

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 823

CS 001 875

TITLE Correct Reading Services.
INSTITUTION Upper Dublin School District, Ft. Washington, Pa.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 6p.; See CS001934 for "Effective Reading Programs: Summaries of 222 Selected Programs"

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Effective Teaching; Elementary Secondary Education; Language Experience Approach; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Reading Programs; Right to Read

ABSTRACT

This program, included in "Effective Reading Programs...", serves 150 children in kindergarten through grade 9 who are reading below grade level and show measurable potential for improvement. The activities in which children engage depend on the diagnosis of their skill deficiencies. At each grade level, a reading specialist leads small groups of from six to ten children with similar reading problems. At the elementary level, children with severe word-recognition problems are given remedial word-learning activities. General reading and language problems, including younger students' deficiencies in language readiness, are treated with a language-experience approach. At the secondary level, groups are formed for children with mild and severe reading problems. All of these groups meet from two to five times a week under the direction of a reading specialist. Skills taught in these groups are reinforced by the regular classroom teacher. Children who need concentrated language readiness and beginning reading instruction are placed in an open-space second grade. In this setting, two classroom teachers and volunteer aides work with a reading specialist on an intense language readiness program. (WR/AIR)

ED106823

CORRECTIVE READING SERVICES
SCHOOL DISTRICT OF UPPER DUBLIN
Fort Washington, Pennsylvania

I. PROGRAM SIZE AND TARGET POPULATION

The program serves 150 children in grades K-9. Children included in the program are economically and educationally deprived. They are selected on the basis of the following needs.

A. Reading

The children's lack of reading ability seriously limits their successful adjustment to school and school work. This results in poor performance on standardized tests, achievement below grade level in other skill areas, and a negative attitude toward education. Children in grades one through three are greatly lacking in language readiness for reading or have reading levels considerably below their grade placement. Those in grades four through nine vary in reading levels; some are considerably below grade level, and others are somewhat below. All of the children have difficulty in performing adequately in other areas because of their deficiencies in reading skills.

B. Language Readiness

Some of the children in kindergarten and first grade have considerable difficulty in dealing with the appropriate uses of language in both thinking and communication. They are also limited in experiences which are basic to language development. They need concentrated instruction in listening and thinking experiences to enable them to function in classroom activities.

II. STAFF

The district elementary reading coordinator directs the program in the two elementary schools and the secondary reading coordinator in the junior high. There are two full-time reading specialists working in the elementary schools. One teaches full-time in the school with the largest project population; the other divides her time between the two schools. There is one reading specialist in the junior high. Classroom teachers work in coordination with the reading specialists in each school. A clerical teacher aide assists the reading specialists. Parent volunteers work with the children in various activities planned by the teachers.

Additional support is given to the program by a Home and School visitor who helps to improve school-home relationships through personal contacts. Two district psychologists test children and make appropriate recommendations.

528
1001

Corrective Reading Services - School District of Upper Dublin (Cont'd.)

III. METHODS, PROCEDURES, AND ORGANIZATION

A. Kindergarten

1. Evaluation and Selection

The kindergarten children will be observed daily by the teachers to note those with language readiness needs. Those who evidence the greatest needs will be recommended for supplementary small group instruction.

2. Assignment and Activities

Children selected will be assigned to a small group of five or six for instruction. Reading teachers will work with the groups on a concentrated language readiness program three or four times a week in the reading room. Both auditory and visual equipment and varied approaches will be used.

B. Grades One through Nine

1. Children who are reading one or more levels below their age and grade level who show measurable potential for improvement will be identified by the classroom teachers.
2. Recommended children in grades one through six will be tested individually by district reading personnel. Those in grades seven through nine will be given group tests by the reading staff.
3. Pupils will be assigned to a corrective learning situation based on test findings.
 - a. Elementary - (1) mild corrective reading problem indicating a frontal approach can be used in teaching reading skills; (2) severe word recognition problems indicating the need for individual and small group work in remedial word learning activities; (3) reading and language problems indicating the need for a language experience approach to develop improved listening and speaking, as well as reading skills; (4) language readiness lacks indicating the need for a language experience approach to develop prerequisite skills for reading; (5) comprehension problems indicating a need for small group work in developing more adequate skills.
 - b. Secondary - (1) mild corrective reading problem indicating a frontal approach can be used in teaching reading skills; severe corrective problem indicating the need for concentrated small group work.

Corrective Reading Services - School District of Upper Dublin (Cont'd.)

4. Corrective activities will take place using the following facilities, schedules, and materials.
 - a. Language readiness groups for first grade will meet three or four times a week with a reading specialist. The instruction will take place partly in the classroom and partly in the learning center. Extensive use will be made of the media available in and through the learning center. Varied approaches will be used to help these pupils acquire control over oral language for thinking and communication purposes. A major concern will be to deal with attitudes so that these children will become more receptive to formal reading and language activities. Basal and supplementary materials will be used when appropriate.
 - b. Reading and language groups for grades one and two will be organized on a grade level basis and will meet two to four times a week with a reading specialist. The majority of the instruction will take place in their regular classrooms (self-contained or open space), and some will be in the learning center. Extensive use will be made of the equipment in the learning center to help those children develop oral language experiences for thinking and communication. Language experience approach and appropriate basal and supplementary materials will be used in instruction. Classroom teachers and reading specialists will work coordinately. Parent volunteers will be used with individuals and small groups of children in reinforcing activities.
 - c. Corrective groups for grades two through six will be organized on a grade level basis and will meet two times a week with a reading specialist. The majority of the instruction will be conducted in the classroom. At times, the groups may be scheduled in the learning center where media and individual learning facilities are available. Reading activities will be planned coordinately with the classroom teacher and will be prescribed for each child on the basis of needs. Basal, supplementary, and high interest-low vocabulary materials will be used. Parent volunteers will be used with individuals and small groups.
 - d. Severe word recognition problems will be assigned to small groups or to individual classes with a reading specialist trained in the use of the remedial word learning technique (Fernald). Pupils will meet three times a week in a reading room that is more private and free of noise and visual distractions. The reading specialist will be responsible for most of the child's formal reading instruction. She will work closely with each child's classroom teacher so that a maximum of reinforcement and transfer will be possible when the child is in his regular classroom. High interest supplementary materials will be used.

Corrective Reading Services - School District of Upper Dublin (Cont'd.)

- e. Severe reading problems for seventh grade will be assigned to the learning center for one period daily. There will be ten to twelve pupils in this group. They will receive concentrated instruction in reading and related language arts. Others from seventh and eighth grades with less severe problems will be assigned to the learning center a minimum of twice weekly. There will be from six to twelve pupils in these groups. Instruction will also stress reading and related language arts. High interest-low vocabulary, programmed, and specific skills materials will be used.
- f. Comprehension and reading-study skills groups for grades seven through nine will be organized on a grade level basis and will meet two to five times a week with a reading specialist in the reading room. Group size will range from one to twelve. Comprehension and study skills for the content areas will be stressed. Work will be coordinated with the regular classroom program through frequent communication with the classroom teachers involved. Skills materials for developing reading-study skills will be used.

IV. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The following evaluation procedures are used to measure the effectiveness of the program. Testing is done in September for children in grades one through nine who have not been in the program previously. All children in the program are tested in May of each year.

- A. Jansky Readiness Screening Index is administered to children on readiness level.
- B. Standardized Tests of Achievement - an appropriate form of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests will be used for pupils in grades two through nine.
 - 1. Primary A - Vocabulary and Comprehension, Grade 1
 - 2. Primary B - Vocabulary and Comprehension, Grade 2
 - 3. Primary C - Vocabulary and Comprehension, Grade 3
 - 4. Survey D - Speed, Vocabulary, and Comprehension for Grades 4-6
 - 5. Survey E - Speed, Vocabulary, and Comprehension for Grades 7-9
- C. Informal Tests of Achievement
 - 1. Informal Reading Inventory, Upper Dublin (Grades 1-6)
 - 2. Word Recognition Test, Temple University (Grades 1-6)
 - 3. Informal Spelling Inventory, Temple University (Grades 1-6)
 - 4. Word Opposites, Upper Dublin (Grades 7-9)

Corrective Reading Services - School District of Upper Dublin (Cont'd.)

V. COST

- A. Total cost of instructional materials for a class of thirty - \$1,050.00
- B. Sources and amounts of funding -
 - 1. Federal - Title I - \$43,000.00
 - 2. State - Appropriation - \$17,189.00
 - 3. Local - Real Estate, Per Capita, Act 511, Delinquent
Taxes - \$24,065.00
 - 4. Private - Interest and other sources - \$1,719.00

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 824

95

CS 001 876

TITLE [Atlanta Right to Read Project.]
INSTITUTION Atlanta Public Schools, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Right to Read Program.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 34p.; See CS 001 934 for "Effective Reading Programs: Summaries of 222 Selected Programs"
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Disadvantaged Youth; *Effective Teaching; Elementary Education; Reading Diagnosis; Reading Improvement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; *Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Reading Programs; Right to Read

ABSTRACT

This program, included in "Effective Reading Programs...", serves 1,200 students in K-5 at three elementary schools. Most of the students are black, live in the inner area of a large city, and come from low-income families. The program provides an opportunity for diagnostic treatment, remediation, motivation, and observation of each individual student. For example, at six-week intervals, children are given several comprehensive diagnostic tests. The major purpose of these tests is to give the teachers periodic informal evaluations of pupils' strengths and weaknesses in selected reading skills and to guide them in pinpointing the instructional needs of specific children. The general program objectives are as follows: to provide developmental and corrective reading experiences for all students in the program; to improve academic achievement; to organize reading centers providing special reading instruction for the most severely retarded students; to encourage teachers to use a variety of reading materials and teaching techniques; and to involve students, teachers, and parent tutors in a nontraditional learning environment. Inservice training is an important component and features bimonthly workshops. (WR)

Identifying, Validating and Multi-Media Packaging
of Successful Reading Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED106824

PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

Identifying, Validating and Multi-Media Packaging
of Successful Reading Programs

A Project sponsored by
The National Right to Read Program
U.S. Office of Education

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Please answer each item carefully and completely
before you return this form. The information you
provide will be used for evaluating your program for
further consideration in this study.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

05001876

PROGRAM INFORMATION FORM

SECTION I -- Identification Information

Program Title Right-to-Read

Program Director Louise George Title CIP* Reading Coordinator

Address 2930 Forrest Hill Dr., S. W., Atlanta, Georgia 30315 Phone 761-5411

Sponsor (school district or other) Atlanta Public Schools

Superintendent or director Dr. Alonzo A. Crim

Address 224 Central Avenue, S. W. Phone 659-3381

Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Address where your program is operating

E. A. Ware - 569 Hunter St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Herndon - 1075 Simson Rd., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Fowler - 595 Fowler St., N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313

If you know any, please list one or two other school districts or sponsoring institutions where the total program named in Item 1 is being duplicated.

Educational Facility

Address and Zip Code

* The Comprehensive Instruction Program (CIP) is a locally funded project. Its purpose is to provide diagnostic measures and inservice training for teachers to insure pupil development in reading and math. Tests are supplied to teachers for development of diagnostic prescriptions several times each year.

SECTION II -- Program Screening Information

In this section, all questions are numbered at the right-hand edge; please answer each by marking the letter X in the appropriate box.

Is cognitive improvement in reading and reading-related skills a major focus of your program?

YES

NO
 **

How long has your program been operating continuously?

Less than a year

At least a year but less than two years

Two years but less than three

Three years or more

None of these (If none, indicate why)

Do you plan to keep your program operating for at least two more years (through the 1974-75 academic year)? Current program funding is scheduled to terminate in August, 1974.

YES

NO

(If no, indicate why not)

However, a new proposal is being submitted and the Atlanta system will continue successful components identified from the 3 years of program development.

Are evaluation reports (e.g., baseline test data, re-test data, measures of the program's effect) available?

None available and none planned **

None available but initial steps taken

Available but not published

Most recent publication prior to 1/1/68

Most recent publication since 1/1/68

Evaluation data are available for how long?

Three years or more

More than two years, less than three

More than one year, less than two

Only one year

Less than one year

Not available **

Are the data evaluating your total program approach available for one or more sites?

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|------|
| More than one site (e.g., more than one school) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (11) |
| Your site only | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Not available | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

How many participants or individual records are included in the evaluation?

| | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------|
| Less than 10 | <input type="checkbox"/> | ** (12) |
| 10 to 29 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 30 to 49 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 50 to 99 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 100 to 199 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 200 to 499 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 500 or more | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

If you marked any one of these boxes, do not complete this form or send program documents. INSTEAD, please detach the first 3 pages and return them so that your response can be recorded.

What measures have been analyzed to show the success of your program?

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|------|
| Analysis of nationally standardized reading test results | YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NO <input type="checkbox"/> | (13) |
| Analysis of locally developed reading test results | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (14) |
| Analysis of nationally standardized general ability measures | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (15) |
| Analysis of locally developed general ability measures | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (16) |
| Analysis of other program success indicators (e.g., observations, affective measures, teacher records, questionnaires) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (17) |
| Other procedures (Please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (18) |
| Measures not yet analyzed | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (19) |

Are up-to-date program descriptions available (e.g., staff, participants, schedules and activities)?

YES NO

(2)

The mean test score of the students exceeds a specified norm *

YES NO

(2)

A mean gain over exactly one year is bigger than expected

YES NO

(2)

A mean gain for less than one year is bigger than expected **

YES NO

(2)

What kind of improvement or gain by program students was found?

The mean of students in the program exceeds that of comparable students not in the program ***

YES NO

(2)

* Predicted gain is based on an equation statistically determined by a linear multiple step-wise regression which weighted six factors - past scores on standardized tests; socio-economic level of school community; mobility rates of pupils; attendance; pupil-teacher ratio; and per cent of pupils passing.

The mean gain of students in the program is greater than for comparable students not in the program ***

YES NO

(2)

** In many cases, predicted (or expected) gain is less than a month for each month of instruction. The tests were given in October and April, 1972-73.

Some other improvement, not one of these (Please specify)

YES NO

(2)

*** These figures were taken from the predicted achievement quotient, national achievement quotient figure for 1972-73.

No tests of significance were made

(27)

No significant differences found yet

How significant were the statistical results showing the effect of your program?

The program showed differences significant between the 5 and 10 percent one-tailed (10 to 20 two-tailed) level

The program showed differences significant at better than the 5 percent one-tailed (10 per cent two-tailed) level

* Pupil data is available but tests of significance have not been done.

The program showed differences significant at better than the one percent one-tailed (two per cent two-tailed) level

By what amount does the annual per-pupil cost of this program exceed that of the regular district program?

- Less than \$50
- \$50 to \$99 (1962-73) (12.42)
- \$100 to \$199
- \$200 to \$299
- \$300 to \$399
- \$400 to \$499
- \$500 to \$999
- \$1000 or more

For what target population of students is your program designed?

- | | YES | NO | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| Unselected cross section | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (29) |
| Mentally retarded | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (30) |
| Bilingual | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (31) |
| Disadvantaged | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (32) |
| Physically handicapped (deaf, blind, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (33) |
| Institutionalized | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (34) |
| Other groups (Please specify below) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (35) |

Are 20 percent or more of your program students in any of the following categories?

- | | YES | NO | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------|
| American Eskimo, Aleut, or Indian | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (36) |
| Black | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (37) |
| Oriental or Asian | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (38) |
| Spanish-speaking | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (39) |
| White * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (40) |
| All others | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (41) |

* 35% of the pupils at Fowler Elementary School are white.

In which area do the majority of the program students live?

- Rural and small town of less than 10,000
- Small city of 10,000-199,000
- Small city suburbs
- Inner area in large city of 200,000 or more
- Residential area in large city
- Suburbs of a large city

What is the average family income level of students in the program?

- Low income (under \$6,000)
- Middle income (\$6,000-\$15,000)
- High income (above \$15,000)

Are specific diagnostic techniques or instruments used to:

Determine each student's level of reading readiness or skill (e.g., his reading grade level)? YES NO
 (If yes, please specify)

CIP, PRI, Informal Reading Inventory

Determine each student's strengths, weaknesses, and difficulties in language and reading skills (e.g., difficulty with decoding)? YES NO
 (If yes, please specify)

CIP, PRI, IRI

In this program, how many hours per week are scheduled for the subject Language Arts?

- Less than 2 hours
- 2 hours to 3 hours 59 minutes
- 4 hours to 5 hours 59 minutes
- 6 hours to 7 hours 59 minutes
- 8 hours to 9 hours 59 minutes
- 10 hours to 11 hours 59 minutes
- 12 hours or more

What summary statistics were used in the analysis of program data?

| | YES | NO | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----|
| Means or medians | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (4) |
| Standard deviations or variances | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (4) |
| Covariances or correlation coefficients | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (4) |
| Frequency counts, percentages, or proportions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (5) |
| Significance tests | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (5) |
| Methods not mentioned above (Please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | (5) |

* predicted - 6 factors - Ware

How large was the estimated program effect on achievement (i.e., the average gain of students in the program over and above the gain expected in a comparison group)?* (If more than one estimation, give the higher figure only.)

* data from predicted achievement scores shows which grades in ~~R2A schools~~ exceeded expected gains. City-wide comparisons are not available.

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----|
| One-tenth of a standard deviation unit | <input type="checkbox"/> | (5) |
| One-fifth of a standard deviation unit | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| One-quarter of a standard deviation unit | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| One-third of a standard deviation unit | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| One-half of a standard deviation unit | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Better than a half SD | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Gain cannot be given this way | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |

Which of these factors were taken into explicit account in the analyses of BOTH program AND comparison data?

| | YES | NO | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| Age | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (54) |
| Sex | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (55) |
| Grade level | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (56) |
| Ethnic proportions in group | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | (57) |
| Past scores | X | | |
| Socio-economic levels | X | | |
| Mobility rates | X | | |
| Attendance | X | | |
| Pupil-Teacher ratio | X | | |
| Per cent of pupils | X | | |

What was the reliability coefficient of the test used to measure reading achievement for this program?

- Between .6 and .69
- Between .7 and .79
- Between .8 and .89
- .9 and over
- Given by publishers for standardization group only as over .8
- Not yet determined
- No such test was used

What percentage of annual attrition or loss of students from the program was allowed for, to correct for bias in statistical analysis (e.g., by eliminating from consideration persons who start the program but do not finish)?

* Mean percentage of pupils moving into or out of the three R2R schools between September '72 and June, '73.

- Was 15 percent or more *
- Was between 10 and 14.9 percent
- Was between 5 and 9.9 percent
- Was between 0 and 4.9 percent
- No allowance was made for losses
- No losses occurred

How similar were the pre- and post-tests used to determine gain in reading skills?

* Form 5 was used in the Fall, '72 on the assumption that the city-wide spring testing would use Form 6. However, the city used Form 5 in the Spring.

- Were identical *
- Were parallel forms of a single test
- Were consecutive forms from the same source
- Were similar in form, but from different sources
- Only one test has been applied
- Tests were not of reading skills
- No tests were applied

SECTION III -- Brief Descriptive Information

In what year did the program begin operation? January 1972 (6)
(Year)

How many program participants and classes (groups) are there in your program? (6)
If this is a school-based program, indicate enrollment by class and grade level

| Grade or Other Level | Number of Participants | Number of Classes or Groups |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| K | 194 | 7 |
| 1 | 217 | 8 |
| 2 | 216 | 9 |
| 3 | 133 | 9 |
| 4 | 217 | 9 |
| 5 | 182 | 8 |
| Spec. Ed. | 22 | 2 |

Please list the major instructional strategies used to help clients improve their reading-related skills. Briefly describe, if necessary. * (63)

A. "Six-prong approach"

1. School tone
2. Teaching style
3. Curriculum
4. Demonstration
5. Inservice
6. Community involvement

B. Parent tutors to help individualize and release teachers for inservice.

*descriptions can be found in Blueprint for Commitment, page 2.

Are there any major program features (e.g., parent involvement) which are not included in your list of instructional strategies above and are not included in your list of key program objectives in the chart at the end of this questionnaire? If so, please list up to three (3) of these major program features. Briefly describe, if necessary. (64)

1. Demonstration teachers task force from Ware conducted inservice at Herndon and Luckie in 1972-73. In 1973-74 teachers from Ware and Herndon will be working with staff from Fowler.

Please list up to five (5) kinds of materials and/or equipment which are absolutely indispensable for your program, noting their availability as "commercial," "district," "teacher-prepared," "student-prepared," or other appropriate comment.

| Most Essential Items of Materials and/or Equipment | Quantity for 30 Students | Availability |
|--|--------------------------|--------------|
| Phonics We Use | Whatever Needed | Commercial |
| Barnell-Loft Specific Skills | Whatever Needed | Commercial |
| SRA Reading Kits | 1 Kit | Commercial |
| Continental Press Reading/Thinking | Skills Whatever Needed | Commercial |
| Classroom Paperback Libraries | \$1.50 per room | Commercial |

Where are program activities physically located? If any special features were provided to suit these facilities to the program, briefly note.

| Location of Program Activities | Special Features |
|--------------------------------|---|
| In-School | A. Reading Center was developed in each Right to Read school. |

What is the total cost of instructional materials for a class of 30?

\$1,402 for a class of 30, to the nearest dollar

To the nearest dollar, roughly what portion of the funds currently required to maintain the program come from the following sources? Please specify the exact source for each category, e.g., Title III.

| | | |
|------------|---------|---------------|
| \$ 121,236 | Federal | Right to Read |
| \$ | State | |
| \$ | Local | |
| \$ | Private | |

What is the average, annual per-pupil cost for the district's regular school program (i.e., cost per pupil for students outside the special reading program described herein)?

\$ 640.00, per-pupil cost for regular program

What are the staff requirements for your program?

(70)

| Staff Category | # Req'd. for Students | Portion of Time | Special Professional Qualifications for Program | Special Role Performed in Program | Program Requires Inservice Training? If so: In What Skills? | For How Many Hours |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------|
| ADMINISTRATIVE: | 3 principals 1 director 1 coordinator | All as Needed | -Certified -Administrators | Director of All CIP schools coordinates | Reading, Management | 72 hours |
| INSTRUCTIONAL: (Certified) | Merndon-28 Ware - 25 Fowler- 17 | All | Certified | Classroom teachers. 1 Reading teacher (operates reading center) itinerant teachers in: art speech music sight band | Language arts and math | 24 hours |
| PARAPROFESSIONAL: (Parent tutors) | 5 per school (15) | 4 hrs. daily | Must be indigenous to school community. | Assist classroom teachers. Release teachers for inservice. | Reading | 40 hours. |
| SUPPORT OR SPECIAL RESOURCE: | CIP Reading director (APS) Area Reading Resource Personnel Testing & Guidance L&D, Learning Resources Area Supts. | When Needed | Certified | Supportive | | None |
| OTHER: | Unit task force Technical Asst. team | Quarterly 8 days/yr. | Teachers/administrators in program. University professors appointed by national in each school | Organize plan, implement RtoR program | None | None |

Right to Read office. Train unit task forces.

... consistently across columns.) ... these desired outcomes assessed? (Your responses

| Major objectives of the program (List the key objectives, even if they cannot be adequately tested or were difficult to measure.) | What assessment techniques and instruments were used to measure student achievement of each objective in Column 1? For example: Test--Specify title, level, form, and developer or publisher Observation--Of what? By whom? Teacher report--Of what? Questionnaire--About what? Answered by whom? Etc. | What were the results? How did the target group perform or change? (See two : tached evaluation reports) |
|--|--|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> to raise the average reading level of students one month of instruction. to organize reading centers in each school to offer special reading instruction. to utilize parent tutor aide in each reading center. to involve students, staff, and parent (tutors) in a non-traditional learning environment. to give teachers access to, and to encourage use of a variety of materials and techniques. | <p><u>Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)</u></p> <p>Evaluation: <u>Aclanta Right-to-Read</u></p> <p>" " " "</p> <p>" " " "</p> <p>" " " "</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A total pupil gain of nearly one month for each month of instruction. Mean gains of tutored pupils were higher than one month for each month of instruction. Accomplished in all 3 schools. Very positive in 2 of the schools. - Very positive in 2 of the schools. |

Return to:

John E. Bowers

American Institutes for Research

P. O. Box 1113

Palo Alto, California 94302

We would appreciate it if you
would return this form by
First Class mail. Documents
may be sent under separate
cover.

ATLANTA'S RIGHT-TO-READ PROGRAM, 1972-73

A BLUEPRINT FOR COMMITMENT

Joyce McWilliams
Acting Research Assistant
Research and Development
Atlanta Public Schools

ATLANTA'S RIGHT-TO-READ -- A SIX PRONG APPROACH AND ITS
EFFECT ON E. A. WARE, LUCKIE STREET AND
A. F. HERNDON ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

In 1972-73 three elementary schools in the Atlanta School System were involved in the Right-to-Read Project: E. A. Ware, Luckie Street, and A. F. Herndon. The goals and objectives of the national Right-to-Read effort demand full community cooperation and participation in local programs. As Ware Elementary School had been involved in the Educational Improvement Project since 1965, a program which also hinges on cooperative community involvement, Ware was chosen as the impact sight for Right-to-Read. Success of the program at Ware was then replicated in the two satellite schools, Herndon and Luckie. Development of the local program was based on the following assumptions:

1. That measurable intelligence can be developed or improved by stimulating environmental situations.
2. That reading is an important aspect of communication and can be developed and expanded throughout life.
3. That the establishment of reading centers for remediation will provide opportunity for diagnostic treatment, motivation, observation, and growth of each individual student.
4. That reading, a communicative skill, is closely related to listening, speaking, and writing. These four language arts are sequentially related to one another.
5. That the reader's facility in the use of language is directly related to comprehension.
6. That the improvement of reading skills will improve the achievement in the content areas.
7. That the extension of psychological, mental, social, and emotional experiences of the students will result in the development of an improved citizenry better prepared for the future.

General program objectives were:

1. To provide developmental and corrective reading experiences for all students enrolled in kindergarten through grade seven.
2. To organize reading centers providing remedial work for the most severely retarded students.

3. To focus attention on raising the sights of all students involved in the program.
4. To upgrade teaching techniques of all teachers.
5. To improve the academic achievement in the content areas of all students as a result of an increased reading efficiency.

The design for Ware's successful reading program hinged on a "six prong approach" to school achievement. The six prongs were (1) school tone, (2) teaching style, (3) curriculum, (4) demonstration, (5) inservice, and (6) community involvement.

School tone includes the physical aspects of the school plant, administrative philosophy, emotional mood of faculty and students as well as learning environment, the focus on change and community involvement.

Teaching style centers attention on diagnostic procedures of teachers, individualization of instruction, evaluation and interaction of teachers and students in the learning environment; including the physical aspects of the room, teacher decorum, and management.

The curriculum refers to content, subject matter, or that which is to be taught and learned.

Demonstration teaching refers to observing sequential teaching of reading skills on a grade level for a given number of weeks or months.

Inservice education includes planned regular instruction on school time. In addition it includes evaluation of instruction by outside consultants, attendance at local, state, and national professional meetings, and visits within the schools as well as reimbursing tuition to teachers and librarians for one graduate course in the reading sequence taken during the summer.

Community involvement encompasses hiring and training of a given number of community parents as part-time parent tutors; to assist classroom teachers in providing students with optimal learning opportunities, which in turn will help them (parents) function more effectively as facilitators of learning. Parent tutors also relieve the classroom teacher for scheduled inservice sessions.

The Atlanta Public School System committed itself to the Right-to-Read effort by making the following resources available as an integral part of the program:

Comprehensive Instructional Program - Supplies and schedules administration of CIP tests for grades one through three (in 1973-74, grades one through seven). Personnel to aid teachers in interpreting results.

Testing and Guidance Services - Supply and schedule administration of standardized achievement pretest and posttest.

Research and Development - Evaluation of student achievement, assessment of effectiveness of program, and dissemination of information.

Department of Learning Resources in Title I - Media specialists and librarians are available for services when needed.

Area I Resource Personnel - (In 1973-74 this will include Area IV Resource Personnel.)

The specific objectives and procedures of the Atlanta Right-to-Read Program are as follows:

1. To raise the average reading level of students one month for each month of instruction.
2. To organize reading centers in each school to offer special reading instruction to selected students in grades four through seven, and to improve the instructional skills of the faculties.
3. To involve students, staff, and parents in a learning environment that breaks "traditional" teaching methods.
4. To utilize parent tutor aides efficiently for individualized and small group instruction.
5. To give teachers access to a wide range of materials, and to encourage utilization of a variety of techniques.

In order to implement these objectives and procedures through the six prong approach the following steps were taken:

Implementation of Six-Prong Approach

GOALS

Positive School Tone

ACTION STEPS

1. Faculty and Staff re-orientation sessions on the purpose and procedures of local R₂R Program.
2. School Organization explained.
3. Reading Centers established and students assigned.
4. Learning Centers organized in each classroom.
5. Cultural enrichment activities for pupils and parents.

Teaching Style

1. Eighteen two-hour workshop sessions with teachers on each grade level stressing phonics, comprehension, and classroom organization.
2. Purchase of books for teachers. (Julie Hay, Charles Wingo, Mary C. Hletke, Reading With Phonics).

Curriculum

3. Invite consultants.
1. Interpret and evaluate achievement test scores.
2. Administer EIP developed reading diagnostic test.
3. Sequential behavioral objectives in all subject areas to be analyzed and used in prescribing for individualized instruction.

Demonstration

1. Impact school teachers will demonstrate the sequential teaching of reading skills on grade levels. Follow-up and feedback will be available through scheduled weekly visitations of coordinator to satellite schools. Help to individual teachers will be possible by releasing certain skilled teachers from the impact schools.

Community Involvement

1. In-service training program for parent-tutors once weekly.
2. Utilizing parent-tutors to relieve classroom teachers for in-service meetings.

Evaluation (Internal)

1. Pre- and Post data on the reading growth of students in the program is to be secured through the Atlanta Public School System's testing program. Test data will include Iowa Tests of Basic Skills.

Evaluation (External)

2. Students' growth through reading will be evaluated by comparative data on free reading, and teacher observations.
1. Invite consultants to assess effectiveness of instruction.

Evaluation for 1972-73

At each of the three schools involved with Right-to-Read in 1972-73, a group of about 60 pupils were tutored in the Right-to-Read Learning Center. Matched pretest/posttest scores and gains of tutored and nontutored participants are reported in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4.

At Herndon, higher scoring pupils were tutored because Title I was remediating the lower scoring pupils. The tutored pupils in grades five and seven made larger numerical gains than did the nontutored pupils. However, across grades four through seven, there was no significant difference between the gains made by the tutored and the nontutored groups. At all grades the tutored pupils had higher mean pretest and posttest scores. None of the groups achieved national norms, although all grades of tutored pupils were within six months of norms.

At Luckie, the lowest scoring pupils were tutored by Right-to-Read. What is most impressive at this school is that while all tutored groups pretests were considerably lower than the nontutored participants, in every grade except the seventh the posttest scores of the tutored pupils were considerably higher than the school as a whole. Separate posttests and gain scores for the nontutored pupils were not available for this school. The total posttest scores, then, are composite of the tutored participants' posttests and the non-tutored. In grades four, five, and six the nontutored participants posttest scores alone would have been lower than the total grade posttest, making the difference between tutored and nontutored participants even greater than the difference reported between the tutored and total school.

At Ware, the tutored pupils were also chosen from among the top scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills pretest. In every case except the seventh grade, the tutored pupils had higher pretest and posttest than the nontutored participants. In every grade except the sixth the tutored pupils gains were also higher. Also, as at Herndon, there was no significant difference between gain scores of tutored and nontutored participants.

TABLE 1

MATCHED PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS AND
 NON-PARTICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT-TO-READ TUTORIAL PROGRAM
 AND TOTAL GRADE ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

E. A. WARE

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>N=</u> | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | <u>Gain</u> |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| 4th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 17 | 4.0 | 4.7 | .7 |
| Non-Tutorial | 55 | 2.9 | 3.5 | .6 |
| Total | 72 | 3.2 | 3.8 | .6 |
| 5th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 29 | 4.4 | 4.8 | .4 |
| Non-Tutorial | 27 | 3.4 | 3.9 | .5 |
| Total | 56 | 4.0 | 4.4 | .4 |
| 6th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 6 | 4.8 | 5.8 | 1.0 |
| Non-Tutorial | 10 | 4.1 | 4.6 | .5 |
| Total | 16 | 4.3 | 5.1 | .8 |
| 7th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 6 | 4.4 | 5.2 | .8 |
| Non-Tutorial | 8 | 4.6 | 5.3 | .7 |
| Total | 14 | 4.5 | 5.3 | .8 |

TABLE 2

MATCHED PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS AND
AND NON-PATICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT-TO-READ TUTORIAL PROGRAM AND
TOTAL GRADE ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

A. F. HERNDON

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>N=</u> | <u>Grade Equivalent</u> | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | <u>Gain</u> |
| 4th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 16 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 0.2 |
| Non-Tutorial | 56 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 0.4 |
| Total | 72 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 0.3 |
| 5th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 19 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 0.6 |
| Non-Tutorial | 56 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 0.3 |
| Total | 75 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 0.3 |
| 6th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 11 | 5.8 | 6.3 | 0.4 |
| Non-Tutorial | 74 | 4.2 | 4.8 | 0.6 |
| Total | 85 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 0.5 |
| 7th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 16 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 0.8 |
| Non-Tutorial | 50 | 4.4 | 4.9 | 0.5 |
| Total | 66 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 0.6 |

TABLE 3

MATCHED PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS AND
NON-PARTICIPANTS IN THE RIGHT-TO-READ TUTORIAL PROGRAM AND
TOTAL GRADE ON THE READING SUBTEST OF THE
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

LUCKIE STREET

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>N=</u> | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | <u>Gain</u> |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| 4th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 16 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| Non-Tutorial | | 3.7 | | |
| Total | | 3.1 | 3.7 | .6 |
| 5th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 7 | 3.3 | 5.4 | 2.1 |
| Non-Tutorial | | 4.1 | | |
| Total | | 3.7 | 4.1 | .4 |
| 6th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 6 | 4.3 | 5.7 | 1.4 |
| Non-Tutorial | | 5.0 | | |
| Total | | 4.8 | 5.0 | .2 |
| 7th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 10 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 0.9 |
| Non-Tutorial | | 6.7 | | |
| Total | | 5.6 | 6.7 | 1.1 |

TABLE 4

TOTAL MEAN PRETEST/POSTTEST AND GAIN SCORES OF PARTICIPANTS IN
THE RIGHT-TO-READ PROGRAM ON THE READING SUBTEST
OF THE IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS

| <u>Groups</u> | <u>N=</u> | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | <u>Gain</u> |
|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| 4th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 49 | 3.7 | 4.3 | .6 |
| Total | -- | 3.2 | 3.7 | .5 |
| 5th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 55 | 4.2 | 5.2 | 1.0 |
| Total | -- | 3.9 | 4.3 | .4 |
| 6th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 23 | 5.0 | 5.9 | .9 |
| Total | -- | 4.5 | 5.0 | .5 |
| 7th Grade | | | | |
| Tutorial Participants | 32 | 5.3 | 6.1 | .8 |
| Total | -- | 5.0 | 5.8 | .8 |

All three schools did organize and are operating reading centers. As every child in each participating school is technically a "Right-to-Read" pupil, all faculty members receive in-class and on-site inservice, and all pupils have access to center materials. Interest centers, and the use of art and drama to integrate reading and language arts into all phases of curriculum were developed and are being used at all class levels. Across-school training and demonstrations are facilitated by use of the parent tutors, who fill-in in the classrooms when the teachers are receiving instruction.

To summarize pupil test results then, at all three schools, with few exceptions, the Right-to-Read tutored participants did gain a months score for each month of instruction. Ware and Herndon tutored participants were chosen from high pretest scorers because Title I was remediating the low scoring pupils. In all cases, Title I personnel provided assistance in program planning and implementation.

In keeping with the commitment of Right-to-Read to encourage teachers to utilize a variety of techniques and most particularly to individualize instruction and provide highly motivating material to their pupils, the Opinionnaire on Attitudes Toward Education developed by Lindgren and Patton was administered to all teachers and aides at Ware and Herndon and to all Right-to-Read parent tutors at Herndon, Luckie, and Ware. This instrument was constructed to measure attitudes toward child-centered policies and practices in education. Teachers' attitudes toward education play an important part in creating school climate, and a child-centered rather than subject-centered climate is necessary in moving toward individualization.

The instrument is a 50-item scale. The statements are concerned with the desirability of understanding the behavior of students, the desirability of the teachers using authoritarian methods as a means of controlling the behavior of students, and the desirability of subject matter centeredness as compared with learner child centeredness.

The attitude score is the number of positive items agreed with plus the number of negative items disagreed with, where positive items are favorable toward child centered practices. The theoretical range of scores is from 0 to 50, with the highest scores indicating more favorable attitudes toward child-centered policies and practices in education.

Twenty-six teachers and aides from Herndon responded to the Questionnaire. Their mean score was 37.0 with a range of 29 through 46. Twenty-eight teachers and aides at Ware responded to the Questionnaire and had a mean score of 36.8. The Title IV-A Day Care staff also responded to the Questionnaire, and of the eleven responding the mean score was 34.7. All the Right-to-Read parent tutors responded to the Questionnaire, five at Herndon, five at Luckie Street, and six at Ware. Their mean score was 32.2.

These scores are high enough to indicate favorable attitudes in all groups toward child-centered policies and practices. These data are presented in Tables five and six.

Luckie Street school was closed at the end of the 1972-73 school year due to shifting population patterns. Fowler Elementary School is to take its place in this final funded year of Right-to-Read. It would seem at this point that the project has achieved stated purposes and is providing information to the entire school system on the planning, implementation, operation, and evaluation of a new, totally integrated approach to reading instruction in the elementary schools.

TABLE 5
OPINIONNAIRE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION
 WARE, APRIL, 1973

| | <u>Mean</u> | <u>N=</u> |
|------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| <u>Day Care</u> | | |
| Teachers with Aides | 34.7 | 3 |
| Aides | 34.8 | 8 |
| Total Day Care | 34.7 | 11 |
| <u>Elementary</u> | | |
| Teachers with Aides | 35.1 | 13 |
| Teachers without Aides | 37.9 | 11 |
| Aide COP* | 39.5 | 2 |
| Aide non-COP* | 37.5 | 2 |
| Total Elementary | 36.8 | 28 |

(Principal - 43)

*All elementary aides were paid under Title I. However, the Career Opportunities Program (COP) aides were also supported as college education majors by COP.

TABLE 6
OPINIONNAIRE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATION
 APRIL, 1973

RIGHT-TO-READ PARENT-TUTORS

| | <u>Mean</u> | <u>N=</u> |
|---------------|-------------|-----------|
| Herndon | 33.6 | 5 |
| Luckie Street | 32.2 | 5 |
| E. A. Ware | 31.0 | 6 |
| OVERALL | 32.2 | 16 |

Fowler Elementary School has replaced Luckie as a satellite Right-to-Read site. Teachers from Ware and Herndon have been conducting regular inservice in principles and methods of the Right-to-Read concept to all staff at Fowler.

Profiles of all Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores given in April, 1973 are shown in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. The summary index shows the per cent of achievement of predicted scores and of national norms. Herndon was the only Right-to-Read school which did not reach at least an average 100 per cent of prediction. They were an average of 97 per cent of prediction -- but the predicted scores for this school were higher than for the others.

In 1972 and 1973 selected pupils were tutored in the Right-to-Read reading centers. This process is described in "Blueprint for Commitment." However, in 1973-74, the reading centers have been turned over to the general school use, most specifically, Title I. The Right-to-Read parent-tutors are involved in direct classroom work, and still provide individualized and small group instruction, and release time for teacher inservice.

This fall, all Right-to-Read schools contain only grade K-5; the sixth and seventh grades having been transferred to middle schools. Tabel 5, then, contains comparison of ITBS reading subtest scores for fourth grade tutored and non-tutored pupils (spring 1973) and matched fifth grade former tutored and former non-tutored pupils (fall 1973). No pupils are being R₂R lab-tutored this year, and all are receiving benefits of parent tutors in the classroom, yet Table 5 shows that the former tutored pupils are maintaining their significantly higher test scores.

Table 6 reports the fall 1973 mean reading subtest scores at the participating schools. In comparing this fall's scores with the reading test data in Tables 1, 2, and 4, it can be seen that most grades are progressing. However, this is not a direct comparison as last spring's reading data is a composite of several subtest scores.

Identification of significantly effective program components is under way, so that these aspects of Right-to-Read may be replicated in other Atlanta Public Schools (as in the satellite schools -- Herndon, Luckie, and Fowler) in the future.

TABLE 1

WARE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

| Grade | Grade Equivalent Score | | | Summary Indices | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Actual Achievement | Predicted Achievement | National Norm | Predicted Achievement Quotient | National Achievement Quotient |
| Reading Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 106 | 72 |
| 3 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 128 | 84 |
| 4 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 4.7 | 108 | 76 |
| 5 | 4.1 | 3.9 | 5.7 | 105 | 72 |
| 6 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 6.7 | 109 | 73 |
| 7 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 7.6 | 91 | 64 |
| | | | Average | 107 | 73 |
| Mathematics Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 110 | 88 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 111 | 81 |
| 4 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 106 | 83 |
| 5 | 5.1 | 4.3 | 5.6 | 119 | 90 |
| 6 | 5.1 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 102 | 76 |
| 7 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 7.6 | 95 | 73 |
| | | | Average | 107 | 81 |
| Composite Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 105 | 83 |
| 3 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 121 | 88 |
| 4 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 108 | 83 |
| 5 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 5.7 | 110 | 80 |
| 6 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 123 | 88 |
| 7 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 107 | 80 |
| | | | Average | 112 | 83 |

The Predicted Achievement Quotient equals the Actual Achievement divided by the Predicted Achievement Quotient. The National Achievement Quotient is the Actual Achievement divided by the National Norm.

TABLE 2

HURNDON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

| Grade | Grade Equivalent Score | | | Summary Indices | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Actual Achievement | Predicted Achievement | National Norm | Predicted Achievement Quotient | National Achievement Quotient |
| Reading Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 95 | 76 |
| 3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 95 | 66 |
| 4 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 4.7 | 100 | 70 |
| 5 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 102 | 72 |
| 6 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 6.7 | 102 | 71 |
| 7 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 7.6 | 100 | 68 |
| | | | Average | 99 | 70 |
| Mathematics Tests Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 95 | 84 |
| 3 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 87 | 65 |
| 4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 101 | 75 |
| 5 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 5.6 | 104 | 79 |
| 6 | 4.8 | 5.0 | 6.6 | 96 | 72 |
| 7 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 7.6 | 94 | 68 |
| | | | Average | 96 | 73 |
| Composite Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 98 | 87 |
| 3 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 90 | 67 |
| 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.7 | 100 | 74 |
| 5 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 5.7 | 102 | 75 |
| 6 | 4.8 | 4.9 | 6.7 | 98 | 72 |
| 7 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 99 | 70 |
| | | | Average | 97 | 74 |

TABLE 3

LUCKIE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
IOWA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

| <u>Grade</u> | <u>Grade Equivalent Score</u> | | | <u>Summary Indices</u> | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | <u>Actual Achievement</u> | <u>Predicted Achievement</u> | <u>National Norm</u> | <u>Predicted Achievement Quotient</u> | <u>National Achievement Quotient</u> |
| Reading Tests Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 106 | 69 |
| 3 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 3.8 | 101 | 68 |
| 4 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 117 | 78 |
| 5 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 5.7 | 106 | 72 |
| 6 | 5 | 4.4 | 6.7 | 113 | 74 |
| 7 | 6.7 | 5.4 | 7.6 | 123 | 87 |
| | | | Average | 111 | 74 |
| Mathematics Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 119 | 88 |
| 3 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 114 | 84 |
| 4 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 4.7 | 106 | 77 |
| 5 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 100 | 74 |
| 6 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 6.6 | 106 | 78 |
| 7 | 6.0 | 5.9 | 7.6 | 102 | 78 |
| | | | Average | 107 | 79 |
| Composite Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 103 | 75 |
| 3 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 101 | 75 |
| 4 | 3.6 | 3.3 | 4.7 | 107 | 76 |
| 5 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 5.7 | 100 | 72 |
| 6 | 4.8 | 4.7 | 6.7 | 103 | 72 |
| 7 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 111 | 82 |
| | | | Average | 104 | 75 |

TABLE -

FOWLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PROFILES OF ACHIEVEMENT QUOTIENTS
 IOFA TESTS OF BASIC SKILLS, APRIL, 1973

| Grade | Grade Equivalent Score | | | Summary Indices | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Actual Achievement | Predicted Achievement | National Norm | Predicted Achievement Quotient | National Achievement Quotient |
| Reading Tests Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 151 | 102 |
| 3 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 108 | 71 |
| 4 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 4.7 | 94 | 59 |
| 5 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 5.7 | 123 | 80 |
| 6 | 4.9 | 4.8 | 6.7 | 101 | 73 |
| 7 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 7.6 | 108 | 70 |
| | | | Average | 114 | 75 |
| Mathematics Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 145 | 111 |
| 3 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 3.7 | 97 | 70 |
| 4 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 95 | 66 |
| 5 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 5.6 | 105 | 77 |
| 6 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 6.6 | 100 | 78 |
| 7 | 6.1 | 5.5 | 7.6 | 111 | 79 |
| | | | Average | 108 | 80 |
| Composite Test Data | | | | | |
| 2 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 147 | 109 |
| 3 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 110 | 77 |
| 4 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 4.7 | 95 | 63 |
| 5 | 4.2 | 3.9 | 5.7 | 107 | 73 |
| 6 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 6.7 | 99 | 75 |
| 7 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 7.6 | 105 | 72 |
| | | | Average | 110 | 78 |

TABLE 5

7

Spring and Fall Mean Scores on the Reading Subtest
of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for the Tutored
and Non-tutored Participants in the
Right to Read Program

| Herridon | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------------------|----------|------------------|
| | <u>N</u> | <u>Spring 1973</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>Fall 1973</u> |
| Tutored | 16 | 4.2 | 14 | 4.7 |
| Non-tutored | 56 | 2.3 | 64 | 3.5 |

| E.A. Ware | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------------------|----------|------------------|
| | <u>N</u> | <u>Spring 1973</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>Fall 1973</u> |
| Tutored | 17 | 4.7 | 16 | 5.0 |
| Non-tutored | 55 | 3.5 | 44 | 3.8 |

Pupils were fourth graders in the spring, 1973, and fifth graders in the fall, 1973. Spring testing was done in April, 1973. Fall testing was done in late November, 1973.

mean scores are given by site
 Tutored includes 4th grade which was not
 tested by project in fall comparisons excluding
 4th grade shows N = 20 mean = 3.7 for
 tutored and N = 52, mean = 3.3 for non-tutored.
 Fourth grade not tested by project in fall.

TABLE 6

1973 Mean Scores on the Reading Subtest of the
 Iowa Tests of Basic Skills for the Second to the
 Fifth Grades at the School on the Right
 to Read Program

| Grades | Fowler | | Herndon | | Ware | |
|--------|--------|------|---------|------|------|------|
| | N | Mean | N | Mean | N | Mean |
| 2 | - | - | 75 | 1.8 | 54 | 1.7 |
| 3 | 32 | 2.6 | 116 | 2.4 | 62 | 2.6 |
| 4 | 29 | 3.2 | 87 | 2.8 | 72 | 2.9 |
| 5 | 22 | 3.9 | 74 | 3.5 | 59 | 4.1 |

| | | | <u>N</u> | <u>Mean</u> |
|--|--|-----|----------|-------------|
| | | 126 | 3.0 | |
| | | 93 | 3.7 | 64 |
| | | | | 73 |
| | | 82 | 4.4 | 55 |
| | | | | 4.7 |