According to Gallup, "If even one parent in 100 holds to this view, future trouble may be in store for the schools." Poll results showed that 28 percent of the parents with children now in the public schools favored the idea. National results show 27 percent favoring the concept, 60 percent opposed and nine percent with no opinion on the subject.

Currently, professional educators, researchers, laymen, and political leaders disagree over the magnitude of the nation's reading problem, but virtually all agree a problem does exist. For example, the January 1973 issue of *Scholastic Teacher*,¹ following a survey of nearly 2,000 teachers by *Scholastic Magazine*, Inc., stated that the biggest single daily classroom problem perceived by today's elementary and junior/senior high school teachers is student reading difficulties.

Speaking to the Women's Joint Congressional Committee on April 2, 1973, Senator Thomas Eagleton (D/Mo.)² explained the extent of the national reading problem: "There are an estimated 3,000,000 adults who are totally unable to read and write and another 20,000,000 who read so poorly that they are classified as 'functionally illiterate' . . . . Ten million children and teenagers in

---

¹Levinthal, Sonia, "Teachers In National Survey Cite Biggest Problems." A news release from *Scholastic Magazine*, Inc., to the National School Public Relations Association, December 18, 1972, 1. (Mimeographed)

²Eagleton, Thomas, (D/Mo.), In a speech presented before the Women's Joint Congressional Committee in Washington, D.C., April 2, 1973, 1. (Mimeographed)
elementary and secondary schools throughout the country have severe reading deficiencies."

A 1970 study by Louis Harris and Associates[^1] for the now-defunct National Reading Council to determine the "survival" literacy rate in the U.S. indicated that "A total of 4.3 million Americans fall into the 'Low Survival Threshold' group, 7.1 million into the 'Questionable Survival Threshold' group, and 18.5 million into the 'Marginal Survival Threshold' group."

Survival literacy was determined by the ability to fill out five simulated application forms for a social security number, a personal bank loan, public assistance, Medicaid and a driver's license. Low survival threshold was indicated with 20 percent incorrect answers and marginal survival threshold was determined by 10 percent incorrect responses.

Right To Read's Director Holloway[^2] says that political affiliation is no barrier to national and state efforts to improve reading instruction. California's Republican Governor Ronald Reagan is a typical example.

Responding to questions from Education U.S.A., Reagan[^3] replied, "I agree with those who are concerned about the fact that there are so many functionally illiterate people in the United States. We can


[^2]: Holloway, op. cit.

ill afford such a situation in a free and open society which requires a reasonably informed and enlightened citizenry for its very existence. Since functionally illiterate people are unable to meet fully their responsibilities to society or to share fully in the economic and social benefits to be derived from it, they become a burden to all of us. Because of its many implications and ramifications, this is a problem requiring immediate and continuing attention."

The National Assessment of Educational Progress

Attempts to assess the reading problem in the United States have tended to generate even more debate about the scope of the problem. The long-awaited report of the National Assessment of Educational Progress on reading, which was conducted from October 1970 through August 1971 by the Education Commission of the States (ECS), did not provide the negative conclusions many educators anticipated. In fact, the results seem to suggest that the reading problem may not be as great as many people had believed.

According to J. Stanley Ahmann, National Assessment staff director, results were a "pleasant surprise." Ahmann said the test makers had expected most of the students (i.e., approximately 100,000 in four age groups: 9, 13, 17, and 26-35) to be able to answer at least 50 percent of the exercises. The final rate of success was about 70 percent.


2Ibid.
Following their release in May 1972, the test results and the favorable interpretations by NAEP came under fire. Northwestern University reading specialist Sidney Bergquist\textsuperscript{1} suggested the results were so far from expectations that caution was called for in interpreting the overall findings of the survey. George Weber\textsuperscript{2} of the Council for Basic Education objected to the "optimistic interpretation of the results," stating that the assessment did not disprove the previous appraisals of reading achievement. William F. Furlong\textsuperscript{3} of the National Reading Center in Washington warned that the results might be misleading, telling "more about the testers' expectations than about the kids' ability to read."

Regardless of the criticism, which the NAEP group had come to expect following three previous surveys in writing, science, and citizenship, educators generally agree the survey was both valuable and valid and had solid, practical applications.

The primary assumption of the National Reading Assessment (NRA) was that the information obtained from the research would aid anyone interested in determining how well children and young adults read. The National Assessment officials\textsuperscript{4} outlined five major objectives to be measured. These included the ability to: comprehend the material

\textsuperscript{1}ibid.
\textsuperscript{2}ibid.
\textsuperscript{3}ibid.
read, analyze this material, use it (as in following directions), reason logically (or draw inferences) from it, and make judgments concerning its authenticity and reliability.

The assessors then identified nine reading skills necessary to achieve the objectives: knowing word meanings, understanding visual aids (e.g., road signs, labels, maps, and graphs), carrying out written directions, using reference materials, understanding significant facts in passages, identifying main ideas in passages, drawing inferences from these passages, reading critically (e.g., weighing the mood, clarity, and tone), and reading and comprehending at a reasonable rate of speed.

The assessment breakdown gives results for the four age levels of respondents, as well as the region where they live (i.e., Northeast, Southeast, Central and West), whether they are black or non-black, according to their sex, the size and economic level of their community, and the educational level of their parents.

The results of the comprehensive study obviously have many educational implications, and Hope Justus1 identified some of these in the August-September 1972 issue of American Education:

1. Evidently the most influential factor in giving one person a reading edge over another comes down to the character of the home environment.

2. Students typically seemed to have less difficulty with exercises that called for them to distinguish word meanings, read signs

---

1Justus, op. cit., 11-12.
and merchandise labels, follow written directions, and extract important facts from passages; however, they tended to falter on exercises requiring them to discern main ideas and the organization of passages and to read critically.

3. Most young Americans read with reasonable comprehension at a rate of under 200 words per minute.

4. The difference between the typical performance of each of the various groups—black, white inner-city, affluent suburban, and so on—and the typical performance of students in the nation as a whole remained relatively constant regardless of whether the reading ability being measured involved some of the simpler activities or activities considered more difficult and complex.

5. As reading activities grow more complex, smaller percentages of students are able to complete them. The ability to perform the more difficult reading tasks may depend primarily on the student's initial acquisition of certain basics. A youngster who fails to learn these basics early is at a severe disadvantage in trying to catch up.

Those who expected a definitive answer to the nation's reading problem to appear in the NRA were disappointed, but the assessors did achieve their goal of stimulating questions and probing. In fact, NAEP officials did not make any claim to easy answers as noted in their preliminary summary of the reading assessment results: "Though the study of reading and the reading process has yielded much valu-

Gadway, op. cit., 1.
ble information in the last decade, there is still a great deal to be learned about how people read and how best to help children acquire reading skills."

No Easy Answers Exist

Similar conclusions have been reached in numerous other studies, which all indicate that there is no simple answer to the precise extent of the national reading problem, nor will any one reading method work for all teachers and/or students, regardless of the often-times grandiose claims of publishing companies and other single method advocates.

Following a review of the literature published in the United States between 1960 and 1970 to determine the extent of the reading problem in the country, Abraham Carp\(^1\) concluded, "The data base does not exist to permit adequate estimates of the reading problem in the United States in terms of a standard of meeting individual and social needs . . . . The incident of reading problems in grades K through 12 has been demonstrated, but the extent of the problem depends on definitions, measures and populations. If the average (median) score is defined as the standard, obviously half of the population will fail to achieve the standard."

Carp's conclusions were contained in "The Reading Problem in the United States," a portion of a study The Information Base For Reading (IBR) by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) in Berkeley, California. Funded by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE), the report was released in 1971 and documents the existence of a "national reading problem of significant size, particularly among certain population subgroups, and describes the personnel and material resources used to teach reading in the United States."

Reginald Corder\(^1\) of ETS summarized the study, one of three funded as a part of a USOE Targeted Research and Development Program in Reading, as it related to five basic assumptions:

1. **Improvement in reading seems to have reached a plateau.** According to Corder, the literature surveyed for the project did not support this view as a general assumption.

2. **Differing methods for teaching reading do not produce significantly different results.** The ETS study concluded that this assumption was valid, especially since teachers appear to develop their own eclectic methods of teaching reading, once the classroom door is closed, and it is difficult to know what procedures they are actually using.

3. **A broadly accepted model of reading, showing its constituent elements and their interactions, does not exist.** Survey results did not turn up any broadly accepted model of reading; however, the report did state that most teachers seem to base instruction in read-

\(^{1}\)loc. cit., 220-225.
ing upon some one of the basal reading series, accepting an eclectic method. "In effect, the eclectic method is probably so eclectic that it is no model at all," wrote Corder.

4. Summaries of research on reading indicate that most of the research in the field has been done in a manner that prohibits synthesis. ETS researchers agreed that the reported research in reading does appear to make synthesis difficult and tenuous, if not impossible.

5. Previous attempts to concentrate emphasis on reading, undertaken on the part of funding agencies, have produced proposals for research on parts of the problem with little hope for cumulative solution of the total problem. Since this was the basic assumption justifying the USOE Targeted Research and Development Program in reading, Corder felt ETS could take no position on the assumption because the project review did not include an analysis of the proposals.

Overall, ETS conclusions tended to confirm earlier in-depth Putting Research Into Educational Practice\(^1\) (PREP) studies by USOE. Perhaps the most significant of these for the school administrator related to the classroom teacher, who PREP researchers believe is the single most important factor in whether, and how well, a child learns to read.

Despite the current extensive methodology debate, ETS findings also appear to confirm the view that regardless of the method used,


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
no one method works for all children and teachers should be trained in identifying reading skills and in matching problems with appropriate corrective techniques and materials.

The Search Goes On

Although the NRA and the ETS studies are among the most extensive undertaken in recent years to define the reading problem in the United States, they are only two of many aimed, directly or indirectly, at determining how well educators are doing their job.

In an attempt to obtain a firmer grasp on the current level of illiteracy among the nation's 17-year-olds, the Education Commission of the States (ECS)\(^1\) has undertaken a $166,555 "mini-assessment" funded by the USOE Right To Read program.

The mini-assessment defines literacy on the basis of demonstrating competence in reading skills necessary to function in today's world.

According to R2R's Holloway,\(^2\) the project is highly significant to her program's goals, since it will provide necessary information toward assessing how R2R is progressing in its battle to eliminate illiteracy by 1980.

In addition to the emphasis at the national level for hard facts in assessing educational results in reading and other academic sub-

\(^{1}\)Vandermyn, Gaye, "New Program Designed To Pinpoint Illiteracy." A news release from the Education Commission of the States (Denver) to the National School Public Relations Association, July 5, 1973, 1.

\(^{2}\)Ibid.
jects, increasing numbers of states are yielding to public pressures to show what and how well their schools are achieving. For example, at least 16 states are currently using NAEP materials to compare student achievement results with national and regional data. Some states, like Michigan, are using yearly state-wide assessment testing to determine student learning success and, in some instances, allocations of state monies to fund special programs.

As stated in the 1970 Education U.S.A. Special Report The Reading Crisis: The Problem and Suggested Solutions, "No one who knows the problem of improving reading instruction believes in 'any great magic' which can provide a solution over night. But there are many practical steps, often small in themselves, which have made a difference."

With the ever-increasing public and political pressure for improved reading success among students, knowledge of what is happening in the reading field and of the most effective instructional methods available is critical for any successful school system. Reading has become the most publicized of all educational efforts and it seems certain to be the first area where the nation's schools are going to

---


2Hunter, Mike, Michigan Department of Education, In a presentation to Dr. Ted Ploughman's Data Analysis I class at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, October 10, 1973.

be held accountable for positive, measurable gains. Additionally, a growing tendency to place blame on more than the classroom teacher or home conditions for reading failures makes it appear vital that parents, teachers, administrators and board of education members work together to obtain results instead of seeking a scapegoat to blame for continued reading problems.

John Ottina,\textsuperscript{1} U.S. Commissioner of Education, best summarized the direction for the future in December 1973: "I do not intend to apportion blame for the existence of the reading problem. Regardless of who is at fault, the problem will not be solved by blaming someone. Our need is to define the problem and concentrate all our efforts on its solutions."

\textsuperscript{1}Ottina, John, "Who's Teaching Johnny To Read?" A statement by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, prepared for the National School Public Relations Education U.S.A. Special Report on Reading, December 10, 1973, 2.
CHAPTER II

RIGHT TO READ: THE KEY NATIONAL EFFORT

The late James E. Allen, Jr., former U. S. Commissioner of Education, initiated one of the most ambitious federal programs in history September 23, 1969, when he proclaimed, "We should immediately set for ourselves the goal of assuring that by the end of the 1970's the right to read shall be a reality for all--that no one shall be leaving our schools without the skill and the desire necessary to read to the full limits of his capability."

Allen's speech before the National Association of State Boards of Education was the first announcement about a program that since has become one of the most highly publicized federal efforts in educational history: Right To Read (R2R).

Although announced in 1969, R2R did not become a demonstrable reality until 1972, when the first grants were made to a few selected school sites. Designed to utilize all possible public and private resources, the R2R effort is aimed toward achieving highly ambitious goals: insuring that by 1980, 99 percent of all people under 16 years of age living in the United States and 90 percent of all those over 16 will possess and use literacy skills.

---

1International Reading Association, "IRA Reports on the Right To Read Effort." A bulletin prepared by the International Reading Association, Newark, Delaware, May 1973, 1.

2Ibid.
"We're really serious about this goal of ending illiteracy by the 1980's," said R2R Director Ruth Holloway\textsuperscript{1} in July 1973. "It is a massive effort, not just here in Washington (D.C.), but in every community and school district across the country.

"The enthusiasm coming out of the states is tremendous," she added. "We're giving more than just dollars. We're giving leadership to show how things can be done effectively. Money alone doesn't do it. We're giving structure."

R2R Deputy Director Edward Cain\textsuperscript{2} echoed Holloway's comments as he elaborated on R2R efforts and goals which he sees being achieved through correcting the educational system that produces nonreaders.

"We're not just interested in bringing kids up to grade level in reading," he said, explaining that this can be little more than a "self-defeating process," which doesn't change the educational system that created the problem in the first place.

"We want to make learning a constant factor," said Cain, who believes that one of the ways to do this is to change the present system by working with a total community concept, involving not only the states and local school districts, but all segments of society--public and private--in the process.

Although the R2R effort has received some criticism, much of it has been directed at the lack of federal funding and resources being

\textsuperscript{1}Holloway, Ruth L., Right To Read Director, In an interview with the author in Washington, D.C., July 6, 1973.

\textsuperscript{2}Cain, Edward, Right To Read Assistant Director, In an interview with the author in Washington, D.C., July 6, 1973.
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provided for the program. According to Holloway,¹ there has been no congressional objection to the R2R program. The only major question has been, "Can R2R do the job with the resources they have available?"

"In order to accomplish the R2R goal, a two-pronged approach is essential. The existing problem must be corrected and the schools must be changed so as to prevent massive reading difficulty. R2R is concerned also about influencing teacher training institutions to change their standards and their ways of training teachers in reading instruction," said Holloway.²

She added that people will make the difference and major emphasis is being placed on training existing school staff rather than adding large numbers of personnel. Staff development, which focuses on the needs of teachers, librarians, specialist aides, and parents, is a significant aspect of the R2R program.

Basically, the overall R2R effort is aimed at achieving what USOE officials call the "multiplier effect", which will eventually involve every school system and administrator in the nation. The multiplier effect concept centers on the development of a cadre of reading specialists at the state level. These specialists will then provide training and leadership for schools throughout their state until eventually every district in the nation is involved in the R2R effort.

The success of R2R depends on many factors; however, according

¹Holloway, op. cit.

to Cain,¹ two items are critical: a real commitment that reading is important and massive support to conquer illiteracy.

Speaking to ten directors of the eleven Phase I R2R states in Washington in July, 1973, Cain said: "The role of the state agency is not to improve reading in the states. The role of the state is to eliminate illiteracy in the state.

"The fact of being a citizen in this country and not being able to read is one of the biggest handicaps a person can have, and I am, as I'm sure you are too, sick and tired of half-hearted efforts to improve education. Our role is the eradication of illiteracy. Nothing else."

Basic Assumptions Behind Right To Read Efforts

Right To Read operates under eight basic assumptions USOE² believes are valid:

1. All but one percent of the population can be taught to read.

2. Parents have the right to expect that each one of their children will learn how to read.

3. Drastic reform is necessary of at least that part of the educational system which has so consistently produced such a large number of functionally illiterate individuals.

¹Cain, Edward, Right To Read Assistant Director, In a presentation during the July 12, 1973, meeting of the Phase I Right To Read State Directors in Washington, D.C.

²Holloway, Ruth L., Right To Read Director, "A Rationale for a Statewide Right To Read Program." A speech during the July 12, 1973, meeting of the Phase I State Right To Read Directors in Washington, D.C., 3. (Mimeographed)
4. The needed reform is apparently not something that can be purchased because no solution appears to be for sale. Mere money alone will not solve the problem, and the solution will need to be built rather than bought.

5. The needed reform must be comprehensive in order that rural as well as urban, small as well as large, and non-public as well as public school districts are served equally.

6. The needed reform must be systematic and pervasive.

7. The plan for reform must be replicable.

8. The plan for reform must have clearly stated objectives, defined action steps, the necessary human and dollar resources, a broad base of support, and a limited amount of time in which to complete the task.

The Scope of Right To Read

A variety of approaches are involved in the R2R effort. Its strategy includes establishing demonstration projects, working with existing special projects having broad implications for education, and working closely with state departments of education.

The R2R approach is primarily based on a systems analysis approach.\[1\] For example, schools involved in the program spend most of the first year analyzing where they are in reading programming and accomplishment, what resources they have, what proficiency they want to achieve, 

\[1\]: "Right To Read - 'As Audacious As It Is Beautiful'." Focus, VI (May-June 1973), 1-3.
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what skills the teachers need to develop, and how will they accomplish these objectives.

Some key requirements for participating schools include: conducting a needs assessment of the current program, utilizing a local unit task force for program planning, staff development, student evaluation, use of the diagnostic/prescriptive approach to reading instruction, parent participation, and on-going evaluation.

R2R is primarily funding two types of demonstration programs: school-based and community-based. Each of the 244 centers presently involved in the effort has the goal of planning the best possible program for its particular needs through the use of R2R materials, information and assistance.

Each site has a representative unit task force responsible for planning and implementing the program, which stresses parental and community involvement and the use of local resources. As mentioned previously, emphasis is also placed on the use of diagnostic-prescriptive and individualized instruction utilizing multiple reading methods.

For school administrators interested in improving their reading programs, but fearful of increased costs at the local level after R2R funding ceases, one of the most important aspects of the plan is the focus on development of existing staff. The aim is to train current staff, rather than employing new personnel, so an effective reading program will be able to continue when federal funding stops.

---

1International Reading Association, op. cit., 1-2.
The 170 school-based sites, serving over 100,000 students, are designated in one of four categories:

1. Transition sites, which do not receive substantial federal funds to improve reading programs, but are willing to make the transition from existing ineffective reading programs to more effective ones;

2. Redirection sites, which do receive funding, but still need to improve their reading programs;

3. Expansion sites, which have promising reading practices and students achieving in the second and third quartiles instead of the lowest, as in the first two types of sites; and

4. Impact sites, which have exemplary programs that can serve as demonstration models for the application of reading methods, sound management, use of the diagnostic/prescriptive approach, and community involvement.

Over 20,000 students are involved in the 74 community-based programs, which are directed toward the out-of-school adolescent population, as well as other adults who need reading help. More diverse in location, population and program intent than the school-based sites, these programs are located in areas such as prisons, community colleges, inner cities, and Indian reservations.

In addition to their efforts in the school- and community-based sites, R2R is also funding a number of special projects. Some current ones include assessment of reading proficiency in 17-year-olds to determine tasks necessary for functional literacy; development of materials and guidelines to help meet the needs of capable disadvan-
taged children whose reading problems cannot be helped by regular classroo
t teachers; preparation of TV scripts for adult bilingual education; and establish
tment of a reading program for children using TV as the instructional medium.

State Leadership Critical

Perhaps the most important element in the overall success of the R2R program is the involve
ment of the state departments of education that will be responsible for training the initial cadre of reading spe
cialists and providing leadership and support for the local school districts.

At the July, 1973 meeting of the Phase I states, R2R Director Holloway 1 made the state role clear: "The state must provide much more than a policy statement—much more than an offer of assistance, if requested. This must be an aggressive state initiative, aimed at assisting each adult and each child in every community through a program based upon diagnosis of the existing reading programs and reading problems of each local unit, a prescription for needed changes, and access to necessary resources, so that the goals can and will be met."

According to Holloway, achievement of the R2R goal requires a total quality reading program in each school district or corporation. "The mere fact that reading is being taught by individual teachers in a school district does not prove the existence of a reading program.

---

1Holloway, "A Rationale for a Statewide Right To Read Program," op. cit., 2-5.
'Program' connotes a unified and pervasive effort in a predetermined direction," she said.

To be a true instructional program in reading, she believes the school must include three components: a specified curriculum (i.e., what is to be taught), recommended methodology (i.e., how it is that the curriculum components may best be taught), and a defined, complete system of organizational procedure and administrative practices.

Necessary efforts for successful state programs, according to Holloway, must include:

1. Formulation of a plan to build quality reading instruction programs in each school in the state;
2. Provisions for specific in-service and leadership needs in each school;
3. Creation of competence and support structures in each school district;
4. Continuation of state department of education movement toward new positions of leadership, which emphasize the initiation of programs and the development of service-delivery systems; and
5. Involvement of top governmental and educational leaders, as well as parents, students and board of education members, to maintain massive public demand for local reading curriculum improvement.

Minnesota, one of the eleven states originally funded by R2R, has been the leading state in developing a broad reading program at the state level. In fact, in early 1973 USOE officials designated the

1 Education Update, (May 1973), 9.
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state as having developed the model program for other states to follow in setting up R2R programs.

At the time, over 234,000 people were participating in the Minnesota program, more than all of the other ten Phase I states combined (n.b., The Minnesota plan is outlined in the next chapter.).

Materials for the Local District

A variety of materials have been developed for schools involved in the R2R program. Information regarding the program or the materials listed below may be obtained by contacting your state R2R coordinator (See Appendix A.). Materials currently available include:

1. **The Needs Assessment Package**: Step-by-step instructions for gathering data on student achievement, faculty skills and training needs, and information on basic approaches to reading and available materials are included in this package.

2. **The Program Planning Procedure Kit**: Charts plus definition and objective cards which lead education decision makers through eleven essential planning steps are part of this kit.

3. **The Status and Reporting Center Kit**: These materials include charts designed to illustrate the progress of the project, highlight future decision points, and keep track of responsibilities. The kit provides for the self-monitoring of every aspect of the individual site's program and is made available to each grantee.

4. **The Assessment Scale**: Designed for use in examining a reading program, the scale can be used to assist communities in developing

---

1 International Reading Association, op. cit., 3.
reading instruction programs that meet the needs of learners within the communities, permit self evaluation of reading programs, and provide a basis for the development of criteria for program approval.

5. Description of Validated Programs (Information Capsules): Five effective reading programs in actual operation are presented in packaged form through an overview using charts, sample materials, tapes, and filmstrips. Grantees choose one of these programs to replicate in part or completely. Materials include the process for implementing a program as well as descriptive information. Specific information may also be obtained directly from the model sites.

6. The Guideline: This item provides summary data on each of the five model programs.

Coordination in the Reading Effort

One of the major goals of R2R is to increase effective cross-bureau coordination within USOE to facilitate planning between the various federal reading and reading-related programs and the R2R office. By mid-1973, federal funds for reading were scattered under a variety of programs, including bilingual education, library services, and Titles I, II, and III of ESEA\(^1\) (\(n.b.\), in September, 1973, USOE's Cain indicated that nearly $700 million is currently being funneled into federal reading programs.).

Additionally, R2R personnel are working with other federal agencies, such as the Department of Defense dependent schools, and a

\(^1\)Cain, Edward, Right To Read Assistant Director, In an interview with National School Public Relations Association research assistant Suzanne Ripley in Washington, D.C., September 17, 1973.
variety of industrial and educational organizations to increase involvement in the R2R goal.

The International Reading Association, the American Library Association, Action, Volunteers in Education, Reading is Fundamental and numerous other professional organizations are also either involved or working with R2R personnel.

Future Directions for Right To Read


States receiving second-year funding included: California, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas. (Vermont also received second-year funds, but joined the New England consortium as well.)

These grants, which totaled $4.4 million, are to be used for development and operation of programs aimed at improving reading skills among children and adults and will primarily be used for staff development in programs calling for substantial amounts of state and local resources.

1 "Thirty-One States Get Right To Read Grants." Education Daily, VI (July 16, 1973), 1.
The primary emphasis of R2R efforts in Fiscal Year 1974 will be on those efforts which will have a multiplier effect and broad implications for reading. According to an IRA\(^1\) report in May, 1973, these efforts include the:

1. Initiation of seminars for school administrators in R2R demonstration programs;
2. Increased state education agency utilization of R2R concepts, materials, and processes, and increased training of state technical assistants;
3. Validation of effective programs and promising practices by The American Institute of Research (AIR) and dissemination and installation of these successful efforts;
4. Improvement of existing demonstration school- and community-based programs and preparation for selecting additional impact sites which meet criteria for exemplary reading programs;
5. Initiation of limited demonstration programs in schools of education;
6. Implementation of R2R integrated demonstration programs;
7. Increased coordination among OE bureaus and agencies;
8. Expansion of systematic assessment and evaluation of all programs and grantees;
9. Increased involvement of the private sector in accomplishing R2R's goals; and
10. Initiation of an adult "Sesame Street".

\(^1\)International Reading Association, op. cit., 4.
The national mini-assessment of the nation's 17-year-olds mentioned earlier will also be conducted during March and April of 1974. The NAEP, a subsidiary of the Education Commission of the States, will conduct the $166,555 survey. The results of the study are scheduled for publication in 1975.¹

Criterion for the assessment will be a new definition of functional literacy adopted by the USOE and the National Institute of Education (NIE). The move is designed to eliminate a major problem encountered by R2R—wide variations in the definition of functional literacy from state to state and within many institutions.

According to the new definition, a literate person is one who "has acquired the essential knowledge and skills in reading, writing, and computation required for effective functioning in society, and whose attainment in such skills makes it possible for him to develop new aptitudes and to participate actively in the life of his times."

James Hazlett,² director of elementary and secondary services of ECS and administrative director of NAEP, termed the mini-assessment "an important step forward in defining and assessing the level of literacy in the U.S. The U.S. has long accepted as a definition of literacy the completion of four years of schooling. The mini-assessment defines literacy on the basis of demonstrating competence in the handling of reading skills and understandings necessary to function in today's world."


²loc. cit., 1.
R2R: A Success or "A Sham"?

In early 1973, one-time vice-presidential candidate Thomas F. Eagleton (D/Mo.),¹ called the Nixon Administration's Right To Read program a "sham".

The July 1973 Nation's Schools² headlined a brief "Washington Wire" feature: ""Right To Read' Program: Half-Dead Now And Going Fast."

Simon Beagle,³ chairman of the American Federation of Teachers National Council for Effective Schools, tersely responded to R2R goals in the January 1973 American Teacher: "'Who is kidding whom?"

Senator Edward Kennedy (D/Mass.)⁴ wrote in the September 1973 Parents and Better Family Living: "As a people, as a government, and as a nation, we have failed to make the right to read a part of our heritage."

Although the R2R concept has received wide support from virtually all educational and political leaders, similar criticisms have also been heard from the other side of the political/educational fence. The obvious question for the local school administrator, after hearing such rhetoric, must be "Is R2R really going to be of help?"


²________, "'Right To Read' Program: Half-Dead Now And Going Fast." Nation's Schools, XCII (July 1973), 21-22.


⁴Kennedy, Edward, "What Parents Can Do to Guarantee Every Child's Right To Read." Parents and Better Family Living, XLVIII (September 1973), 14.
According to Holloway,¹ there should be no doubt. "Sixty-two percent of our school-based demonstration programs made month-to-month progress in 1972-73, and the community-based programs are also progressing.

"It's an interesting experience when I go before appropriations committees. They don't ask why are we asking for so much money. They ask questions more in line with why aren't we asking for more," she explained, at the July meeting of the Phase I states.

And, it is the lack of funding for Right To Read that has and is generating the majority of complaints about the program, with the exception of the defunct National Reading Center (NRC).

Finally, a new type of demonstration project (i.e., Special Reading Projects)² encouraging quality reading programs within an integrated setting was begun for Fiscal 1974. Fifty-one school sites in 15 states were chosen. These sites have a 20 to 50 percent minority enrollment and were awarded three-year grants, funded under the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA).

The Nation's Schools¹ report³ was related directly to the NRC, which had lost administration support. The NRC was created to enroll private industry and community volunteers in the battle against illiteracy. Funding was cut off for the center, following wide-spread accusations of ineffectiveness. Audit reports that the center misused

¹Holloway, Ruth, in a presentation at a meeting of the Right To Read Phase I State Directors in Washington, D.C., July 12, 1973.

²International Reading Association, "IRA Reports on the Right To Read Effort." A bulletin prepared by the International Reading Association, Newark, Delaware, September 1973, 4.

³"'Right To Read' Program: Half-Dead Now And Going Fast," op.cit.
some $288,000 of its initial $1.5 million federal grant did not help its cause.

As noted, the other criticism directed at the main R2R effort has centered on the need for massive funding to accomplish the goal of eliminating illiteracy by 1980.

For instance, Eagleton's comments\(^1\) regarded his allegations that President Nixon had pledged he would request $200 million a year for R2R, but that when the budget request came the money didn't. Instead of the $200 million in new money, there was "a shuffling around of funds already committed to existing library and education programs," said Eagleton.

Kennedy\(^2\) also criticized the Nixon administration for not providing additional funding for R2R: "Our federal government was first unwilling to recognize the problem, then unwilling to commit the resources necessary to remedy it. I cannot conceive of a program more important to the national interest than one to teach all our children to read. And I cannot conceive of a program that will pay back more to the Treasury in taxes and in lower welfare costs. Now is the time to rewrite national priorities and place the right to read at the highest rung of the ladder."

Beagle's comments\(^3\) had a similar ring: "While applauding their intent, I emphatically charge that the refusal of governmental agen-

---

1Wagner, op. cit.
2Kennedy, op. cit.
3Beagle, op. cit.
cies to supply the needed funds to translate worthy goals into reality makes one wonder whether those who proclaim these goals and are in the position of responsibility can be taken seriously."

In the midst of the political and educational debate over funding there are numerous bright spots on the horizon for Right To Read. Its programs do appear to be producing results. Cross bureau coordination of funds for reading is becoming an increasing reality, while more state boards of education and local school districts are committing themselves to the R2R program. Additionally, the support that Holloway and her associates say is critical to the success of the program seems to be growing rapidly across the nation.

As Sheila Canning reported in the February 1973 Saturday Review of Education: "...with a little help from its friends, Right To Read will help end the contradiction of millions of illiterates in the wealthiest--and best-educated--nation in the world."

Although it may not be quite that simple, that is the goal.

---

CHAPTER III

ASSISTANCE FROM THE STATES: ACTION OR RHETORIC?

Effective reading programs at the local school district level rarely happen as a natural occurrence, but are the result of good leadership, expert guidance, and extensive effort. Many U.S. schools, especially the smaller ones, don't have all the financial, physical and/or intellectual resources to initiate effectively a coordinated K-12 program and must seek assistance outside the district.

Generally, this help must come from the state boards of education and the legislatures. However, such specialized aid has not always been available, and "Will the state help?" is a critical question for schools seeking to develop successful reading programs.

The answer, at this time, is a definite "Maybe."

Following the lead of the federal government, many—but not all—state legislatures and boards of education are becoming increasingly involved in providing leadership, monetary support, and technical assistance to local school districts in reading curriculum development.

With the increased state involvement in reading program improvement, however, the educational "hot potato" of accountability is appearing with regularity. Currently, assessment of school-student progress, especially in reading and math, has been initiated by several state boards of education, and a number of others are considering such action.
According to Phyllis Hawthorne\(^1\) of the Cooperative Accountability Project, a federally-funded, three-year project in state accountability, most states now have or are planning an assessment program.

For example, CAP data indicate Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Colorado, Florida, California, Connecticut, and Texas all have operating assessment programs, and Michigan, Florida, Maryland and Colorado have added the additional concept of legislated accountability.

The CAP report\(^2\) *Legislation By The States: Accountability and Assessment In Education* (April 1973), indicated that 39 of the 50 states already had assessment legislation on the books or were contemplating it during 1973.

The implications of both assessment and accountability for local school districts are both numerous and debatable. However, regardless of academic debate, one fact appears certain: the local board of education, administration and faculty are going to be held increasingly responsible for producing reading progress in students.

Besides the assessment and accountability efforts being initiated by individual states, each of the 49 states involved in the federal R2R project must incorporate assessment as a part of their commitment to the program.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\)Hawthorne, Phyllis, Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction Division for Management and Planning Services staff member, In a letter on assessment to the author, August 8, 1973.


\(^3\)________, "Suggested Considerations in the Development of a Comprehensive Right To Read Plan." A paper distributed by the Right To Read staff during the July 13, 1973, meeting of the Phase I Right To Read State Directors, Washington, D.C., 1. (Mimeographed)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
The cadre of training reading specialists being developed in the R2R states will probably prove to be one of the more valuable tools for local school districts involved in improving their reading programs.¹

These highly-trained experts will travel throughout their respective states, holding training sessions for local administrators, reading teachers, school personnel, community leaders and other groups whose involvement and leadership are considered necessary to overall program development for student reading success.

Many educators, who are often skeptical of assessment-accountability programs, tend to charge the state boards of education and the federal government with providing funds, but no leadership. The development of the state reading cadres is, in part, designated to answer this accusation.

Minnesota: The Model State

Leadership from the state is the key to success for initiating the reform needed to change conditions that promote reading failures in local school districts, according to Minnesota's Right To Read Director Hugh Schoephoerster.² In fact, the success of Minnesota's program of leadership development was one of the primary reasons for the state's being selected in 1973 as the model for the other 48 states electing to participate in the R2R program.

¹Schoephoerster, Hugh, Minnesota Right To Read Director, In a presentation during the July 12, 1973, meeting of the Phase I Right To Read State Directors in Washington, D.C.

²Ibid.
Schoephoerster believes there are two major aspects to the illiteracy problem: those people who have been failed by the system by not being taught how to read at a functional level and those who are currently in the process of being failed.

"To prevent more of this, we must reform the school systems that allowed the problem to exist originally," he told the participants at the July 12-13 meeting of the Phase I State R2R Directors in Washington, D.C. "The programs in the past have addressed failures in the system, not the conditions that caused the problem. Leadership is the key to success... we can't buy the solution to this problem."

Formally implemented on January 17, 1972, the Minnesota R2R program\(^1\) is essentially not a dollar program, but promises only help in building a school program and in preparing a competent reading director in local school districts that elect to participate in the program.

The Minnesota Plan\(^2\) is a four-phase, three- and one-half year effort scheduled to end on December 31, 1975, and has two basic dimensions: (1) making direct technical assistance available to each public school district and to each private and parochial school administrative unit for a sustained period of time in order that a total reading program may be built which will meet the state's "criteria of excellence" and (2) encouraging the identification of a director of reading for each local education agency to be prepared by

---

\(^1\) "Minnesota Right To Read Presentation." Number One of a series of eighteen papers on the Minnesota Right To Read Plan. U.S. Office of Education Demonstration Center, Washington, D.C., February 1973, 15. (Mimeographed)

\(^2\) loc. cit., Number Two, 4.
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the state R2R staff with the full range of competencies to permit the local reading program to be directed by a highly qualified individual.

Participation in Minnesota's program requires a formal commitment from each school district and board of education.\(^1\) Minnesota's initial commitment plan has since been adopted by R2R and is a part of their recommended program for developing a comprehensive reading effort at the local level. The commitment requested from Minnesota education agencies includes:

1. Authorization of a local R2R advisory council consisting of nine-to-thirteen members, including: a board member, school administrator, teacher(s), parent(s), librarian(s), and representatives of local organizations concerned with the quality of education.

2. Adoption of a formal resolution affirming reading as a priority.

3. Designation of a reading director, who is given the authority necessary to execute the school's reading program. Although the directorship need not be a full-time position, sufficient time must be provided by the board of education to allow the director to perform his duties. The director may be a principal, curriculum coordinator, remedial reading teacher, classroom teacher, or any other qualified individual.

4. Provision of time for the local reading director to attend a series of 30 full-day work sessions, with the state underwriting transportation, food and lodging costs and the local district assum-\(^{\text{—}}\)

\(^{1}\)Schoephoerster, op. cit.
ing the salary costs of the reading director.

5. Support of the teaching and administrative staffs prior to entering into a Minnesota Right To Read local education agency contract.

Additional considerations for local schools, under the federal R2R recommendations, include provisions for continuous staff development of a plan of action congruent with the state program and actual implementation of the plan, which will be evaluated.

In Minnesota, one of the primary evaluation tools is a 14-page document "State of Minnesota Criteria of Excellence in Reading Programming," approved by the state's R2R advisory council on November 20, 1972 (See Appendix A.). The document provides a definition as to what is believed should characterize a quality reading program and it is against these 24 criteria that the local advisory councils are requested to evaluate their programs.

Included among the 24 criteria for excellence are the following recommendations: coordination of all administrative facets of the reading curriculum; a complete testing system which includes the use of criterion-referenced measures; intensive and extensive ongoing in-service education for the total certificated teaching, supportive, and administrative staffs; development of a cadre of trained volunteer reading helpers; inclusion of an adult basic education component; involvement and education of parents; and provision for the availability

---

1Minnesota Right To Read Advisory Council, "State of Minnesota Criteria of Excellence in Reading Programming." Guidelines prepared by the Minnesota Right To Read Advisory Council, St. Paul, Minnesota, November 1972, 1-14. (Mimeographed)
of the achievement levels of all pupils in reading by grade and/or age level.

Evaluation--by an outside agency--of the state program has also been a component of the Minnesota plan, and the first such evaluation, prepared by the Department of Programs and Services of CTB/McGraw-Hill of Monterey, California, was released in late summer, 1973.¹ The focus of the evaluation was on student achievement in reading, and criterion-referenced reading tests (i.e., the Prescriptive Reading Inventory) were administered on a pretest/post-test basis to samples of R2R and non-R2R students in 22 Minnesota school districts in grades two, four and six.

While warning about the inadvisability of extending conclusions until a more comprehensive, broadly-based design could be incorporated, the researchers² did conclude that the data gathered favored the R2R students.

Incorporating R2R's concept of the multiplier effect, Phase I of the Minnesota plan,³ which ended December 31, 1972, included 19 public and three non-public schools (representing 39,095 pupils, 2,053 teachers, and all the adult illiterates within the boundaries of the participating schools). By 1973, Phase II of the program had grown to include an additional 119 public school districts and 23 non-pub-

¹Department of Programs and Services CTB/McGraw-Hill, Minnesota Right To Read Program Evaluation Report 1972-73. An evaluation of the Minnesota Right To Read Program, conducted by the Department of Programs and Services CTB/McGraw-Hill, Monterey, California, 1973, 1. (Mimeographed)

²loc. cit., 63.

³"Minnesota Right To Read Presentation." Number One, op. cit., 15-17.
lic schools. During the initial 12-month period after the program officially began, over 30 percent of the state's public school districts committed themselves to participation, with total involvement including over 25 percent of the entire public and non-public student population in Minnesota.

Phases III and IV will be conducted in a like manner, attempting to increase the schools involved until every school in the state is participating by the conclusion of the R2R program in Minnesota in 1975. At that time, state leaders plan to take steps to institutionalize the operation to allow the local education agencies to continue to maintain and refine their reading programs.

Currently, the state R2R\(^1\) staff has identified what they feel are some model reading programs that can be used in working with students (e.g., Hermantown's Reading is Fundamental program) and adult non-readers (e.g., Shakopee's Laubach Literacy Project, which is based on the Laubach Method of instruction for adult illiterates).

One key element of the Minnesota R2R program is strong public support from the state's governor Wendell R. Anderson, as well as a number of major educators, political leaders, and a wide variety of special interest groups and organizations, including: Minnesota Indian Education Committee, Minnesota Federation of Teachers, Minnesota Association for Supervision of Curriculum Development, Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, Minnesota Congress of Parents and Teachers, Minnesota Reading Association, Minnesota Ele-

\(^1\)Schoephoerster, Hugh, Minnesota Right To Read Director, In a letter to the author, September 14, 1973.
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According to Schoephoerster, massive, formal public support of influential figures and organizations is a critical aspect to the success of their program. He feels the strong stand taken by Governor Anderson has been especially valuable in gaining backing for the state's reading program and cites the governor's December 2, 1971, Schoolmen's Day address as an example of Anderson's support: "The diversity and complexity of the educational enterprise has made it difficult for the public to adequately assess school programs. Very seldom are specific, achievable goals identified and spoken of in a way that enlists public support and understanding and on which educators are willing to stand or fall . . . . I see in a R2R program the potential for a specific identifiable goal in education—a goal which is understood, which stands out clearly amidst the complexities of the many current education endeavors. It can be the rallying point for renewed confidence in our schools."

Basically, the Minnesota R2R staff views the reading program as a totality involving three major components: curriculum, method, and

1"Minnesota Right To Read Presentation," Number Two, op. cit., 1.
organization and administration. According to Schoephoerster,¹

"Local education agencies can buy their curriculum(s) and method(s) from publishers and this they do, but they cannot buy organization and administration from a commercial source." This, he feels, can be provided, in part, from the state and the R2R reading specialists.

The key ingredient, usually found missing in many earlier reform programs in reading education, seems to be a systematic, comprehensive and unified plan of action that is coupled with a mobilization of massive public support in order to achieve the goal. Schoephoerster believes this is what Minnesota has developed and that it seems to be working.

(For further information, contact Hugh Schoephoerster, Director, Right To Read Program, Department of Education, Capitol Square, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.)

New York's Project Alert

Although New York is another funded Right To Read state and its education department offers many services similar to Minnesota's, special emphasis has been placed on a massive-in-service training program for current teachers, in addition to stiffening certification requirements for all elementary teachers.

Based on a Regents¹ position paper² on reading in July 1971,

¹Schoephoerster, Hugh, Minnesota Right To Read Director, in a memorandum to Patricia Goralski, Director of the Minnesota Professions Development Section, July 30, 1973, forwarded to the author by Schoephoerster in September 1973.

²New York State Education Department, "Regents Issue Position Paper on Reading." A news release from the New York State Education Department (Albany) to the National School Public Relations Association, July 30, 1971, 1.
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which cited improved teaching of reading as a top priority concern, the Bureau of Reading in the New York State Education Department (NYSED) created Project Reading Alert (i.e., A Learning Enterprise to Retrain Teachers). The program is designed to provide training for teachers in the use of a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to individualized reading instruction. It entered its third phase of teacher training in the home districts and work in the classroom on methods and diagnosis of reading during the 1972-73 school year.¹

Project Alert was designed to overcome the negative response to traditional in-service programs, which normally utilize outside experts for a short-term course having little emphasis on practical classroom demonstration, according to the NYSED.² Believing the use of local talent appeared to enhance the potential for in-service training, Project Alert officials organized the efforts of a core of trained reading specialists functioning in classrooms at the local level to generate and guide teacher self-improvement.

Additionally, the Reading Bureau prepared a reading resource kit—now available for in-service programs to all districts in the state—for use in each of the 50 districts initially selected for participation in the program. The multimedia kit contains six packages on exploring readiness skills, informal reading inventory, word recognition skills, listening, readability formula, and classroom management. It is designed to permit the teacher to select areas of interest and

¹"A Look At Reading Progress." Inside Education, LVIII (December 1972/January 1973), 4.

²New York State Education Department, "Project Reading Alert." A report on Project Reading Alert by the New York State Education Department, Albany, New York, 1972, 1-4. (Mimeographed)
to work through the readings, tasks and evaluations either singly or in interested groups.

The cadre of 50 reading consultants initiated their training under NYSED sponsorship during an intensive two-week session in March 1972. While there they explored the resource package, investigated diagnostic-prescriptive techniques and visited Albany area schools to observe the methods in practice, rehearsed the techniques they would need to act as trainers for teachers in their own districts, and worked on refining in-service models.

That summer, Phase II of the program also began as Title I funds were used to help finance the 50 specialists, who returned to their local communities to manage a summer instructional program for children and in-service training for 670 teachers. By fall of the 1972-73 school year, these teachers had been trained in the individualized learning procedures in reading and massive teacher-training in the home districts began.

For instance, in Freeport, new elementary teachers are now introduced to the materials through in-service courses, where items from the state’s reading resource kits are combined with those prepared by Freeport teachers. Currently district leaders claim good results from their efforts.

In North Syracuse, a team of reading teachers worked out their own resource kits, complete with cassettes, film-strips and tapes, and have introduced the new materials to teachers at several schools.

"A Look At Reading Progress," op. cit.
There, the teachers who were trained earlier were used during the 1972-73 school year to present demonstrations and as resource people for the local district.

At the regional Boards of Cooperative Educational Services, master copies of in-service resource kits for elementary teachers are available and seven regional consultants in upstate New York and two in New York City are available to assist local districts in developing and evaluating programs, in-service education, and parent workshops.

Early evaluation\(^1\) of the Project Alert program was based on data collected from the project directors, project monitors, teachers and children. Included among the major conclusions of that evaluation were:

1. On an over-all basis children who participated in Project Alert summer programs made significant gains in reading as measured by pre- and post-reading tests. (Children took part in summer programs for an average time of \(4\frac{1}{2}\) weeks and the average gain in reading scores was approximately \(12\frac{1}{2}\) weeks.)

2. Reading directors reported they accomplished less than they planned in every area about which they were questioned.

3. Factors such as years of teaching and academic background were unrelated to the gains pupils made in reading.

\(^1\)New York State Education Department, "Project Alert Analysis of Data." A report on an analysis of Project Reading Alert by the New York State Education Department, Albany, New York, November 1972, 16-17. (Mimeographed)
As part of the R2R effort in New York, schools are seeking to better inform parents about reading methods, problems and the meanings of test scores; public libraries are extending their programs to reach a wider variety of the state's citizens, including reservation Indians and inmates in prisons and county jails; and adult volunteers are being trained to go into the schools as reading helpers.

(For further information, contact Jane Algozine, Chief, Bureau of Reading Education, The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany, New York 12224.)

Michigan: Assessment and Accountability

Michigan's State Board of Education (MSBE) has created what are perhaps the nation's most extensive, on-going assessment and accountability programs, and each has strong ties with reading.

The Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) was initiated by the state board, supported by the governor and funded by the legislature initially in 1969. Basically, the state board has adopted a six-step educational management system as a guide for improving Michigan education, and the Michigan plan is not only influencing the state's school districts, but also is making its impact felt

---

1"A Look At Reading Progress," op. cit.


3Hunter, Mike, Michigan Department of Education, In a presentation to Dr. Ted Ploughman's Data Analysis I class at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan, October 10, 1973.
across the U.S., as it has implications for all the nation's schools.

The six steps of the Michigan plan include:

1. **The identification of common goals:** To date, the MSBE has developed "Common Goals of Michigan Education" guidelines and has been encouraging local school districts to develop local goals.

2. **The development of performance objectives:** According to the state board, performance objectives are the "things children ought to know at various stages in their development--certain measures of performance." K-6 objectives in reading and math have already been approved for the purpose of assessment. In addition to these efforts, tests and performance objectives are now being developed by Michigan educators in other priority skills areas, such as: science, social studies, fine arts, health education, physical education, and occupational skills.

3. **The assessment of educational needs:** Assessment tests of fourth and seventh grade students in reading and other areas have been conducted in Michigan, state-wide, since 1970 to provide a common educational needs assessment program for all of the over 500 school districts in the state.

4. **The analysis of delivery systems:** The MSBE says simply that if some children are not growing in some skills as they should, local educators are then in a better position to analyze the present educa-

---

tional services to see if better ways should be sought to help children learn better.

5. **The evaluation and testing of these systems or programs:** The MSBE feels any changes in methods of instruction or educational services, based upon the analysis in step four, call for testing and evaluation to help local educators decide if those changes helped children learn better.

6. **Recommendations for educational improvement:** The recommendation phase completes the process of educational accountability in Michigan. The recommendations are to be made to local school district policymakers of the best means to accomplish improvement of methods to help children learn better, based on the results of the previous steps of the program.

The results of the assessment tests reported back to the local school districts so they can compare (1) how well they are achieving their educational goals in reading and math and (2) their students' scores with those of other students throughout the state. These results are intended as a guide for local school districts.

Currently, the tests are moving from a norm-referenced base to a criterion-referenced format. At this time the test results are not being used as a means of accountability for the local schools; however, the state has developed a program of accountability in compensatory education, which, according to Michael Hunter\(^1\) of the MSBE research staff, is having implications at the national level.

\(^1\)Hunter, op. cit.
During the 1971-72 school year, under Section 3 of the State School Aid Act, the state legislature appropriated $22,500,000 for compensatory education. The 740 schools participating in the program were selected on the basis of the composite achievement scores of their students on the 1970-71 MEAP, and the money (i.e., $200 per eligible pupil) was to be used to improve the reading and arithmetic skills of children with serious deficiencies in these areas and could not be used to supplant local expenditures.

The Section 3 program is a three-year performance contract between the local school district and the state. Each participating district is required to submit a proposal describing its goals, objectives, and instructional processes. The minimum accomplishment objectives (i.e., a month's gain for every month of instruction) have been established as performance objectives for each student in the program.

For each student achieving 75 percent of the accomplishment level, the school district would receive a full allocation per pupil for the following fiscal year. For each pupil achieving less than the minimum objective, the district would receive an amount proportional to the gains attained. Because of the late implementation of the compensatory education program, which wasn't funded until October, 1971, the legislature authorized a one-year waiver of fiscal accountability, so there was no penalty in the 1972-73 school year.

---

First year results were impressive. According to Hunter, speaking at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan, in October 1973, "Michigan has the Title I program in the United States" and is having a "tremendous impact on federal funding and programming."

The results of the first year's efforts showed:

1. Among the students with matched pre- and post-test scores, more than half achieved at or above the 100 percent accomplishment level of at least one month gain in achievement per month in the program.

2. Twenty-eight percent of the students achieved at or above the 200 percent accomplishment level.

3. Twelve percent of these students made the 300 percent of accomplishment level or above.

4. Sixty-six percent of the students, for whom matched pre- and post-test scores were available, achieved at the 75 percent or above level.

The State Department of Education concluded that these data indicate a large percentage of students who previously had performed below average can perform at an average or above pace when the programs are designed to meet their needs. Two general conclusions of major importance for local school districts appear obvious, if Michigan's assessment and accountability programs continue to prove successful: not only is it likely that the state will expand its efforts outside

---

1Hunter, op. cit.

2Sie, op. cit., 11-12.
the areas of reading and math, but other state boards of education may also seriously consider adopting similar programs.

(For further information, contact Michael G. Hunter, Research Data and Evaluation Programs, Research, Evaluation and Assessment Services, Michigan Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan).

Reading Achievement in Colorado

The major assistance provided Colorado local school districts interested in improving remedial reading instruction began in 1969, according to Robert Cheuvront\(^1\) of the Compensatory Education Services Division of the Colorado Department of Education. In the May 1973 issue of Education Colorado, Cheuvront stated that the results of the Colorado General Assembly Education Achievement Act (EAA) of 1969 have led to a variety of conclusions for educators:

1. Poor readers should not be written off as helpless.

2. School districts need money to make significant changes in traditional practices, and these funds should be used to help retrain teachers and provide new materials and equipment.

3. Perhaps the exact method to be used with low-achieving students is less important than the fact that they receive attention which is related to their needs.

Funds appropriated under the EAA were distributed among approximately 68 local districts in roughly four program types. A different

emphasis on providing remedial instruction was utilized for each program:

Program A emphasized the utilization of adult teacher aides to assist the regular classroom teachers, Program B emphasized the use of commercially prepared instructional programs, Program C emphasized the use of teaching machines and programmed materials for the machines, and Program D represented a variety of different projects in five districts that didn't fit the classifications of categories A, B or C.

The state funding was maintained in approximately the same districts from fall 1969 until June 1972.

Thirteen projects in 60 districts were involved in the adult teacher aide program at an average per-pupil cost of $185 for the three-year period. Cheuvront stated that the major reason for the aides was to provide greater personal attention to each student through reducing the adult-student ratio. In these projects elementary pupils showed a gain for 1972 of approximately 1.3 years and junior high students increased their reading ability by 2.9 years. Aides were not provided at the senior high level.

Two large districts participated in Program B, using commercially prepared reading instructional materials and methods. The average cost per pupil for the three-year period was $95. Conducted at the elementary level only in 1971-72, pupils showed an average gain of approximately one year.

Programmed teaching materials and machines were used in five different districts, with an average cost of $221 per pupil. In Program C, students in elementary, junior high, and senior high grades were included in the project. Reading gains averaged approximately
one year in the elementary, 1.1 years in the junior high, and 2.3 years in the senior high grades in 1971-72.

Five schools participated in the various Program D projects, which cost $289 per pupil over the three-year period. Students in these programs gained an average of 1.3 years in the elementary and junior high grades and 2.3 years in the senior high grades. Included among the Program D projects was the pairing of older students with younger ones with the older student assisting the younger. Another district used the national Follow Through program principles to continue the work begun by Head Start in the elementary grades.

Cheuvront does not say the results of these state-sponsored programs will provide the answers needed to truly achieve reading reform. However, he does believe, "The promise provided by the past efforts of the EAA is that no future child who has the physical and mental capabilities will complete programs in our schools without being functionally literate. Within these programs are procedures to compensate for learning losses a child has incurred."

Colorado has been funded as a Right To Read state and is presently attempting to provide remedial reading services in all of its local school districts.

(For further information, contact Robert F. Cheuvront, Consultant, Compensatory Education Services, Colorado Department of Education, Denver, Colorado.)

Other States are also Helping

Many other state boards of education throughout the United
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States are also going beyond educational rhetoric without action and are attempting to provide leadership and/or additional monetary support for local school districts working to improve their reading programs.

Included among these are:

Mississippi,¹ where an elective achievement testing program in reading, math and language was made available to all school districts beginning in 1970-71 and the state department of education has developed "Guidelines To Reading," a document designed to provide ideas for reading teachers in grades 1-6, where reading is a compulsory subject.

New Jersey,² where the department of education conducted a statewide survey of reading practices K-12 to establish baseline data to use when planning future services and materials for local school districts (n.b., Results should be available by May 1974.). A recent state Supreme Court ruling has initiated a study by the department to define a "thorough and efficient" education program in reading and other curriculum areas, and field-testing was under way in 1973 of in-service sessions on the diagnostic approach to classroom reading. Additionally, reading supervisor certification requirements have been upgraded, effective July 1, 1975.

¹Baird, Mary Ann, Mississippi Department of Education State Reading Supervisor, In a letter to the author, August 13, 1973, 1-2.
²Swalm, James E., New Jersey Department of Education Supervising Consultant in Reading, In a letter to the author, September 17, 1973, 1-3.
Nebraska,\(^1\) where a number of reading projects have been developed under grants from Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act (ESEA) and designated as model programs for adoption in other school districts. The model programs range from early childhood to high school, and as local school personnel identify their needs, the state can help by providing programs to fit these needs. The criteria for model programs require uniqueness, evaluation showing positive student gains in reading, low cost of adoption, and easy adoptability for other schools with similar needs.

Florida,\(^2\) where reading was selected in 1972 as the first subject area to be assessed in the initial statewide objective-based test. The statewide assessment program resulted from the Accountability Act of 1971, which required that statewide objectives be established and student achievement of each objective be assessed. Floyd Christian, Commissioner of Education, said in November 1972 that the ultimate effect of the assessment effort will be to provide information for tailoring instruction experiences to the specific needs of individual students.

Connecticut,\(^3\) where the state has identified, through a statewide reading assessment in 1971-72, Connecticut's most severe reading

\(^1\)Petersen, Susan, Nebraska Department of Education Dissemination Consultant in Reading, In a letter to the author, September 17, 1973, 1-2.

\(^2\)Christian, Floyd T., In a press release from the Florida Commissioner of Education's office (Tallahassee) to the National School Public Relations Association, November 16, 1972, 1-5.

problems; has developed an instrument for local schools to use in evaluating and improving their reading programs (i.e., "Criteria For Assessing School Reading Programs"); and has adopted a 12-point, ten-year plan to help the state's children read to their full potential.

Included among the 12 points are the production of video-taped demonstrations of the teaching of reading which can be used for inservice education of teachers, increased certification requirements in reading for all elementary teachers and secondary English teachers, the development of a self-evaluation instrument for local schools to assist them in formulating their reading curriculum, provisions for consultant services so children in day-care centers will have an enriched language and experience background for learning to read, the development of a supply of early childhood for learning kits to be loaned to homes with children in need of enriched experience to help guarantee initial success in learning to read, and incentive grants to strengthen reading instruction for educationally disadvantaged children.

Utah, where the state law forbids the legislature or state board of education to prescribe textbooks. However, the state board has developed a comprehensive reading guide Reading for Information and Enjoyment and a "Reading Position Paper" for guidance for local school district personnel. Additionally, the state has developed a

---


2 Hancock, Vola, Utah Board of Education Reading Education Specialist, In a letter to the author, October 18, 1973, 1-3.
four-part Reading Handbook, which deals with teachers and students, diagnosis, vocabulary, functional reading, recreational reading, oral reading, reading in the content area, and writing and reading programs. Maryland, where responses from 11,000 state residents during an extensive education needs assessment survey revealed that the primary concern of the citizenry was that their children learn to read. The survey was prompted by a 1971 state law requiring (1) school accountability and (2) that the state report in January 1975 on accomplishments for the 1973-74 school year. According to Maryland State Superintendent of Public Instruction James A. Sensenbaugh, the high points of the new law include: accountability for the operation and management of the public schools; educational goals and objectives, subject areas including, but not limited to, reading, writing and math; programs for meeting needs based on priorities; evaluation programs; re-evaluation of programs, goals, objectives and guidelines; assistance and coordination; and a report and recommendations for changes in legislation. In discussing the law at Maryland University on November 28, 1972, Sensenbaugh said that close coordination between all levels of school government and administration would be required, since the law placed responsibility with each and not just with the state education department.

1 "Maryland Survey Finds Reading Paramount Public Concern." Education Daily, V (December 26, 1972), 3-4.

2 Sensenbaugh, James A., Maryland Superintendent of Schools, "Accountability in Education in Maryland." A speech at the University of Maryland Adult Education Center, Baltimore, November 28, 1972, 1-12. (Mimeographed)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Oregon, where the state department of education has prepared a planning statement (i.e., "Emphasis on Prevention--A Statement on the Teaching of Reading") for districts to use as a guide in developing their local plans for improving their reading program. Each district in the state has utilized the plan and filed a district reading plan with the state.

Arkansas, where the state board has conducted a needs assessment program in grades 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 and has prepared a guide book on reading (i.e., READING: A Guide For Elementary Teachers) to assist both elementary teachers and administrators.

Wisconsin, where reading and mathematics were selected as the first areas to be assessed in spring, 1973, following a mandate from the state legislature to do educational assessment. Additionally, the state has updated certification requirements for reading teachers and specialists and has changed the certification code to include course work in developmental reading for all teachers regardless of grade level or subject area.

Other states, especially those included in Phase I Right To Read funding, have initiated extensive programs of leadership and assistance.

---

1 Florence, Ninette, Oregon State Department of Education Reading Education Specialist, In a letter to the author, August 17, 1973, 1-3.

2 Hubbard, Vernice, Arkansas Department of Education Supervisor of Reading and Elementary Education, In a letter to the author, August 6, 1973, 1-3.

3 Klein, Marvin L., Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction English/Language Arts Consultant, In a letter to the author, August 9, 1973, 1.
to local school districts. For instance, California, Texas, and Ohio have all initiated programs with many key elements similar to Minnesota's.

Following an *Education U.S.A.* survey of the state departments of education, however, it is obvious that the services offered the local school board of education, administration and faculty vary widely from state to state at the current time. Nevertheless, if the federal Right To Read program continues to grow and expand, local schools should find during the coming years that the services and leadership provided by their state boards of education will increase dramatically.

Edward Cain of the R2R staff summarized the federal view of the states' value in conquering the nation's reading problem during the July 1973 Phase I meeting of state R2R directors when he said, "The

---

1Reagan, Ronald, Governor of California, In a letter to the author, September 4, 1973, 2.

2Davis, Clestia, Texas Education Agency Reading Consultant, In a letter to the author, September 6, 1973, 1-5.


4Boes, Shirley, and Roger D. Dixon, "NSPRA Query On Reading In The States." A survey of the fifty state departments of education, conducted July-October, 1973, and prepared under the direction of the National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Virginia. Twenty-four states responded to the survey.

5Cain, Edward, Right To Read Assistant Director, In a presentation during the July 12, 1973, meeting of the Phase I Right To Read State Directors in Washington, D.C.
reading problem in this nation cannot be solved without the cooperation of the states."

If Ruth Holloway and the members of the R2R staff have their way in the future, the states will provide ever-increasing assistance to local school districts. In fact, growing support from the states will probably continue even if R2R efforts falter, as local, state and national pressures to eliminate functional illiteracy continue to grow at a rapid rate.
CHAPTER IV

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE SCHOOLS?

Reading has been declared a national educational priority and a number of state boards of education are attempting to provide leadership and financial assistance for local school districts; however, the big question is what's happening in the schools?

Are reading programs being developed that produce positive, measured results (i.e., Successful programs are generally accepted to be those that produce a minimum of one month of reading growth for each month of instruction.)? If so, what are these districts doing and are these programs versatile enough to be adopted by other school districts in the nation?

Results from an Education U.S.A. survey† of the largest school districts in the United States indicate reading is rapidly becoming a major item of concern and local administrators and teachers are working, often with community leaders and volunteers, to produce increasingly better reading programs.

For example, over 62 percent of the schools responding to the survey indicated they now have either a coordinated K-12 (i.e., 53 percent) or K-8 reading program, and many other schools indicated they

†Boes, Shirley, and Roger D. Dixon, "NSPRA Query on Reading In The Nation's Schools." A survey of the 100 largest school districts in the United States, conducted July-October, 1973, and prepared under the direction of the National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Virginia. Forty-five schools responded to the query.
were planning such an effort.

Additionally, 90 percent of the schools have conducted a recent assessment of their reading program, and 27 percent of them do so on a yearly basis. As a result of these surveys, over 70 percent of the schools have instituted changes in their system, primarily through the expansion of their current programs to include more diversified individualized materials and of their staff to include more reading teachers and/or specialists.

Perhaps the most important aspect for local school district personnel of the increased emphasis on the development of improved reading programs is the fact that these new programs are being highly publicized. The federal government, the states, educational journals, a large number of family magazines, and the press in general are producing story after story about exemplary reading programs that can serve as guides for local school personnel attempting to initiate changes to increase the effectiveness of their reading programs.

Scores of schools now have developed or are working to create successful programs, and a few of those are discussed briefly in the following pages. Since it is impossible to give the complete data concerning each program or to include all of the outstanding programs currently in operation, contact people have been listed if further information is desired.

Dade County's (Florida) D.I.P.

The Dade County Public School system1 (Miami, Florida) is the

---
1Slack, Georgia, "Reading In Dade County Public Schools." An unpublished summary of reading efforts in the Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida, prepared for the author in September 1973, 1-4.
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sixth largest in the nation and is located in a sprawling metropolis that encompasses farm lands and city ghettos, middle class suburbia and blue collar housing developments, and thousands of Cuban refugees.

In line with Florida State Department of Education guidance, the system has declared the improvement of reading competence as its number one priority for its 240,000 students.

Like most of the schools surveyed by Education U.S.A., Dade schools have been moving away from large group, subject-matter-oriented instruction toward a diagnostically individualized program for the past three years. This program is designed to provide for the instructional needs of the potentially gifted, average and below average students, primarily through small group instruction. Group composition, instructional methods and materials are determined by the needs of the students.

Dade County's efforts to revise their reading curriculum began in 1968-69 when a reading task force of educators with expertise in reading instruction recommended the establishment of individualized diagnostic-prescriptive, developmental reading programs. In 1970-71, they began compiling and releasing systemwide test scores, which indicated improvement was needed in basic skills instruction, including reading, in the system.

Dade County's reading push is a coordinated one, involving students from kindergarten through twelfth grade. For example, at the kindergarten level some 10,000 of the county's 12,000 five-year-olds in 161 of 173 elementary schools were involved during the 1973-74 school year in the Southwest Regional Laboratory's reading readiness
program SWRL.

Initiated the previous year, the program, according to school officials, is highly popular with the staff and the board of education, which matched a $50,000 federal grant for the program during the 73-74 school year. The 12 other elementary schools are using other structured reading skill programs similar to SWRL.

A systems approach to reading is being used for first through sixth grade youngsters. This management technique permits the classroom teacher to diagnose what skills a student has and/or needs, prescribe the proper techniques for learning, and assess the results.

In an attempt to provide training in classroom management techniques for the school elementary teacher, over 1200 attended special summer training sessions in 1972 and 1973. During these sessions, the teachers were given instruction in how to rearrange their conventional classrooms into learning centers, group children according to skill development, work with one group while others work independently, use materials from a variety of sources, and keep the records necessary for a viable systems approach.

Teachers were not the only staff members involved in the special training either. A group of 100 principals and assistant principals were also involved in the summer learning programs. Included among their instruction were such practical items as how to get local carpet companies to donate remnants so youngsters could sit comfortably on the floor in small groups; how to get fathers and interested parent-teacher groups to build shelves for the stacks of materials used in systems approach; and, how to function in a classroom where noise is
not prohibited as youngsters tutor their peers.

Development of the systems approach has been one of the major tasks of the school system since 1970. During this time, staff members have worked to identify effective components of existing commercially produced materials and adapt them to the sequential skill development program at Dade County.

Performance objectives have also been established. Assessment items to measure these objectives were designed, field tested and revised. Finally, the objectives and assessment items were organized into usable banks, procedures for using the banks were developed, and staff development programs were organized.

In addition to regular teaching personnel, volunteers figure heavily in the Dade systems approach. Parents, college students, and public school students—sometimes as young as fifth and sixth graders—are all being used to help students improve their reading skills.

In 12 of the county's 39 junior high schools, High Intensity Reading Labs—each staffed by a teacher and an aide—were being established in late 1973. The other junior highs received an extra $1,000 allocation for reading materials to begin reading lab establishment, with the possibility that additional monies would be forthcoming when available. At the senior high level, Title I and Model Cities funds are also being used to establish similar reading labs.

Although the systems approach has presented some problems and takes a great deal of work on the part of the teachers, school officials say the overwhelming majority of the staff who began using the approach two years ago have accepted it and are recommending it to their colleagues.
The basal reader is also in general use and many schools rely on a variety of other approaches to reading, as each strives to meet the needs of its particular student population; however, the primary guideline at Dade is meeting individual needs through flexibility in programming and assessment of stated reading objectives.

(For further information, contact Richard O. White, Director, Department of Program Development, Dade County Public Schools, 1410 N. E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.)

LaLuz (New Mexico) Attacks Illiteracy

In 1972, 30 percent of the students at La Luz Elementary School in Albuquerque, New Mexico, couldn't read at all. In November, 1973, the school was featured in American Education as having one of the best reading programs in the country.

Selected as a Right To Read expansion site school (i.e., a school which has promising reading programs and contains a substantial number of students who have average to above average reading ability) for the 1972-73 school year, La Luz was targeted as the pilot school for the entire Albuquerque School System due to its severe reading problems.

The La Luz school has a racially-mixed student population of over 600 students in grades K-6: 348 Mexican Americans, 244 whites, 35 Indians, and one black.

---

According to Ms. Henrietta Sanchez, who took over the La Luz principalship after the 1971-72 school year, parental involvement at the school was "almost nil". The teachers were frustrated in their efforts and needed help in specific reading techniques, student absenteeism was running as high as 40 percent, attitudes were poor, and an assessment test of student reading abilities showed discouragingly low scores, as most of the children were reading below their grade levels.

Her first effort at remodeling the school's program involved working with the teachers, explaining the R2R program and exchanging ideas. After her initial work with the staff, Ms. Sanchez identified 17 parents who were active in school affairs and immediately enlisted them as members of a planning team for the new program. Many of these parents were later signed on as paraprofessional classroom aides.

The broad-guaged testing of the La Luz students was then initiated to determine exactly where the youngsters were in their reading abilities. This initial testing was followed by additional testing by commercial and staff-designed instruments to further determine areas where student reading skills were weakest.

The next major move Ms. Sanchez and her staff initiated was communication with the school's parents.

"From the beginning we let the parents know where their children stood in reading skill. If they were poor readers, we were honest and told them so. We wanted them to know precisely the situation that confronted us. How could they possibly help in the workshop if they didn't have the true picture?" she said.

In a project summary by R2R, three of the strongest components
for the success of the La Luz program were identified as: staff
development, a diagnostic-prescriptive approach and strong parental
involvement.

Additionally, Ms. Sanchez mobilized another corps of reading
aides to supplement the parent paraprofessionals. This group initially
included 31 tutors from the Special Education Department and 16 stu-
dent teachers from the Education Department of the University of New
Mexico, six teaching assistants from Freedom High School, three
interested girls from a nearby detention home, and two girls from a
neighborhood youth center. During the ensuing year, as many as 104
people were involved in teaching reading at the school.

And, the parents and student aides proved highly effective in
working on a one-to-one basis with the slow readers, especially in
the lower grades.

Other actions included a program to enter the homes of preschool
parents and provide four- and five-year-olds and their parents with
prereading training, based on 45-minute instruction periods. Finally,
Ms. Sanchez bought the most advanced teaching aids and materials she
could find.

Although the program did not produce a problem-free situation at
La Luz (i.e., The two major weaknesses identified for future work
include vocabulary building and an attempt to provide further techni-
cal assistance for the paraprofessionals.), the overall results were
more than acceptable and Ms. Sanchez expects the parents to pick up
the extra costs to continue the program when OE funds run out. In-
cluded among the changes noted following one year in the program were:
1. Many children achieved a two-or-three-grade jump in reading ability.

2. The first graders progressed fastest of all.

3. Boys improved more than girls. (Ms. Sanchez feels this occurred because of two major reasons: (a) the boys were generally farther behind than the girls and required more personal attention from the teachers and (b) most of the reading materials were girl-oriented, so the school began stocking reading matter of interest to boys.)

4. The high absenteeism rate plummeted, while low student morale and negative attitudes completely reversed themselves into positive factors at the school.

(For further information, contact Ms. Henrietta Sanchez, Principal, La Luz Elementary School, North Area, Albuquerque Public Schools, Albuquerque, New Mexico.)

Fort Worth (Texas): Continuum of Reading Skills K-12

In an attempt to head off reading problems before they develop, the majority of American schools have traditionally centered their reading instructional efforts at the elementary level, growing increasingly lax in this area as students progress through the grades. However, as indicated by the Education U.S.A. survey, more and more administrators and teachers are working to develop a co-ordinated K-12 reading program that provides reading diagnosis and instruction through-

---

1Boes, op. cit.
out a student's school years.

The Fort Worth Independent School District\(^1\) has been making a concentrated effort in this area, with special emphasis on developing their reading program at the middle school and secondary levels, since 1970.

At the elementary level, the school district\(^2\) has adopted six basal reading programs for students. In addition, spelling and English textbooks and a variety of auxiliary reading materials, used under a modified systems approach, are utilized to reinforce and extend the reading program skills.

The multiple adoption of textbooks and the use of the modified systems approach are designed to help the classroom teacher correlate the materials and approaches needed to meet the individual needs of the children, who operate on a continuum of twenty-five reading levels in the elementary schools, moving to new skill areas after they meet the objectives at their current level.

In an effort to continue this reading effort, the district\(^3\) has implemented a continuous progress skills program at the secondary level (grades 6-12). This program includes five major skill areas (i.e.,


\[^3\text{Mills, Ruby, In a response to the "NSPRA Query on Reading in the Nation's Schools" from the Fort Worth (Texas) Independent School District, September 1973, 1.}\]
improving word study, reading with understanding, using various reading speeds effectively, practicing study skills, and independent reading), with 800 sub-category skills and seven phase levels.

In the middle schools (i.e., grades six through eight), the teachers are organized into teams, including a team leader, regular teachers, resource teachers, instructional and clerical aides, and student and parent volunteers. During his years in the middle school, a pupil is rotated between skill areas, being placed where he needs the most assistance and on a phase level where he can function, regardless of his grade level.

In the high schools, reading centers have been created to help any pupil at any given time, regardless of his grade or ability level, and the teachers provide individualized programs for each student. The students work in small groups, moving from one assignment to the next under the direction of a teacher.

At the completion of each phase of his work, a pupil must demonstrate his ability to perform the objectives for that phase through teacher observations, standardized tests, informal tests, pupil questionnaires, charts, self-evaluation check lists, and other evaluation methods.

According to Ms. Ruby Mills, Reading Consultant, the program has been quite successful and better than the multiple text, basal reader program used in the elementary schools, because students are allowed to work in skill areas on an individual need basis, as opposed to a sequential developmental pattern. They also feel a major factor contributing to the success of the program has been the elimination of
the homogeneous grouping plan, since pupils are now placed on different levels in each skill, depending upon their needs.

Assessments of the middle school and high school levels are conducted yearly, using a pre and post Gates MacGinitie Reading Test to help determine problem areas and to determine teaching strategy for coming years. Additional testing includes the use of various forms of the Gray Oral Reading Test for further specific diagnostic purposes, and school reading specialists administer the Quick Test and the Cattell Culture Fair Test to determine potential levels of students.

Teacher in-service is also a major part of the Fort Worth program, as each reading consultant is responsible for several days of in-service programming of the ten days required yearly for teachers.

The secondary reading teachers have also taken 14 hours of college graduate work to write a Continuous-Progress Reading Program for secondary schools and the Basic Studies - Secondary Reading Program.

Although the administration and faculty have been working for the past three years to develop the program, they are not yet finished. Included in their reading efforts for the 1973-74 school year are development of a materials retrieval system and a criterion-referenced test based on the 800 objectives program.

As a result of their testing, which has indicated the success of their earlier efforts, a number of other activities are currently being initiated or expanded:

1. The secondary reading teachers are continuing to implement the reading continuum idea in a team teaching situation, where they rotate pupils into the skills areas which are most needed at the time.
2. The high school teachers are continuing to develop the reading center program.

3. Title I reading program personnel have been organized as a satellite team to care for low phase students in small group situations.

4. The ESAA reading specialists are working to further coordinate the program between the middle and high school to begin looking more closely at assessing the needs of each pupil as an individual.

Volunteers, trained by the reading teachers, have also been used on an experimental basis. Following "very successful" early experiences with the student-parent volunteers, school officials are hoping to expand the program.

The board of education and superintendent have lent strong support to the school reading efforts, and the board\(^1\) even declared the 1972-73 school year as "Reading Emphasis Year" at Fort Worth.

In the 1973 Reading Continuum Handbook,\(^2\) developed over a three-year period by a committee of teachers to provide the guidelines for the Fort Worth skills-centered program, Superintendent Julius Truelson noted: "Authorities estimate that between eighty and ninety percent of the learning which takes place in the secondary schools is based upon reading. Therefore, a pupil's ability to handle the reading required in secondary schools becomes critical. His graduation with honors—or his inability to cope with his work—have a direct correla-

\(^1\)Fort Worth (Texas) Independent School District Board of Education, "Reading Resolution." A resolution declaring 1972-73 as "Reading Emphasis Year" in the Fort Worth Independent School District, September 27, 1972, and forwarded to the author in September 1973. (Mimeographed)

\(^2\)Fort Worth (Texas) Independent School District Department of Curriculum, Reading Continuum Handbook, op. cit., iii.
tion to his ability to read with comprehension."

(For further information, contact Ms. Ruby Mills, Reading Consultant, Fort Worth Independent School District, 3210 West Lancaster, Fort Worth, Texas 76107.)

Criterion Reading In Linden (New Jersey)

A highly developed community located within 20 miles of New York City, Linden, New Jersey, has developed as a manufacturing center for both heavy and light industry. The city's population of over 41,000 residents is highly diverse, with a wide variety of ethnic backgrounds evidenced by the fact that almost 17,000 are either foreign born or the children of at least one foreign born parent.

A district-wide student assessment using the Stanford Achievement Test indicated that students in grades two through six were below national norms.

Reading deficiencies increased as the students progressed through school, which indicated to school officials a strong need for emphasis at the readiness and prereading levels. During the 1971-72 school year, the school received an initial allocation of $107,923 from ESEA Title I funds and initiated their highly-publicized "Criterion Reading Instructional Project".

Diagnostic tests and teacher recommendations were used to select

the 220 students who participated in the first year program.

Based on a "test-teach-test" method to identify individual student needs on a hierarchy of skills, small group or individualized instruction was the most commonly used method of instruction. The team approach was used in some schools and learning centers were set up within the classes to teach or reinforce the skills which the assessment identified. Students who worked in small groups of two to four were then rotated from center to center as they completed assigned activities.

Among the wide variety of instructional materials and educational equipment used to supplement the criterion reading hierarchy of skills were: Language Masters, controlled readers, language development kits, individualized phonics kits, educational games, prepared and teacher-created tapes and cassettes, and a wide variety of other educational tools.

During the project year, in-service teacher training included visits by Title I teachers to the classrooms throughout the district, classroom observations, workshops by publishing companies, and Title I staff programs designed to familiarize the teachers with the wide variety of materials available in the program.

A number of teachers' aides were also used to assist in the program, as were parents of children either participating or eligible to participate in the program. These parents were organized at each school into a parent council, which met four times yearly to make recommendations to a city-wide executive parent council composed of local council representatives. The executive council met monthly
with community and school personnel who acted in an advisory capacity.

During the first year of the program, two of the three major performance objectives were achieved and significant progress was made in the third. The primary objectives of the program, which were tested after seven months of participation, included:

1. Kindergarten students will demonstrate an average gain of seven months in reading as measured by the ABC Inventory. (In fact, the average gain was 14 months, double the objective level.)

2. A minimum of 80 percent of the first grade students will demonstrate the cognitive skills required to gain one or more levels for readiness as measured by the Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness Profile. (Of the 103 students who took the post-test, 95 met the desired proficiency level, representing 92 percent success.)

3. A minimum of 66 percent of the first grade students will demonstrate the cognitive skills required for reading readiness as measured by their scoring at the sixtieth percentile or above on the individual subtests of the Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness Profile. (Of the five areas tested, the students scored well above the minimum level in three of the five subtest areas, but did not meet the objective in two others.)

The overall success of the Linden Criterion Reading Instructional Project led to its being featured at the May 1973 Education Fair.

(For further information, contact Anita Schmidt, Office of the Superintendent, 16 West Elizabeth Avenue, Linden, New Jersey 07036.)
Corrective Reading in Wichita

Although over 50 percent of the schools responding to the Education U.S.A. survey indicated they had established a coordinated K-12 reading program, Wichita's Corrective Reading Program\(^1\) is perhaps one of the oldest and most effective.

A metropolitan community of approximately 263,000 people, Wichita is located in south central Kansas. The public school system first began its compensatory education program in the spring of 1966 as a Title I project with corrective reading as its focus, with the long range goal of improving reading instruction grade level and the basic reading skills of vocabulary and comprehension for Title I eligible students. However, reading efforts have not been limited to just Title I students at Wichita, as teachers and students in other reading programs and curriculums have benefited from offshoots of this primary effort.

The major emphasis of the program is on a preventive approach to corrective reading problems in grades one, two and three. As noted, other youngsters are also included in the program, which operates K-9, and in the 1973-74 school year, the system added to their special reading teacher staff to direct even greater attention toward pupils with reading problems in grades 4-6.

Regular needs assessment--primarily through the use of standardized instruments like the Metropolitan Readiness Test in first grade,

\(^1\)Howell, James, "Corrective Reading Program - 1973-74." A nine-page, unpublished paper forwarded to the author October 30, 1973, from the Wichita Public Schools, Wichita, Kansas, 1-3. (Mimeographed)
the Metropolitan Achievement Test in second grade, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills in the upper grades—is a major part of the school's efforts. Individual deficiencies and instructional needs are assessed from pupil personnel records, the results of the tests, and specific skill deficiencies indicated through criterion-referenced tests. Basically, three levels of needs are identified: mild corrective, one to two years below grade level; corrective, over two years below grade level; and severe corrective, nonreading.

The program utilizes a team approach that combines the efforts of administrators, classroom teachers, nurses, counselors, parents, and special reading teachers to correct the deficiencies. Additionally, experimental approaches are encouraged and evaluated, with the more successful ones continued. Priority help is aimed at the mild corrective and corrective cases, especially in the lower grades, where school officials feel the students can best be prevented from developing even greater reading and social problems in the future.

Six major phases are included in the program: identification of students with reading problems, screening, diagnosis, scheduling, instruction and evaluation. Special reading teachers with paraprofessionals are assigned to one or more attendance centers to meet students in small groups of two to eight in 30 to 60 minute periods three to five times per week.

Parents have also been involved as a built-in factor in the program since its inception, and the special reading teachers' time allocation requires four-fifths for pupil instruction and one-fifth for planning, visitations and conferences with parents. Included
among the procedures is the involvement of a Title I Parent Council in the recruitment of paraprofessional aides.

According to James Howell, director of reading, the system uses 850 volunteers K-12 and they have proven "very effective" in providing reading guidance for students and support for the teachers. He added that the volunteers and tutors are not merely sent into the classrooms cold, but receive special training before they begin their efforts.

"Tutors receive 20 hours of preservice and 20 hours of in-service training," he said. "They work with individual students under the supervision of the classroom teacher."

Reading teachers in the system also receive extensive in-service on an annual basis, including four in-service sessions after school, paid curriculum summer workshops, and an annual in-service session in the system's Reading Services Center.

Although systemwide reading behavioral objectives have been established and criterion tests have been written to test these, the system does not rely on any single program to solve the needs of its students.

"We have not eliminated any of the systems that we are using," said Howell. "It is our experience that the teacher--not materials--is the critical factor. Most of our programs are eclectic at the teacher's discretion."

---

1Howell, James, In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Wichita (Kansas) Public Schools, October 1973, 1-2.
In addition to the written behavioral objectives and reading in-service provided for the reading staff and the tutors and paraprofessionals in the 106 different Wichita schools (K-12), a number of background materials and teaching tools and guidelines have been prepared for instructors including: Team Approach To Successful Reading, a handbook for corrective reading; The JOY of READING, a "cookbook" for secondary developmental reading; Secondary Reading Handbook, a publication designed to provide secondary administrators, counselors, and teachers with a general guideline and description of the secondary reading courses; Almost Everything English Teachers Want to Know About Reading Skills (But Were Afraid To Ask), a collection of reading information, techniques, and tools; Guide To Reading Skills K-6, an extensive outline guide and background source book for elementary reading instructors; and Band-Aids For Reading Aides or What to Do 'Till the Special Reading Teacher Arrives, a comprehensive booklet designed to provide background information in reading, job expectations and other critical guidelines for reading aides and tutors.

The overall results of the long-running program have been impressive. For instance, the results of a study1 of over 1500 students in grades two through nine enrolled in the corrective reading program during the 1971-72 school year showed gains ranging from eight to thirteen months in vocabulary grade scores, seven to fourteen months in comprehension grade scores, and eleven to seventeen months in instruc-

1_____, "Title I Corrective Reading in Wichita." A pamphlet from the Wichita (Kansas) Public Schools describing the Wichita Title I Corrective Reading Program for the 1971-72 school year, 1972.
Manhattan's P. S. II: Success in the Inner-City

Manhattan's P. S. II (K-5) in Chelsea is an unlikely candidate for national recognition. It is a hard-core, inner-city school, with an average class size of 32 per teacher, and the building is old. The pupils are both "disadvantaged" (i.e., Approximately 80 percent qualify for free lunch.) and racially mixed. Roughly half are Puerto Rican and 17 percent are black.

However, following a nation-wide search in 1970-71 for schools with proven success in teaching poor children to read well, P. S. II was selected by George Weber of the Council for Basic Education (CBE) as one of four outstanding inner-city schools in the U.S. (n.b., The others were the John H. Finley School (P. S. 129) in Manhattan, Woodland School in Kansas City, and the Ann Street School in Los Angeles.) It was featured in a CBE Occasional Paper "Inner-City Children Can Be Taught To Read: Four Successful Schools."

According to the results of regular evaluation of pupil progress, on-the-site visitations by Weber, and test scores on a culturally unbiased instrument devised and field tested in advance by Weber, the...
the students at P. S. 11 were achieving reading success significantly higher than others in "typical inner-city schools." For example, 42 to 46 percent of the third-graders tested scored at the fourth grade or higher level on a national norm basis, much better than the 15 to 25 percent normally found in such schools.

Although constructed in 1925 and classified as an old building, P. S. 11 is a clean, orderly and business-like school with a purposeful-optimistic atmosphere, according to Weber. Murray A. Goldberg, principal, is highly concerned with the school and its reading program. He runs a "tight ship" and operates from a well-organized base. The current reading program has been in existence for several years, and Goldberg\(^1\) says it is still succeeding and has not been changed since the CBE report was issued in October 1971.

Teachers in the schools have a great deal of freedom in selecting materials and programs, since P. S. 11 has no single reading program.\(^2\) Eight or nine sets of reading materials are available to the instructors, including the Scott Foresman basals, the Bank Street readers, the Science Research Associates' We Are Black series, SRA's reading laboratory, the McCormick-Mathers' phonics workbooks, and a variety of other commercial materials, games and teacher-created materials, which generally center around a phonics approach. Also, in addition to a large school library, every classroom has a library of its own, with a wide variety of storybooks.


\(^2\)Weber, op. cit.
A specialized reading teacher works with the poorer reading students in groups of six during two 45-minute sessions weekly, and she uses a large variety of phonics materials not used in the regular classrooms. Her efforts, as well as those of the regular classroom teachers, focus on individualization, with diagnosis of pupil ability being a key element in the program. Regular classroom reading instruction includes from one- and a-half to two hours a day of work.

Students are grouped on a carefully-constructed heterogeneous basis, with pupils being ranked in terms of reading achievement and assigned to classes by random distribution of each of the various achievement groups. The school provides additional help for the regular classroom teacher through the use of supplementary "cluster teachers" (i.e., a fourth teacher for every three classes), who visit each of their three classes one- and a-half hours daily and either instruct the class or aid the regular teacher by working with groups of students within the class.

In summing up P. S. 11's success in reading, Weber noted that the extra personnel and a pre-kindergarten element were advantages, but not highly significant since other schools with similar elements should be--but generally weren't--equally successful.

"At P. S. 11 there is the order and purpose of a well-run school. High expectations and concern for every pupil are reflected in many things, including the atmosphere of individualization. Most of all, there is an obvious emphasis on early reading achievement and the importance given to phonics instruction," said Weber.

(For further information, contact Murray A. Goldberg, Principal, P. S. 11, Manhattan, 320 West 21st Street, New York, New York 10011.)
Evansville-Vanderburgh's Summer Television Project

School officials in the Evansville-Vanderburgh Schools,¹ located in southern Indiana, were becoming increasingly concerned by the late 1960's with student learning losses during the summer vacation months, especially in reading and mathematics. Comprehensive educational studies and an extensive examination of local school records reinforced their feeling that something needed to be done to help students avoid losing much of what they had already learned during the summer.

Their concern extended beyond just the poor readers, who often had the opportunity to attend remedial classes during the summer. According to school officials, there was no accommodation to help all children to maintain their learning achievement during the summer months, nor were most school districts financially capable of offering supplementary services to all children during the summer.

Therefore, with financial aid through Title III funding, school reading specialists initiated an ambitious project to develop reading and mathematics instruction for all youngsters--not just those in the local school district--during summer vacation: Summer Television Arithmetic and Reading. (An initial grant of $153,257 was approved in May, 1970. Since then, a total of over $440,000 has been awarded to the school to continue development of the project.)

¹“Descriptive Data: Summer Television Arithmetic and Reading.” A paper forwarded to the author by Jack Humphrey, Project Director, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana, August 17, 1973, 1-10. (Mimeographed)
There were three major goals of the project: to maintain academic basic skills over the summer months, to involve parents in the learning process and to involve teachers in reading in-service training. Since they first initiated their project, the district has produced five color television programs for students in grades two through nine (i.e., Ride the Reading Rocket, two; Catch a Bubble, three; Up Up and Away, four through six; A Math-A-Magic World, five through eight; and Summer Journal, seven through nine).

Additional materials developed at the school include a brochure and a one half-hour program for parents entitled Tips for Parents of Pre-schoolers and the Reading In-Service Television Series for teachers, which consists of ten half-hour programs that present practical ideas and techniques to help teachers meet the needs of today's students.

Arrangements were made with educational and commercial television stations throughout Indiana to telecast the programs, which were available on a voluntary basis to all interested children and adults. In an attempt to inform as many people as possible of the special programs, an intensive information campaign was conducted by disseminating information about the project to all principals and superintendents in the state prior to the start of each series.

During the project period, 66,000 workbooks to be read at home while reviewing the programs were sold to dubious youngsters, and commercial TV advertising executives estimated that for every child who purchased a book there were ten more watching without workbooks. The workbooks were made available for each series and contained
materials designed to help maintain the skills the students already have, as well as enhance their normal learning rate. An estimated 3,000 teachers viewed the Reading In-Service Series and 10,000 parents watched the Tips for Parents of Preschoolers.

Evaluation results have proven the effectiveness of the program. For instance, a study of approximately 2,500 first grade children in a control and an experimental group showed that first graders normally lose two months in reading achievement during the summer. Children watching over half of the 40 telecasts in the Ride the Reading Rocket series gained a full month in reading achievement during the summer.

Pre- and post-tests, using the Nelson Reading Tests, of third and fourth grade students watching Up Up and Away showed a mean gain of 1.6 months of reading achievement during the summer. The math program studies produced even more impressive results.

Positive comments by the thousands were forwarded from parents and teachers, who participated in the program or had children who did so. On a questionnaire, seventy-five percent of the teachers responded that in-service training via television was effective.

One of the key items of interest for local school district personnel is the exportability factor built into the project. The television programs have been produced on video tape and can be distributed to other areas.¹ Currently available are Ride the Reading Rocket and Summer Journal, which cost $2,500 to lease for broadcast on the air or $7,200 to purchase as 40 half-hour U-Matic Videocassette lessons.

¹Tredway, Joy, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation (Evansville, Indiana) Reading Clinician, In a phone interview with the author, November 11, 1973.
The *Catch A Bubble* series is scheduled to be ready for distribution by spring or summer, 1974. The preview materials and programs are being distributed by the Great Plains National Instructional Television Instructional Television Library, P. O. Box 80669, Lincoln, Nebraska 68501.

The program has proven so effective that the Evansville-Vanderburgh Schools were selected to receive an "Educational Pacesetter Award" for their efforts by USOE.¹ According to Joy Tredway,² Evansville-Vanderburgh reading clinician, the school district will continue televising the various series locally, since they have been so effective, even though the system must pay for the television time themselves.

(For further information, contact Jack Humphrey, Summer Television Project Director, Reading Center, Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, Administration Building, 1 S.E. Ninth Street, Evansville, Indiana 47708.)

Other Model Programs

Scores of other schools throughout the nation have also been identified as having exemplary reading programs, which offer guidelines for consideration by local school district boards of education, administrators and teachers seeking to improve their reading curricu-

¹Humphrey, Jack W., Project Director of the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation (Evansville, Indiana) Summer Television Arithmetic and Reading Project, in a letter to the author, August 17, 1973, 1.

²Tredway, op. cit.
lum. For instance, in October, 1973, eight Title III "innovative, cost-effective, and worthy of consideration for adoption/adaption" programs, including the Evansville-Vanderburgh summer television project, were identified by the National Advisory Council in a booklet Innovative Education Practices. Included among these were:

PEGASUS (Personalized Educational Growth and Achievement: Selective Utilization of Staff)

PEGASUS attacks the problem of elementary children's reading deficiency by operating a personalized, process-oriented program of continuous learning, developed and implemented locally through the organizational arrangement of a differentiated staff. The curriculum structure consists of performance objectives and corresponding diagnostic instruments within sixteen sequential reading levels.

Operating the program requires determining entry levels in reading, diagnosing skills in which instruction is needed, and grouping children according to established needs of specific skills. Necessary planning and coordinating tasks, and corresponding requirements in time and responsibility, are continually reanalyzed, reassessed, and redefined. Support components include project-directed graduate study for teachers, student-teacher training, and community involvement.

(For further information, contact Ms. Marie Sinclair, Project  

---


Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Early childhood preventive curriculum

The purpose of this project was to evaluate and further develop an early-identification program which could be effective in preventing failure in the first grade. Approximately 15 to 20 percent of the first-grade population was expected to have problems with learning in the conventional classroom. Of this percentage, one-half of the pupils fail first grade and almost all tend to develop learning disorders that require special support service and remedial programs in later grades.

To achieve the stated purpose, three areas of need were delineated and the following measurable objectives stated: (1) the learner would develop perceptual, cognitive, and language skills to the degree necessary to respond to instruction within the regular classroom; (2) the teachers who received special training would demonstrate competencies in diagnostic-prescriptive teaching skills indicated by their ability to select appropriate instruction, and individualize learning tasks, and (3) each project classroom would be established as a primary learning laboratory which would provide a fully functional and appropriate learning environment for an early identification program for students with a tendency to fail or to develop learning problems.

(For further information, contact Richard O. White, Project Director; School Board of Dade County, Lindsey Hopkins Education Center, 1410 N. E. Second Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.)
Vocational reading power

The project (n.b., grade level: 11-12) intent is to minimize or eliminate the communications-learning gap in vocational education by enrichment of teacher knowledge, attitudes and skills as they relate to text utilization, reading-related activities, and cognitive learning. The program is implemented by: (l) identifying the discrepancies between student reading levels and text reading demands; (2) involving other institutions in the community in the process of developing these materials; and (3) establishing the use of objective criteria in the evaluation, selection, and use of reading-related instructional materials.

(For further information, contact Roy J. Butz, Project Director; Oakland Schools, 2100 Pontiac Lake Road, Pontiac, Michigan 48054.)

Project INSTRUCT

All students (n.b., grade level: K-3) participating in Project INSTRUCT—especially those who have difficulty learning basic word attack language skills—receive instruction designed to improve their reading achievement scores, reduce the percentage of students who fail to learn the fundamental skills necessary to read, and provide a comprehensive program for instruction of reading skills at the primary level. The program requires that the following criteria be met: (a) is capable of being adopted and implemented readily by interested schools without extensive use of external consultants, (b) is relatively inexpensive, and (c) requires little in-service training.

Similar "mastery" curriculum has been developed for initial hand-
writing and spelling skills correlated to the basal reader. A pro-
gram of special techniques for increasing student response in all of
these instructional areas has also been designed.

(For further information, contact Carl R. Spencer, Project
Director; Lincoln Public Schools, 720 South 22nd Street, Lincoln,
Nebraska 68508.)

**Accountability in primary reading education**

Within this project (n.b., grade level: 1-3) the Burlington
City School System has elected to assume total accountability for
achievement of specific objectives. To this end, the school system
has established explicit, measurable objectives—a hierarchy of per-
ceptual and study skills to be achieved by students in the project.

Basic perceptual skills are taught and reinforced in the class-
room through basic sight word tracking, letter identification, and
phonics drill and instruction. Equipment rolls from classroom to
classroom as needed during the two-and-one-half-hour block devoted to
language arts each morning. The repetition integral to reinforcing
perceptual skills is achieved without boredom through a variety of
instrumentation.

Individual needs are identified through initial testing and a
continual monitoring system, and joint planning by classroom teachers
and laboratory personnel results in prescriptive support for the indi-
vidual child. The classroom teacher devises the format of activities
and evaluates and integrates the perceptual skills learned with the
child's basal reader program.
Measurable extensions to reading

Measurable Extensions to Reading (n.b., grade level: 5-8) is based on three major premises: Each child has a right to read, each learner can improve his reading skills and abilities, and large motor muscle movement can facilitate improvement in reading-language achievement. The major objectives of the program are to increase the reading proficiency of learners, to improve attitudes toward reading, and to develop innovative methods and materials.

Learning stations in the gymnasiums and classrooms are used to provide prescriptive individualized instruction without making sharp divisions in the class. The learning stations provide developmental, remedial and enrichment needs and become a treasure hunt for learners as they travel from station to station with curiosity and excitement. The project activities are formulated in performance and process objectives at the administrative, supportive, and instructional levels.

(For further information, contact Charles Cheney; Project Director; L. E. Berger Middle School, West Fargo, North Dakota 58078.)

Itinerancy of specialized educational services for low socio-economic deprived areas in Ciales School District:

This project (n.b., grade level: elementary, junior, senior) is geared toward use of the educational resources of a school district characterized by a high concentration of low socio-economic families.
It uses traditional itinerant services reinforced by the expertise of qualified staff personnel. Services in the areas of physical education, library facilities, art, music, and reading are designed to correct educational inequalities of the past, reduce dropout patterns, and improve reading achievement in Spanish.

The primary objectives of the project are to retain 85 to 90 percent of students enrolled at the beginning of the year while at the same time improve their abilities in Spanish and other curriculum areas.

(For further information, contact Jose M. Sanchez Torres, Project Director; Department of Education, Avenue Teniente Gonzalez, Hato Rey, Puerto Rico.)

Obviously, there are many other exemplary reading programs that have been developed by local school districts, either on their own and/or with monetary or leadership assistance from state or federal agencies; however, from the few reported here and as the results of the Education U.S.A. survey indicated, a pattern of common elements seems to have developed independently in each of these schools where students are experiencing reading success.

Elements found in most of the successful schools include: ¹ a needs assessment of the entire school system, as well as an assessment of individual student weakness; a multi-text and materials approach, as opposed to reliance on a single commercial series of books; parent involvement through in-service meetings between school

¹Boes, op. cit.
personnel and parents, home visitations and instruction in school-student needs, and the use of parents as paraprofessionals and/or volunteers; regular staff in-service training in reading methods, priorities, and objectives; follow-up assessment of programs and objectives to determine if the initial goals are being met and where new emphasis should be directed; a planned, systematic approach to attacking the reading problem; one-to-one help, where possible, with slow learners, especially through the use of volunteers, older students, and parents at home; program flexibility; and a commitment to reading as a priority, not just in English classes, but within the entire school system in all content areas.
CHAPTER V

VOLUNTEERS AND READING SUCCESS

Do volunteers and/or paraprofessionals really help students in attaining reading skills? Administrators at the schools surveyed by Education U.S.A. certainly feel their impact is significant, as 95 percent\(^1\) of the responding schools indicated they used volunteers and/or paraprofessionals in their programs.

The responses of school personnel to the impact of non-professional educators from the community were overwhelmingly favorable. Sample comments provide some indication of educator feelings:

"Great!"—Metropolitan Public Schools, Nashville, Tennessee.\(^2\)

"Volunteers have proved invaluable . . . ."—Norfolk (Virginia), City Schools.\(^3\)

"They (i.e., volunteers) have built confidence in the children as much as helping them to improve in reading skills."—Cincinnati (Ohio) Public Schools.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\)Boes, Shirley, and Roger D. Dixon, "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools." A survey of the 100 largest school districts in the United States, conducted July-October, 1973, and prepared under the direction of the National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Virginia. Forty-five schools responded to the query.

\(^2\)McDonald, Ruth, In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Metropolitan Public Schools, Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, September 1973.

\(^3\)Curry, June, In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Norfolk City Schools, Norfolk, Virginia, September 1973.

\(^4\)Evans, Anna M., In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 1973.
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"Tremendous . . . . Some students have made in excess of three years of achievement (in reading) for one year of instruction."—Dallas (Texas) Independent School District. 1

"Excellent. This is a source of dedicated help available to help the teacher individualize instruction. It is also an effective way of combining professional and community resources toward a common goal."—New York City (New York) Public Schools.2

"More individualized attention for students . . . better parent understanding of our methods of teaching reading . . . increased skills for parents in helping their own children."—Ferguson-Florissant Schools, Ferguson, Missouri.3

"Tutors have added an extra 'touch' to the reading program. They have been the individuals who have taken the time to care and have come to the schools to further assist pupils."—City School District, Rochester, New York.4

"The attitude of everyone from tutors to principals, teachers and children is very positive and for that reason if no other, the

1 Davis, Rodney, In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, Texas, August 1973.

2 Gaines, Eddythe, In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the New York City Public Schools, Brooklyn, New York, September 1973.

3 Stumpe, Doris, In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Ferguson-Florissant Schools, Ferguson, Missouri, August 1973.

4 Burkhardt, Mary L., In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the City School District, Rochester, New York, October 1973.
tutors and volunteers have been encouraged to continue in that role."—Seattle (Washington) School District No. 1.¹

In fact, it appears that the use of volunteers and paraprofessionals in reading is not only making a positive impact on students, teachers and parents, but the movement toward utilizing these interested district residents, whether paid or not, is increasing at a tremendous rate.

Only a few years ago, many educational groups feared the utilization of auxiliary personnel was little more than an administrative ploy to cut school costs;² however, in-the-classroom experiences have made believers out of most skeptics.

For instance,³ Los Angeles launched a modest volunteer program in 1963 with only 380 aides. By 1973 it had the largest program in the nation with more than 10,000 volunteers donating some 45,000 man-hours a week. In Boston the volunteer program expanded from 28 unpaid assistants in six schools in 1966 to over 1,500 in 130 schools by 1972. The number of paraprofessionals,⁴ who were used sparingly in the sixties, jumped to over 300,000 in 1973, and the National

¹Davis, Floyd W., In a response to the "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools" from the Seattle School District No. 1, Seattle, Washington, September 1973.


⁴Barnard, op. cit.
Congress of Parents and Teachers has predicted that over 1.5 million of these paid aids may be employed by America's school system by 1977.

Volunteers and paraprofessionals are also being used at all grade levels—not just primary—by the majority of the schools responding to the Education U.S.A. survey.¹

Traditionally, volunteerism and community involvement have been a part of American life since the first settlements sprang up along the eastern coastlines; however, until recently, the schools have not tended to utilize this source of free or inexpensive assistance, which has been proving so valuable in terms of student growth. Since these resources haven't been tapped in the past, for a variety of reasons, why have volunteers and paraprofessionals suddenly become such a key element in the educational vista?

Some answers appear obvious.² For instance, unpaid volunteers have become an increasingly vital factor in local schools today due, in part, to the fantastic jump in educational expenditures in recent years, rising salaries for teachers, increased pressure for certified teachers to be freed of non-teaching duties, demands for parent and community involvement in the schools, major efforts to individualize instruction, and record enrollments.

The increased use of the paid paraprofessionals in reading programs has also been generally generated by the same reasons; however, there is one other important factor in the growing utilization of

¹Boes, op. cit.
²Whaley, op. cit., 1-2.
these non-educators whose work in and around the schools frees the
teacher to perform other professional functions: federal support.¹
When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 was
passed, paraprofessionals suddenly became an integral part of the
school scene, as government compensatory education programs, especially
Title I, strongly encouraged the employment of community residents
served by the program.

Mesa's (Arizona) Competency-Based Program

Douglas Barnard,² Director of Reading in the Mesa (Arizona)
Public Schools, believes the utilization of paraprofessionals in the
public schools has been one of the "most significant educational move­
ments in the past decade."¹ Mesa has one of the nation's most exten­
sive paraprofessional programs, which Barnard describes in a 1973
monograph A Competency-Based Training Program for Reading Parapro­
essionals.

According to Barnard, the Mesa reading aides—who are classified
as "instructional" aides—are utilized in a wide variety of ways in
the district reading program. Before they begin work in the class­
room, the aides are trained to work with students under the direction
and guidance of a reading specialist.

Although the aides are used at all levels, they are initially
utilized at the first grade level. Once district officials feel the
individual needs of the first graders have been met, the reading aides

¹Barnard, op. cit.
²loc. cit., 1-12.
begin working with older children.

"The reason for this emphasis," says Barnard, "is that potential reading problems must be corrected as early as possible in a child's school experiences. The aides are an integral part of the preventive reading program."

First grade students receiving special assistance from the reading aides are selected on the basis of test scores and teacher consultation. These students are then provided with extra reading guidance from the aides, primarily in letter knowledge and identification of phonemes in spoken words.

Once the youngster achieves these skills, he begins a formalized reading program with the teacher. The aides, after working with the students at the first grade level, begin to work with children in grades two-six on a priority basis (i.e., second graders first, then third grade, etc. until all levels are being serviced).

Once priority student needs have been diagnosed and sub-skill needs identified, the youngsters are tutored in the classroom by the reading aides. Prior to any tutoring, the specific needs of students are discussed with the aide and a "prescription" written to outline measures needed to overcome the individual deficiencies.

Aide instructional time varies by grade level, with about twenty minutes being provided daily for children in groups of three-to-five at the first grade and being increased as the grade level increases.

A district reading resource teacher meets with the aide and students weekly to evaluate progress and provide guidance if a change in direction is needed. Criteria-referenced tests are used to deter-
mine if a child has mastered a given skill, and a weekly written report of progress and instruction provided is distributed to each teacher having children in the program.

One interesting aspect of the Mesa program is the criteria school officials use to select aides. "Other criteria such as educational level, writing or printing ability, fluency of speech and correct speech might be important for certain paraprofessional roles, but was not considered critical to the Mesa Reading Program," said Barnard. "The Mesa Reading Department discovered that the main criteria for selecting effective aides are that the person is personable, relates to others, and is interested in the job to be done with the children."

Therefore, the two basic, subjective criteria for the selection of reading aides at Mesa are:

1. Is the applicant personable with that "twinkle" (i.e., enthusiasm and intelligence) in the eye?
2. Does the applicant demonstrate human compassion?

"If the applicant met the two aforementioned criteria," said Barnard, "the skills to be performed could be taught and learned. Experience has indicated the assumptions inherent in the criteria to be valid."

Pre-service training for the reading aides at Mesa consists of four hours per day for one week. The program is designed to have aides working with children as soon as possible.

Upon completion of the training, the aide is assigned to a reading resource teacher at a school, where further in-service training is
provided to meet the immediate needs of individual aides, based on
pre-service test results and teacher observation. Also, no aides
are placed at a school unless they score 75 percent or greater on a
criteria-referenced test.

Once placed, each aide is on a six-week probationary period and
will be evaluated by his supervisor before being completely accepted
into the program. Reimbursement for the aides is based on scores on
the criteria-referenced test, as well as on performance evaluations
by the supervisor.

Program evaluation at Mesa has involved two key elements: student
achievement and teacher reaction.

According to Barnard, the percentage of students reading below
grade level has decreased every year since the inception of the pro-
gram and Title I evaluations have reflected an average gain in excess
of one month's gain per one month of instruction.

Staff and principal evaluations showed that the certified
teachers and administrative personnel in the schools agreed that the
aides were exceptionally well trained. These evaluations also identi-
fy the major strengths and weaknesses of the aides.

Major contributions of the aides included:

1. Providing more individual one-to-one attention for students
   in need of special reading instruction.

2. Helping provide regular guidance to children by adults on a
   consistent basis.

3. Developing positive adult-child relations in a school setting.

5. Providing feedback data to use during parent/teacher conferences.

The major weakness of the program, as identified by the teachers, included a lack of sufficient physical space, enough aides to provide all the help needed, and sufficient aides to adequately service the upper grades.

(For further information, contact Douglas Bernard, Director of Reading, Mesa Public Schools, 549 North Steley Drive, Mesa, Arizona 85203.)

Other Problems also Exist

While the Mesa paraprofessional program has been highly effective and the staff supportive of the reading aides, local school administrators should be aware of a number of problems encountered by school districts utilizing paraprofessionals and volunteers.

Perhaps the key problem is staff resistance, oftentimes among administrators and teachers alike, to the idea of teacher aides. Once a program is initiated, studies tend to confirm that pupils, teachers, parents, principals and the aides themselves strongly feel such help is extremely valuable. For instance, NEA studies have indicated that nine out of ten teachers who have worked with paraprofessional aides have found them helpful.

Other problems some school districts have encountered, espe-


\[2\] Whaley, op. cit., 9.
cially with volunteers, include: irregular attendance, a high dropout
and turnover rate, recruitment difficulties, making certain the aides
are properly utilized, and poor communications between the staff,
administration and aides.

According to the Texas Education Agency,\(^1\) key elements in using
volunteers and overcoming staff resistance include careful planning
as to how they will be used, obtaining board of education approval,
and teacher and administrative acceptance of the program.

One of the ways to achieve these goals, they say, is to clearly
define the roles of teachers, aides and volunteers and to stake out
boundaries to avoid conflicts of interest and responsibilities.

Additional elements\(^2\) that have consistently appeared in school
districts that have been successful in the use of volunteers and
aides include co-ordination of the program, establishing criteria
for and a method of recruiting aides, determining the needs of the
district, establishing objectives for the program, identifying the
material, financial and human resources that can aid in the program,
providing respectively for both teacher and aide in-service and train-
ing, selling the program to the public, evaluating the results, and
altering the program as needed to make it more effective.

Perhaps the next major question facing school administrators
considering the development of a volunteer or paraprofessional pro-
gram in their district must be: Is it worth the effort?

\(^{1}\)loc. cit., 11.

\(^{2}\)loc. cit., 11-12.
The numerous schools who have watched student reading achievement steadily increase after the introduction of student and/or parent volunteers and paraprofessionals as a part of their programs would surely agree the work was well worth the time and energy involved.

Mesa's Barnard\(^1\) perhaps best summed up the majority feeling when he said, "Although the recipients of the added services were the children, other 'spin-offs' have altered the educational process. Teachers are able to spend more time individualizing instruction, and students in the bottom third of a class have more adult instructing time with paraprofessionals. The liaison between school and community has increased cooperation resulting in a rebirth of mutual goals."

\(^1\)Barnard, op. cit., 1-2.
CHAPTER VI

THE GREAT METHODOLOGY DEBATE

Words in Color . . . ITA . . . phonics . . . LEA . . . linguistics . . . basal readers . . . eclectic teaching . . . multilevel reading . . . PLAN . . .

The educational jargon of reading instruction and the often-heated academic debates over the best method of teaching reading are enough to boggle the mind of the most dedicated administrator attempting to develop a successful reading program in his school.

Speaking before the NAESP about the Right To Read program in April 1970, the late U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen¹ specifically warned the principals not to become enmeshed in the methods debate: "Methods, of course, are important, but it is the results that matter, and one of your most important contributions will be to see that the Right To Read effort does not become bogged down in debates over method."

Allen's warning might better have been directed at the reading specialists and publishers, who have been expounding the virtues of their "successful" reading programs/methods with ever-increasing volume and hyperbole. For example:

"There are no reading problems. I have solved them." -- Caleb Gattegno,\textsuperscript{1} inventor of the "Words in Color" reading program, in the February 1971 McCall's.

"A phonics-oriented reading program is the only rational answer to the reading problem . . . . The use of a phonics-oriented teaching approach--THERE IS NO OTHER ANSWER!--Eugene Ragle,\textsuperscript{2} California State Board of Education, speaking at the Eleventh Annual Reading Reform Foundation Conference, July 31-August 1, 1972.

"Educators could find a better way to teach reading but they won't . . . . There is not really a desire to find a better way to teach reading by those in charge; there is a desire to prove that the thing they have is right . . . . The method in look-say or phonics is pretty much the same." -- W. T. Smith,\textsuperscript{3} Language Arts Consultant, Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, Region VI, 1972.

"The trouble is that the 'Distar' system of instruction is now being introduced into the general public school system as a panacea for all children . . . . Among the other flaws of the 'Distar' system is the appalling quality of the visual material and the illustrations.

\textsuperscript{1} Gattegno, Caleb, "Oust ABC's, Teach Reading By Color." McCall's, XCVIII (February 1971), 42.

\textsuperscript{2} Ragle, Eugene, "California - The Reading Situation." A speech presented at the Eleventh Annual Reading Reform Foundation Conference in San Francisco, California, July 31-August 1, 1972, and contained in The Eleventh Annual Reading Reform Foundation Conference, a reproduction of the presentations at the conference. Reading Reform Foundation, New York, November 1972, 54.

\textsuperscript{3} Smith, W. T., PACE Region VI Language Arts Consultant, In a letter to Education U.S.A., National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Virginia, March 29, 1972, 1.
that accompany the test. The text itself is a more sophisticated version of the old 'Run, Spot, Run' readers. But the pictures are just as bad."—Arnold Arnold,¹ author of Your Child and You, June 28, 1972.

Nearly everyone agrees that an ideal reading program should be designed to meet the individual needs of children. It should provide, according to George D. Spache² in Phi Delta Kappa's 1972 The Teaching of Reading, for the adequate development of fundamental reading skills (i.e., word recognition, word analysis, comprehension, rates of reading, critical reading, etc.) and should offer a wide experience with types of reading matter to provide a foundation for the development of permanent reading interests and for the vocational needs of the student.

Considering the agreement as to what a desirable reading program should do, the obvious question is why hasn't one been developed? Spache³ cites two major reasons:

1. "Progress toward the maximally effective reading program desired by all concerned is thwarted by the well-meaning but naive attempts of pressure groups, teachers, and school administrators to find simple answers to a multi-faceted problem in the claims of innovators and publishers. Change of any kind is often conceived of

¹Arnold, Arnold, "What is the 'Distar' Teaching Method." A news release to the National School Public Relations Association on June 28, 1972, 1. (Mimeographed)


³loc. cit., 151.
as a step toward improvement, and the temporary Hawthorne effect is considered valid proof of the desirability of the change, at least until boredom or the long-range results stimulate another search for a panacea.

2. "Significant reading research is not only relatively scarce, but also fails to have the effect on classroom practices it should because it is not popularized or presented theatrically. The implications of sound reading research take years to trickle into the content of teacher training courses and to influence teachers."

Research Findings: No Help for the Purist

Even if the administrator or teacher does look to research for guidance in selecting a reading method, there is little that will provide him with a conclusive answer, regardless of the claims of advocates of any single method. For example, The Information Base for Reading (IBR) researchers,¹ who attempted to look for the most effective teaching models, concluded that—if acceptance is defined as "general use"—most teachers use an unidentifiable eclectic method of reading instruction based upon some use of a basal reading series.

Since an eclectic method² is one that utilizes a variety of


approaches designed to give children the skills they need to develop into capable readers, a definite, authenticated answer to the methods' question doesn't seem to exist. Other research findings seem to confirm this. According to Spache,\(^1\) one of the major findings of the Cooperative Research Program in First Grade Reading was that no method of teaching reading was generally superior to others in promoting reading skills, improving attitudes, or creating interests.

Another IBR result\(^2\) regarding methods stated: "All methods of reading instruction instruct some children (probably the same ones) well and do not succeed with some small proportion of others that have been studied." Again, little help is offered if a safe answer is being sought.

Therefore, what guidelines should the local school district follow concerning methods when implementing or remodeling a reading program? Ms. Mary Woodfin,\(^3\) associate professor of elementary education at California State University (Long Beach), offered the following suggestions in the April 1973 issue of Educational Leadership:

1. The teacher is usually more successful teaching the reading

---

\(^1\)Spache, op. cit., 149.


\(^3\)Woodfin, Mary J., "Whatever Happened To Reading." Educational Leadership, XXX (April 1973), 622.
method(s) he believes to be best.

2. Student learning styles can be identified and used in reading instruction.

3. Attention to student and teacher self-concept may be more productive in teaching reading than any new method.

4. Self choice in learning methods usually succeeds better than forced choice, both for teacher and student.

5. In-service methods designed to help teachers look at self have often resulted in concrete, significant increases in results from standardized reading tests, as the teacher is better able to look at and accept what the student really is, not what the teacher wishes him to be, thus relieving one pressure on much-pressured students.

6. The strength modality of diagnosis and remediation, where students learn through their strengths instead of concentrating on their weaknesses, works quite well for most students.

Breaking Down the Reading Jargon: A Translation

Because of the extensive debate over the various reading methods and the specialized language of the curriculum, many administrators, board of education members, classroom teachers, and members of the lay public are often overwhelmed by the educationese they encounter in researching the best method(s) for their schools.

According to Mortimer Smith,¹ CBE Executive Director, Robert C.

Aukerman's 1971 book *Approaches to Beginning Reading* (John Wiley & Sons, New York) can be a valuable guide in this area. Aukerman describes scores of systems for teaching reading, including some information about their origins, creators, and research findings, where available.

Most of the well-known approaches to reading are included in Aukerman's book, as are many relatively obscure systems. *Approaches to Beginning Reading* provides a thorough and objective examination of many current reading systems, but Smith does note that the text, while valuable, only partially meets the complete needs of educators and parents.

"Strangely absent are any descriptions or even any mention of the old-established look-say programs, such as Ginn, Harper & Row, Allyn & Bacon, Scott Foresman, etc.," says Smith. "These, too, are approaches to reading, whatever one may think of their effectiveness . . . . It seems to us the book would be better if it included all approaches to beginning reading now in use."

Another major study in reading methodology that is generally available to educators is Jeanne Chall's *Learning to Read: The Great Debate* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967). In fact, in a summary of the the IBR study, Paul Diederich\(^1\) recommends that educators wishing to delve more deeply into research on reading would do well to start with Chall.

Chall's study is a 'readable' survey of research on reading from

\(^1\)Diederich, op. cit., 2-3.
1910 to 1965. Specifically, it is concerned with the effects of early and systematic instruction in phonics verses the "whole-word" method of teaching reading (i.e., Under the whole-word or look-say method, children are generally taught to recognize a word by studying its overall form while they repeat the word aloud. By attempting to match the form with the sound for each word, they are supposed to build up a vocabulary of "sight-words.").

As a result of her research, Chall made five major recommendations for educators interested in reading curriculum improvement:

1. Change is needed in primary (i.e., grades K-3) reading instructional methods from a system that emphasizes meaning to one that views beginning reading as essentially different from mature reading and emphasizes learning of the printed code for the spoken language (n.b., Chall does stress that she did not discover evidence to endorse any single code-emphasis method over another and that her recommendations was for beginning programs only and should not ignore reading-meaning practice.);

2. Further research is needed regarding current ideas about the content of beginning reading materials, since she felt too many people were making recommendations about content without any proof whatsoever;

3. Grade levels should be reevaluated and schools should not restrict students in their reading materials, but should allow and encourage youngsters to read books two and three grade levels above

---


their current placement, if they could do so with profit and enjoyment;

4. A broad range of new tests—including single-component tests (e.g., tests of word recognition and tests of reading comprehension) and tests that provide absolute measurements (i.e., a test that will indicate how much of each reading component each child has mastered at a given time)—needs to be developed to help teachers determine if they are achieving good results; and

5. Reading research, although extensive, needs to be improved to follow the norms of science, with researchers trying to learn from prior studies and add to a unified body of knowledge, putting the results in a form more directly useful to educators in the field.

Some state boards of education also have attempted to provide assistance to the local school districts in deciphering the methods’ jargon. For example, both the Arkansas\(^1\) (Language Arts Book I: Reading for Elementary Schools, 1972) and Utah\(^2\) (Reading For Information and Enjoyment, 1970) State Boards of Education have prepared reading guides for local schools that list and define some of the major, current approaches to teaching of reading.

Included in the Arkansas and Utah materials are information on the following approaches/methods to teaching reading: Language


\(^{2}\)Utah State Board of Education, Reading For Information and Enjoyment. Salt Lake City: Utah State Board of Education, 1972, 1-139.
Experience Approach (LEA), phonics, basal reading series, individualized reading, multilevel reading, ITA, Words in Color, linguistics, PLAN, and Programmed Reading.

Descriptions of these programs, as prepared by the two states, attempt to highlight the major emphasis and—in some cases—objectives of the programs.

**Language experience approach**

This approach draws on the actual experiences of the children and their own language, combining reading and the other communications skills in the instruction program.

According to R. V. Allen, University of Arizona, the three major emphases of the program include: "(a) extending experiences to include words that express them—through oral and written sharing of personal experiences, discussing selected topics, listening to and telling stories, writing independently, and making and reading individual books; (b) studying the English language—through developing an understanding of speaking, reading and writing relationships, expanding vocabularies, reading a variety of symbols in the environment, improving style and form of personal expression, studying words, and gaining some awareness of the nature of the English language (use of high frequency words and English sentence patterns); and (c) relating ideas of authors to personal experiences—through reading whole stories and books, learning to use a variety of printed resources,

---

1Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit., 32-33.
summarizing, outlining, reading for specific purposes, and determining the validity and reliability of statements."

Allen states that the LEA's use of a basic framework of language experiences serves as a device for screening and selecting activities that contribute to balanced development of communication skills and attitudes.

The Utah bulletin\(^1\) adds that reading skills are taught as needed in the LEA program and recommends an abundance of varied supplementary reading materials.

**Phonic approach**

Basic phonetic approaches, according to Aukerman,\(^2\) are systems where letter-sound relationships are taught as first steps to beginning reading. Other terms associated with this method include: "breaking the code", "code emphasis", "synthetic phonics" and "phonetic". The Arkansas study\(^3\) cited the Reading with Phonics approach as representative of the phonics approach to teaching reading.

Reading with Phonics, according to Monmouth College's Charles E. Wingo,\(^4\) is a system which develops efficiency in word recognition

\(^1\)Utah State Board of Education, op. cit., Appendix A-8.


\(^3\)Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit., 33.

\(^4\)loc. cit., 33-34.
by employing a multisensory approach and a sequential introduction of speech sounds of the English language. All the language arts are integrated to provide broad approaches to the use of unlimited vocabularies.

Utilizing the 44 most frequently used speech sounds in English, this method begins with the teaching of short sounds of five vowels and progresses to the study of the most frequently used consonants. In each early lesson, a consonant is blended with the vowels in pronouncing units or syllables, then whole words. Progression is from the known to the unknown and from the simple to the more complex.

Designed for use with all basal reading series, this program provides exercises and activities related to the entire language arts program and has no grade level designation, says Wingo.

**Basal reader approach**

The Utah State Board of Education explains¹ that there are many good basal reader programs, which are typically supported by six main principles: vocabulary control; content of importance and relevancy; complete organization of reading experiences; variety in reading activities; a developmental and integrated approach to phonics; and continuity of growth in reading skills, habits and attitudes.

A. Sterl Artley of the University of Missouri notes² that a basal

1Utah State Board of Education, op. cit., Appendix A-1.

2Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit., 34-35.
A basal program carried on through the use of a series of basal materials is concerned with the systematic and sequential development of all the skills, abilities, and understandings necessary for interpreting written symbols.

Artley also states that if basal materials are to be an effective part of a total reading program, two key elements are necessary:

1. The teacher must be able to make adaptations in the use of basal materials in keeping with the learning rates of the pupils, their backgrounds of experience and their levels of skill mastery.

2. The teacher must be able to supplement the basal program with a wide variety of materials (e.g., trade books, magazines, reference books) on various levels of readability to meet the personal interests and needs of the students.

"A basal program," he says, "is not a prescription but a base of operations . . . . It should be considered as only part of a well-rounded reading program."

Individualized reading

Willard Olson, University of Michigan,1 explained the primary techniques of the individualized method(s) in the Arkansas study, stating that this approach seeks guidelines to practice from within the child more than from "extrinsic considerations of learning or reading method."

Teachers utilizing an individualized method require a variety of

1loc. cit., 35-36.
books for browsing and include conversation, storytelling and reading aloud as a part of the program. The teacher provides, often with child participation, a supply of books varied in range of difficulty and interest. A child's ability is judged by the teacher and evaluation is generally based upon performance with materials selected by the pupil.

The individualized approach, explains Olson, emphasizes success and satisfaction for the learner and asks for constructive language and approval techniques from the teacher, who has no common expectations for children and little faith in either the effectiveness of grouping or special methods designed to have children learn more, earlier. Formal remedial efforts are believed to be effective only in instances of prior deprivation, and specific skills are taught to individuals, small groups, or the total group as needed.

There are, according to Jeannette Veatch,¹ who is known as the "Mother of individualized reading," three prime characteristics of individualized instruction that occur regardless of any variations in practice: self-selection of materials by pupils for their own instruction, individual conferences between each pupil and teacher, and organization of groups for reasons other than reading ability or proficiency.

"The area in which an individualized program makes its greatest contribution to reading instruction is that of classroom management,"

¹Veatch, Jeannette, Individualizing Your Reading Program. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959, ix-x.
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she noted in *Individualizing Your Reading Program* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959). "The concepts of seeking, self selection, and pacing lend a new element to the reading period . . . . A child's energy and power when he is reading on a self-selection basis enormously reduces the need for a teacher to drill in phonics, word attack skills, the use of context and picture clues, and the like. Individualization gives a unique and unprecedented quality to the motivation which is the source of its strength."

**Multilevel reading instruction**

Studies of the reading process, children and learning provide the basis for multilevel reading instruction.

In this type of program, says Don Parker, \(^1\) Emlimar, Big Sur, California, the teacher introduces the learning laboratory process (SRA Laboratories) to the class and supervises it individually. Each child, as identified with a placement test, starts on the skill track at a spot where he can, with effort, achieve success. Continuous testing provides pupil feedback, reinforcement or redirection, and self-programming frees the teacher to help each child as needed.

This approach calls for the student to learn the names and sounds of the ordinary English alphabet, its phonic and structural sight-sound combinations, and linguistic word patternings as units of thought. After completing these steps, he goes on to decoding mean-

\(^1\)Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit., 36-37.
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ings from more complex units, such as paragraphs, stories, and chapters of stories.

"Paralleling this multilevel individualized reading instructional program," says Parker, "the pupil moves readily into individualized reading, selecting books at his own level for pleasure or study, for a balance between skill-getting and skill-using."

**Initial teaching alphabet (ITA)**

The Utah booklet\(^1\) explains that ITA is a two-stage approach to teaching reading where the student first learns to read and write using the "Initial Teaching Alphabet" of 44 characters, where sounds and written symbols have a consistent relationship.

Once a pupil learns to read and write using ITA, a transition is made to reading materials prepared with the traditional 26-letter alphabet. Not proposed as a spelling reform on the English language, ITA is designed as a means of providing temporarily the advantage of a consistent spelling form at the time its need is most critical for a youngster—when he is first learning to read and write.

According to Sir James Pitman,\(^2\) a former member of the British Parliament whose grandfather created ITA, the approach has been used for both beginning reading and remedial teaching in England since 1961 and in the United States since 1963, with wide application in

---

\(^1\)Utah State Board of Education, op. cit., Appendix A-5.

\(^2\)Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit., 37-38.
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both countries. Young and old learn alike, he notes, and have demonstrated that they can make an effortless transfer from ITA to the traditional alphabet and its spellings.

"Since it is a medium, not a method, ITA can be used with any method of reading instruction," says Sir Pitman.

Words in color

Words in Color was originated by educator Caleb Gattegno\(^1\) to teach reading in a direct way, especially with children in beginning reading, other children who are having difficulty with reading, and adults who do not read. The basic principles of the method, as identified by the Utah State Board of Education,\(^2\) are: (1) start with what we have (i.e., speech) and find the means of translating it through a code into sets of signs, (2) put full responsibility on the learner, and (3) let the child learn by the discovery method.

A strong phonic approach is used with this method, as 39 colors are used, each representing an English speech sound. Any letter or combination of letters representing a given sound are presented as a visual stimulus in the particular color assigned that sound.

A wide variety of materials are used with this approach. Teacher materials include: "Background and Principles," "Words in Color," and "Teacher's Guide, Words in Color". Classroom materials include 21 wall charts in color, eight phonic code charts in color,

\(^1\)loc. cit., 38-39.

and a set of word cards (i.e., over 1200 words printed in black on colored cards). Pupils also receive (printed in black only) a book of stories, a set of 14 work sheets, and a number of other supplementary items.

According to Dorothea Hinman\(^1\) of the Encyclopedia Britannica Press, "The most important contribution of the approach is its full and rapid extension of the linguistic capacities of learners who already speak their language. . . . The power of reading, writing and spelling with meaning all language already owned as meaningful speech is developed as a unity."

**Linguistics**

The linguistic approach proposes that teachers describe and recognize the English language to better understand it and have it serve our needs. Emphasis is placed on the sound of the language (i.e., phonology), meanings of words and sentences (i.e., morphology), and the variety of patterns of the language (i.e., syntax), according to the Utah report.\(^2\)

Linguistics advocates maintain we do not get meaning directly from writing, but proceed from writing to sound to reading; therefore, beginning readers participate in a great deal of speech activity while reading. As they increase their reading skills, the amount of silent speech subsides, but never disappears completely.

\(^1\)Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit.

\(^2\)Utah State Board of Education, op. cit., Appendix A-3.
Although the linguistic approach varies with each series, it is basically the process of turning printed symbols into sounds in order for the pupil to "hear what they say." The goals of the approach are recognition and comprehension of the printed word.

While there is no standard linguistic approach, many of the available series of programs combine reading, language, spelling and writing—particularly in the first and second grades. These series separate words that are consistently or regularly spelled and present those that are irregularly spelled as exceptions.

**Program for learning in accordance with needs (PLAN)**

PLAN is a program identified for consideration by the Utah State Board of Education.¹ Developed by the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, PLAN is built around the idea that children have different abilities and learning rates and encourages students to assume responsibility and planning for their own learning.

Designed to fit the needs of students from first grade through senior high, beginning students are tested to determine which program best fits their needs and on what level they are to begin.

Constant reevaluation and revision, when needed, is a part of the method.

Students are guided by the teacher through a series of Teaching Learning Units (TLU's), which have been prepared to allow for individual learning styles and to utilize contemporary learning tools and

¹loc. cit., Appendix A-6 and A-7.
and techniques. The teacher selects the TLU for each student on the basis of his ability, established objectives and interests. Once a test shows he has mastered the objectives, he may review it before proceeding.

The program aims at allowing the teacher to spend most class-room time working with individual students through the use of a computer which performs most non-teaching tasks: storing and assessing tests, providing suggestions for direction, keeping records up to date, and using programmed knowledge in recommending the next TLU for a student to study.

**Programmed reading**

The programmed instruction approach to teaching reading places considerable emphasis on phonics or associated printed letters with speech sounds. The method is also linguistically oriented in that words are arranged in patterns of words of similar spellings.

Nila Banton Smith, of the University of Southern California and a former president of IRA, states that the key principles of programmed reading instruction are:

1. **Active response:** The pupil must make continuous responses involving explicit practice.

2. **Immediate confirmation:** Each response must be checked immediately by the student to see whether the response was right or

---

1 loc. cit., Appendix A-2.

2 ibid.
wrong.

3. **Small steps**: The material to be learned is broken down into small steps and carefully sequenced.

4. **Reinforcement**: Each step must be given repeated practice in order to establish the initial learning.

5. **Self-pacing**: Each pupil proceeds on an individual basis at his own rate.

Essentially an individualized approach to the teaching of reading, beginning readers in programmed instruction classes are provided with programmed texts, which move from easy to increasingly more complex reading situations and call for the students to monitor their own progress.

'Do Your Own Thing'

The reading methods and/or programs identified by the Arkansas and Utah boards and briefly described here obviously only scratch the surface of the scores of programs available to the nation's schools.

In addition to broader research into the methods and programs currently available, perhaps the best possible guideline for local school districts in selecting methods is the conclusion contained in Arkansas' *Reading for the Elementary Schools:*¹ "Some approaches (to reading) are relatively new; others have been developed over 50 years or more. Some have been in continuous use; others represent older ideas in new dress; and still others have only recently appeared in

¹Arkansas Elementary School Council Division of Instructional Services, op. cit., 40-41.
the reading spectrum. Several are the subjects of research studies.

"It has never been possible in the history of reading in the United States to adopt any one approach exclusively. Freedom to choose, however, carries with it responsibility for an evaluation based on the needs of children in each situation. Every possible means should be used to meet the reading problems of all children, including the hard-to-reach and the talented child.

"Evaluation cannot be limited to the use of test results. Careful observation of children's overt reactions, their choice of a wide variety of reading materials, and demonstrated success in using these purposefully represent important evidence. . . . Each (educator) must make his own decision concerning the relative values to children of each of the approaches . . . ."
CHAPTER VI

BUILDING AN EFFECTIVE READING PROGRAM

"There is no reading problem. There are problem teachers and problem schools. Most people who fail to learn how to read in our society are victims of a fiercely competitive system of training that requires failure. If talking and walking were taught in most schools we might end up with as many mutes and cripples as we now have non-readers," contends Herbert Kohl in Reading, How To (E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., New York, 1973).

Although Kohl's opening statement is not designed to win instant acceptance from professional educators, especially reading specialists, he does offer what he feels are some basic conditions "sufficient to enable people to acquire the skill of reading." Learning to read, he says, is no more difficult than learning to walk or talk. Kohl's conditions are:

1. A person who knows how to read and is interested in sharing that skill, and who has

2. A nonelitist, noncompetitive attitude toward sharing knowledge and information as well as

3. Some understanding of the process of learning to read and

---


2loc. cit., xi-xii.
4. A belief that reading is an important human activity that the young should master;

5. Pencils or pens, writing surfaces and printed material, if possible;

6. A context for learning in which learners feel secure enough to make mistakes and ask questions;

7. Respect for the culture and mind of the learner and, therefore, an ability to understand and use what the student brings to the situation; and finally

8. Patience, a sense that there is time to learn.

Kohl also applies two other conditions specifically for the learner, who should have the ability to use some language as well as reasonably intact senses and a desire to read or at least curiosity about reading.

Obviously, Kohl does not provide all the answers for the district administrator seeking to expand or improve his reading program; however, he does touch upon many areas identified by USOE and a number of educators and research agencies as elements found in successful reading programs.

These conditions for success, which have been identified through years of study, research and experimentation can serve as invaluable guidelines for school districts seeking to revamp their elementary reading curriculum, work with exceptional readers, expand or develop a secondary reading program, or coordinate a K-12 reading curriculum.

Success Factors in Elementary School Reading Programs
The elementary schools have traditionally born the brunt of educational efforts to teach reading and most innovative programming in recent years has originated at this level, since experts almost unanimously agree that the reading instructional efforts in the first few years of school are crucial to future reading success.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)\(^1\) re-emphasized their concerns in this area in 1972 when they passed a resolution urging "all elementary school principals to develop with their faculties and their communities programs that will study and diagnose the needs of each child so that he may enjoy reading and work toward his potential through effective reading."

The question, of course, is how does the principal establish such a program. George Weber's CBE study\(^2\) of inner-city schools with successful reading programs provides some direction, especially since his findings were not related to any particular federal or state programs, but to schools with high percentages of students generally expected to fall below standard reading norms.

Noting that it is not easy to be certain of the "secrets of success" in teaching beginning reading well, because of the complexity of schools, Weber did attempt to identify common factors in the

---


successful schools he studied. However, he added a word of caution: "The mere fact that a successful school is going something different from unsuccessful schools does not mean that the different practice is the cause of success. The matter is made more complicated because successful schools always seem to do many things differently."

Discovering which of these practices are responsible for the higher pupil achievement, Weber openly admits, is impossible to determine with certainty. The eight factors common to the successful elementary schools, as identified by Weber, include:

1. **Strong leadership:** All four schools had clearly identifiable leaders--three principals and one superintendent--who specifically led the beginning reading program, supporting it at its inception and following up to see that it kept on a productive course.

2. **High expectations:** The school staff all evidenced high expectation with regard to the potential achievements of their children and believed that the youngsters could succeed.

3. **A good atmosphere:** Explaining that a "good atmosphere" is hard to define, Weber said that the "order, sense of purpose, relative quiet, and pleasure in learning of these schools play a role in their achievements."

4. **Strong emphasis on reading:** While not concentrating all their attention on reading, the four successful schools all recognized that reading is the first concern of the primary grades.

5. **Additional reading personnel:** All four schools had reading specialists working with the primary grades.

6. **Use of phonics:** Although each of the schools did not
necessarily use a specific phonics (i.e., word decoding) oriented reader as a basic text, all included extensive supplemental phonics material.

7. **Individualization:** Individualization, as identified by Weber, meant that there was a "concern for each child's progress and a willingness to modify a child's work assignments, if necessary, to take account of his stage of learning to read and his particular learning programs."

8. **Careful evaluation of pupil progress:** All of the schools included regular evaluations of pupil progress, either through diagnostic tests, text objective achievements, and/or a variety of other formal/informal methods.

An interesting aspect of the Weber study was the fact that he did not stop with simply identifying common elements found in the successful elementary programs. He also looked at some characteristics generally thought important to improve achievement in beginning reading that were not common to the four successful schools. Since these characteristics were not present in all of the schools, Weber concluded that they "apparently are not essential to success" in reading programs. These items include:

1. **Class size,** which ranged from an average of 22 to 29;
2. **Achievement grouping,** which was not present at all in P. S. 11, although used in some way by the other three schools;
3. **Ethnic background of the principals and teachers,** which varied widely in each of the systems, regardless of the student ethnic backgrounds;
4. **The existence of preschool education**, which had been available to only a small minority of the children studied;

5. **Physical facilities**, which Weber concedes are nice, but costly and not vital to success, since not one of the successful schools was modern and two were noticeably old; and

6. **The quality of teaching**, which ranged from excellent to poor among the different instructors in the schools.

"Naturally any program is better by virtue of its being implemented by good teachers," noted Weber. "The relevant point here is that not one of the four schools had, in the primary grades, a group of teachers all of whom were outstanding." He felt this point was important because outstanding teachers can teach beginning reading successfully with "any materials and under a wide range of conditions," while poor teachers will fail regardless.

A final observation by Weber also seems worthy of mention for local districts considering major reading efforts: "None of the success was achieved overnight; they required from three to nine years."

**Action in Reading at the Secondary Level**

Ms. Margaret Early, a professor of education at Syracuse University (New York), made a sweeping indictment of secondary schools in the February 1973 *Journal of Reading*, charging that in the past 30
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years the status of reading instruction in secondary schools has changed very little.

"We are still debating the merits of special reading services and urging the whole school faculty to teach reading in content fields," she said. "Despite the steady increase in professional books and courses in secondary reading, it is the exceptional school system that offers courses in reading and study skills beyond eighth grade."

Nor is Ms. Early alone in her critical opinion of secondary school efforts in reading. Shortly after her article (i.e., "Taking Stock: Secondary School Reading in the 1970s") appeared, Ms. Signe Harlow,\(^1\) president of the Lewis and Clark Reading Council and a reading teacher at the Helena (Montana) Capital High School, also accused educators for trying for too long and in vain to hold the elementary schools solely accountable for teaching reading skills which would insure competency for the high school student.

"The results have not been successful, as is graphically shown by the number of students who are being graduated from secondary schools today who fail to qualify for employment because they lack the necessary reading skills," she stated in the April 1973 issue of *Montana Education*.

Ms. Harlow contends that motivation of students who can read, but won't, is one of the keys to unlocking most high school reading

programs. Additionally, she feels secondary school readers usually resent elementary materials, procedures and techniques that in many cases they have been exposed to already.

To combat this problem, she recommends that teachers avoid excessive drill work and overuse of programmed workbooks and skill building exercises and concentrate on providing a variety of stimulating materials (i.e., a large selection of paperbacks, current books, the daily newspaper, and numerous magazines) more appropriate to the interests of high school students.

Ms. Early, although accusing secondary school educational leaders of providing far more rhetoric than action when it comes to efforts to increase student reading ability, does see some signs of change. For example, she cites middle schools, where modular programs permitting daily planning and meeting time for teachers offer excellent opportunities for staff development in reading. Additionally, she feels the current trend toward special elective reading courses in high schools is a positive sign.

Specifically, she makes a number of recommendations for secondary educators to improve their reading programs. Included among these are:

1. Elementary schools are sending better readers to secondary teachers, so secondary efforts should focus on study skills and higher thought processes.

2. Educators should welcome the framework of elective courses

---

1Early, op. cit., 62-63.
and modular scheduling to develop mature reading and study skills.

3. Educators must rekindle interest in books--hardback and paperback--to help students learn a love for books that record the past as well as forecast the future.

4. Secondary educators must work to avoid the two extremes of losing a skills emphasis altogether or overemphasizing mechanistic approaches.

5. Advantage should be taken of schemes that permit staff development within the school day.

A number of characteristics\(^1\) of a good reading program at the secondary level were identified and forwarded with materials submitted along with the Education U.S.A. survey on reading. These characteristics include: a thorough analysis of the reading difficulties being experienced by the school's students, development of planned objectives in accordance with initial diagnostic results, systematic instruction to correct the problem area, materials selected with motivational effect in mind (\(i.e.,\) interesting and relatively easy at first and gradually becoming more difficult as success and improvement result), and provisions for a variety of reading experiences and activities.

Others include an optimistic and encouraging attitude from teachers, distribution of practice to avoid fatigue and boredom, recognition of successes, measured pupil progress through testing,

elimination of new programs that fail to produce positive results after a fair trial, and post evaluation of objectives, along with replanning to work on weak areas.

Earle W. Wiltse,\(^1\) professor emeritus of Northern Illinois University, attempted to provide definitive guidelines for school administrators in the October 1972 Northern Illinois Cooperative in Education (NICE) Occasional Paper No. 6.

In his article "Improving Reading at the Secondary Level," Wiltse wrote, "The role of the secondary school teacher is rapidly changing. The teaching of subject matter is no longer sufficient. Students must know how to read subject matter and how to evaluate what they read . . . . Reading improvement is every teacher's problem. It cannot be left to a reading specialist . . . ."

Addressing himself to administrators wishing to organize a schoolwide approach to reading improvement, Wiltse identified two major problems involved in the effort: the need for involving the entire teaching staff in reading improvement and the techniques all teachers can use in order to help students become better readers.

"Total staff involvement in reading improvement requires administrative leadership. Without enthusiastic support from the top, nothing much will happen," he charged, hitting upon one of the key recommendations of the federal Right To Read program. Wiltse also offered a number of suggestions to help local administrators provide

leadership in developing staff involvement in reading program improvement:

1. **In-Service Training:** In cooperation with selected co-workers, including teachers, plan a program of in-service training related to reading improvement. This may include pre-opening workshops, staff meetings, and college courses in reading. Administrators should also invite reading specialists to assist with seminars, ask counselors to interpret the results of standardized reading tests that dramatize the critical reading problems in their school, and explore the possibility of giving college credit for work done in the workshop.

2. **Strategy Committees:** An overall strategy committee can be organized to plan and promote the reading improvement program. For example, it could include such schoolwide activities as the preparation of local pooling and sharing bulletins; appraising the several elements in the reading program; planning, preparing and using reading filmstrips in class; writing a study-habits manual for students; and setting the theme for each year. Theme setting, Wiltse believes, gives the program a new direction each year. One year the theme might be "establishing effective habits of study." Another, it might be "building vocabulary essential to the understanding of each subject . . . ." In addition to the schoolwide committee on strategy, a local reading improvement committee can be organized in each building, with the responsibility of carrying out the strategy plans, evaluating progress, suggesting improvements, and reporting on progress of the reading improvement program at departmental and general
staff meetings.

3. The Reading Coordinator: A reading coordinator who is familiar with reading problems and able to work cooperatively with staff is also needed. Although it is important that the superintendent and the principal recognize the importance of reading improvement and give it leadership and encouragement, administrators have many other responsibilities. Thus, since reading improvement should be a fundamental and on-going part of a well-organized modern high school, its implementation should not be left to the administrators alone. The guidance and direction of a knowledgeable person who can give full time to reading improvement is required. The importance of such a person is not reduced in smaller high schools, even though he may also be required to do some regular teaching.

4. The Reading Budget: Provide a budget for promotion of reading. Its size will depend upon financial resources and the extent of the program. Funds are required for such things as the purchase and scoring of standardized reading tests, an abundance of reading materials, teaching machines, slides, projectors, film strips, cassettes, study carrels, consultant services, and clerical assistance. It may be possible to secure federal and state funds through the Economic Opportunity Act or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The budget might also include funds for professional materials, travel, workshops and institutes.

Wiltse also identified the four elements most frequently found in well-organized, ongoing high school reading programs. These are:

1. A Reading Center: There should be a well-equipped, attrac-
tive area in every school where students may go for help in becoming better readers. It should contain the latest equipment and a wide variety of reading materials. The teacher(s) should have special training in reading instruction, and competence in diagnosis and remediation are essential. The center should be designed to attract both college-bound students and those needing remedial instruction. Remediation, Wiltse believes, loses its stigma when slow readers discover the center is also used by average and superior students. In some schools, the remedial reading room, he explained, has been replaced with a reading center open to all secondary pupils.

2. **Motivation:** When students see the need for improving their ability to read, Wiltse believes they often develop a desire to improve. Assembly programs devoted to reading improvement are sometimes used. Other ideas include displaying reading motivation posters developed by the art department and organizing reading clubs through the reading center.

3. **Vocabulary Development:** Every teacher can be responsible for developing the technical vocabulary needed in his own discipline, according to Wiltse. In one high school, teachers decided to develop the meaning of five basic technical words daily as part of the next day's assignment, meaning a student taking only four courses per semester was introduced to approximately 3500 new words yearly.

4. **Reading in the Subject-Matter Fields:** Certain reading skills (e.g., following directions) can probably be taught better in one discipline (e.g., science) than another. Subject-matter teachers should be able to isolate them and work on their development. De-
partment chairmen can assist with this activity.

Wiltse also contends that as the reading program progresses, an on-going evaluation of success and/or failure is a necessary element for successful development. In addition to regular testing with standardized reading tests to determine program weaknesses and strengths, he suggests student opinionnaires to get feedback concerning pupil involvement and awareness of the reading program. Studies of library book circulation may also provide helpful indicators of the program's success. However, exact types of evaluation must ultimately be determined by the performance objectives that have been established for the program.

"There should be a comprehensive program of reading improvement in every secondary school," concluded Wiltse. "It should involve all teachers at all levels and in all areas of the curriculum. This comprehensive approach to reading improvement requires leadership, motivation, cooperation and planning. Nothing less than an all-out attack will be sufficient to equip modern youth to meet the reading demands of the times."

'Exceptional' Students Present Special Problems

The challenge of teaching average students to read is difficult enough; however, school districts are burdened with the additional obligation to provide reading instruction for a variety of "exceptional" students with special reading needs: educationally and economically deprived children, gifted children, and--increasingly--adult non-readers in the community.
The disadvantaged reader

Massive federal support to develop reading programs for the educationally and economically deprived students has provided local school districts with perhaps the most heavily researched guidelines for development of reading programs for these youngsters. The most outstanding example is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA),1 which was first passed in 1965 and has funded special compensatory education reading programs in every state and the majority of school districts in the nation.

Created primarily to strengthen and improve educational quality and opportunity in America's schools, ESEA-sponsored programs have attacked problems of racial and language minority groups, migrant children, American Indian youngsters, and non-public school children, as well as numerous other young people who enter school with backgrounds that tend to hinder their reading progress.

Following nine years of extensive effort to provide adequate instruction for these youngsters, USOE's Division of Compensatory Education2 has been able to identify eight common characteristics of successful programs. Just as CBE's Weber did in his report of common elements in the successful schools he studied, USOE also cautions that while the characteristics do provide guidelines for program ini-


2loc. cit., 29-30.
tiation, they are no guarantee for instant success with disadvantaged students. The overriding characteristic of successful programs, according to USOE, is a committed, competent staff.

The eight characteristics common to successful ESEA programs include:

1. **Systematic planning**, which begins with formal policy decisions to increase support for quality compensatory programs. These decisions are the basis for the necessary partnerships among board members, educators and parents as they plan the program's design, implementation and evaluation.

2. **Clear objectives**, which must be written and stated in specific measurable terms. Instructional techniques and materials must closely relate to those objectives.

3. **Intensity of treatment**, which includes the amount of time the child spends in the program and the staff/pupil ratio within the classroom. The programs studied, according to USOE, exhibited a wide variance in the number of instructional hours per week, ranging from three-fourths of an hour per day twice weekly to seven hours a day, five days a week. The staff/pupil ratio varied from 1:1 to 1:15.

4. **Attention to individual needs**, which includes a careful diagnosis and individualized plan for each student.

5. **Flexibility in grouping**, which allows staff opportunities to provide small group instruction and to teach frequently on a one-to-one basis, while not confining students to the same group for more than several days without reassessment of both the teachers' and students' strengths.
6. **Personnel management**, which allows key staff personnel to work individually with teachers in the classroom. USOE stresses the need for coordination and cooperation among staff members and a well-designed in-service program.

7. **Structured program approach**, which stresses sequential order and activities, along with frequent and immediate feedback to students.

8. **Parental involvement**, which means the home must support what the child learns in school. Parents, according to USOE, must also be committed to work as partners with school personnel and students.

Donald Cushenbery, Reading Clinic Director, and Kenneth Gilreath, assistant professor of education at the University of Nebraska, identified some additional elements in *Effective Reading Instruction For Slow Learners* (Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Illinois, 1972).

Included in their list, which generally paralleled USOE's findings, of conditions for building an effective program for slow readers were guidelines stating that:

1. There is no single reading approach or method far superior to all other procedures in meeting the reading needs of retarded learners. Therefore, competent teachers must be provided with a wide variety of materials to utilize in meeting each child's needs.

2. Reading instruction should be oriented to preventing serious reading problems instead of trying to remediate them after they have
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become serious. In this respect, the authors concur with one of the most heavily emphasized objectives of the R2R program, which is educational reform directed at program development to prevent reading deficiencies before they become critical.

3. The end product of any reading program should be geared to building a love for reading on the part of every child.

4. Each teacher should help each child develop a high level of listening skills, since the slow learner is typically retarded in listening growth.

Obviously, there are numerous factors that have been identified as elements for successful programs. Perhaps of equal importance for local school districts are the conditions that have been identified as pitfalls in remedial reading program development. USOE, in a Putting Research into Educational Practice (PREP) study\(^1\) released in 1972, noted a number of potential problem areas to be avoided.

Included among these were: a lack of definition of responsibility and authority for the reading specialist; scheduling 15 to 20 students per hour into a remedial class; assuming that a good classroom teacher—who generally does not have the specialized skills and technical knowledge needed for remedial instruction—will make a good reading specialist; inadequate physical facilities; and inadequate
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funding for materials (n.b., According to the PREP report, $2,500 to $3000 is needed to adequately supply one remedial reading teacher.).

Other problem areas included: selecting students for participation in the program solely on the basis of a score on a standardized group reading test or on the difference between his reading level and grade placement; providing once-a-week reading sessions of 60 minutes or more; terminating instruction at the end of an arbitrary time period (e.g., six weeks) as opposed to continuing instruction until the student's progress indicates he can profit from regular classroom instruction; and determining progress by scores on standardized group tests, which ordinarily do not measure the skills taught in a remedial reading class.

The gifted reader

The present needs of the gifted and the creative pupil in our schools are acute, according to Paul Witty,\(^1\) editor of the International Reading Association's (IRA) 1972 text Reading for the Gifted and the Creative Student.

"Education has come to be regarded by many persons as a process through which the maximum development of every child is sought in accord with his unique nature and needs . . . . Educators have awakened to the fact that too often gifted children have been neglected in our schools," writes Witty.

\(^1\)Witty, Paul (Ed.), Reading For The Gifted And The Creative Student. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1971, 50.
Gifted children, he notes, have seldom been sufficiently challenged to develop their unusual abilities in the public schools and large numbers often fail to achieve their youthful promise. "Of all groups of exceptional children, perhaps the most neglected is the gifted," says Witty. "In many schools today, the abilities of gifted children are unrecognized; and in others, they are unchallenged or neglected."

Witty's charges of educational neglect of the gifted aren't aimed merely at public school personnel. Teacher-training institutions do little to cultivate appreciation of the needs of the gifted, and even in the professional literature on the teaching of reading and in books on the education of the gifted, discussion of the topic of reading for the gifted is "conspicuously meager or absent," according to Witty.

Joan Nelson and Donald Cleland's article "The Role of the Teacher of Gifted and Creative Children" in the IRA monograph notes that while reading programs for gifted children will deviate in methods, materials and content, certain features are necessary components of reading programs for gifted students. These include:

1. Early assessment of intellectual, perceptual and reading abilities: Many gifted children learn to read before coming to school, often as a result of "high interest, extraordinary discrimination, and generalizing abilities." The authors explain that if these youngsters are placed with other children in a readiness program,
they may become bored, restless, and disruptive or withdraw into fantasy to escape the boredom, lose their eagerness to read and become disillusioned with school in general.

2. **A highly individualized reading program:** Following early and accurate assessment of a gifted child's abilities, the teacher should analyze his strengths and weaknesses in reading skills, permitting each child to move ahead as rapidly as he desires and is able to proceed. Ms. Nelson and Cleland sound a warning about letting the child move too rapidly, however, pointing out that basic word recognition skills should be stressed to provide the foundation for reading growth.

3. **Emphasis on the development of higher mental processes:** Since gifted children attain independence in reading earlier than other students, they are also ready earlier for instruction in inferential, interpretive and critical reading.

4. **Efforts to extend the student's interest in reading:** "The importance of adequate reading skills instruction for the gifted cannot be overstated, but reading is much more than just knowing how to read," note the authors. An abundance of reading material is required to be certain the gifted youth are being provided with the best possible reading instruction not only to develop skill in reading but to nurture a love of learning that guarantees their education will continue as long as there are good books to read.

"It is almost inconceivable that educators and citizens have permitted the long standing neglect of gifted and creative children
and youth to persist," says Witty, who adds that there are some current trends and practices in education that are heartening, as some schools are currently including reading programs for the gifted and creative youth as part of their overall curriculum planning.

Additionally, he believes that with the present trend toward increased attention to individual differences, gifted and creative pupils are becoming the recipients of much needed opportunities and enrichment. Nonetheless, the total provision is small and a need exists for more developmental reading programs designed to care for the full range of pupil abilities and aptitudes, according to Witty.

The adult non-reader

The federal R2R effort, as noted earlier, is not aimed just at developing effective reading programs to eliminate illiteracy in school graduates, but is also highly concerned with teaching adult functional illiterates how to read. As a result of this emphasis from the federal level, more and more states and local school districts are becoming increasingly involved in adult basic education programs.

"Revolutionary changes have occurred in the field of adult basic education (ABE) over the past few years. A wealth of new approaches, methodologies, and materials has been developed and tried," said Ms. Catherine White in the 1970 IRA text Reading and Revolution. "ABE

1loc. cit., 61-62.

classes are attracting more and more students each year. Some communities now have set aside whole schools as adult education centers."

The difficulties of initiating an ABE program in reading present school administrators with an entirely different set of problems than they normally face in the battle against illiteracy. Perhaps the greatest of these is simply locating the student and convincing him to return to school, where he has often experienced little more than failure.

Adult illiterates are also often reluctant to admit their deficiency and must be persuaded to try school again and encouraged to believe in their own ability to read, according to Edwin and Marie Smith¹ in the National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education's Teaching Reading To Adults.

Following the successful implementation in several communities of the Laubach method of teaching reading to adults, Minnesota, R2R's model state, decided to incorporate the method as its model for statewide use. According to Peter Enich² of Minnesota's R2R staff, the Laubach method includes many of the elements necessary for a successful ABE program and the instructional materials "appear to be as good as anything on the market today and in many respects better than most."


²Enich, Peter, In a June 6, 1973, letter from the Minnesota Right To Read staff to Lloyd D. Bender. Xeroxed and forwarded to the author by Minnesota Right To Read Director Hugh Schoephoerster, St. Paul, Minnesota, September 14, 1973, 1-5.
Enich lists ten elements of the Laubach method which he believes are necessary to the success of an ABE reading program:

1. The material has been developed specifically for adults. Both the story material and the methodology are geared to the adult mind.

2. The program is based on a proven method, which has been used with adults learning to read in most countries of the world over the past 40 years. The first edition of the series was published more than 20 years ago and has been used by thousands of teachers and students in the United States and abroad.

3. A reading program is provided for adults from the zero level to seventh grade, which provides a comprehensive program in terms of reading skill scope and sequence.

4. Lessons are presented in small learning increments in consistent lesson patterns.

5. Independence in reading is encouraged through self-help devices and correlated readers. Pictures and aids for pronunciation of new words provide for maximum self-help and minimum teacher help.

6. Problems of English spelling are considered. In addition to controlled vocabulary, the series uses existing phonetic regularities, emphasizes regular spellings and provides aids to irregular spellings.

7. Meaning, as well as word recognition, is emphasized. Each lesson contains a story structured around the key words and sounds being taught. Checkups are provided to test comprehension.

8. Reading and writing lessons are correlated to reinforce skills.
9. Vocabulary is controlled, introducing most frequently used words.

10. The materials have been planned for ease of teaching. The detailed guides for teachers make it possible for relatively inexperienced teachers to use the material successfully. (In Minnesota, a special teacher-training workshop, offered by the R2R Regional Reading Director, is recommended also).

Enich adds that another advantage offered by the Laubach method includes an extensive use of volunteers, which serves the double purpose of easing the financial burdens involved in developing an ABE reading program and helping to protect the anonymity of the students, who often fear to expose themselves as nonreaders.

Some Basic Steps in Program Development

"Although there are many combinations of ways to overcome environmental obstacles to reading, one fact emerges clearly: Schools must take the lead in initiating change before improvement can come about," the 1970 PREP study¹ concluded, adding that the crucial factor in improvement is change initiated by the school principal.

The PREP report did not place the entire burden on the principal's shoulders, stating that given the magnitude and complexity of

environmental effects on reading, it is possible even well conceived, planned, structured programs might fall. Nevertheless, the ultimate conclusion was that the principal was the key individual within the school district who had the power to reduce the possibility of failure and to enhance the chances for success.

Although a number of elements of successful programs have already been discussed, the question remains as to how does a principal proceed in a logical way to establish a reading program. PREP findings indicate there are eight basic steps to follow:

1. **Survey the needs related to reading**: What factors in the neighborhood may interfere with the reading performance of some, or even all, of the children? Examples include a poor self-image, lack of language stimulation, non-standard dialect and negative attitude toward school and authority. Study committees, questionnaires and school records can help determine these factors.

2. **Assess resources**: What people, facilities, money and procedures can you use to act on the needs? Interested teachers and community groups, temporary buildings, contingency funds and federal grants, and participation in pilot programs are a few examples.

3. **Consider possible solutions-programs**: What do research, demonstration programs, or common sense suggest as ways that will ease the reading problems in your school district? Ungraded classes, home-school teachers, family library programs, tutors, directed field trips and stimulating materials are some possibilities.

4. **Include the community in planning and in execution**: What groups or individuals should help solve some of the reading problems?
Examples are the PTA, local business associations, political pressure groups, professional associations and interested parents. These people are important not only for generating good will, but also for selling the programs to the community and for finding resources to operate the proposed programs.

5. Set specific objectives: What should the children (or adults) be able to do as a result of your programs? For example, with a home-school coordinator program, the child and the parent should be able to conduct a simple reading and comprehensive exercise after a visit from the coordinator. Establishing specific objectives is an important factor both in "selling" the program to others and in evaluating its effectiveness.

6. Clarify operational procedures: Who are the people with the responsibility and what are the rules for the programs? For example, publicize the leader of the program and the guidelines for its operation. A necessary condition is that the principal must give the program leader freedom to operate. Innovative programs, like innovative teachers, must be free to make mistakes or it is unlikely that anything exciting can happen.

7. Submit a proposal: If the program needs central approval for any reason, write a proposal that describes the first six steps and gives a budget.

8. Evaluate the program: Are the procedures being carried out? Have the objectives been realized to some degree? Be willing to evaluate in terms of the response of the teaching staff, the pupils, and the local community. Use some format measures of achievement.
Obviously, these eight steps are not the only considerations in establishing an effective reading program, especially on a coordinated K-12 basis. For instance, authorities\(^1\) state that perhaps the greatest mistake a superintendent or principal can make in attempting to establish a school reading program is to plan it himself and attempt to mobilize the staff to initiate it.

Few administrators, they say, have the technical background in reading instruction or the time to develop a sound reading program and curriculum. Additionally, making broad changes and attempting to impose them on the teaching staff tends to stir resentment and may doom any program, regardless of merit, before it gets a good start.

Besides utilizing key community members in the development of a program, PREP researchers report another critical step is to bring in all staff members (i.e., principals, reading coordinators, special consultants, remedial instructors and classroom teachers) who will be involved in the program early in the planning state.

When is a Reading Program Successful?

Assuming the local administrators, teachers and community leaders have developed and initiated a K-12 reading program, how can they tell if they have succeeded? Kenneth Goodman and Olive Niles,\(^2\) in the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) 1970 text *Reading*


Process and Program, state the following conditions should generally be present:

1. It is a well-rounded program, giving attention not only to both basic and specialized skills and their application in all appropriate ways but also to the effective aspects of the process.

2. It is a respecter of all groups of students: the handicapped, the gifted, the ethnically or socially different.

3. It is also a respecter of individuals and provides for their needs and interests so far as it is possible to do so.

4. It is continuous and sequential through the entire range of a school system's responsibility.

5. It is as relevant as possible to conditions in a school and a community.

6. It exists in an atmosphere of expected success on the part of both teachers and students.

7. It is implemented by the entire professional staff, which keeps up with the best available theory and practice.

8. It is supported by a community which willingly supplies the funds for adequate staffing and materials.

9. It is continuously evaluated and changed, if evaluation indicates that change is required.

Ms. Katherine Torrent,¹ in IRA's 1969 Reading and the Elementary Curriculum, perhaps best foresaw the direction of successful reading

---
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program development efforts in the 1970's, when she concluded that reading instruction does not end at sixth grade, but is part of a continuing process that should be present on a K-12 basis.

"Not only does a total reading program within a school system provide reading instruction into the secondary level, but such a program serves also to improve the quality of education throughout the entire instructional span, from kindergarten through grade twelve," says Ms. Torrent.

"More effective techniques, a wealth of attractive new materials, and experimentation with fresh approaches to reading continue to be essential to the maintenance of a reading program commensurate with the educational and vocational demands and the conflicts that confront today's school-aged and college-aged young people. This calls for total involvement of many disciplines and lay groups," she says.
CHAPTER VIII
WHERE TO FROM HERE

Are the American schools failing to provide adequate reading instruction for the nation's children? Does a "reading crisis" actually exist? If so, how extensive is the problem? Can it be solved?

In the face of overwhelming statistics, few people will argue that there are millions of Americans who cannot read. Ever since Rudolph Flesch published his sensational best-seller Why Johnny Can't Read in 1955, educators, legislators, parents and citizens in general have become increasingly interested in reading instruction and achievement.

"Never before have the mass media reported so many conflicting stories about how 'well' or how 'poorly' Americans read. According to these reports, Americans appear to believe that they can hardly read, that large numbers of people are illiterate, that reading failures have reached epidemic proportions, and that school systems neglect reading to such a degree that a national crisis exists," stated Richard Petre,¹ reading consultant for the Maryland State Department of Education in "The 70's: Decade of Achievement?" (Journal of Reading, December 1972).

Petre argues that "emotionalism" has had a strong effect on the views of the public and educators alike in attempting to assess the reading problem in the United States. Reason must replace emotionalism, he argues, if any concrete results in reading achievement are to be reported by 1980.

Citing the 1970 report of the U. S. Census Bureau, which stated that illiteracy for all persons fourteen years and older in the U.S. was cut in half during the 1960's and reached a new low, as 1.2 million individuals learned to read and write for the first time, he contends that illiteracy in the country is declining.

"Nationally we have reached our highest percentage level of people who can read and write," says Petre. "Teachers need not and should not be on the defensive."

Petre does not deny that reading problems do exist in our country, as evidenced by the national and state priorities to eliminate illiteracy in the U.S. and to improve each citizen's quality of reading. However, while acknowledging cause for concern about the reading problem, he does provide an optimistic prediction of continued future success and confidence in our ability to overcome the problem.

Ralph Staiger, executive secretary-treasurer of IRA, echoed Petre's optimism in September 1973 when he wrote, "There appears to be a resurgence of confidence that reading can be taught well and that it can be taught in many ways. More preservice teachers are having

---

1Staiger, Ralph C., Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the International Reading Association, In a letter to the author, September 10, 1973, 2.
experiences in real school situation than ever before . . . . In-service teachers appear to be interested in why they do things, not only in how they can teach.

Like the results of the NAEP studies, which indicated Americans read much better than many people thought, other current studies of educational progress have also sounded positive notes regarding reading achievement in the U. S.

For example, Torsten Husen, chairman of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), stated in August 1973 that their studies show the best students in a universal education system, such as America's, do as well as the best students in a school system which caters only to the elite.

Husen said this principle is evident especially in comparing students in the U. S., where roughly 75 percent of the age group surveyed by IEA complete formal upper secondary schooling.

IEA, like its American counterpart NAEr, is an educational survey project designed to assess skills, knowledges and attitudes of young people at various age levels. Its results are based on tests of over 250,000 students in 23 countries.

If nothing else, such encouraging views and research findings do provide some hope for future success in America's attack on illiteracy and poor reading skills. The battle cry was sounded by the late USOE Commissioner Allen in 1969 and thousands of educators, legisla-

1 Husen, "International Achievement Survey Challenges Education Myths." A news release from the Education Commission of the States (Denver), forwarded to the author, August 13, 1973, 2-4. (Mimeographed)
tors and members of the lay public have joined in the fight since then.

Petre¹ perhaps best summed up the outlook for the future and the challenges ahead when he wrote: "Historically the 70's may become the greatest decade for reading in the United States if we provide reading instruction and guarantees of achievement to all citizens. Certainly, everyone wants to eliminate illiteracy, improve the quality of reading in our schools and refine the reading curriculum to make it more meaningful. All should have a part to play after assessing our potential . . . . Reading's place in the sun depends on the response made by the professionals in education, especially those in reading."

¹Petre, op. cit., 206.
One of the basic assumptions of principals and board of education members—that state-certified graduates of accredited teacher training institutes possess at least a minimal understanding of how to teach reading—is not always valid. In fact, according to Harold Roeder, State University College (New York), "Nothing could be more remote from reality!"

Roeder, in the fall 1973 Journal of Research and Development in Education, said that there is no guarantee that graduates of accredited elementary, secondary and junior high school education sequences have completed a course in reading methods or have demonstrated a fundamental understanding of how to teach reading prior to being graduated and awarded certification.

"In fact," charges Roeder, "the majority of Johnny's teachers have no doubt spent more time in college gymnasiums learning to play volleyball and similar games than they have spent in college classes learning how to teach reading."

The seriousness of the situation, he explains, is especially critical since numerous research studies have revealed that the teacher is one of the most important variables in successful reading instruction.

---

"Perhaps Johnny is experiencing difficulty in learning to read because many of his teachers have not been adequately prepared to teach reading," charges Roeder, adding one more reason among many as to why student reading achievement isn't as high as desired.

Roeder made his indictment of teacher training institutions following a three-year (1970-73), nation-wide investigation of every four-year institution in the 50 states and the District of Columbia which offered an accredited elementary, secondary or junior high school teacher education program and graduated students who were awarded state certification.

For example, the survey of 940 teacher-training institutes offering elementary programs, 10 percent did not have any requirements for courses in reading and only 94 schools required teacher trainees to complete more than three hours in reading courses. In contrast, Roeder noted that 305 of the institutions required over three hours in religion, 300 required more than three hours in physical education, and 133 required more than three hours in music.

While admitting that a course in teaching of reading isn't a guarantee of success in the classroom, Roeder feels requiring a course in reading methods, or a related course, does offer certain advantages, including emphasizing the importance of reading as an area of instruction to prospective teachers.

"If cliches such as 'every teacher is a teacher of reading' and prophecies such as the 'Right To Read' are to become realities, then the colleges and universities which are responsible for the pre-service preparation of teachers need to continue to close the gap.
between what a classroom teacher needs to know about the teaching of reading and what teacher education curricula are doing in order to prepare teachers to teach reading," concluded Roeder. "Until this is done, all the impressive cliches and slogans will remain unfulfilled promises and Johnny will grow older watching his offspring experience some of the same reading difficulties which plagued him."
THE DYSLEXIC CHILD: A SPECIAL PROBLEM

Seven million elementary and secondary school students suffer from the "academic wounds" of dyslexia—or a specific reading disability—says Rudolph F. Wagner, school psychologist for the Richmond (Va.) Public Schools.

Dyslexic children derive little information from the printed word. According to Joseph Stocker of the Arizona Education Association, the dyslexic child often evidences such symptoms as poor coordination, a limited attention span, language and speech disorders, and perceptual difficulties.

"Frustrated in his attempts to learn, he may become a discipline problem and an early dropout," said Stocker, who noted that dyslexic children often have average or superior intelligence, citing Thomas Edison and General George Patton as examples.

The dyslexic student, Wagner said, is often difficult to spot because he is usually bright and learns to read lips. The main symptom of the problem, he stated, is the reversal phenomenon (e.g., 18 becomes 81). Additionally, the child is probably hyperactive, has


2Stocker, Joseph, "Non-Reading Child May Have 'Word Blindness'" A news release from the Arizona Education Association to the National School Public Relations Association, October 12, 1972, 1-2.

3Wagner, op. cit.
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poor auditory discrimination, displays poor spelling ability, and may appear clumsy due to poor orientation in space.

Speaking before the 1973 NAESP Convention in Detroit (MI), Wagner, author of *Dyslexia and Your Child: A Guide for Teachers and Parents* (Harper & Row, New York), said that one of the most effective and least expensive ways to help the dyslexic child is to provide him with a tutor for at least 15 minutes a day. The tutor, he explained, can be the child's parent, a school volunteer, a peer or an older student; the method works because of the skill and affection offered in this type of one-to-one relationship.

"Children With Specific Reading Difficulties," a 1972 report issued in England to advise the Secretary of State for Education and Science on the dyslexia problem, also emphasizes the need for personal, teacher-involved remedial work in this area.

Other recommendations of the English study call for: systematic screening by school officials to identify problem readers in their early school years, continuing checks on the progress of children identified as backward in reading, skilled remedial teaching in their regular schools, and paying particular attention to the needs of children with reading backwardness in secondary schools.

---

Audiovisual materials are widely used in reading programs throughout the United States to strengthen reading skills and improve the reading process. These reading tools are generally designed to stimulate student interest, provide incentive, and serve as a teaching aid for individualized instruction.

The Utah State Board of Education has identified a number of audiovisual machines that provide purposeful training in reading programs. These include:

**Tachistoscopes**

- T-matic 150
- Tach X

Tachistoscopic attachments are available from several companies. Tachistoscopic training strengthens word and phrase recognition, visual memory, increases eye span, speed of recognition, and can be used as a review for vocabulary and spelling words.

**Reading Machines**

- Tachomatic 500

This device projects multi-level words and phrases at varying rates. It uses filmstrips that break up the line of print into three

---

and two fixations. Efficiency in reading is increased as the recognition span is widened and the rate increased. The Tachomatic 500 strengthens left to right direction, recognition of more than one word per fixation, return sweep, and decreases regressions.

Controlled Reader       Educational Development Laboratory

This machine controls projection of reading material. The basic concept is seeing one and a fraction words per fixation. It is instrumental in strengthening left to right direction, return sweep, and in decreasing regressions.

Craig Reader               Craig Research - Los Angeles

This is a combination reading pacer and tachistoscope. It is suggested for on or above grade achievers.

Pacers (non-projecting)

Skimmer                      E.D.L.
Shadowscope                   Psychotechnique
Rateometer                    Audio Visual Research
Model IV and III             Science Research Associates

Pacers usually involve a light beam that travels down the page at controlled speeds.

Filmstrip Projectors

A wide variety of filmstrips are available which feature phonics, spelling instruction, vocabulary development, words and phrases, and stories.

Tape Recorder

This is probably one of the best and most versatile pieces of
equipment. Materials can be developed or purchased to improve oral
skills, oral fluency, and rate.

**Tape Players**

Tape players provide for the same learning opportunities as
listed above. Students can listen to material but not record. The
cost is slightly less expensive than tape recorders.

**Language Master**

The Language Master is designed for auditory and visual stimuli.
It uses cards with recording tape attached to the lower part. Words,
phrases, and sentences can be printed and recorded on the card. The
student sees and hears the word or phrases. On the student's track
he verbally records what he heard. He then checks his response
with the instructor's recording and corrects any errors. Commercially
prepared cards are also available.

**Overhead Projector**

A wide selection of transparencies are available commercially.
Overlays are most effective. Special pencils may be used to write on
transparencies as needed.
MINNESOTA'S CRITERIA OF EXCELLENCE IN READING PROGRAMMING

As part of the Right To Read effort in Minnesota, the state Right To Read Advisory Council\(^1\) approved (November 20, 1972) the following 24 criteria which they believe should characterize a quality reading program:

1. There is coordination of all the administrative facets of the reading program.

2. There is continuous progress organization of the reading curriculum so as to preclude gaps and omissions.

3. There is a record keeping system for individual pupils.

4. There is a complete testing system which includes the use of criterion-referenced measures.

5. There is a commitment by staff to pupil learning and not just to teaching.

6. There is refined accommodation of the varying moments of readiness, varying rates of learning, and special needs and problems of all children.

7. There is accommodation of the instructional reading level of all children.

8. The reading program recognizes and accommodates the implications that racial, cultural, and sexual differences may have in terms
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of curriculum, methodology, organization and administration, and materials.

9. There are curriculum adjustments in other subject areas for the children who are unable to cope with grade level reading matter.

10. There is ongoing in-service education for the total certificated teaching, supportive, and administrative staffs that is both intensive and extensive. Supportive staff is interpreted to include librarians, teachers of special subjects such as music and physical education, counselors, et cetera.

11. There is a program of preparation in reading for all substitute teachers, non-certificated staff who work in the classroom, such as teacher aides, parent volunteers, et cetera, and for the auxiliary personnel associated with the school.

12. Opportunities are provided to junior and senior high school teachers in academic subject areas to develop the competencies which will allow them to accommodate the varying reading achievement levels of their students.

13. Each local education agency (lea) has a cadre of trained volunteer reading helpers.

14. There is an adult basic education component.

15. There are defined curricular provisions within the lea for gifted and/or high achieving pupils.

16. There is an articulated quality preschool component that involves parents.

17. There exists readily available quality school and public library resources and services that are maximally utilized.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
18. Provision has been made within the local education agency to produce quality instructional and practice materials for distribution to the teachers of reading. Materials that allow pupils to work independently and that articulate with the defined curriculum of the lea are desirable.

19. Junior and senior high school teachers of reading have a demonstrated knowledge of developmental reading as it relates to their local education agency's curriculum.

20. The board of education of the local education agency has established an incentive program for teacher in-service education in reading.

21. Each local education agency defines their reading curriculum and makes the information available to the public.

22. Each local education agency has identified someone within the lea who has the authority, responsibility, and time for the development and maintenance of a quality reading program.

23. The local education agency annually has available the achievement levels of their pupils in reading by grade and/or age level.

24. Each local education agency has developed a reporting system for reading development that fully, accurately, and specifically documents a child's learning and provides such information to the parents.
Reading Is Fundamental (RIF) is a national program designed to give children a pleasant incentive to read by letting them choose, from a wide variety of inexpensive, attractive paperback books, the ones that interest them, and by letting them keep the books as their own.

The magic word "motivation" is the key element of the RIF program, which was initiated in 1966 by Ms. Margaret McNamara, wife of former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Since its conception, over 3,000,000 paperback books have been distributed in participating communities to over 750,000 children throughout the United States.

As of September 1973 there were 128 RIF projects under way in 43 states, including 18 organized within the R2R program, which is only one of the many RIF supporters. In addition to these operational projects, an additional 89 RIF programs--including 31 as part of local R2R efforts--were in the process of development.

The national RIF program, in association with the Smithsonian Institution, sets goals and guidelines, provides project development materials and technical assistance to local RIF projects throughout the United States.

---


2 "Projects Increasing As Total Reaches 128 in 43 States." RIF Newsletter, III (September 1973), 1.

the United States. But the strength of RIF projects lies in their grass-roots involvement, for each community organizes, develops, funds and runs its own program.

The concept of the program is simple: given free choice and the opportunity to own their own books, children discover the wealth of enjoyment and fun in reading that so often eludes them in the classroom situation. Most RIF programs have been implemented with the cooperation of local school systems, but the program has not been designed as an educational resource for the school. Rather, it is meant as a recreational resource for the child with obvious and tangible educational benefits.

To this end, RIF programs work closely with school boards, principals, librarians and teachers to insure that the values of "free choice" and "pride of ownership" are preserved while capitalizing on the children's newly found interest in books and reading. For this reason, it should be emphasized that RIF does not assess the effectiveness of its programs through traditional indices such as reading scores.

Far more important to the success of a RIF program is community involvement. In practical terms, volunteer help is necessary for the implementation of the program: selection of books, inventory and storage, displaying the books and helping the children during distribution all demand many man-hours of work.

Even more essential, however, is involving the parents of the children who are receiving the books in the program. The byproducts of parent involvement, cited in city after city, are greater interest
and ability to cope with the educational needs of their children.

And, as has happened in several cities, as the program has progressed book fairs have been instituted for parents. In making books and reading a natural part of a child's daily experience--by allowing the child to bring his or her own books home--RIF has found that the entire family is stimulated to read, enjoy and own books.

(For further information, write: Reading is FUNdamental, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.)
GUIDELINES FOR A SUCCESSFUL INDIVIDUALIZED READING PROGRAM

Richard Wilson and Helen James\(^1\) in *Individualized Reading A Practical Approach* (Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, second edition, 1972) have identified twelve common factors found in current successful reading programs based on an individualized teaching approach. These are:

1. Every child is encouraged to select his own reading material for free reading and for skill growth.
2. The child may read at a pace he sets and not a pace established by a group leader.
3. There is no minimum or maximum amount of reading required for individuals or for a group.
4. There is no labeling of children in terms of reading ability. There are no high groups or low groups, no bluebirds or redbirds; and John and Susie have no groups named for them.
5. A child's ability to read is judged by the teacher in an individual conference or in a group organized for a specific reason. Evaluation is based upon performance with materials selected by pupils more often than with materials selected by the teacher.
6. Record keeping is a responsibility of the pupil as well as the teacher.

7. Skills are taught to individuals or to small groups as well as the total group when they are needed.

8. Oral reading is used for diagnosing reading needs of individual pupils. The data may be collected as children work in a group and confirm findings by reading specific sentences, as they read to each other or the total group a material selected expressly for oral reading, as they read during a conference to prove a point or to satisfy a request of the teacher, or as they read portions of selections to develop the interests of other children in a specific selection.

9. Silent reading is emphasized, the goals being to improve comprehension and rate and to encourage extensive individual reading.

10. Records kept by pupils and the teacher enable the teacher to know pupils' strengths and weaknesses and to plan appropriate activities in terms of needs and interests.

11. Curiosity about available reading materials is increased rather than diminished, since there are few occasions when pupils hear oral reading and discussion of selections which they will eventually read themselves.

12. Current commercially available materials and aids may be incorporated into the program for skills learning, insuring a variety of activities and greater provision for children's needs and interests.
CONDITIONS THAT LEAD TO READING FAILURE

Delwyn Schubert and Theodore Torgerson, in their 1972 edition of Improving The Reading Program (W. C. Brown Company, Dubuque, Iowa), provide further ideas for both administrators and teachers interested in creating a successful reading program.

Knowing what not to do, as stated earlier, can provide as many valuable guidelines and program implications as knowledge about successful elements of program development and administration. In this area, Schubert and Torgerson list a number of conditions and practices that tend to produce or aggravate reading disabilities.

Although the list is lengthy (i.e., 31 items), it includes most of the items many reading experts agree contribute to student failure.

Included are: beginning formal instruction in reading before a child has attained readiness (i.e., the level of maturity a child must reach before he can succeed in formal reading under normal instruction), accepting a low level of mastery of word recognition in primary grades, employing a round-robin method of teaching oral reading, failing to develop independent reading habits in all pupils in the primary grades, and failing to use instructional material diversified in difficulty and content in each grade.

Other conditions for failure are: requiring retarded readers to use material on a frustration level of difficulty; relying on group

—

instruction to meet the reading needs of all pupils; failing to promote a balanced program with a variety of materials in reading; considering reading as a mechanical process; failing to motivate children to read widely; assuming that teaching, instead of learning, is the goal of education; assuming reading can be taught effectively as an isolated communicative skill; and failing to recognize that mastery of reading skills differs from mastery of information.

Additional problems listed include: failing to promote wholesome teacher-pupil relationships; failing to detect hazards to learning, such as physical impairment, emotional immaturity and cultural deprivation; failing to estimate the potential of all children; failing to discover the educational causes underlying individual reading problems; failing to adequately utilize cumulative records; failing to provide a systematic and objective testing program; and assuming that retardation is nonexistent when the class average on standardized reading tests reaches or exceeds the norm.

Failing to provide a systematic longitudinal program of developmental and corrective reading; failing to eliminate individual difficulties when they first appear; failing to correct individual difficulties in word analysis in the intermediate grades; failing to utilize adequate and appropriate corrective material; exposing pupils to fourth-grade materials before they have achieved independent reading habits; and failing to limit the size of classes are other considerations that can lead to reading difficulties in the classroom.

Schubert and Torgerson conclude their list with five other areas of consideration that can create problems. These are failing to:
consider competence in the teaching of reading when hiring new teachers; provide in-service education for all teachers in the area of reading; provide ample material needed for meeting the wide range of reading ability and interests in each classroom; interpret the school's reading program to the public; and provide a well-staffed and well-equipped school library.
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READING EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Evaluation of a student's status, as well as his achievement, in reading is a critical element in every reading program, according to both reading experts and research studies on program effectiveness. In addition to teacher-constructed tests, the schools responding to the Education U.S.A. survey\(^1\) indicated they utilize a wide variety of standardized tests to assess reading readiness and progress as a means of evaluating pupils and programs.

In 1972, the Ferguson-Florissant School District\(^2\) in St. Louis, Missouri, prepared a booklet "The Reading Diagnosis," which lists and briefly summarizes a number of evaluative instruments available to reading and school personnel. Although the list is not all-inclusive and there are numerous other tests available, it does contain valuable information on many of the standardized tests being used throughout the nation's schools. Therefore, the list is reproduced to provide local school districts with an initial survey of some available means of evaluation. (For school personnel interested in a more complete listing of tests and background in reading evaluation, Roger Farr's\(^3\) Reading: What Can Be Measured? (IRA, 1969) provides a comprehensive background on testing in reading.)

---

\(^1\) Boes, Shirley, and Roger D. Dixon, "NSPRA Query On Reading In The Nation's Schools." A survey of the 100 largest school districts in the United States, conducted July-October, 1973, and prepared under the direction of the National School Public Relations Association, Arlington, Virginia. Forty-five schools responded to the query.

\(^2\) Ferguson-Florissant (Missouri) School District Department of Curriculum and Instruction, "The Reading Diagnosis." A report on reading evaluation instruments used in the Ferguson-Florissant School District, St. Louis County, Missouri, January 1972, 1.
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Instruments for Diagnosis

**Standardized diagnostic tests**

1. **Gray Oral Reading Paragraphs**: Graded paragraphs are read orally by the child. The rate of reading influences the score achieved. Simple recall questions check the comprehension. This test indicates the level at which a child can read with ease and fluency. Coding errors allow analysis of reading difficulties.

2. **Gilmore Oral Reading Test**: Oral reading of graded paragraphs aid in a detailed individual analysis of oral reading abilities. The test is used at all levels and determines performance as to accuracy, rate of reading and comprehension. It also indicates basal reading level and may indicate listening level.

3. **Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test**: Speed, accuracy, vocabulary and comprehension are measured in this survey test. It gives a grade level and a percentile score. There are various forms for all levels and it helps estimate student reading level.

4. **Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Level I and Level II**: Standardized reading tests are administered individually or in groups. The two levels of the test aid in the identification of specific strengths and weaknesses in reading comprehension, vocabulary, syllabication, auditory skills, various aspects of phonetic analysis, and rate of reading. The tests provide estimates on a student's reading

---

\[\text{Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.}\]
level based on comprehension and identifies areas of reading difficulties.

5. **Gates-Mckillop Reading Diagnostic Test**: Tests of oral reading of paragraphs are compared with the child's ability to master sub-skills in the areas of word analysis, phrase perception, word recognition, and spelling. They provide intensive analysis of reading problems and evaluate a child's functional reading level with his skill ability.

6. **Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty**: This instrument contains tests of oral and silent reading, listening, comprehension, word analysis, phonics, writing and spelling. It provides intensive analysis of reading problems and evaluates the child's listening comprehension as compared to his reading achievement.

7. **Bond-Balow-Hoyt Silent Reading Diagnostic Test**: These tests may be administered to a group but provide an individual test profile. They indicate reading ability as to vocabulary, literal and creative comprehension and analyze the specific word recognition skills of pupils.

**Informal inventory tests**

1. **Ferguson-Florissant Informal Inventory**: Stories are selected from the readers for oral and silent reading with accompanying questions on details, main ideas, vocabulary, and implied meanings. These tests help indicate the reading level at which a child can be instructed, as well as his independent, frustration and listening levels. They also show types of word recognition errors.
2. Macmillan Placement Test: A word pronunciation list measures the ability of the child to pronounce words in isolation and determines the place to initiate the oral reading. Graded selections in oral reading provide a means for assessing the child's ability on aided and unaided recall. The test indicates the reading level at which the child can be instructed, as well as his independent and frustration levels. It also shows types of word recognition errors.

3. Houghton-Mifflin Placement Test: This instrument contains selections for both oral and silent reading, with questions concerning literal and interpretive comprehension, as well as vocabulary meaning. It indicates instructional level, as well as rate of reading. Specific comprehension and word recognition skills can be observed.

4. Ginn Informal Inventory: A series of selections provides information on word recognition and comprehension skills with various reading levels. The test identifies the instructional level of reading.

5. Scott, Foresman Informal Inventory: Oral reading from the selections allows notation of word recognition skills. Comprehension is checked with specific questions. The instrument helps to indicate appropriate placement for the child and provide specific clues in his ability to use various comprehension strategies.

General mental tests

1. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC): This powerful test differentiates intelligence into verbal and performance levels.
It analyzes verbal intelligence involving facility in the use of language, practical intelligence involving manipulating objects, and social intelligence involving facility in dealing with common sense situations.

2. **Wechsler Preschool Primary Scale of Intelligence (WPPSI)**: This instrument includes a series of developmental tasks for assessing the young child's mental ability. It indicates the child's present functional level for the same kind of tasks as measured by the WISC and compares the child's verbal ability with his performance ability.

3. **Slosson Intelligence Test**: This individual intelligence test can be given in a short period of time and provides an indication of a child's present functioning.

4. **Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test**: This test has a series of picture plates arranged in consecutive order which are identified by the child when the oral word is pronounced. It evaluates the individual's ability to associate a given picture with an oral word.

**Visual tests**

1. **Beery-Buktenica Developmental Form Sequence**: In this instrument a series of geometric forms are arranged consecutively in developmental levels and copied by the child. It approximates the ability of the child in reproducing with the hands what the eyes see, in executing designs from left to right and from top to bottom, and in attaining proper focus with the two eyes.

2. **Bender Visual Motor Gestalt Test**: It consists of a series
of nine copy forms arranged in consecutive order of difficulty. Measures the maturation development of the child in the visual motor areas.

3. *Betts Ready to Read Tests on Visual Discrimination*: Lists of similar letters, blends and words which are to be assorted and identified as being alike or different are used in this instrument. It tests the ability to name upper and lower case letters and checks visual discrimination, reversal tendencies, and knowledge of letter names.

**Memory and concentration tests**

1. *Detroit Auditory Attention Span for Unrelated Words*: Series of unrelated words are heard and reproduced in this test. It determines the child's ability to recall unrelated words which are read to him. This test should be compared with the Visual Span for Unrelated Items. Low score indicates that there is a need for relating facts, events, or words to be learned to the child's experiences.

2. *Detroit Attention Span for Related Syllables*: Sentences are heard and repeated with a variety of concepts added consecutively in this instrument, which tests the ability of a student to retain information and to use context clues.

3. *Detroit Visual Span for Unrelated Items*: A child is asked to recall a series of flashed items with this test, which measures ability to recall items presented visually. It is used to compare visual channel as opposed to the auditory channel.

4. *Detroit Visual Attention Span for Letters*: A child is asked
to recall a series of flashed letters with this instrument, which evaluates his ability to perceive in proper sequence a group of unrelated letters and to retain the image long enough to repeat the sequence. It is also a test for letter reversals.

5. Detroit Test on Oral Directions: This test contains a list of drawings on which the child executes a series of directions. It measures the child's memory for organizing and sequencing oral directions.

Auditory tests

1. Monroe Auditory Discrimination Test: A list of 20 words arranged in pairs are identified as alike or different in this test, which measures ability to discriminate sounds.

2. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test: This test contains a list of 40 words which are arranged in pairs and identified as alike or different. It also measures the ability to discriminate sounds.

3. Katz Kindergarten Auditory Screening Test: Early detection of auditory skills is noted through a series of recorded tests. Children working in small groups respond on an individual worksheet. It measures the skills of sound blending, likenesses and differences, and speech in environmental noise.

4. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Test: This is an individual test presented on tape. Sound discrimination is presented in both a quiet and a noisy background. The instrument delineates speech-sound discrimination ability.

5. Ferguson-Florissant Phonics Test: Beginning and ending
sounds, blends, vowels, vowel teams, syllables, and accents are heard and recorded by the learner to indicate his ability to distinguish sounds and use phonetic principles.

6. Test of Word Recognition Skills: This test allows for informal diagnosis of basic phonetic skills. It measures a variety of phonetic skills.

7. Doren Diagnostic Reading Test: Basic techniques of word recognition are divided into eleven subtests with this instrument, which measures the degree to which children have mastered word recognition skills.

8. Roswell-Chall Auditory Blending Test: This test is administered individually. Norms are provided for the elementary school age child. The test evaluates a child's ability to blend words when the sounds are presented orally.

Oral language tests

1. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities: A series of activities involving the learner in acts of expressing, receiving, generalizing, manipulating, and recalling stimuli through the sensory channels are used in this test. It assesses the individual's ability to handle oral language situations and denotes a child's auditory or visual modality for learning.

2. Slingerland Test for Identifying Children with Specific Language Disability: This instrument contains a series of eight tests covering different visual and auditory skills. The test may be given to small groups. It identifies children with specific per-
ceptual-motor behavior that interferes with adequate development in writing, reading and spelling. It also indicates modality strength, whether it be visual, auditory, kinesthetic or a combination approach.

3. **Boehm Test of Basic Concepts**: This group test contains fifty concepts that deal with space, quantity and time. It helps indicate knowledge of concepts basic to instruction.

4. **Detroit Verbal Opposites Test**: Lists of words are given orally for which opposite responses are solicited with this instrument, which helps identify a child's ability to understand word meanings.

5. **Engelmann's Basic Concept Inventory Test**: Statements are given orally and the child responds by picture interpretation and verbal responses with this test. It identifies concepts which are basic to school success.
NSPRA CONTRACT

National School Public Relations Association
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209
July 20, 1973

Memorandum to Roger Dixon:

This will serve as a formal agreement between you and NSPRA regarding your assignment as the writer of the Education U.S.A. Special Report on Reading.

As with all of the Specials, your report can be a maximum of 64 book pages (130 double-spaced copy pages) or a minimum of 56 book pages (120 double-spaced copy pages). We will pay a minimum of $1,200 for a published report, with the amount ranging to a maximum of $2,000. This amount is determined by the managing editor, but is based on the writing quality, substance, accuracy and completeness of your manuscript. It also depends on how well you meet your deadline, which is important because of the need for an efficient production schedule in the office.

As we have discussed, I would suggest that you aim for an October 15 date for the submission of your outline. I think you would have adequate reason to ask for an extension on this date if the Right To Read Office cannot supply us with the model projects by mid-September, as promised by Dr. Holloway. Once your outline is approved by the editor, I would suggest that you work for a three-month completion date on the manuscript itself—approximately January 15.

I will leave to the discretion of the new editor whether you should submit the first couple of chapters on the report for his/her comments and suggestions re direction, style and general comments.

When the manuscript is completed, the editor will send it to several readers. These, in my view, would have to be experts in the field of reading. (It would be helpful, I think, for you to suggest names of such experts that you come across as you do the research and writing.) When the suggestions are in, the editor has the option of getting you to redo or rewrite anything you have omitted inadvertently or stated erroneously.

I will suggest to Mr. Wilson and Dick that you receive half your final payment for the manuscript at the time the manuscript is sent.
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out to readers and the balance when the editor of the reports is completely satisfied with it.

Although you have already been through the mill on one Special Report during your internship, it might help if we review the general principles for a Special: Number one is that you keep in mind that the intended audience is the school administrator, principal, school board member and teacher--generally the people who set policy and carry out programs in the school. We need to tell the scope and depth of the problem (why we are doing the report); what it is, how it operates, its key elements; a little of its history and background; legislation or action at the federal or state level; and probably most important--how the local program operates, including, where appropriate, descriptions of programs, staffing requirements, costs, and significant differences between and among programs. We always include descriptions of working "model" programs or those that have been especially successful. We also carry a chapter on the pros and cons of the approach or program, but sometimes these are better if they are interspersed throughout the copy. The last chapter is usually the last word--a sort of "this is what we see in the future" or "these are the emerging trends" kind of treatment. This is a general, quickie sketch of what constitutes a Special Report and you will need to modify it to fit your subject.

For any questions on editorial content or general direction of the report, you should call the editor; requests for research help should be directed to Suzanne. You can, of course, call on NSPRA to send out any questionnaires (to the state departments of education, individual programs, Right To Read directors, etc.) or at least to reimburse you for any expenses you incur if you do so yourself. Other reimbursable items include any tolls for phone calls, supplies, typing help on the report (at the going local rate), payments for books and reports you need but cannot get from NSPRA, and any necessary travel. If you spot a convention or seminar (such as the annual convention of the International Reading Association) that you feel could give you insight into the reading situation, please call the editor and get an ok before you pack your bag!

When the report is finished, you will need to return all source materials to the NSPRA office, with quotes, statistics, cost figures and the like marked for subsequent quick checking or review. Unused materials can be returned in a separate bundle.

The Education U.S.A. Special Report on Reading becomes the property of and will bear the copyright of the National School Public Rela-
tions Association. I think you may need to insert this notation on any copies of the report you need to submit as part of the procedure in using the report simultaneously for your doctorate at Western Michigan U.

One additional warning on the report—Suzanne and the editor will continue to send you research materials all the time you are working on the report—which is frustrating, but helps keep you up to the minute on any developments. When you hit the point of writing the last word, let Suzanne know she should cease sending you large packages.

As you will note, Roy K. Wilson is receiving a copy of this agreement; if he sees any reason to change anything contained in it, I am sure he will write to you directly.

Good luck!

(Miss) Shirley Boes
Managing Editor
Education U.S.A. Special Reports

SB/jhp

cc: Roy K. Wilson
    Richard Nielsen
Mr. Roger D. Dixon  
322 Prince Street  
Plainwell, Michigan 49080  

Dear Roger:  

In line with new policies on the Education U.S.A. Special Reports for the 1973-74 budget year, I wanted to tell you as soon as possible what is proposed.

The main thing that affects the writing of your report is a proposed change in format. Instead of the usual typewritten format, we are going to switch to cold type composition (similar to the style used in the Current Trends Reports). Enclosed is the latest in the Current Trends Series—Citizens Advisory Committees—to give you an idea of format.

It is only 56 pages long, but we would still aim for 64 pages in length on your report. That allows for one-third expansion in the amount of copy I told you that you needed to submit. Instead of 120 double-spaced pages, you will need to write approximately 160 pages. There is an option, however, that will perhaps ease your mind. We will be able to use any good appendix items that you find—which means that you should watch for illustrations, graphs, guidelines, perhaps even a very good speech that puts the whole report or a particular part of it in focus (in this case you would need to write only a pre-cede that could introduce the article and then let it stand on its own). You might also consider picking up lists of state coordinators (of bilingual education or reading—whatever suits your topic), people or organizations for further information, or good bibliographies that you run across.

Roy Wilson will contact you soon about a revised payment schedule in line with the additional work we are asking you to do. He also will advise you shortly on who will be coordinating the Special Reports and Current Trends Reports beginning in September.
If you have questions at this point about the revisions suggested above, please contact Roy Wilson.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Shirley Boes
Managing Editor
Education U.S.A. Special Reports

SB/jhp
cc: Roy K. Wilson
What's an Education U.S.A. Special Report?

An attempt to capture in 64 pages a single, important, current area of education.

That sounds dull, but it shouldn't. It is difficult, time-consuming, frustrating, perhaps; but never dull.

The Special Reports are written in plain, everyday English—instead of educationese—although most of the readers of the report are school superintendents (Many are gray or balding, bearing Dr.'s degrees and all sorts of credentials.); elementary and secondary school principals; school community relations directors; school board members; teachers of every curriculum area, type of degree and experience; some parents, congressmen, legislators; and other writers and editors.

All have one demand: understandable, interesting, accurate information.

That's our goal; the ground rules are as follows:

1. We are reporters, not experts. We do not make world-sweeping statements that we cannot back up with facts. We report the experts' views, pro and con, in context and with accuracy. The 'expert' need not be a name, although we certainly don't want to ignore people who have devoted their life's work to a subject. The expert may also be the school superintendent or the teacher who faces the problem every day. He may have better insight into how to do something right or what went wrong than the university "thinker" or big-name author. Balancing theory with practical experience is one of the most important types of information a Special Report can provide. We never want to say or infer that "This Education U.S.A. Special Report has decided that ____________ is the best means of educating a child." We can quote other people who say it, or oppose it, but we can't honestly claim to be expert enough to take this stance.

2. Keep in mind who makes up our audience. Explain in as much depth as needed what the reader must know, but avoid phrases or quotes that you fall in love with, but that don't necessarily pertain to the topic. For instance, if you are telling how some innovative teacher decided that kids should learn something about water and soil and
math and reading and history by going to visit an old well that is, for some reason, being put in use again—great, that's a good example of an innovative teacher. But, don't include in your description the depth of the well, the way the old bucket cable system worked, how many people fell in, or the exotic types of algae growing between the decaying rock. Save this information for the feature you write and sell to the local newspaper. We are NOT in favor of publishing "How a Well Was Built (or the West Was Won) and the History of Education," all in one Special Report. And our reader is much more interested in finding out what works and what doesn't—in education—and why. Please write with him in mind.

3. Don't use educationese—your editor can't understand it. If our readers wanted it, they'd be reading a professional journal or be asking some research assistant to come up with the facts they need.

4. Get as close to the source as you can, literally. If you have a choice of using your notes or quoting a newspaper or another journal or whatever, use your notes (you can still verify them with the newspaper). If you want to use a great story from a newspaper, verify the story—first. This way, you get additional information and can write it up as an interview. We get some of our best leads from newspaper clips, but we must follow up on them. Likewise, if we surveyed Education U.S.A. subscribers, large cities and state departments of education in doing research for your special, please use the information. This amounts to an "exclusive" for us and gives credence to the report. If you find 300 school districts reporting that something doesn't work, contrary to the experts' view, the reader deserves the benefit of your toil in wading through the replies. The surveys and reply forms provide ample ammunition for spotting trends, picking out particular problems and successes, contrasting the views of different school districts, cities and states. Sometimes, this works in reverse. If a district cites as "best" a program that by all standards is lousy, the program can be spotlighted (anonymously) as an example of what not to do.

5. Interpret, paraphrase, interpret, paraphrase. You can still attribute to the person whatever he said, but put it in your own words if you can say it better. Paraphrasing reduces the burden on the reader, alleviates the problem of putting attribution after every other long quote, and makes the reader feel confident in your confidence. This doesn't mean that we don't use good quotes; it does mean that we don't want to appear to be reprinting last year's New York Times, however readable and accurate it is as a source. Generally, we do not use newspaper editorials as "expert" opinions. Perhaps our best use of editorials comes if we need to show how the media view a particular topic.

6. Make judicious use of dates. Since we figure the average life of a Special Report is two to three years, the writer must include dates, where applicable. Instead of saying "recently," "currently," "now,"
"this year," "last year," "two months ago," please use the date. This rule applies particularly to any reference to laws, decisions, hearings, incidents, fiscal-year expenditures, magazine articles, books, reports. If the best source in the world dates back to 1922—say it's 1922 and then somehow explain to your reader (and your editor) why something that stood up in the Jazz Age still stands up or is being revived today.

7. Write in sentences long enough to say what you want to say, but short enough to be understandable. Compound/complex sentences are usually the latter; they discourage the reader's pace. Generally, if you choke over a sentence or gasp for breath when you read it aloud, your reader will do likewise. Two which's and two that's in the same sentence are like two sets of in-laws in the same house; two and possibly three must be thrown out before the nouns and the verbs are again in command.

8. Strong, accurate leads can get the reader into the copy quickly. Generally speaking, a quote shouldn't bear the brunt of the lead sentence for every graph, or for every other graph. Paraphrasing of particularly long quotations can let the reader know what is coming. Then he can have the pleasure of savoring the way the Bible put it (if, for example, you are quoting Genesis).

9. Use words—particularly verbs—as strong as needed; passive voice usually sounds passive.

10. Watch for appendix items, "box" items, "For More Information" and "Selected References."
LETTER TO READING SPECIALISTS

National School Public Relations Association
1801 North Moore Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209
August 23, 1973

Dear XXXX:

We are currently in the process of preparing an Education U.S.A. Special Report on reading for publication in the spring of 1974. We published an earlier reading report in 1970 (copy enclosed), but the reading field has changed so rapidly since then that we feel a new publication is mandatory. In connection with the new report, we would like some of your thoughts for direction and "inspiration."

The "Special Reports" have covered many education issues--everything from "Shared Services and Cooperatives" to "Dropouts." We make every effort to cover the topic completely, always from a reportorial stance, with particular emphasis on what the federal government, state and local governments and boards of education, research organizations and private organizations throughout the country are doing or can do about the particular area of concern. Our readers are mainly superintendents, principals, school board members and classroom teachers--the people who have to be informed about education.

As an acknowledged expert in the area of reading, you can help us by giving us your views. The following questions will give you some idea of the specific type of information we need:

1. Do you know of any new approaches to teaching reading? If so, would you please comment on them: what are they, where are they being implemented, rationale, successes, failures, and differences from prior approaches or methods.

2. What kind of reading objectives are teachers currently using? Are these different from those used in the past? If yes, how?

3. What is an adequate reading level for a high school graduate in the United States? Does a student need different reading skills if he intends to become a mechanic, opposed to becoming a teacher, for instance?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
4. Should our public schools do more work on remedial reading? Is remediation the answer to the problem? If not, what is? Or, is there an answer?

5. What are your reactions to current reading trends and programs throughout the United States? And, what changes do you foresee concerning reading programs in the schools and institutions of higher learning regarding the teaching of reading?

6. What are your views concerning the federal government's efforts in the field of reading, especially the Right To Read program?

7. Would you please indicate what you feel are the best current tests available to gauge pupil reading ability and to pinpoint individual weaknesses in reading. What are the other means, besides a standardized test, a teacher may use to determine reading deficiencies?

8. What do you feel is the major reason many students fail to learn to read?

9. What do you feel is the best "method" for teaching reading? Why?

I realize you are busy and I have requested a lot of information; however, we feel your views are quite important and we would appreciate responses to as many of these questions as possible. Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Roger D. Dixon

RDD/jhp

Enclosure
READING SPECIALISTS RESPONDING TO NSPRA LETTER OF INQUIRY


15. Ralph C. Staiger, IRA Executive Secretary-Treasurer, IRA, Newark, Delaware, September 10, 1973.
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Dear XXXX:

We are preparing a special report on education for publication in the spring of 1974. We publish a number of special reports each year on topics which, like reading, are of current interest to educators. Each of these reports attempts to compile whatever information is currently available on a particular topic, presenting it strictly from a reportorial stance.

Receiving accurate, firsthand information concerning your state’s current activities in reading is essential to the accuracy of the report, and we would appreciate any pertinent materials you can offer us. The following questions will give you some idea of the specific type of information we need:

1. What kind of legislation is on the books or in the works for your state concerning reading, the teaching of reading, reading objectives or educational assessment concerning reading?

2. Has your state drafted or adopted guidelines for local districts to follow in establishing a reading program? If so, please send us a copy.

3. Have any outstanding reading programs been developed by school districts in your state? If so, may we have the names of the districts, addresses and contacts, so we can check into them?

4. Have you made any state studies to determine how well your schools are teaching their students to read? If so, when was this study conducted and what were the results? Also, has any legislative action been taken as a result of the study?

5. Do you have any programs established for adult nonreaders in your state? If so, we would be especially interested in obtaining the names of those that have been successful and what measurements were used to determine the results.
6. Is industry involved with education in your state in helping adults (or students) learn to read? If so, could you give us the names of contact people in the specific companies?

7. How much money is your state spending on reading programs in 1974? How much were you spending in 1964? How much do you estimate the state will be spending in the next decade to eliminate illiteracy where possible?

8. Who are the leading political and educational supporters of reading in your state?

9. Do you know of any teacher training institutions in your state that have outstanding programs in the teaching of reading area? If so, would you please give us a list of these institutions, as well as contact people?

Obviously, we would also welcome any other related materials or ideas you might wish to contribute. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Roger D. Dixon

RDD:acm
STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION RESPONDING TO NSPRA QUERY

1. Minnesota
2. New York
3. Michigan
4. Mississippi
5. Nebraska
6. New Jersey
7. Florida
8. Connecticut
9. Utah
10. Maryland
11. Oregon
12. Arkansas
13. Wisconsin
14. California
15. Texas
16. Ohio
17. Colorado
18. Alabama
19. South Carolina
20. Montana
21. Missouri
22. Virginia
23. West Virginia
24. Delaware
Dear XXXX:

We are currently in the process of preparing an Education U.S.A. Special Report on reading for publication in the spring of 1974. In connection with this report, we would like to know what your school district is doing to improve the reading ability of your students K-12.

The "special reports" have covered many education issues—everything from "Shared Services and Cooperatives" to "Dropouts." We make every effort to cover the topic completely, always from a reportorial stance, with particular emphasis on what the federal government, state and local governments, boards of education, school district administrators, research organizations, institutions of higher learning and private organizations throughout the country are doing or can do about the particular area of concern. Our readers are mainly superintendents, principals, school board members, and classroom teachers—the people who have to be informed about education.

As one of the nation's largest school districts, you obviously are faced with the enormous task of teaching thousands of young people how to read. Your experiences and comments can provide invaluable contributions to the report, and we would appreciate it if you would fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to NSPRA as soon as possible. Any additional comments or materials besides those requested would also be welcome.

Since you have had the experience, no doubt, of finding methods/programs that do not work, for whatever reason, we would like to have you share that information with us. We feel this type of information may help another district gain from your experience. We would not, of course, cite you as the source of any adverse comments. You will note that we do give you the option on the questionnaire of not being identified.
Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Cordially,

Roger D. Dixon

RDD/jhp
Enclosure
NSPRA QUERY ON READING IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS

1. Do you have a coordinated K-12 reading program? YES _____ NO _____
   If YES, please send us a copy of the curriculum outline and any related materials.

2. What have you found to be the most successful programs/materials? Why?

3. What programs/materials have proven to be the least successful? Why?

4. How do you identify children with reading problems? For instance, what tests do you use to gauge pupil reading ability? To pinpoint individual weaknesses in reading? What other means do your teachers use to determine reading deficiencies?

5. Are you planning any major changes in your reading curriculum in the near future? YES _____ NO _____ If YES, what changes do you anticipate and why are you changing?

6. What kind of objectives do your reading teachers have? How are these determined and assessed?

7. Approximately how much money does your district spend per pupil per year to teach children how to read?

8. Do you provide in-service training for reading teachers? YES _____ NO _____ If YES, what is the nature of this training?

9. What do you consider an adequate reading level for a graduate of your school system?
10. Have you done an assessment of your reading program? YES __NO ____ If YES, when? _____________________ How? _____________________

What were the results? ____________________________________________

Have you made any changes in your program as a result of this (these) assessment(s)? If so, what were they?

11. Are you using volunteers in your reading programs? YES ____ NO ____ If YES, at what grade levels are the volunteers being used? ______________________________

How many are currently working for your school in this area? ______________________

12. If you do use volunteers and/or paid tutors, how are they utilized and trained?

13. What has been the impact of volunteers on your reading program?

14. Do you prefer that the name of your school district be kept confidential? YES ____ NO ____ Would you be willing to answer additional inquiries on the subject of reading? YES ____ NO ____

Name of school or district _____________________ Total enrollment ____

Person to contact for additional information __________________________

Mailing address _____________________________________________________

City, State, Zip Code ________________________________________________

Telephone (Please include area code) _________________________________

Please mail completed form to: Reading Report, National School Public Relations Assn., 1801 N. Moore Street, Arlington, Va. 22209
# TOTAL RESPONSES TO 'NSPRA QUERY ON READING IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS'

## 1. Do you have a coordinated K-12 reading program? YES _____ NO _____
If YES, please send us a copy of the curriculum outline and any related materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-6 or K-8 coordination</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 coordination</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal coordination</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. What have you found to be the most successful programs/materials? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized approach</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project CARE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basal reader</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGraw-Hill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginn 360</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWRL</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2R</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills-centered approach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Reading Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading For Meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA Tutor Tapes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Individualized Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippincott Basic Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words In Color</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Instruction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Forty-five schools responded to the survey. Responses to some questions total over 45, as many schools provided multiple answers.*
2. Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Random House High Intensity</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics-based programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems approach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison-Wesley Early Reading Program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-text approach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers are the key, regardless of materials</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha One</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally-constructed materials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What programs/materials have proven to be the least successful? Why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered approaches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott-Foresman Open Highways</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-decoding programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westinghouse Project PLAN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher lack of competency</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Time</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous grouping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking Page</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a single approach</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippincott</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict Basal, with little or no supplementary material</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look-say approaches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed decoding materials without supplementary materials</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of organized program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let's Read</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How do you identify children with reading problems? For instance, what tests do you use to gauge pupil reading ability? To pinpoint individual weaknesses in reading? What other means do your teachers use to determine reading deficiencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'Standardized' Tests</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.T.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkin Phonic Survey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Guidance Servicing Test</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Achievement</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Range Achievement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTBS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally-constructed (generally criterion-referenced)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Achievement</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal-inventory tests</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleidscope Inventory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBS</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Wide Assessment Tests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botel Reading Inventory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson-Denny</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Silent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattell Culture Fair Test</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE Procedure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Haven</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates-MacGinitie</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Reading Diagnostic (Iowa)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Oral Reading Test</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Are you planning any major changes in your reading curriculum in the near future? YES ____ NO ____ If YES, what changes do you anticipate and why are you changing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If YES, what?

- Establishing performance objectives in reading | 2
- Moving to systems approach | 4
5. Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moving to criterion-referenced testing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding new programs/materials</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adding more extensive teacher in-service</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving to more individualized approach</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing K-12 coordination</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding reading to content areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing to non-graded program</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing reading staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What kind of objectives do your reading teachers have? How are these determined and assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual building objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System-established</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Approximately how much money does your district spend per pupil per year to teach children how to read?

Answers here varied so widely as to be worthless. Thirty-five schools indicated no answer and others gave several, ranging from $7.00 to $700-800 for each regular student and up to $1,551 per pupil for "exceptional" readers.

8. Do you provide in-service training for reading teachers? YES _____ NO _____ If YES, what is the nature of this training?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Of Training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School orientation for new teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced training for reading supervisors, as needed</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Cont.

Nature Of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature Of Training</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems approaches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific yearly programs as needed</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer workshops</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use local and/or university programs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What do you consider an adequate reading level for a graduate of your school system?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth/sixth grade level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh grade level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth grade level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth grade level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth grade level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work up to potential</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBS Level 14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional literacy</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must pass local instrument</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you done an assessment of your reading program? YES _____ NO _____ If YES, when? How? What were the results? Have you made any changes in your program as a result of this (these) assessment(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In planning stages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When?</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yearly</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Cont.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in overall scores</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School at national norm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School below national norm</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School above national norm or better than expected</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned/Initiated Changes As A Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum changes, as indicated by test results</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating reading test committees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated five-year program in reading improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems approach being implemented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing K-12 coordination in reading</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking increased federal funding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded programs, materials, in-service</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set reading as a priority item</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased reading staff</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Are you using volunteers in your reading programs? YES _____ NO _____
If YES, at what grade levels are the volunteers being used? How many are currently working for your school in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of volunteers varied from a low of two to a high of 2,000.

12. If you do use volunteers and/or paid tutors, how are they utilized and trained?
12. Cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trained By</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading teachers</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District reading supervisors or in special district workshops</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special district programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use local universities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Used In/As</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-to-one tutoring situations</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading labs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aides as teacher directs</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical assistants</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What has been the impact of volunteers on your reading program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOLS RESPONDING TO 'NSPRA QUERY
ON READING IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS'

1. Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida.
2. Fort Worth Independent School District, Fort Worth, Texas.
3. Wichita Public Schools, Wichita, Kansas.
4. Mesa Public Schools, Mesa, Arizona.
5. Ferguson-Florrissant School District, Ferguson, Missouri.
11. Metropolitan Public Schools, Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee.
15. Memphis City Schools, Memphis, Tennessee.
17. Salt Lake City Schools, Salt Lake City, Utah.
20. Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
21. Prince George's County Schools, Lanham, Maryland.
25. Baltimore City Public Schools, Baltimore, Maryland.
27. Kanawha County Schools, Charleston, West Virginia.
28. Hermantown Public Schools, Duluth, Minnesota.
30. Montclair Public Schools, Montclair, New Jersey.
32. Spokane Public Schools, Spokane, Washington.
33. Jackson Public Schools, Jackson, Michigan.
34. San Diego City Schools, San Diego, California.
35. Charleston County Schools, Charleston, South Carolina.
37. Omaha Public Schools, Omaha, Nebraska.
38. Kenosha Unified School District #1, Kenosha, Wisconsin.
39. Wilmington Public Schools, Wilmington, Delaware.
40. Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio.
41. Norfolk City Schools, Norfolk, Virginia.
42. Washoe County School District, Reno, Nevada.
43. Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax, Virginia.
44. Newark School District, Newark, Delaware.
45. Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation, Evansville, Indiana.
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