

APPLICATION FOR INTERVENTION PARTNER

**Reading Recovery: An Evidence Based Intervention
In Support of Michigan Children, Teachers, and Schools**

Submitted to:

Michigan Association of School Administrators

Title I Accountability Grant

Statewide System of Support for Title I High Priority Schools

Submitted by:

Reading Recovery Center of Michigan

School of Education and Human Services

Oakland University

Rochester, Michigan

September 15, 2009

(original application submitted June 5, 2009)

Table of Contents

	Page
Intervention Partner Information.....	5
Intervention Partner Contact Person.....	5
References – Site 1 and Site 2.....	6
Response to Questions.....	7
Intervention Description.....	8
Documentation for Evidence-Based Status.....	17
Implementation Fidelity.....	20
Evaluation Tools.....	22
Capacity to Provide Implementation Training.....	25
Experience Implementing Intervention at Multiple Sites.....	26
Capacity for Scaling Up.....	27
Project Timeline for Full Implementation.....	30
Budget.....	33
Cost for One-Time Training (Overview, Awareness, Exploration, Training for Trainers).....	34
Alignment of EIB with Michigan School Improvement Framework and Statewide System of Support.....	35
Intervention Partners Curriculum Vitae.....	39
References.....	54

Appendix A: United States Department of Education *What Works Clearing House*

Report March 19, 2007 (enclosed as PDF)

Appendix B: United States Department of Education *What Works Clearing House* Report August 13, 2007 (enclosed as PDF)

Appendix C: Instrument 1 Teacher Training and Professional Development Fidelity of Implementation; Instrument 2a: Reading Recovery Intervention Program Components; Instrument 2b: Reading Recovery Intervention Program Strategies (pages 60-62 of application)

Appendix D: Reading Recovery in Michigan in 2007-2008: An Oakland University Executive Summary (enclosed as PDF)

Appendix E: Letter of Introduction by Dr. William G. Keane (enclosed as PDF)

Appendix F: Florida Center for Reading Research Report of Reading Recovery

Evidence Based Intervention:

**Reading Recovery: An Evidence Based Intervention In Support of Michigan
Children, Teachers, and Schools**

Date of Application Submission:

September 15, 2009

June 5, 2009 (original submission date)

Intervention Partner Information

Reading Recovery Center of Michigan at Oakland University
School of Education and Human Services
Oakland University
Rochester, MI 48309
248-370-3057

Contact Person

Dr. Mary K. Lose, Associate Professor
Director, Reading Recovery Center of Michigan
lose@oakland.edu
248-370-3085

References

Site 1:

Ms. Susan Matz, Principal
Oakley Park Elementary School
2015 Oakley Park Rd.
Walled Lake, MI 48390
248-956-4100
susanmatz@wlcsd.org

Site 2:

Mr. Anthony Sitko, Principal
Potter School (K-6)
Flint Community Schools
2500 N. Averill, Flint 48506
810-760-1813
tsitko@flintschools.org

Response to Questions

Reading Recovery: An Evidence Based Intervention in Support of Michigan Children, Teachers, and Schools

Answer “yes” or “no” to the following:	YES	NO
This intervention has clearly documented implementation strategies	√	
This intervention could be easily replicated	√	
Training for implementation includes coaching and technical assistance	√	
Identify populations this intervention serves:		
• Special Education	√	
• English Language Learners	√	
• Alternative Education		√
• High School		√
Your organization is willing to be an MAISA contractor	√	

Explanation for “NO” responses:

Reading Recovery is an early intervention approach. The services we offer provide support for the lowest performing first grade students and professional development for primary grades teachers, special educators, reading specialists, literacy coaches and teachers and administrators interested in beginning reading instruction, support of primary grades students’ literacy learning, and teacher professional development.

Intervention Description

Reading Recovery is a highly effective short-term intervention of one-to-one tutoring for the lowest literacy achievers in Grade 1. The goal of Reading Recovery is to dramatically reduce the number of first-grade students who have extreme difficulty learning to read and write, and to reduce the cost of these learners to educational systems.

Developed by Dr. Marie Clay, an early literacy researcher and developmental psychologist from New Zealand, the structure and design of Reading Recovery are consistent with a large body of research on how children learn to read and write. In addition to basic research on the reading and writing of young children (Clay, 1966), a series of studies in the 1970s and 1980s including field trials, follow-up studies, replication studies, monitoring studies, and subgroup studies, led to the development of Reading Recovery. Numerous studies have subsequently examined the effectiveness of Reading Recovery for children with literacy difficulties.

Because Reading Recovery operates within an education system, a published set of *Standards and Guidelines of Reading Recovery in the United States* protects the royalty-free trademark in this country. Standards ensure the internal and external fidelity of Reading Recovery implementation. Four features distinguish the comprehensive nature of Reading Recovery in schools/districts, each of which is described in subsequent sections:

- Intensive, daily, one-to-one, 30-minute lessons for children
- Intensive professional development program through which educators learn to teach children with extreme literacy difficulties
- Network of professional support for teachers and administrators
- Research and evaluation system to continuously monitor results, ensure accountability, and provide information for making implementation decisions.

As a component of a comprehensive literacy plan, Reading Recovery supplements good classroom teaching for the lowest achievers in reading in Grade 1. Individual students receive a 30-minute lesson each school day for 12 to 20 weeks with a specially trained Reading Recovery teacher. As soon as students meet grade-level expectations and demonstrate that they can continue to learn in the classroom, their lessons are discontinued, and new students begin individual instruction. There are two positive

outcomes for students who complete the 12- to 20-week intervention: Students meet grade-level expectations in reading and writing and continue to work successfully within their classroom programs. The outcome category for these “responders” (about 75% annually) is *discontinued*.

The few students still having difficulty after a complete intervention are recommended for further evaluation. The outcome category for “non-responders” (about 25% each year) is *recommended*. Recommendations may be made for future support (e.g., classroom support, small group support, LD referral). This category represents a positive, supportive action on behalf of the child and the school. Reading Recovery diagnostic information on rate of progress and key measures of outcome is available to inform decisions about future actions in support of the child.

These outcomes strongly support the use of Reading Recovery as a response to intervention (RtI) option as described by the 2004 Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act. It is a compelling option for schools designing RtI models to meet the needs of struggling beginning readers and writers (Clay, 1987; Dunn, 2007; Lose, 2008; Lose, et al., 2007; Lyons & Beaver, 1995; O’Connor & Simic, 2002).

Professional development is a hallmark of Reading Recovery, utilizing a three-level structure that includes teachers, teacher leaders, and university trainers. Professional development for all Reading Recovery professionals begins with an academic year of graduate-level study and continues in subsequent years. With the support of a registered teacher leader, Reading Recovery teachers develop observational skills and a repertoire of intervention procedures tailored to meet the individual needs of at-risk students.

Reading Recovery has a strong history of success with the lowest-achieving children in the United States as well as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Wherever it is implemented, Reading Recovery is accountable to decision makers because data are collected for every child, regardless of the number of lessons. Adopting Reading Recovery means savings in dollars and in human costs by (a) reducing future spending for education interventions; b) reducing achievement gaps across racial, economic, and language factors; and (c) preparing highly qualified teachers who use their knowledge in their other professional roles and support school-wide literacy efforts. By comparing societal costs and consequences of reading failure to costs for Reading

Recovery, educators and economists in the United Kingdom calculated large national cost savings if Reading Recovery were available to every child who needs it (Gross, Jones, Raby, & Tolfree, 2006).

A number of structures ensure the integrity of Reading Recovery. The International Reading Recovery Trainers Organization (IRRTO) and the North American Trainers Group (NATG) provide leadership for professional development, implementation, and research. The National Data Evaluation Center (NDEC, <http://www.ndec.us/>) collects, analyzes, and reports outcome and process data at multiple levels of the education system. The Reading Recovery Council of North America (RRCNA, <http://www.readingrecovery.org/>) is the membership organization that serves Reading Recovery professionals, administrators, and the educational community.

Scope of Reading Recovery Lessons

Daily Reading Recovery lessons incorporate the five essential components of reading instruction outlined by the National Reading Panel (NICHD, 2000) plus four additional elements supported by research literature (Doyle & Forbes, 2003; Forbes & Doyle, 2004; Pinnell, 2000). The following summary is based on a more-comprehensive table on pages 201–203 in *Changing Futures: The Influence of Reading Recovery in the United States* (Schmitt, Askew, Fountas, Lyons, & Pinnell, 2005).

Phonemic Awareness – Reading Recovery addresses phonemic awareness in a number of ways in daily lessons. In her comprehensive review of research on beginning reading instruction, Marilyn Adams (1990) provided a positive evaluation of the code-based instruction involved in the Reading Recovery lesson framework.

Phonics – Reading Recovery encourages purposeful decoding. Recognizing that the alphabetic principle and orthographic knowledge are important factors in beginning reading and writing, Reading Recovery teachers guide children to hear sounds in words, associate letters with those sounds, recognize and use spelling patterns, and apply this knowledge in both reading and writing.

Vocabulary – In Reading Recovery lessons, children acquire vocabulary in a variety of ways — through conversations with the teacher, reading new and familiar texts, composing and writing messages, and learning how words work.

Fluency – Fluency is explicitly recognized in Reading Recovery lessons. Examples include the daily guided reading of familiar texts and the rereading of the child’s own written texts. Specific teaching procedures are used to promote fluent and phrased reading.

Comprehension – Comprehension is the goal of reading. Each lesson provides opportunities to reread several familiar texts and to read a new text. The teacher offers an individually tailored introduction to new texts to foster comprehension. Conversations throughout the lesson encourage attention to meaning when reading and writing.

Writing – About one-third of each Reading Recovery lesson is spent composing and writing a message. Writing is a significant contributor to the development of phonemic awareness, phonics, and word solving. Children compose increasingly complex messages and increase their personal writing vocabularies.

Motivation – The close relationship between the Reading Recovery teacher and student promotes the enjoyment of reading. Texts and tasks are carefully selected to ensure interest and success.

Oral Language – Brief conversations throughout the lesson support the development of oral language structures, build vocabulary, foster strategic activities necessary for reading and writing texts, and create motivation for literacy tasks. The emphasis on oral language is especially beneficial to English language learners.

Independence – The goal of Reading Recovery is to help children make accelerated progress in order to become independent readers and writers. Teaching is directed toward helping children consider their own actions, learn the strategic activities needed for successful reading and writing, and take control of their own learning.

Sequence of Reading Recovery Lessons

In each segment of the Reading Recovery lesson framework, the teacher creates learning opportunities for a particular child at a particular moment in time. Each task is designed to elicit and support a broad range of strategic behaviors needed for reading and writing texts. A brief description of the lesson framework with rationales is provided below.

Reading familiar books – Provides opportunities to practice the complex range of literacy behaviors on easy texts that still offer a challenge for learning new things.

Reading yesterday's new book – Provides opportunities for the teacher to observe and carefully record behaviors without interruption as the child reads a book introduced yesterday, and for the child to problem solve independently, using a range of strategic activities.

Letter identification, breaking words apart, and words in isolation – Provides opportunities for manipulating magnetic letters to extend the range of known letters and words and to learn how words work.

Composing and writing a message – Provides opportunities to compose messages and engage in the detailed analysis of writing known words, analyzing sounds in words, and using known words to get to new words.

Reassembling the cut-up story – Provides opportunities for the child to put his/her message back together after the teacher cuts it apart on a sentence strip, supporting sequencing, using visual information, rereading, monitoring, and correcting.

Introducing a new book – Provides opportunities for the teacher to help the child prepare for the new text, for the child to learn how to orient himself to a new text and to access knowledge that will help in reading a new book.

Reading a new book – Provides opportunities for the child to bring all he knows to a new text independently, with the support of the teacher through teaching, prompting, and confirming.

The sequence for instruction is data driven, with each lesson individually tailored for each child based on systematic and controlled assessments and observational records.

- Reading Recovery teachers use *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 2002, 2006) to assess each child's strengths and confusions.
- Teachers take daily running records of the child's progress on text reading and use the data to make teaching decisions.
- Teachers use other observational data to inform instruction: daily lesson records, students' writing books, and records of growth in reading and writing vocabulary.

As teachers gather data, they use a wide range of procedures, making moment-by-moment decisions within each lesson to support the individual child. The teacher creates

opportunities for the child to problem solve with appropriate support. The child is held accountable for using what is known as the teacher pushes the boundaries of his knowledge. *The goal is accelerated progress so that the child will reach grade-level expectations and be able to work within the regular classroom program.*

Teacher Materials

Assessments – The primary assessment tool used in Reading Recovery is *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 2002, 2006). The survey is used to select students for the intervention, to determine exit status, and to assess continued progress at the end of the year (see section on *Evaluation Tools*).

The Observation Survey is a teacher-administered standard assessment that adheres to characteristics of sound measurement instruments: standard tasks, standard administration, real-world tasks to establish validity, and ways of knowing about reliability of observations. The tasks were developed in research studies to assess emergent literacy in young children. Reading Recovery teachers learn to administer, score, and interpret the Observation Survey through extensive training.

The Observation Survey incorporates six literacy tasks, all of which are necessary for assessing a young child's emerging reading and writing behaviors:

1. Letter Identification - to determine which letters the child knows and the preferred mode of identification
2. Word Test – to determine if the child is building a reading vocabulary
3. Concepts About Print – to determine what the child knows about the way spoken language is represented in print
4. Writing Vocabulary to determine if the child is building a personal resource of known words that can be written in every detail
5. Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words – to assess phonological and orthographic awareness by determining how the child represents sounds in graphic form
6. Text Reading – to determine an appropriate level of text difficulty for instruction and to record what the child does when reading continuous text (using a running record)

In addition to the Observation Survey, for this project teachers will also assess students using the *Slosson Oral Reading Test-Revised*, a standard norm-referenced measure.

Instructional Materials – Reading Recovery teachers make careful selections from teaching procedures in *Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals Part One and Part Two* (Clay, 2005) based on each child’s current knowledge and skill. The power in the procedures comes from the intensive professional development that guides teachers in making timely instructional decisions while children read books, write messages, and learn about letters and words.

Student Materials

The primary materials used in Reading Recovery lessons are largely nonconsumable and represent authentic reading and writing tasks: (a) a large quantity and wide variety of carefully selected little books from many publishers; (b) a blank book for writing daily messages and working on words within that message; (c) sentence strips for recording and reassembling cut-up messages; and (d) magnetic letters and magnetic boards for work with letters and words. Word work may also involve whiteboards, chalkboards, and other media as needed.

Teacher Professional Development in Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery represents an investment in the professional skills of teachers. It builds professional communities and has been widely praised as a model worth emulating (e.g., Bryk, 2009; Herman & Stringfield, 1997; Wilson & Davis, 1994). For all Reading Recovery professionals—teachers, teacher leaders, and university trainers—a full academic year of initial professional development is followed in subsequent years by ongoing professional development sessions. Our affiliated network of teacher leaders in districts across Michigan demonstrates our capacity to train Reading Recovery teachers for participating schools.

Integral to Reading Recovery professional development at all levels is the use of a one-way glass allowing teachers to observe a child’s literacy behaviors, the teacher’s organization for instruction and contingent teaching decisions. These facilities, available

at our university and regional sites, are used both in initial training and ongoing professional development.

Because Reading Recovery depends on a teacher who can design and deliver individual lessons, she must be able to observe and record student behaviors and to make contingent responsive teaching decisions (Lose, 2007; McEneaney, Lose, & Schwartz, 2006). The teacher must also know how to evaluate her teaching decisions to determine subsequent teaching moves. This process takes a high level of skill combined with ongoing study and support from colleagues and a teacher leader. The three-level system of professional development in Reading Recovery is summarized below.

University Trainers – The Ohio State University and Texas Woman’s University provide the 1-year post-doctoral residency program to prepare university faculty to serve as university trainers. These Reading Recovery trainers operate the 20 Reading Recovery university training centers that provide the organizing structure for states or regions of the country. University trainers are faculty members responsible for providing initial and ongoing professional development for teacher leaders, supporting a network of Reading Recovery teacher training sites, expanding and strengthening network sites, reporting data on children, schools, and districts served, conducting research on implementation, and ensuring the integrity of Reading Recovery in the region. In Michigan, Oakland University serves as the university training center for the state.

Reading Recovery Teacher Leaders – Teacher leaders are selected by a school district or consortium of districts that have made a commitment to implement Reading Recovery. Teacher leader candidates must have a master’s degree and leadership potential. The candidate attends one of the UTCs for an academic year of full-time professional development that includes (a) teaching four Reading Recovery students daily for a minimum of eight students per year; (b) participating in clinical and leadership practica; (c) participating in graduate-level classes in reading, writing, reading difficulties, and adult learning theory; (d) participating in teacher professional development classes and fieldwork at established sites; and (e) preparing their home sites and districts for Reading Recovery implementation.

After the initial year of professional development, teacher leaders return to full-time positions in their districts/sites. They continue to teach children daily in Reading

Recovery, train Reading Recovery teachers, and provide leadership for site implementation. They oversee data collection on all Reading Recovery children and work with school leadership teams to improve student performance and implementation decisions based on evaluation data. For ongoing learning, teacher leaders participate in regularly scheduled professional development sessions conducted by university trainers. They attend a required National Teacher Leader Institute annually to ensure current knowledge about all aspects of their teacher leader roles.

Reading Recovery Teachers – Reading Recovery teacher candidates are selected by their school districts and must be certified teachers with a record of successful teaching experience with young children. Teacher leaders provide Reading Recovery teachers with training that spans one academic year. Teachers receive graduate credit while working with four children individually on a daily basis for a minimum of eight children per year and actively participating in weekly classes. To further support their teaching of individual children each teacher trainee receives at least four individualized school visits by the teacher leader during the school year.

Professional development for teachers integrates theory and practice. A one-way mirror enables teachers to observe, discuss, and reflect on Reading Recovery lessons with the teacher leader and other trainees. When a teacher is scheduled to teach for the group, the school arranges to transport the child to the training site. Reading Recovery teachers develop effective observational skills and a repertoire of teaching procedures designed to meet the particular needs of individual students. Following their initial training year, Reading Recovery teachers receive ongoing professional development that consists of at least six sessions each year led by their teacher leader. At least four of these sessions involve observing lessons through a one-way mirror while engaging in in-depth discussion about children's reading and writing behaviors and teachers' teaching decisions. Each teacher also receives coaching and support for their teaching at their school by their teacher leader.

National data for 2007–2008 show that Reading Recovery teachers taught an average of 8.1 Reading Recovery students, plus 40.6 children in their other teaching roles. These teachers also interacted with other teachers in collaborative and leadership

roles, building literacy expertise and capacity for working with struggling readers in classrooms and small group instructional settings.

Administrative Support – Because Reading Recovery is a system intervention, each Reading Recovery site has a site coordinator, an administrator who is responsible for implementing the services for children and teachers into an existing educational system. Site coordinators generally are not trained in Reading Recovery, but they are familiar with all aspects of implementation (see Reading Recovery Site Coordinators Guide, 2006). Working closely alongside Reading Recovery teacher leaders, they serve as the liaisons for communicating and problem solving within the district/site. Administrators at the school level work with a school leadership team to problem solve and refine the implementation on their campuses.

University training centers and the Reading Recovery Council of North America (RRCNA) provide professional development opportunities for site coordinators and other administrators. Several materials published by RRCNA support administrators.

Documentation for Evidence-Based Status

Definition 1 from the MAISA Application Help Guide, p. 8 is used for documentation for the Evidence Based Status of Reading Recovery:

“An intervention may be considered evidence-based if it is included on Federal Lists or Registries of evidence-based interventions.

Guidelines for Definition 1:

- For a beginning list of Federal Lists or Registries, see the Title I Accountability Grant link on the MAISA website.
<http://www.gomaisa.org/TitleIGrant/tabid/479/Default.aspx>
- Additional credible lists and registries beyond this list may be considered for review.
- It is recommended that credibility be established for any intervention by citing positive effects from multiple lists or registries.
- Applicant must include relevant reports as documentation in the application.

- Applicant must summarize the reported evidence, the intervention research status, strengths and weaknesses, and the targeted population.”

Empirical Support for Reading Recovery

Several reports establish the evidence base for Reading Recovery. Two of these reports are highlighted in this application: The What Works Clearinghouse Report of Reading Recovery (2007) and the Florida Center for Reading Research Report of Reading Recovery (2008). See Appendices A and F.

Perhaps the world's most-widely researched early literacy intervention, Reading Recovery has been examined by high-quality experimental and quasi-experimental studies, evaluation studies, and meta-analyses. An independent review of the experimental research on Reading Recovery by the What Works Clearinghouse (WWC), a branch of the United States Department of Education (USDE) Institute of Education Sciences (IES), establishes that Reading Recovery is an effective intervention based on scientific research (Appendix A).

What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) - The mission of the WWC is “to provide educators, policy makers, researchers and the public with a central and trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education” (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/>). WWC bases its analyses on research studies that meet their standards for demonstrating *causal validity*. In many cases these standards require randomized clinical trials conducted within school settings. Although these types of studies are rare in education, five Reading Recovery studies met WWC’s evidence standards for inclusion in its review of causal validity research. This evidence is more than sufficient to establish causal validity. The WWC requires only two independent, well-designed clinical trials to establish a positive causal finding. The evidence that Reading Recovery is an intervention based on scientific research is now documented and acknowledged by the USDE and IES (Schwartz, Askew, & Gómez-Bellengé, 2007; also see Appendix A).

Of all interventions reviewed by the WWC (Appendix B), Reading Recovery was the only one with positive or potentially positive effects across all four domains studied and the only intervention with positive effects (strong evidence of a positive effect with no overriding contrary evidence) on general reading achievement. The WWC reported positive effects for alphabetic skills (phonemic awareness, print awareness, letter

knowledge, and phonics) and general reading achievement, and potentially positive effects, their next highest level of evidence, on fluency and comprehension outcomes. An improvement index with scores ranging from –50 to +50 represents the difference between the percentile rank of the average student in the intervention condition versus the percentile rank of the average student in the comparison condition. The average index scores for Reading Recovery children show large and impressive effect sizes: (a) Alphabetics (+34 percentile points); (b) Fluency (+46 percentile points); (c) Reading comprehension (+14 percentile points); and (d) General reading achievement (+32 percentile points).

Evaluation Data – The findings of the WWC are supported by evaluation data collected annually for more than 20 years in the United States. In the U.S., the National Data Evaluation Center (NDEC) in Columbus, OH, uses systematic, empirical methods to collect data on all children served by the intervention (about 90,000 first graders in 2007–2008). Data are also collected on a random sample of grade-level peers to provide a comparison group. Information about implementation factors is also collected to inform local decision makers. This web-based data collection system provides a highly sophisticated system for reporting and aggregating program and school measures of student performance. See www.ndec.us for information about evaluation methodology and technical characteristics of this reporting system.

On a national level, the significant and large effects of the Reading Recovery intervention shown in clinical trials are replicated each year in the large-scale implementation data (Table 1). Evaluation data show the same strong gains reported in experimental studies that used randomized comparison groups to establish causal validity. Complete Statistical Abstracts and National Reports for recent years are available at www.ndec.us.

Meta-Analyses – Well over 100 research and evaluation studies have examined various aspects of Reading Recovery and some of these have been included in meta-analyses. D’Agostino and Murphy (2004) analyzed 36 U.S. studies, most of which were unpublished evaluation reports by districts implementing Reading Recovery. Since most of these studies did not include a randomized control group, they used a combination of meta-analysis and regression procedures to estimate comparison group values and

interpret these non-experimental reports. They also conducted an analysis that showed that findings from the better-designed studies converged with those from the evaluation reports. D’Agostino and Murphy found positive effects for Reading Recovery, though the effect size estimates were not as large as those from the high-quality, experimental studies included in the WWC report. Their findings extend Reading Recovery’s evidence for causal generalization by providing replication of positive effects across varied settings and student populations. D’Agostino and Murphy also used regression procedures and meta-analysis to determine if Reading Recovery gains were sustained into second grade and concluded that “the results seem to indicate a lasting program effect, at least by the end of second grade, on broad reading skills” (p. 35).

Florida Center for Reading Research

An independent review of the experimental research on Reading Recovery was conducted by the Florida Center for Reading Research, further verifying the findings of the What Works Clearinghouse. The Florida Center for Reading Research establishes that “Reading Recovery provides intensive one-on-one tutoring in beginning reading skills...with a strong level of support for alphabets and general reading growth and with potentially positive effects in fluency and comprehension” (Appendix F, p. 5). The Florida report describes in detail how Reading Recovery is aligned with current research derived from cognitive psychology and an apprenticeship model of instruction (Rogoff, 1990). The reviewers also highlighted the important role of responsive scaffolded instruction:

“The teacher designs and conducts each day’s lessons based on assessments, observations, and the student’s responses within the lesson. Responsive teaching involves knowing where students are and helping them figure out where they need to go. The notion of scaffolding plays a crucial role in responsive teaching (Rayner, Foorman, Perfetti, Pesetsky, & Seidenberg 2001)” (Appendix F, p. 2).

The report noted no weaknesses of Reading Recovery and also identified several strengths of the lessons for students and the training and professional development for teachers.

Strengths noted for lessons with students included:

- Daily assessments that inform instruction
- Wide variety of books both expository and narrative
- Close relationship between teacher and student providing a highly motivational context for struggling readers
- Reciprocal relationship between reading and writing to foster daily progress
- Rereading texts to benefit and reinforce word recognition and comprehension.

Strengths of the training and professional development for teachers noted in the report focused on the extensive professional development and ongoing professional development for teachers and teacher leaders, with the reviewers noting in particular:

“The hallmark of Reading Recovery is a strong model of professional development that is delivered through a three-tiered system consisting of university based trainers, teacher leaders, and Reading Recovery teacher candidates. University trainers train the teacher leaders, and the teacher leaders provide the prospective reading Recovery teachers with training, and then offer ongoing support, and coaching after the initial training. Three features characterize professional development for everyone who receives it: (a) they receive a full academic year of professional development followed by ongoing training sessions; (b) they work concurrently with students; (c) they make use of the one-way glass, where class members observe a lesson and discuss the student’s reading behavior and possible teaching decisions to accelerate learning. Focal points of the professional development include open discussion, systematic observation and analysis of student reading behavior, self-analysis of teaching based on student progress, and the design and delivery of lessons” (Appendix F, p. 3).

In summary, the Florida Center for Reading Research establishes the evidence base for Reading Recovery, noting several strengths based on research and noting no weaknesses either in the program for children or the training and professional development of teachers.

Closing the Gap Research – It is important for educators to know if an intervention reduces or closes achievement disparities across various subgroups of the population. National Reading Recovery evaluation data were examined to indicate the relationship of economic status, race/ethnicity, and early intervention in predicting end-of-first-grade reading achievement (Rodgers, Gómez-Bellengé, & Wang, 2004; Rodgers, Gómez-Bellengé, Wang, & Schulz, 2005). These studies demonstrated that the Reading Recovery intervention is effective across race/ethnic and socio-economic groups and that access to the Reading Recovery intervention reduces but does not eliminate the achievement gap among these groups. Regression procedures indicated that the strongest predictor of literacy success in first grade was access to the Reading Recovery intervention. The regression model included economic status as a predictor variable, but race did not contribute to the prediction of success beyond these two main factors. These results suggest that effective early intervention is a critical component toward providing educational opportunity for all students.

Closing the achievement gap for English language learners is also a major concern of United States educators. Kelly, Gómez-Bellengé, Chen, and Shultz (2008) examined the performance of 17,792 English language learners from the national program evaluation data. They found only a slight difference in the outcome status success rate and performance levels between English language learners and native English speakers. The length of interventions did not differ between these groups, nor was it related to rating of oral English proficiency prior to the intervention.

Implementation Fidelity

Monitoring and Assessing Fidelity of Implementation

What is Fidelity of Implementation? - Fidelity of implementation is the delivery of instruction in the way in which it was designed to be delivered. In Reading Recovery, fidelity is important at both the school level (e.g., implementation of the process) and the teacher level (e.g., implementation of instruction and progress monitoring). In this section, we present two instruments for assessing the fidelity of the Reading Recovery implementation:

1. Teacher Training and Professional Development

2. Intervention Implementation (Reading Recovery)

Reading Recovery Implementation Fidelity

Background on the Development of the Instrument – In 2004, the U.S. District Court required the Little Rock School District to hire outside evaluators to conduct a formal evaluation of programs within the district as part of an ongoing remedy to improve the academic achievement of African-American students. The Court recommended that Dr. Steven Ross and his research team at the Center for Research in Educational Policy (CREP), University of Memphis conduct the evaluation of the Reading Recovery program. A major goal of the evaluation was to assess the implementation fidelity of the Reading Recovery program. Dr. Ross and the CREP team collaborated with Dr. Linda Dorn, Reading Recovery Trainer at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock on the development of two instruments for observing the program fidelity of the Reading Recovery implementation (Appendices C and D). The CREP research team randomly selected two Reading Recovery trainers from a list of all U.S. university trainers and invited them to participate in the study. Dr. Cliff Johnson, Georgia State University, and Dr. Emily Rogers, Ohio State University, agreed to conduct the observations using the fidelity instrument. The Reading Recovery teachers and principals in the participating schools did not know when the observations would occur, and Dr. Johnson and Dr. Rogers did not know the participating schools until the morning of the observations. All data from observations were submitted to the CREP research team, and the results were presented in a formal report to the U.S. District Court.

Evaluation Tools

The primary measurement instruments used for selection of students for intervention services and to assess criterion to discontinue individual instruction are six subtests from *An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (Clay, 2002, 2006), designed to assess a variety of reading and writing knowledge necessary for progress in learning to read. The tasks provide indications of strengths and needs that can guide

instruction. For this project we also intend to use the *Slosson Oral Reading Test–Revised* (SORT-R).

Clay (2002, 2006) provides a summary of reliability, validity, and discrimination indices established in research on Observation Survey tasks. The National Data Evaluation Center (NDEC) has established national U. S. norms for these tasks (Gómez-Bellengé & Thompson, 2005). Alternate forms are available for three of the tasks with specified forms used at each test period. Inter-correlations between tasks are reported for age groups ranging from 5.0 to 7.0 in half-year increments (Clay, 2002, 2006). For the total sample of 796 children, correlations ranged from .554 to .894.

The *Text Reading* task, as conducted in the United States, uses a standard set of books that are leveled by difficulty and specific text characteristics (Peterson, 1991). The gradient of difficulty reflected in these texts is similar to instructional materials used in Reading Recovery lessons and many early literacy classroom programs (Fountas & Pinnell, 1999). The NDEC random sample data indicate an average end-of-first-grade text reading level of 20 for a proportional stratified national sample (Gómez-Bellengé & Thompson, 2005). Clay (2002, 2006) reported that the scoring of running records, on which the text reading decisions were based, was reliable across two scorings by a trained recorder over a 2-year interval ($r = .98$). Denton, Ciancio, and Fletcher (2006) report an interassessor raw score R^2 value of .96 ($SE = 2.30$).

The *Letter Identification* task requires students to respond to 26 uppercase and 28 lowercase letter forms (including two forms of “a” and “g”). The child can respond with a letter name, a sound, or a word beginning with that letter (maximum score = 54, Cronbach’s Alpha = .95, Clay, 2002, 2006).

The *Concepts About Print* task is a research-based measure (Clay, 2002, 2006) of emergent readers’ knowledge of conventions related to printed language. The task includes standard procedures for administration and four specialized booklets to provide alternate forms. The adult reads one of these booklets to the child. The child responds to questions or requests related to book handling, directional behavior, visual scanning, and specific concepts related to printed language such as punctuation and the relationship of letters and words within sentences (maximum score = 24, Cronbach’s Alpha = .78; split-half $r = .95$, Clay, 2002, 2006).

The *Ohio Word Test* is a 20-item list of high frequency words, available in three alternate forms. Scoring is based on the number of words read correctly (maximum score = 20, Cronbach's Alpha = .92, Clay, 2002, 2006).

The *Writing Vocabulary* task allows 10 minutes for children to write as many words as they can on a blank sheet of paper. A standard set of prompts is used to encourage additional attempts if needed. Scoring is a count of the number of words correctly generated (test-retest $r = .62$ and $.97$, Clay, 2002, 2006). Denton, Ciancio, and Fletcher (2006) report an interassessor raw score R^2 value of $.87$ ($SE = 7.4$).

The *Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words* task is a writing assessment of sound-letter correspondence. The teacher reads one of five short passages (alternate forms) aloud and asks the child to write each word as the passage is read again word-by-word. When a child does not know a word, the child is prompted to say the word slowly, think about what he hears and how to record it in print. The task is scored on the number of phonemes correctly recorded (maximum score = 37, Cronbach's Alpha = .96, Clay, 2002, 2006).

The *Slosson Oral Reading Test-Revised* contains 200 words arranged in ascending order of difficulty with 20 words per list. The administration stops when the child misses all the words on one list. This is a standardized, norm-referenced measure (maximum score = 200, Kuder-Richardson 21 for ages 6 to 7 = .98, Nicholson, 1990).

Although a separate measure of comprehension is desirable, this construct is difficult to operationalize for young children. At early reading levels, measures of word recognition and measures of reading comprehension tend to be highly related. For example, the developers of the Slosson measure report a correlation of $.83$ with the reading comprehension section of the *Peabody Individual Achievement Test* (Nicholson, 1990). Gains on the Slosson and the Text Reading level measures provide indications of increased reading comprehension if only through increased access to readable texts. The middle-of-second-grade scores reported by Center, Wheldall, Freeman, Outhred, and McNaught (1995) indicated that Text Reading level was highly correlated with the Woodcock Passage Comprehension ($r = .87$) and Passage Reading fluency measure ($r = .86$).

There is no perfect early literacy assessment instrument. Some of the Observation Survey measures have floor and ceiling effects at various levels of literacy development. This is to be expected when the desired outcomes are high scores on each of the closed tasks by the end of Grade 1. Denton et al. (2006) point out that of the six subtests only the Writing Vocabulary measure has an approximately normal distribution of scores at the beginning and end of first grade.

Denton et al. (2006) found a number of strengths in their analysis of the Observation Survey subtests. They found that the Text Reading task had strong evidence of concurrent validity and that the Observation Survey measures relevant constructs with reliability and validity. As a screening device they found good predictive validity for Text Reading, Word Reading, and the Writing Vocabulary task. They concluded that the Text Reading, Writing Vocabulary, and Dictation (Hearing and Recording Sounds in Words) tasks provided support to guide instruction. Both Denton et al. and Dunn (2007) found that end-of-program and end-of-first grade Text Reading level provided a strong criterion of progress and prediction of future literacy success.

The Observation Survey measures correlate highly with the *Iowa Test of Basic Skills* (Gómez-Bellengé, Rodgers, Wang, & Schultz, 2005; Tang & Gómez-Bellengé, 2007). National norms have been developed to assist in interpreting scores (Gómez-Bellengé & Thompson, 2005).

To observe change over time in children's literacy development, Reading Recovery teachers regularly and systematically use a range of instruments for recording and describing each child's behaviors and emerging competencies. These include daily running records, daily lesson records, writing books, weekly records of text reading levels, and weekly records of known reading and writing vocabulary. Careful observation and systematic recording of behaviors inform daily teaching decisions.

Capacity to Provide Implementation Training

More than 1.8 million first graders have been served in the United States since Reading Recovery was introduced in 1984. Table 1 shows the rapid expansion and dissemination of Reading Recovery in the United States from 1984 to 2000.

Several factors contributed to a decline beginning in 2001, including a challenging national policy climate that has been investigated and rectified. Over the same period of time, Reading Recovery in the United Kingdom continued to expand and is now a national initiative viewed as a cost-effective approach to early intervention (Douëtil, 2004; Gross, et al., 2006).

Table 1. Growth of Reading Recovery in the United States 1984–2008

School Year	Children Served	Complete Intervention	Discontinued	Percent
1984–1985	110	55	37	67%
1985–1986	230	136	99	73%
1986–1987	2,048	1,336	1,059	79%
1987–1988	3,649	2,648	2,269	86%
1988–1989	4,772	3,609	2,994	83%
1989–1990	7,778	5,840	4,888	84%
1990–1991	12,605	9,283	8,126	88%
1991–1992	21,821	16,026	13,499	84%
1992–1993	36,443	26,582	22,109	83%
1993–1994	56,077	40,493	33,243	82%
1994–1995	81,220	57,712	46,637	81%
1995–1996	99,617	71,193	59,266	83%
1996–1997	109,879	78,935	65,551	83%
1997–1998	122,935	88,929	73,610	83%
1998–1999	142,149	101,023	79,275	78%
1999–2000	150,046	110,913	86,426	78%
2000–2001	152,169	115,284	89,236	77%
2001–2002	148,567	113,791	88,408	78%
2002–2003	142,394	110,197	84,108	76%
2003–2004	126,544	97,643	74,537	76%
2004–2005	117,577	91,916	69,605	76%
2005–2006	109,512	84,946	64,211	76%
2006–2007	99,527	76,809	56,230	73%
2007–2008	91,021	71,175	53,258	75%
TOTAL	1,839,572	1,376,474	1,078,681	78%

SOURCE: National Data Evaluation Center, The Ohio State University

Children Served – Children who received at least one lesson in Reading Recovery

Complete Intervention – Children who had the opportunity for a full series of lessons

Discontinued – Children who successfully met rigorous criteria to be released from Reading Recovery during the school year or at the time of year-end testing

Percent – Percent of children who successfully completed the full intervention and whose lessons were discontinued

Experience Implementing the Intervention at Multiple Sites

Since 1991, when Reading Recovery was established in Michigan, over 87,500 first graders have been served and more than 1,000 teachers have completed the professional development program. During the 2007-2008 school year, 4,193 students were taught by 508 Reading Recovery teachers (41 of whom were in-training) at 360 schools in 108 school districts. These teachers also worked with 33,675 additional

students in their other instructional roles as classroom, special education, Title I reading, ESL, and bilingual teachers, or staff developers.

There are currently 25 teacher leaders in 18 Reading Recovery sites across Michigan. Each of these teacher leaders, working with the Reading Recovery Center of Michigan at Oakland University, can train 8 to 12 new Reading Recovery teachers each year. The university center can also train 8 to 12 new teacher leaders each year, if districts, consortiums of districts or ISDs commit to supporting new Reading Recovery sites.

Current implementation levels in Michigan allow only one out of every six children that would benefit from this highly effective early intervention program to receive services. In Pennsylvania the governor has substantially reallocated school improvement funds to support Reading Recovery's direct service to students and professional development for teachers. Other states, such as Ohio, North Carolina, Massachusetts, Kentucky, and Arkansas have provided state funding for Reading Recovery. To provide this service for the 24,180 Michigan first grade students performing in the bottom 20% of their cohort each year would require this type of support for early intervention (see Appendix E).

Capacity for Scaling Up (After the school returns to Phase 0)

In urban and rural schools with high poverty rates it often appears that 50-70% of the first grade population is at-risk of struggling to learn to read and write. These are the schools that often find themselves in need of Phase 1 or Phase 2 school improvement plans. Unfortunately, one-to-one intensive interventions are mainly intended to apply to the 20-30% of the first grade population that require support beyond what can be provided in a classroom context. Because many children in high poverty areas enter school with little previous literacy experience their classroom teachers need additional professional development to build on the strengths these children have and to start them on the path to literacy learning. We propose to use school improvement funds and the increased Title1 funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) to create demonstration sites with highly skilled Literacy Intervention Teams who provide a

comprehensive approach to literacy learning and instruction in these underserved and under-resourced school settings.

The professional development model for the Literacy Intervention Team members will be based on the year-long model used in Reading Recovery® and Literacy Lessons™. The professional development model allows teachers to maintain their current roles while they participate. Team members will include kindergarten, first and second grade classroom teachers, special education teachers, reading specialists and administrators. The professional development model uses a number of elements to support teacher learning. These elements will include two thirty-minute one-to-one lessons with at-risk students every day, university course work related to their tutoring and classroom experiences including observation of lessons behind a one-way mirror, school visits by a teacher leader to provide feedback on individual and group lessons, and professional conferences related to literacy learning and instruction.

Literacy intervention team teachers will learn to observe and describe student behaviors, develop skills in making moment-to-moment decisions to inform instruction, ways to appropriately identify children with learning disabilities, observe and reflect on guided reading and writing, monitor the progress of the lowest-achieving students, problem-solve students who do not respond adequately to the intervention, track the progress of students after the intervention, and report annual yearly progress which documents the growth of struggling readers. The data they collect will document program effectiveness and provide information to modify and enhance the school's comprehensive literacy program.

During the first year of the project 6 to 10 teachers will participate in the literacy intervention professional development program. Priority will be given to kindergarten and first grade teachers. School improvement and Title 1 funding will support 1.5 faculty positions at each participating school to enable participating teachers to engage in 1:1 tutoring for the most at-risk first grade children. Participating schools must be committed to early intervention with at-least one half-time position devoted to Reading Recovery with a trained or in-training Reading Recovery teacher. Schools should be planning for ways to fully implement Reading Recovery for 20 to 30% of the first grade students. The district/site must also employ a Reading Recovery teacher leader who will provide the

professional development experiences during the school day and the university course work in the evenings. School improvement and Title funds will also be used for costs associated with this professional development training.

During the second year of the project an additional 6 to 10 teachers will be trained for the literacy intervention team. Depending on the size of the participating school these teachers may come from the same building that implemented literacy intervention in year one or include teachers from another building in the district as part of the replication and expansion of the model. Additionally, a teacher participating in the year-one literacy intervention professional development will train as a Reading Recovery teacher leader. This additional teacher leader will enable the continued expansion of the program in year three and beyond. Sufficient .5 FTE Reading Recovery positions will be established in each building to maintain early intervention support for 20% of the lowest performing first grade students in each building. The increased literacy expertise of the primary staff will continue to support children in higher grades and classroom students that do not receive the Reading Recovery intervention.

This approach will capitalize on the proven success of the Reading Recovery to create demonstration sites with highly skilled literacy intervention team members who provide a comprehensive approach to literacy learning and instruction in Phase 1 and Phase 2 school settings where more than 50% of the first grade students appear to need intensive literacy interventions. The project objectives are:

- increase staff knowledge related to literacy learning and instruction,
- reduce the number of children that appear to need intervention support in first grade by improving classroom instruction,
- support the implementation of an effective early intervention program for the lowest performing students,
- increase literacy achievement for all primary students,
- reduce the number of children identified for LD services and therefore increase the quality of services available for children that need these services.

Project Timeline for Full Implementation

The following timeline will result in full implementation of the proposed intervention in Academic Year One (2009-2010) and Academic Year Two (2010-2011).

Project Timeline for Full Implementation	
Year One 2009 - 2010	
September 2009	<p>Training of Year One Teachers (6-10 teachers total) Begins</p> <p>Assessment and Selection of Year One Round One Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of Beginning-of-Program (Pre-Test) Assessment Data for Selected Students (Lowest Performing Students Selected from the First Grade Cohort for Service First in Round One)</p> <p>Identification and Assessment of Year One Random Sample Students; Web-Based Entry of Beginning-of-Year Assessment Data for Year One Random Sample Students</p>
September 2009 – December 2009/January 2010	Treatment Administered to Year One Round One Intervention Students. (Treatment consists of individualized daily 30-minute lessons, average of 15 – 20 weeks)
December 2009 - January 2010	<p>Post-Assessment Administered to Year One Round One Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of End-of-Program (Post-Test) Assessment Data for Year One Round One Students</p> <p>Identification and Selection of Year One Round Two Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of Beginning-of-Program (Pre-Test) Assessment Data for Selected Students (Lowest Performing Students Selected from the First Grade Cohort for Service First in year One Round Two)</p>
January 2010	Post-Assessment Administered to Year One Random Sample Students; Web-Based Entry of Mid-Year Assessment Data for Year One Random Sample Students
January/February 2010 – April/May 2010	Treatment Administered to Year One Round Two Intervention Students. (Treatment consists of individualized daily 30-minute lessons, average of 15 – 20 weeks)

Project Timeline for Full Implementation, (cont.)	
Year One 2009 – 2010 (cont.)	
	<p>Post-Assessment Administered to Year One Round Two Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of End-of-Program (Post-Test) Assessment Data for Year One Round Two Intervention Students</p> <p>Post-Assessment Administered to Year One Random Sample Students; Web-Based Entry of End-of-Year Assessment Data for Year One Random Sample Students</p>
June 2010	Training of Year One Teachers Concludes
Year Two 2010 - 2011	
September 2010-2011	Training of Teacher Leader. (Note: Upon completion of the training, the new teacher leader can train 8-12 new teachers each year and professionally develop and support the 6-10 previously trained teachers and the 6-10 teachers trained while the teacher leader was also in training – a total of 20-32 teachers in Year Three.)
September 2010 – June 2011	Ongoing Professional Development Support for Teachers Trained in Year One
September 2010	<p>Training of Year Two Teachers (6-10 teachers total) Begins</p> <p>Assessment and Selection of Year Two Round One Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of Beginning-of-Program (Pre-Test) Assessment Data for Selected Students (Lowest Performing Students Selected from the First Grade Cohort for Service First in Round One)</p> <p>Identification and Assessment of Year Two Random Sample Students; Web-Based Entry of Beginning-of-Year Assessment Data for Year Two Random Sample Students</p>
September – December 2010 - January 2011	Treatment Administered to Year Two Round One Intervention Students. (Treatment consists of individualized daily 30-minute lessons, average of 15 – 20 weeks)

Project Timeline for Full Implementation, (cont.)	
Year Two 2010 - 2011	
December 2010 - January 2011	<p>Post-Assessment Administered to Year Two Round One Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of End-of-Program (Post-Test) Assessment Data for Year Two Round One Students</p> <p>Identification and Selection of Year Two Round Two Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of Beginning-of-Program (Pre-Test) Assessment Data for Selected Students (Lowest Performing Students Selected from the First Grade Cohort for Service First in Round Two)</p>
January 2011	Post-Assessment Administered to Year Two Random Sample Students; Web-Based Entry of Mid-Year Assessment Data for Year Two Random Sample Students
January/February 2011 – April/May 2011	Treatment Administered to Year Two Round Two Intervention Students. (Treatment consists of individualized daily 30-minute lessons, average of 15 – 20 weeks)
May/June 2011	<p>Post-Assessment Administered to Year Two Round Two Intervention Students; Web-Based Entry of End-of-Program (Post-Test) Assessment Data for Year Two Round Two Students</p> <p>Post-Assessment Administered to Random Sample Students; Web-Based Entry of End-of-Year Assessment Data for Random Sample Students</p> <p>Followup/Progress Monitoring Assessment Administered to Year One Intervention Students</p>
June 2010	Training of Year Two Teachers Concludes

Budget

Training and Professional Development of Teachers and Literacy Intervention Services for Children

The cost to fully implement the literacy intervention in a school that has not yet implemented Reading Recovery is \$63,600 for 1 Reading Recovery teacher and 6 primary grades teachers serving a minimum of 32 first grade children in 1:1 lessons in Year One; a total of 64 first grade children in Years One and Two combined. These 7 teachers also would serve an average of 140 additional children in grades K-5 each year in their other instructional roles resulting in literacy intervention service reaching a total of 344 children in grades K-5 in Years One and Two combined. If 6 additional primary grades teachers are trained in year Two, the costs for training and materials and the number of children served would increase proportionately.

To implement the intervention with 1 Reading Recovery teacher and 10 primary grades teachers, the costs for services in a school that has not yet implemented Reading Recovery would be \$98,000. These 11 teachers would serve 48 first grade children in 1:1 lessons in Year One; a total of 96 first grade children in Years One and Two combined. These 11 teachers also would serve an average of 220 additional children in grades K-5 each year in their other instructional roles resulting in literacy intervention service reaching a total of 536 children in grades K-5 in Years One and Two combined. If 10 additional primary grades teachers are trained in Year Two, the costs for training and materials as well as the number of children served would increase proportionately (See Budget Scenario.)

Budget Scenario

School that has not yet implemented Reading Recovery				
Year	Costs	Reading Recovery Teacher	Literacy Intervention Teachers	**Teacher Leader
		1 (.5 FTE)	6 -10 (.25 FTE each = 1.5 – 2.5 Total FTE)	1 (.25 FTE)
One	One Time Costs: Tuition for Training, Student Books & Teaching Materials	\$8,000	\$33,000-55,000	\$15,500
	Annual Costs: *Data Entry, Professional Development & Institutes	\$2,000	\$9,300 – 15,500	\$3,050
Two	One Time Costs: Tuition for Training, Student Books & Teaching Materials	--	--	--
	Annual Costs: *Data Entry, Professional Development & Institutes	\$2,000	\$9,300 – 15,500	\$3,050
Costs: Years One and Two Combined		\$12,000	\$51,600 – 86,000	\$21,600
**TOTAL COSTS: Years One and Two Combined		\$63,600 – 98,000		

*Additional Cost: One-time Site Set-Up Fee for Data Entry \$450

**Additional Budget Required for .25 Salary for a Trained Teacher Leader to Provide Ongoing Professional Support to 13-21 teachers

Cost for One-Time Training

(Overview, Awareness, Exploration, Training for Trainers, e.g. “Teacher Leader”)

Reading Recovery Teacher Leader Training through the Reading Recovery Center of Michigan at Oakland University is a 20-credit program of graduate study at the post-masters level. Training costs include tuition, teacher leader professional development materials, student materials, student data costs and professional conferences, institutes and symposia or a total cost of \$21,600 for Years One and Two combined. This figure does not include the teacher leader salary which would vary depending on the number of teachers requiring ongoing professional support. Following

Year One of their training, a teacher leader would professionally support between 24 – 48 teachers in his/her other instructional (.5 FTE) teacher leader role.

Total Costs for Implementation: Teachers and Students

The total cost of implementing the Intervention in a school for Years One and Two is \$63,600 to include teacher training, professional development, and teacher and student materials for 7 teachers (1 Reading Recovery teacher and 6 Literacy teachers). The total cost of implementing the Intervention in a school in Years One and Two is \$98,000 for 11 teachers (1 Reading Recovery teacher and 10 Literacy Intervention teachers). For a school that has not yet implemented Reading Recovery, the teacher leader training would take place in Year Two.

Total Costs of Implementation for an Elementary School

The total one-time cost for implementation and service to teachers and children in Years One and Two combined is outlined in the Budget Scenario. Teacher leader services in the form of salary to support teachers’ ongoing professional development would be an additional cost to the school. The total number of teachers trained and professionally supported in Years One and Two combined ranges from 7 – 11 teachers. The total number of children served by the intervention in grades K-5 in Years One and Two combined ranges from 344 to 536 children.

Alignment of the Evidence Based Intervention with Michigan’s School Improvement Framework and Statewide System of Support

Reading Recovery: An Evidence Based Intervention in Support of Michigan Children, Teachers and Schools is aligned with the Goals of Michigan’s School Improvement Framework and Statewide System of Support as follows. A detailed description of the proposed intervention is described in the section titled “Intervention Description.”

Goal 1: Provide customized technical assistance to HP school staff at the request of ISDs and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to address the needs of target populations that did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in English language arts for Whole Group, Students With Disabilities, and English Language Learners.

The Reading Recovery Center of Michigan through its network of affiliated regional training sites throughout Michigan will provide training and professional development support to high priority school staff to address the needs of students in groups, students with disabilities and English Language Learner students through investments in teacher expertise to deliver the proposed intervention. To begin this process, ISDs and LEAs representing the high priority schools will contact the Reading Recovery Center of Michigan to make arrangements for the year-long training and professional support services provided through its regional training sites. Abundant research evidence indicates that children who reach average to above-average achievement levels in literacy by the end of first grade will continue to progress through grade 4. Conversely, children who do not reach grade level performance by the end of first grade are likely to remain low performing throughout their elementary school years. Provided an early intervention tailored to their needs, even the most at-risk literacy learners in grade one are able to take advantage of good classroom instruction and continue learning with their average progress peers. The result is the closing of the achievement gap without further literacy intervention for these students. Through the intensive training in literacy teaching and learning and the continuous high quality professional support provided by teacher leaders affiliated with Oakland University, teachers are able to intervene on behalf of the lowest performing literacy learners to reverse the pattern of literacy underachievement. This investment in teachers will support schools in achieving their goals for adequate yearly progress.

Goal 2: Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address identified needs.

The United States Department of Education Institute for Education Sciences' What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) has established that Reading Recovery is the only beginning reading program with positive or potentially positive effects across all four domains studied with positive effects (their highest rating) for alphabetic skills (phonemic awareness, print awareness, letter knowledge, and phonics) and general reading achievement, and potentially positive effects (their next highest level of evidence) on fluency and comprehension outcomes.

Teachers who participate in the proposed evidence-based intervention will receive training and professional development in literacy teaching and learning delivered by Reading Recovery teacher leaders affiliated with the Reading Recovery Center at Oakland University. Through the year-long initial training and subsequent professional support, the teachers will learn to apply identified research-based strategies and instructional practices with first grade children at-risk for literacy failure and with the children they serve in their other teaching roles.

Goal 3: Create partnerships for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice

The proposed intervention partnership will deliver technical assistance, professional development and management advice to the participating schools. Schools will identify teachers for participation in the year-long training and professional development. These teachers will learn to assess and identify the bottom performing literacy learners in grade one and will serve these lowest performers first in individualized daily lessons. These intervention teachers will monitor the progress of these initially served children on a daily basis and will select the next most needy literacy learners to fill these teaching slots once these children achieve grade level performance. The entire process will result in collaborative planning among the principal, the primary grades teachers and the upper grades teaching staff in support of all (K-5) children's learning. Data submitted at the beginning, middle and end-of-year and on entry to and at the end of each child's intervention will be submitted to the National Data Evaluation Center (NDEC). The NDEC will prepare reports at the Building, Teacher, and Student levels which, in consultation with the teacher leader, will inform subsequent planning and school-wide decision-making by members of the literacy intervention team.

Goal 4: Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of the school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide System of Support.

The teacher leader is trained to have the ability to integrate the development, analysis, and use of the specific evidence-based and data-driven instructional strategies provided to the literacy intervention teachers. Drs. Mary Lose and Robert Schwartz, Oakland University faculty specifically trained in evidence-based literacy intervention

strategies, provide the teacher leaders with the training and ongoing professional support that informs the teacher leaders' work with teachers and schools.

Goal 5 Expanding Capacity to ramp up and support the program to include more schools in years two and three.

Through the intensive one-year training and subsequent year of professional development, each participating teacher will learn to deliver individualized literacy intervention lessons to at-risk first grade students. The participating intervention teachers will receive professional support in how to apply their new learning to intervene on behalf of other students served during the other part of their teaching day. During Years One and Two, each teacher will develop the expertise and the ongoing professional support to enable them to intervene on behalf of 8 first grade students (4 each year) and an additional 40 elementary grades students (20 each year). According to Linda Darling-Hammond (1996) the provision of high quality, sustained teacher training and professional development is the most effective investment a school can make to obtain the greatest student achievement gains. The results of student achievement gains by these intervention teachers will serve as the catalyst for the replication of these outcomes in schools and districts throughout Michigan. The process for achieving this expanded capacity and the potential number of teachers and students participating in schools are further described in the Full Implementation and Budget Scenario sections of this application.

Summary: Sustainability, Accountability, and Continuous Improvement

As presented in numerous reports, professional books, peer-reviewed articles, and research studies, the goal of Reading Recovery is to dramatically reduce the number of children who struggle with literacy learning. The training and ongoing professional support provided to teachers by teacher leaders ensures development of teachers' increasing professional capabilities as measured by student achievement data collected on every student served as required by Reading Recovery national standards. At Oakland University, Reading Recovery teacher leaders receive intensive year-long initial training and continuous professional development provided by the university faculty trained in Reading Recovery. This professional development support offered to the teacher leaders

as a group and on-site in their school districts sustains the quality of the program for children and teachers. As noted by the Florida Center for Reading Research: “the hallmark of Reading Recovery is a strong model of professional development that is delivered through a three-tiered system consisting of university based trainers, teacher leaders, and Reading Recovery teacher candidates.” Reading Recovery collects data on every child served and uses district, building, teacher, and student level data for continuous progress monitoring and improvement. Oakland University has an over 18 year history of implementing Reading Recovery in Michigan: training and professionally supporting teacher leaders, who in turn support teachers who work with children in daily lessons and who also apply their considerable literacy teaching expertise in their other classroom instructional roles.

Intervention Partners Representative Curriculum Vitae
June 2009

Dr. Mary K. Lose
Associate Professor of Education
Director, Reading Recovery Center of Michigan
School of Education and Human Services
Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48309-4494

Dr. Robert M. Schwartz
Professor of Education, Oakland University
Rochester, MI 48309-4494

VITA
Dr. Mary K. Lose
Associate Professor of Education
Director, Reading Recovery Center of Michigan
Oakland University, Rochester, MI 48309-4494

Personal Information

Room 485H Pawley Hall
Oakland University
Phone: 248-370-3085
Fax: 248-370-4367
lose@oakland.edu

Academic Degrees and Studies

Ed.D. Drake University Des Moines, Iowa	1982-1988	Curriculum and Instruction, Language Arts
M.S. Drake University Des Moines, Iowa	1973-1976	Special Education, Learning Disabilities and Emotional Disturbance
B.S. Drake University Des Moines, Iowa	1968-1972	Elementary Education, Mental Disabilities

Post Doctoral Studies

Auckland College of Education Auckland, New Zealand	Summer 2002	Marie M. Clay Literacy Trust Fellowship
The Ohio State University Columbus, Ohio	1997-1998	Reading Recovery Trainer Certification Program
University of Northern Iowa Cedar Falls, Iowa	Summer 1996	Advanced Study in Creative Drama

Professional Employment

2008-Present Associate Professor, Department of Reading and Language Arts
Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan (with tenure 2008)

2002-Present Director, Reading Recovery Center of Michigan [Located in the
Department of Reading and Language Arts, School of Education and
Human Services, Oakland University]

- 2002-2008 Assistant Professor, Department of Reading and Language Arts
Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan
- 2000-2002 Associate Director, Purdue Literacy Network Project and Literacy
Collaborative
Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana
- Associate Professor, Department of Literacy and Language
(Courtesy Appointment, Non-tenure Track)
- 1997-2000 Visiting Associate Professor
The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
- Director, Reading Recovery Center of Iowa
(Located on campus of Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa)
- 1996-1997 Visiting Assistant Professor
The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
- 1993-1997 Associate Professor (with tenure)
Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa
Chair, Education Department, 1994-1996
- 1988-1993 Assistant Professor
Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa
- 1981-1988 Instructor
Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa
- 1976-1980 Consultant in Learning Disabilities
Heartland Area Education Agency, Johnston, Iowa
- 1974-1976 Teacher of Learning Disabilities
Bondurant-Farrar School District, Bondurant, Iowa
- 1972-1974 Teacher of Mental Disabilities
Melcher-Dallas School District, Melcher, Iowa

Selected Journal Articles

- Lose, M. K. (2008). Using RTI to support struggling learners. *Principal Magazine*, 87
(3), 20-23.
- Lose, M. K. (2008). Beyond the words: Considering nonverbal communication in
Reading Recovery teaching. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 7 (2), 5-17.

- Lose, M. K. (2007). A child's 'Response to Intervention' requires a responsive teacher of reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 61(3), 276-279.
- Lose, M. K. (2007). Applying Wood's levels of contingent support for learning in Reading Recovery. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 6 (2), 17-30.
- Lose, M. K. (2007). Marie Clay: Leaving the World a Better Place for Young Literacy Learners and Their Teachers. *Michigan Reading Journal*, 40 (1), 48-49.
- Lose, M. K., Schmitt, M. E., Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., Jones, N. K., Honchell, B.A., & Askew, B. J. (2007). Reading Recovery and IDEA legislation: Early Intervening Services (EIS) and Response to Intervention (RTI). *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 6 (2), 44-49.
- McEneaney, J., Lose, M. K., & Schwartz, R. M. (2006). A transactional perspective on reading difficulties and response to intervention. *New Directions in Research: Reading Research Quarterly*, 41 (1), 117-128.
- Lose, M.K. & Konstantellou, E. (2005). Selection of students for Reading Recovery: Challenges and responses. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 5 (1), 32-45.
- Lose, M. K. (2005). Valuing expert teacher decision-making. *Michigan Journal of Teacher Education*, 2 (2), 7-12.
- Lose, M. K. (2005). Reading Recovery: The optimal response to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 4 (3), 35-37.
- Lose, M. K. (2005). Teacher decision-making or labeling? No contest. *Michigan Reading Journal*, 37 (3), 26-28.
- Lose, M. K. (2003). Complementary and comprehensive: Reading Recovery and Michigan's Reading First plan. *Michigan Reading Journal*. 35 (4), 43-51.
- Lose, M. K. (2001). Why do a follow-up study of Reading Recovery children: Rationales and recommendations. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*. 1 (1), 30-35.
- Lose, M. K. (1997). The teacher, the skater, and the pink shoes. *Teaching pre K-8*, 28 (3), 48-49.
- Lose, M. K. (1996). Interprofessional connections: The University of Iowa College of Medicine. *The Chalkboard: Newsletter of the Iowa Association of Teacher Educators* 3 (1), Cedar Falls, IA, p. 3.

Lose, M. K. (1991). Teachers and the golden years of childhood. *The Clearing House*, 64, (3), 157-158.

Lose, M. K. (1986). A mouse is like a moving mud clod. *The Clearing House*, 59 (9), 416-418.

Selected Technical Reports

Lose, M. K. (2008, November). *Reading Recovery in Michigan in 2007-2008: An Oakland University Executive Summary*. Rochester, MI: Oakland University, 1-4. (Additional Executive Summaries for 2002-03, 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006, 2006-2007).

Lose, M. K. (2007, October). *An analysis of Reports on Reading Recovery Prepared for the Kalamazoo Public Schools* (Executive Summary of Reading Recovery Literature Review and *Early Literacy in Education and Learning Proposed Assessment of Goals*.) Rochester, MI: Oakland University, 1-5.

Lose, M. K. (2007, April). *What Works Clearinghouse report on Reading Recovery: An Oakland University update*. Rochester, MI: Oakland University, p.1.

Lose, M. K. (2000, August). *Executive summary: Iowa Reading Recovery*. Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa, 1-25.

Selected Professional Presentations

Schwartz, R.M., Schmitt, M.C. & Lose, M.K. (2009, May). *The effect of teacher-student ratio on literacy achievement outcomes in preventative early intervention services*. International Reading Association 54th Annual Convention, Minneapolis, MN.

Lose, M. K. & Best, D. (2009, March). *Building bridges from theory to practice: Supporting struggling literacy learners*. Michigan Reading Association State Conference, Grand Rapids, MI.

Lose, M. K. & Johnson, C. (2009, January). *Responding to RtI for children, teachers, and schools*. Southeastern Regional Reading Recovery Conference, Savannah, GA.

Lose, M. K. (2008, December). *Individual vs. small group instruction in a web-based experimental study*. National Reading Conference Annual Convention, Orlando, FL.

Lose, M. K. (2008, November). *A child's response to intervention requires a responsive administrator*. Southwest Regional Reading Recovery Institute, Dallas, TX.

Lose, M. K. (2008, October). *A child's 'Response to Intervention' requires a responsive teacher of reading*. University of South Dakota Reading Recovery Conference.

- Lose, M. K. (2008, October). *Considering nonverbal communication in Reading Recovery teaching*. Wyoming Reading Recovery Institute, Sheridan, WY.
- Mooney, C. Allington, R., Samuels, S. J., Fink, R., Lose, M. K. (2008, May). *Spotlight on Struggling Learners: Research and Practice from IRA Publications*. Panel presentation by authors published in the 2007 editions of *The Reading Teacher*. International Reading Association 53rd Annual Convention, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Lose, M. K. (2008, March). *Responding to RTI: Teachers matter most*. Michigan Reading Association State Conference, Detroit, MI.
- Lose, M. K. (2008, January). *What works? Reading Recovery and 'Response to Intervention' to support struggling readers*. 17th Annual Early Literacy and Reading Recovery Institute. Chicago, IL.
- Konstantellou, E. & Lose, M. K. (2008). *Disciplining the Wandering Eye: Fostering Fast and Efficient Visual Processing Across Lesson Activities Over Time*. National Reading Recovery and K-6 Classroom Literacy Conference, Columbus, OH.
- Lose, M. K. (2007, July). *Fostering efficient and rapid visual processing across lesson activities over time*. Sixth International Reading Recovery Institute, Baltimore, Maryland, USA. (Also co-presented at the National Reading Recovery Conference, February 2007).
- Lose, M. K. (2007, May). *Contingent teaching as a response to the IDEA Act of 2004*. International Reading Association 52nd Annual Convention, Toronto, Canada.
- Lose, M. K. (2007, March). *Struggling readers & writers in the classroom: What you can do, NOW!* Michigan Reading Association State Conference, Grand Rapids, MI
- Lose, M. K. (2007, February). *Contingent and responsive teaching in writing*. National Reading Recovery and K-6 Classroom Literacy Conference, Columbus, OH.
- Lose, M. K. (2007, February). *Contingent teaching to support accelerative progress in reading: Lessons from skilled teachers*. 9th Annual RRCI Early Literacy Reading Recovery Conference Des Moines, IA.
- Lose, M. K. (2007, January). *Contingent teaching in response to the child*. Illinois Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura Institute. Chicago, IL.
- Lose, M.K. (2006, November). *Nonverbal communication in Reading Recovery lessons and how it makes a difference to student learning*. Northeast Reading Recovery and Early Literacy Conference, Providence, RI.
- Lose, M.K. (2006, November). *Contingent teaching to support accelerative progress: Lessons from skilled teachers*. Missouri Association of Reading Recovery

Educators (MARRE) Reading Recovery and Early Literacy Conference. St. Louis, MO.

- Lose, M.K. (2006, November). *Changes over time in word solving in writing and the links to reading*. Missouri Association of Reading Recovery Educators (MARRE) Reading Recovery and Early Literacy Conference. St. Louis, MO.
- Lose, M. K., Gomez-Bellenge, F. X., & Ye, Feifei (2006, April). *Organizational factors and teacher characteristics of low repertoire students successfully served by an early intervention*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Lose, M. K. (2006, March). *Beyond the words: How nonverbal communication makes a difference in learning*. Michigan Academy of Science, Arts, and Letters Annual Meeting. Oakland University, Rochester, MI.
- Lose, M. K. (2006, March). *Reading Recovery and Response to Intervention under the IDEIA, R³: Reading Recovery Roundtable*, Michigan Reading Association State Conference, Detroit, MI.
- Lose, M. K. (2006, February). *Contingent teaching for independent problem-solving in writing: Lessons from skilled teachers*. National Reading Recovery and K-6 Literacy Conference, Columbus, OH.
- Matz, S., Mangold, L. & Lose, M. K. (2006, February). *What it really takes to 'Leave No Child Behind'*. National Reading Recovery and Early Literacy Conference, Columbus, OH.
- Lose, M.K. (2006, January). *Expert teacher decision-making for accelerated learning*. Illinois Reading Recovery and Descubriendo la Lectura Institute. Chicago, IL
- Lose, M. K., Smith, J. M., Smith, J., & Schwartz, R. (2005, April). *Growth curve analysis of first round Reading Recovery students across first grade*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.
- Lose, M. K. & Gomez-Bellenge, F. X. (2004, October). *AYP and data-driven decision-making with Reading Recovery*. Michigan Association of State and Federal Program Specialists Fall Directors Institute, Traverse City, MI.
- Lose, M. K., Schlesinger, J. & Davis, T. (2001, February). *How to design and implement a follow-up study*. National Reading Recovery and Descubriendo La Lectura Conference, Columbus, OH.
- Lose, M. K. & Jasso, L. (1997, February). *La educacion para el siglo 21st: Transforming our beliefs about preservice teacher education and pedagogy*. 77th Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D. C.

Additional national, regional, and state conference presentations 1976-2009.

Selected Awards and Grants

Schwartz, R. M., Schmitt, M. E., & Lose, M. K. (June, 2006). *The effect of teacher-student ratio on literacy achievement outcomes in preventative early intervention services*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America. \$150,000 (\$50,000 p/yr. for 3 yrs).

Lose, M. K. (2005, April). Faculty Recognition Award, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan.

Lose, M. K. (2005, June). *Research support workshop*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America. \$500.

Moore, P., Lose, M. K. & Gomez-Bellenge. (2004, June). *Low repertoire study: Status outcomes in Reading Recovery for children who present low repertoires in fall of first grade*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America. \$4,500.

Lose, M. K. (2003, June). *It takes two to tutor: Reading Recovery teachers' contingent teaching during writing in the Reading Recovery lesson*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America. \$5,000.

Lose, M. K. (2004, March). *Professional development support for Michigan Reading Recovery teacher leaders: A proposal to the Reading Recovery Council of Michigan for Oakland University Reading Recovery Center*. Reading Recovery Council of Michigan. \$14,500.

Lose, M. & Smith, J. (2003, October). *Follow-up study of Michigan Reading Recovery using growth curve analysis*. Reading Recovery Council of Michigan. \$2,100.

Lose, M. K. & Shepardson, R. (1999-2001). Reading Recovery in Iowa: A grant proposal to the Roy J. Carver Charitable Trust in support of the Reading Recovery Center of Iowa, \$576,935. Grant awarded to the College of Education, The University of Iowa.

Additional grants 1985-2000.

Related Professional Service

2007 – Present Co-Chair, Research Committee, International Reading Recovery Trainers Organization

2006 – Present Chair, Research Committee, Reading Recovery North American Trainers Group

Testimony Submitted for the Written Record of the Congress of the United States

Lose, M. K. (2007, April 12). *Local perspectives on the No Child Left Behind Act Hearing Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education*. Testimony submitted for the Written Record, United States Congress.

Invited Testimony – Michigan Senate

Invited testimony by Senator Ron Jelinek, Chair, Michigan Senate Committee on Appropriations K-12 Education. Presentation to the committee, Senate Office Building, Lansing, MI, March 2004.

Vita
Robert M. Schwartz
Professor of Education, Oakland University
Rochester, MI 48309-4494

Personal Information

Robert M. Schwartz
1491 Lake Shore Blvd.
Lake Orion, MI 48362
(248) 693 1941 home
(248) 370 3075 office
rschwart@oakland.edu

Degrees Earned

May, 1978	University of Illinois (Urbana, Illinois) Ph.D. (Major, Educational Psychology)
August, 1973	Loyola University (Chicago, Illinois) M.A. (Major, Educational Psychology)
May, 1970	Carnegie- Mellon University (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania) B.S. (Major, Chemical Engineering)

Professional Employment

1995-present	Full Professor Oakland University (Rochester, Michigan)
1997-present	Site Coordinator, Oakland University Reading Recovery Center
1996-2006	Chair, Department of Reading and Language Arts
1992-1997 Michigan)	Director, Michigan Reading Recovery Program Oakland University Training Center (Rochester,
1984-1995	Associate Professor Oakland University (Rochester, Michigan)
1978-1984	Assistant Professor Oakland University (Rochester, Michigan)
1973-1978	Graduate Assistant & Instructor, Educational

Psychology University of Illinois (Urbana, Illinois)

1971-1972 Teacher, Junior High and High School Science
Forest Hospital (DesPlaines, Illinois)
Residential School for Emotionally Disturbed Children

1970-1971 Engineer
Universal Oil Products (Riverside, Illinois)

Awards and Grants

1978 *Dissertation of the Year Finalist.*
Selected as one of the ten best dissertations of 1978
by the International Reading Association.

1979 *Oakland University Research Grant.*
Factors affecting comprehension of expository prose.

1981 *Oakland University Research Fellowship.*
Coordination of processing decisions for
comprehension
of expository texts.

1982 *Oakland University Research Grant.*
Comprehension: age and context effects.

1986 *Oakland University Research Fellowship.*
Learning to learn vocabulary: Instruction in the
concept of definition.

Oakland University Professional Development Grant.
Reading Recovery training and site development.

Reading Recovery Trainer
Postdoctoral study and certification
The Ohio State University

Oakland University Research Excellence Award

1996 *Meadow Brook Research Conference Grant.*
Social Construction of Knowledge: Theory & Practice. \$3000.00 Oakland University
Conference Grant (Additional funding from the Michigan Reading Recovery Council,
\$4000.00, and the Reading Recovery Council of North America \$3500.00)

1999 *Reading Recovery Effects Study*. \$35,000 grant from the Reading Recovery Council of North America.

2006-2009 *The Effect of Teacher-Student Ratio on Literacy Achievement Outcomes in Preventative Early Intervention Services* \$50,000 grant from the Reading Recovery Council of North America, first year funding for a three year study totaling \$180,000.

Selected Publications

Schwartz, R. M. (1977). Strategic processes in beginning reading. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 9, 17-26.

Schwartz, R. M. (1980). Levels of Processing: The strategic demands of reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 15, 433-450.

Schwartz, R. M. (1980). Resource allocation and context utilization in the reading process. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 841-849.

Schwartz, R. M. & Stanovich, K. E. (1981). Flexibility in the use of graphic and contextual information in good and poor readers. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 13, 264-269. (A version of this article has been included on the ERIC system, ED 193 599).

Reynolds, R. E. & Schwartz, R. M. (1983). Relation of metaphoric processing to comprehension and memory. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 450- 459.

Barron, R. F. & Schwartz, R. M. (1984). Graphic post-organizers: A spatial learning strategy. In *Spatial Learning Strategies: Techniques, Applications and Related Issues*, C. D. Holley & D. F. Dancereau (Eds.), New York: Academic Press, 275-289.

Schwartz, R. M. & Raphael, T. E. (1985). Instruction in the concept of definition as a basis for vocabulary acquisition. In J. A. Niles (Ed.) *Issues in Literacy: A Research Perspective, Thirty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*, 116-124.

Schwartz, R. M. & Raphael, T. E. (1985). Concept of definition: A key to improving students' vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher*, 39, 198-205.

Schwartz, R. M. (1986). Teachers' classroom learning: Toward the development of expertise in reading instruction. In T. E. Raphael (Ed.) *Contexts of School Based Literacy*, New York: Random House, 253-269.

- Schwartz, R. M. (1988). Learning to learn vocabulary in content area textbooks. *Journal of Reading*, 32 (2), 108-118.
- Mosenthal, J. H., Schwartz, R. M., & MacIsaac, D. (1992). Comprehension instruction and teacher training: More than mentioning. *Journal of Reading*, 36 (3), 198-207 (A version of this article has been included on the ERIC system, ED #314 740).
- Schwartz, R. M. (1994). MetaRecovery: Thinking about teaching for strategies. *The Running Record*. 6 (3), 1 & 12-15.
- Schwartz, R. M. (1996). Reviewing the Annual School Report. *Network News*, Spring.
- Schwartz, R. M. (1997). Self-monitoring in beginning reading. *The Reading Teacher*, 51 (1), 40-48.
- Schwartz, R. M. (2002). Self-monitoring in beginning reading. *Evidence-Based Reading Instruction: Putting the National Reading Panel Report into Practice*, Newark, Delaware, International Reading Association.
- Schwartz, R. M. (2005). Decisions, decisions: Responding to primary students during guided reading. *The Reading Teacher*. 58, 436-443.
- Schwartz, R. M. (2005). Literacy learning of at-risk first grade students in the Reading Recovery early intervention. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97, 257-267.
- Jones, N., Johnson, C., Schwartz, R., & Zalud, G. (2005). Two positive outcomes of reading recovery: Exploring the interface between reading recovery and special education. *Journal of Reading Recovery*, 4(3), 19-34.
- McEneaney, J. E., Lose, M. K., & Schwartz, R. M. (2006). A transactional perspective on reading difficulties and response to intervention. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(1), 117-128.
- Schwartz, R. (2006). Supporting teacher learning: Reading Recovery as a community of practice. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 6(1), 49-55. (updated reprint from 1998 *Network News*)
- Schwartz, R., Askew, B. J., & Gómez-Bellengé, F. X. (2007). What works? Reading recovery: Analysis of the What Works Clearinghouse report. *Journal of Reading Recovery*, 6(3), 49-52.
- Gallant, P., & Schwartz, R. (in press). Examining the nature of developing expertise in reading instruction. *Literacy Research and Instruction*.
- Schwartz, R. M., Hobsbaum, A., Briggs, C., & Scull, J. (2009). Reading Recovery and

Evidence-Based Practice -- A response to Reynolds and Wheldall (2007).
International Journal of Disability, Development and Education.

Robert M. Schwartz (in press). Reading Recovery Research in North America. Invited chapter in Barbara Watson and Billie Askew (eds.) *What is possible? Reading Recovery in an historical and international context: The legacy of Marie Clay.* Heinemann.

Schwartz, R. M., & Gallant, P. (in press). The role of self-monitoring in initial word recognition learning. In C. Wyatt-Smith, J. Elkins & S. Gunn (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on difficulties in learning literacy and numeracy.* Springer.

Selected Research Presentations

The second positive outcome: An open forum and follow-up discussion. Paper presented at The North American Leadership Academy, Washington D.C., April, 2003 (with Cliff Johnson, Noel Jones & Garreth Zalud.

Decisions, decisions: Teaching for strategies in a Reading Recovery lesson. Paper presented at the Southeastern Reading Recovery and Early Literacy Conference, Greensboro, NC, January 2003.

Fluency, comprehension & problem solving: Why one 'working system' is not enough. Paper presented at the International Reading Recovery Institute,

Supporting literacy processing: Teaching for fluency and comprehending continuous text. Pre-conference Institute session, National Reading Recovery & Classroom Literacy Conference, Columbus, OH, February 2005. (with Mary Lose).

What do we need to know to help beginning readers. Paper presented at the Michigan Reading Association conference, Grand Rapids, MI, March 2005.

What does it mean to be a research based early intervention? Paper presented at the North American Leadership Academy & Teacher Leader Institute, Washington, D.C., April 2005.

The politic of education and what works. Paper presented at the Western Canadian Institute of Reading Recovery Conference, Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 2006.

Scientific research: The politics of education and what works. Paper presented at the UALR Reading Recovery and Comprehensive Literacy Conference, Little Rock, Arkansas, October 2006.

Developing the brain's activity on text. Paper presented at the Michigan Reading Recovery Institute, Dearborn, MI, November, 2006.

Deficit, difference, and variability: Literacy learning difficulties and response to intervention. Invited presentation at NYU Steinhardt Conference: Response to Intervention, New York University, November 2006.

Emergent literacy: New models of learning & teaching. Paper to be presented at the National Reading Recovery and K-6 classroom literacy Conference, Columbus, OH, February, 2007 (with Mary Anne Doyle, University of Connecticut).

Comprehension, fluency and vocabulary instruction in K-6 classrooms. Paper to be presented at the National Reading Recovery and K-6 classroom literacy Conference, Columbus, OH, February, 2007.

Closing the gap, AYP, and current research related to Reading Recovery. Panel presentation at the National Reading Recovery and K-6 classroom literacy Conference, Columbus, OH, February, 2007 (with Francisco Gomez-Bellenge & Emily Rodgers, The Ohio State University, Catherine Compton-Lilly, University of Wisconsin).

Research on one-to-one and small-group instruction. Paper presented at the Teacher Leader Institute & North American Leadership Academy, Vienna Virginia, June 2007 (with Mary Lose and Maribeth Schmitt).

Emergent Literacy: New models of learning and teaching. Paper presented at the Teacher Leader Institute & North American Leadership Academy, Vienna Virginia, June 2007 (with Mary Anne Doyle).

The scientific basis of Reading Recovery. Paper presented at the Teacher Leader Institute & North American Leadership Academy, Vienna Virginia, June 2007.

RTI: Turning disability into Ability. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, Atlanta, May, 2008.

The effect of teacher-student ratio on early intervention outcomes. Symposium presented at the meeting of the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL, December 2008.

The effect of teacher-student ratio on literacy achievement outcomes in preventative early intervention services. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, Phoenix, February, 2009 (with Maribeth Schmitt and Mary Lose).

Related Professional Service:

President, Reading Recovery Council of North America, 2007-2008, part of a four-year leadership cycle.

References

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bryk, A. (2009). Support a science of performance improvement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 597-600.
- Center, Y., Wheldall, K., Freeman, L., Outhred, L., & McNaught, M. (1995). An evaluation of Reading Recovery. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30, 240–263.
- Clay, M. M. (1966). *Emergent reading behaviour*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Clay, M. M. (1987). Learning to be learning disabled. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 22, 155–173.
- Clay, M. M. (2002, 2006). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (2005). *Literacy lessons designed for individuals part one and part two*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (3), 193-200.
- D'Agostino, J. V., & Murphy, J. A. (2004). A meta-analysis of Reading Recovery in United States schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26, 23–38.
- Denton, C. A., Ciancio, D. J., & Fletcher, J. (2006). Validity, reliability, and utility of the Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 41(1), 8–34.
- Douëtil, J. (2004). *Reading Recovery: Key stage 1 effectiveness*. Retrieved from http://ioewebserver.ioe.ac.uk/ioe/cms/get.asp?cid=9263&9263_0=9268
- Doyle, M. A., & Forbes, S. (2003). How Reading Recovery teaches the five essential elements of reading instruction and more, Part 1. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 3(1), 1–18.
- Dunn, M. W. (2007). Diagnosing reading disability: Reading Recovery as a component of a response-to-intervention assessment model. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 5(2), 31–47.

- Forbes, S., & Doyle, M. A. (2004). How Reading Recovery teaches the five essential elements of reading instruction and more, Part 2. *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 3(2), 16–30.
- Gómez-Bellengé, F. X., Rodgers, E., Wang, C., & Schulz, M. (2005). *Examination of the validity of the Observation Survey with a comparison to ITBS*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Quebec.
- Gómez-Bellengé, F. X., & Thompson, J. R. (2005). *U.S. norms for tasks of An Observation Survey of Early Literacy Achievement* (NDEC Rep. No. 2005-02). Columbus: The Ohio State University, National Data Evaluation Center.
- Gross, J., Jones, D., Raby, M., & Tolfree, T. (2006). *The long-term costs of literacy difficulties*. London: KPMG Foundation.
- Herman, R., & Stringfield, S. (1997). *Ten promising programs for educating all children: Evidence of impact*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Kelly, P., Gómez-Bellengé, F. X., Chen, J., & Schulz, M. (2008). Learner outcomes for English language learner low readers in an early intervention. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(2), 135–160.
- Lose, M. K., (2007). A Child's Response to Intervention Requires a Responsive Teacher of Reading. *The Reading Teacher*, Vol.61 (3), 276-279.
- Lose, M. K., (2008). Using RTI to Support Struggling Learners, *Principal Magazine*, 87 (3) 20-23.
- Lose, M. K., Schmitt, M. C., Gómez-Bellengé, F. X., Jones, N., Honchell, B. A., & Askew, B. J. (2007). Reading Recovery and IDEA legislation: Early intervention services (EIS) and response to intervention (RTI). *The Journal of Reading Recovery*, 6(2), 42–47.
- Lyons, C. A., & Beaver, J. (1995). Reducing retention and learning disability placement through Reading Recovery: An educationally sound, cost-effective choice. In R. L. Allington & S. A. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 116–136). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Mathes, P. G., & Torgeson, J. K. (1998). All children can learn to read: Critical care for students with special needs. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73, 317–340.

- McEneaney, J. E., Lose, M. K., & Schwartz, R. M. (2006). A transactional perspective on reading difficulties and response to intervention. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 117–128.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel*. (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Nicholson, C. L. (1990). *Slosson Oral Reading Test: Revised manual*. East Aurora, NY: Slosson Educational Publications.
- O'Connor, E. A., & Simic, O. (2002). The effect of Reading Recovery on special education referrals and placements. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*, 635–646.
- Peterson, B. (1991). Selecting books for beginning readers. In D. E. DeFord, C. A. Lyons & S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Bridges to literacy: Learning from reading recovery* (pp. 119-147). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Pinnell, G. S. (2000). *Reading Recovery: An analysis of a research-based reading intervention*. Worthington, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.
- Rodgers, E., Gómez-Bellengé, F. X., & Wang, C. (2004). *Closing the literacy achievement gap with early intervention*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association. San Diego, CA.
- Rodgers, E., Gómez-Bellengé, F. X., Wang, C., & Schulz, M. (2005). *Predicting the literacy achievement of struggling readers: Does intervening early make a difference*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Montreal, Quebec.
- Schmitt, M. C., Askew, B. J., Fountas, I. C., Lyons, C. A., & Pinnell, G. S. (2005). *Changing futures: The influence of Reading Recovery in the United States*. Worthington, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.
- Schwartz, R. M., Askew, B. J., and Gómez-Bellengé, F. X. (2007). What works? Reading Recovery: Analysis of the What Works Clearinghouse Report. *Journal of Reading Recovery, 6*(2), 49–52.
- Site Coordinators Guide to Reading Recovery* (2006). Worthington, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.
- Tang, M., & Gómez-Bellengé, F. X. (2007, April). *Dimensionality and concurrent*

validity of the observation survey of early literacy achievement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Chicago (www.ndec.us) .

Wilson, K. G., & Daviss, B. (1994). *Redesigning Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A

United States Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences: What Works
Clearinghouse Beginning Reading (Enclosed as a PDF file)

Appendix B

United States Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences: What Works
Clearinghouse Report: Reading Recovery (Enclosed as a PDF file)

Appendix C

Instrument 1: Teacher Training and Professional Development Fidelity of Implementation

Directions: Reading Recovery Implementation Assessment Instrument

I. Please check: Observed: O Not Observed: N

II. Please rate each of the following terms in items of the quality of the implementation by using the appropriate number according to the following scales:

Quality

1 = Poor or unacceptable

2 = Below average in comparison to other programs observed

3 = Meets nearly all standards of program quality

4 = Above average in comparison to other programs

Observed	Not Observed	Training Standards	Poor	Below Average	Meets	Above Average
		Attend assessment training sessions				
		Successfully complete a yearlong course in Reading Recovery for which university credit is received				
		Teach a child behind the glass at least three times during the training year				
		Receive at least four school visits from the teacher leader over the course of the training year				
		Teach at least four first grade children per day individually for 30-minute daily sessions in a school setting throughout the school year				
		Demonstrate effective teaching of Reading Recovery students				
		Keep complete records on each child as a basis for instruction				
		Communicate with parents, first-grade teachers, and other school personnel on a regular basis throughout the year				

Appendix C (cont.)

Instrument 2a: Reading Recovery Intervention Program Components

Directions: Reading Recovery Implementation Assessment Instrument

I. Please check: Observed: O Not Observed: N

II. Please rate each of the following terms in items of the quality of the implementation by using the appropriate number according to the following scales:

Quality

1 = Poor or unacceptable

2 = Below average in comparison to other programs observed

3 = Meets nearly all standards of program quality

4 = Above average in comparison to other programs

Observed	Not Observed	Lesson Components	Poor	Below Average	Meets	Above Average
		Reading familiar or easy texts				
		Reading a story that was read for the first time the day before – incorporates running record				
		Working with letters and/or words using magnetic letters				
		Writing a story				
		Introducing and reading a new book				

Appendix C (cont.)

Instrument 2b: Reading Recovery Intervention Program Strategies

Directions: Reading Recovery Implementation Assessment Instrument

I. Please check: Observed: O Not Observed: N

II. Please rate each of the following terms in items of the quality of the implementation by using the appropriate number according to the following scales:

Quality

1 = Poor or unacceptable

2 = Below average in comparison to other programs observed

3 = Meets nearly all standards of program quality

4 = Above average in comparison to other programs

Observed	Not Observed	Program Strategies	Poor	Below Average	Meets	Above Average
		Appropriate pacing of lesson components				
		Appropriate texts selected throughout the lesson				
		Appropriate prompts are used for scaffolding the child to problem solve				
		Child is actively engaged in constructive problem solving				
		Echo of focus throughout the lesson				
		Procedures are adjusted according to child's needs				
		Balance of fluency, phrasing practice, and problem solving				
		Opportunities to develop phonological awareness within the lesson				
		Articulates child's strengths and needs				
		Has high expectations for the child				

Appendix D

Lose, M. K. (2006, November). Reading Recovery in Michigan in 2007-2008: An Oakland University Executive Summary. Rochester, MI: Oakland University, 1-3, back cover. (enclosed as a PDF file)

Appendix E

Letter of Introduction – Dr. William G. Keane