

Reading Instruction for Students Who Are at Risk or Have Disabilities

William D. Bursuck

University of North Carolina–Greensboro

Mary Damer

Ohio State University



Boston New York San Francisco
Mexico City Montreal Toronto London Madrid Munich Paris
Hong Kong Singapore Tokyo Cape Town Sydney

Executive Editor: Virginia Lanigan
Editorial Assistant: Matthew Buchholz
Senior Marketing Manager: Kris Ellis-Levy
Production Editor: Janet Domingo
Editorial Production Service: Omegatype Typography, Inc.
Composition Buyer: Linda Cox
Manufacturing Buyer: Linda Morris
Electronic Composition: Omegatype Typography, Inc.
Interior Design: Omegatype Typography, Inc.
Cover Administrator: Kristina Mose-Libon

For related titles and support materials, visit our online catalog at www.ablongman.com.

Copyright © 2007 Pearson Education, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

To obtain permission(s) to use material from this work, please submit a written request to Allyn and Bacon, Permissions Department, 75 Arlington Street, Boston, MA 02116 or fax your request to 617-848-7320.

Between the time website information is gathered and then published, it is not unusual for some sites to have closed. Also, the transcription of URLs can result in unintended typographical errors. The publisher would appreciate notification where these errors occur so that they may be corrected in subsequent editions.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Bursuck, William D.

Reading instruction for students who are at risk or have disabilities / William Bursuck,
Mary Damer.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-205-40404-9

1. Reading—Remedial teaching. I. Damer, Mary. II. Title.

LB1050.5.B87 2007

372.43—dc22

2006048575

Printed in the United States of America.

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 09 08 07 06

To Beth and Stephen for allowing us the immense professional space required to bring this project to fruition. Without your patience, love, and support this book would not have been possible.



Contents

	Preface	xiii
Chapter 1	An Introduction to Systematic, Explicit Reading Instruction	1
	Who Are the Students at Risk for Reading Problems?	3
	When Is the Best Time to Begin Reading Instruction for Children Who Are at Risk?	4
	Which Students Are Likely to Struggle When Learning to Read? How Can I Set Goals for Them and Monitor Their Progress?	4
	What Essential Skills Do Students Need, to Become Mature Readers?	5
	Phonemic Awareness	5
	Alphabetic Principle	6
	<i>The Reflective Teacher: Does Teaching Phonics Make Sense?</i>	7
	Reading Fluency	8
	Vocabulary	8
	Reading Comprehension	9
	What Is the Most Effective Way to Teach Essential Reading Skills to Children Who Are at Risk?	9
	Tier 1 Instruction	10
	Tier 2 Instruction	11
	Tier 3 Instruction	11
	What Are the Instructional Enhancements for Students Who Are at Risk?	12
	Advance Organizers	12
	Unison Responding	13
	Effective Signals	13
	Efficient Use of Teacher Talk	15
	Perky Pace	15
	My Turn–Together–Your Turn Format	16
	Cumulative Review	16
	Systematic Error Correction	16
	Teaching to Success	17
	Student Motivational System	17
	<i>Motivating Your Students to Do Their Best: Using the Teacher–Class Game</i>	18
	What Letter Sounds Do Teachers Need to Know for Teaching Phonemic Awareness and Phonics Skills to Students Who Are at Risk?	20

Using the Chart of Letter Sounds	20
Fact or Fiction	28
Applied Activities	28
References	29
Chapter 2 Phonemic Awareness	31
What Skills Do I Need to Teach?	32
Segmenting and Blending Sequence	33
How Can I Efficiently Assess and Monitor the Progress in Phonemic Awareness Skills?	34
Segmenting First Sound: DIBELS Initial Sound Fluency Assessment	34
Blending Individual Phonemes: Informal Assessments	35
How Do I Teach Children to Segment and Blend?	39
Enhancements to Large-Group Tier 1 Instruction	39
<i>Effective Teachers at Work: Frequent Assessment</i>	40
<i>Research to Practice: Blending</i>	45
Increase Support for New Learning	45
<i>The Reflective Teacher: Always Analyzing Students' Answers</i>	47
Providing Differentiated Instruction	48
<i>Seize the Teachable Moment: All Day Long</i>	49
How Can I Help Students Who Still Are Not Learning to Segment and Blend, Even with Enhancements?	50
Tier 2 Booster Sessions	50
How Can I Help Students Who Still Are Not Learning to Segment and Blend, Even with Daily Tier 2 Booster Sessions?	50
<i>Research to Practice: What We Learned about Booster Sessions</i>	51
Tier 3 Placement Rules	52
Intensive, Alternate Reading Programs for Tier 3	52
How Can I Teach Phonemic Awareness to English Language Learners?	52
<i>Bridging the Gap: Should I Use Manipulatives to Teach Phonemic Awareness?</i>	56
Increase Connections to the First-Language Culture	56
<i>Research to Practice: Intercultural "Blending"</i>	57
How Important Is Phonemic Awareness Instruction for Older Learners?	58
How Can I Use Games to Reinforce the Phonemic Awareness Skills That Students Have Learned?	58
<i>Technology: Phonemic Awareness</i>	59
What Activities Help Students Apply Their New Phonemic Awareness Skills to Reading Words?	60
<i>Motivating Your Students to Do Their Best: Teaching Classroom Routines and Procedures</i>	61

Fact or Fiction	63
Applied Activities	64
References	66
Chapter 3	68
<hr/>	
What Skills Do I Need to Teach?	69
Sequence for Teaching Alphabetic Principle	70
<i>Bridging the Gap: Rationales for Introducing Letter Sounds in Two Systematic Phonics Programs</i>	72
Build on Previous Skills	74
How Do I Efficiently Assess and Monitor Students' Progress with the Alphabetic Principle?	75
Letter–Sound Correspondence: Informal Measure	76
Lexical Retrieval: DIBELS Letter Naming Fluency	76
Alphabetic Principle: DIBELS Nonsense Word Fluency	79
<i>Effective Teachers at Work: Use the DIBELS NWF to Identify Students for Tutoring</i>	83
How Do I Teach Students So That They Attain the Alphabetic Principle?	83
Identifying Letter–Sound Correspondences	84
Writing Letter–Sound Correspondences	88
Providing Differentiated Instruction	88
<i>Seize the Teachable Moment: Help Your Students Articulate and Differentiate Sounds</i>	89
Reading Regular Words Is a Three-Part Process	90
Writing Regular Words	99
Reading Sight Words	101
<i>Bridging the Gap: Which Is the Best Way to Teach Beginning Readers?</i>	101
Reading Decodable Sentences	103
<i>Bridging the Gap: Can I Still Use My Word Wall?</i>	104
<i>Seize the Teachable Moment: A Dozen Creative Suggestions</i>	104
Reading Decodable Passages–Prealphabetic Principle	105
Tips for the Transition from Words to Passages	107
<i>Bridging the Gap: Should I Use Pictures with My Beginning Readers?</i>	110
Selecting Decodable Books	110
<i>Research to Practice: Decodable Reading</i>	112
Putting The Pieces Together: What Does Instruction Look Like for Tier 1 and Tier 2 Students?	112
Kindergarten	112
<i>Bridging the Gap: Should I Use Predictable Books?</i>	113
First Grade	113
How Can I Help Students Who Still Can't Identify Letter Sounds or Read Regular Words or Longer Decodable Passages?	114

What Can I Do for Students When Daily Tier 2 Booster Sessions Aren't Working?	115
How Can I Teach Alphabetic Principle to English Language Learners?	116
How Important Is Alphabetic Principle for Older Learners?	119
How Can I Use Games to Reinforce Students' Decoding Skills?	120
The Word Box Game	120
<i>Technology: Alphabetic Principle</i>	121
What Activities Help Students Apply Their Newly Acquired Alphabetic Principle?	122
<i>Research to Practice: Attitudes of Students Who Are at Risk</i>	123
<i>Motivating Your Students to Do Their Best: Strategies to Encourage Positive Behavior</i>	124
Fact or Fiction	125
Applied Activities	127
References	129
Chapter 4 Advanced Word-Reading	131
<hr/>	
Why Teach Advanced Word-Reading Skills When Students Have Already Attained the Alphabetic Principle?	132
What Advanced Word-Reading Skills Do I Need to Teach?	132
Letter Combinations and Affixes	133
One-Syllable Words Containing a Letter Combination	140
Words with the Vowel-Consonant-Vowel Pattern (VCV)	141
Regular Words with Two or More Syllables	141
Words with Two or More Syllables and One or More Irregular Parts	141
One- and Two-Syllable Sight Words	141
How Can I Assess Students' Advanced Word-Reading Skills?	142
How Can I Teach Students to Decode Advanced Words and Words with Multiple Syllables?	143
Identifying Letter Combinations and Affixes Introduced in the Curriculum	144
The Suffix <i>ed</i>	144
Reading One-Syllable Words with Letter Combinations	146
Reading One-Syllable Words Ending in VCe	146
Reading Regular Words with Two or More Syllables	150
<i>Providing Differentiated Instruction</i>	151
<i>The Reflective Teacher: Teaching Multisyllable Words</i>	154
<i>Seize the Teachable Moment: Enhancers for Advanced Word Reading</i>	155
Putting the Pieces Together: Tiers 1–3	157
<i>Research to Practice: Supporting Tier 3 Students in General Education Classrooms</i>	157
How Can I Teach Advanced Word-Reading Skills to English Language Learners?	159

How Important Are Advanced Word-Reading Skills for Older Learners?	160
What Games and Activities Will Reinforce Students' Advanced Word-Reading Skills?	161
Word Race	161
Short or Long Sort	161
<i>Technology: Advanced Word-Reading Skills</i>	162
<i>Motivating Your Students to Do Their Best: Extending the Teacher–Class Game</i>	163
Fact or Fiction	165
Applied Activities	166
References	167
Chapter 5 Reading Fluency	168
What Is Reading Fluency, and Why Do I Need to Teach It?	168
How Can I Assess Reading Fluency?	169
Scheduling the DORF	170
Administering and Scoring the DORF	170
Interpreting DORF Scores	171
Charting Progress on the DORF	175
How Do I Measure the Growth of Students Who Are Significantly Behind Their Classmates?	176
<i>Bridging the Gap: How Should I Correct Errors During Oral Passage Reading?</i>	177
How Can I Measure How Well Students Read with Expression?	177
How Can I Diagnose Student Error Patterns Using the DORF and Prosody Measures?	179
Low Accuracy, Below Benchmarks for Fluency, and Low Prosody Score	179
High Accuracy, Below Benchmarks for Fluency, and Low Prosody Score	180
At Fluency Benchmark but Low Prosody Score	181
Lacking Specific Skills	181
Over- or Under-Dependence on Context	181
How Can I Teach My Students to Read Passages Accurately and Fluently?	182
SAFER	182
How Do I Place My Students in the Right Reader?	185
How Can I Increase My Students' Oral Reading Fluency and Develop More Expression?	186
Repeated Readings	187
Taped Readings	187
Partner Reading	187
Page Races	188
Echo Reading	189
Neurological Impress Method	189
Choral Reading	189
Different but the Same	190

Think about Your Reading	190
Reading in Chunks	190
Scallop the Text	191
Readers' Theatre	191
Duet or Shared Reading	191
How Important Is Fluency for Older Readers?	191
<i>Effective Teacher at Work: Support Independent Reading of Longer Words</i>	192
<i>Seize the Teachable Moment: Making Time for Fluency Building</i>	193
Putting the Pieces Together: What Does a Tier 1 Classroom Look Like?	193
First and Second Grade	193
Beyond Second Grade	194
What Can I Do for Students Who Still Aren't Learning to Read More Fluently?	194
What Can I Do for Students Who Struggle with Advanced Word-Reading Skills and Fluency, Despite Daily Tier 2 Booster Sessions?	196
<i>Effective Teacher at Work: A Team Uses Data-Based Decision Making</i>	198
How Can I Help Develop the Expressive Reading Skills of My English Language Learners?	199
Up and Down the Scale	200
Turn Up the Volume	200
Variety Is the Spice of Life	200
<i>The Reflective Teacher: Always Learning</i>	201
How Can I Use Games and Activities to Reinforce Students' Fluency Skills?	201
<i>Technology: Fluency Tracking</i>	202
<i>Motivating Your Students to Do Their Best: Working Independently</i>	202
Fact or Fiction	205
Applied Activities	206
References	207
Chapter 6 Vocabulary Instruction	209
What Vocabulary Words Do I Choose for Instruction?	211
How Do I Assess My Students' Vocabulary Knowledge?	212
What Methods Do I Use to Teach Key Vocabulary Words?	214
Selecting Examples for Direct Instruction of Vocabulary	214
Teaching Vocabulary by Modeling	214
Guidelines for Developing Vocabulary Questions	215
Using Synonyms to Teach New Vocabulary Directly	218
Using Definitions to Teach New Vocabulary Directly	218
Using Semantic Maps to Teach New Vocabulary Directly	220

Using Keywords to Teach New Vocabulary Directly	221
Using Context to Teach Independent Word-Learning Strategies	222
<i>Seize the Teachable Moment: Teaching Vocabulary in Context</i>	223
Using Morphemic Analysis to Teach Independent Word-Learning Strategies	226
Using Word Parts to Teach Vocabulary	228
<i>Research to Practice: Vocabulary Instruction</i>	230
How Can I Teach My Students to Answer Vocabulary Questions on High Stakes Tests?	232
How Can I Provide Extra Vocabulary Practice for My Students?	234
Practice Activities for New Words	234
Practice Activities for Review Words: Coordinate Vocabulary with Writing Activities	237
How Do I Teach the Language of Learning?	238
How Important Is Vocabulary for Older Learners?	239
<i>Research to Practice: Language Development</i>	240
How Can I Teach Vocabulary to English Language Learners?	241
<i>Technology: Vocabulary</i>	243
What Games and Activities Will Reinforce the Students' New Vocabulary and Language Skills?	244
<i>Motivating Your Students to Do Their Best: Structuring for Positive Behavior</i>	246
Fact or Fiction	247
Applied Activities	248
References	248
Chapter 7 Comprehension	251
<hr/>	
What Is Reading Comprehension, and Why Teach It?	251
Text	252
Reader	255
Activity	255
Context	255
What Underlying Skills Do Students Need to Comprehend Text?	256
Oral Reading Fluency	256
Oral Language	256
Sentence Repetition	256
Background Knowledge	260
What Are the Essential, Scientifically-Based Reading Comprehension Strategies of the National Reading Panel?	261
Comprehension Monitoring	262
Cooperative Learning	263
Graphic and Semantic Organizers	264
Self-Questioning	266
Story Structure Analysis: Teaching with Story Maps	267
Summarizing	268

Answering Questions	269
<i>Effective Teacher at Work: Demonstrating the KWL Plus Textbook Reading Strategy</i>	271
How Can I Use Multiple Strategies to Maximize Student Gains in Reading Comprehension?	272
How Can I Assess and Monitor My Students' Progress in Reading Comprehension?	274
Screening	274
<i>Research to Practice: Reciprocal Teaching</i>	275
Diagnosis	276
<i>Effective Teacher at Work: Using Story Grammars</i>	280
How Do I Motivate Students to Read Widely?	283
How Can I Give Struggling Students a More Systematic, Explicit Approach to Learning Comprehension Skills?	285
How Do I Prepare My Students to Pass High Stakes Tests in Reading?	286
How Do I Teach Comprehension to Older Learners?	289
How Can I Teach Reading Comprehension to English Language Learners?	291
What Games and Activities Will Reinforce Reading Comprehension Skills?	292
Find the Hot Spots	292
<i>Technology: Reading for Understanding on the Internet</i>	293
Provide Evidence	293
What Would Your Character Do?	294
Try Out Your Test-Making Skills	294
<i>Research to Practice: Begin Writing with Kindergarten</i>	294
<i>Effective Teacher at Work: A Model Comprehension Lesson</i>	295
How Well Do I Understand?	296
The Text Detective	297
Fact or Fiction	297
Applied Activities	297
References	298
Appendix A How Do I Make a Progress Graph for One Student?	301
<hr/>	
Appendix B Signals Used in Formats	302
<hr/>	
Appendix C Teaching Formats	303
<hr/>	
Glossary	321
Index	326

Preface

Between 2000 and 2004 we implemented Project PRIDE, a four-year federal model demonstration project that employed evidence-based practices to prevent reading problems in children who are at risk in three diverse, high-poverty urban schools in Rockford, Illinois. The principals of these schools opted to reverse their course from a more naturalistic reading program and make the commitment to retraining their staff because of a history of chronic reading problems and a teaching environment permeated by failure. Failure rates on the Illinois State Achievement Test (ISAT) for PRIDE schools ranged from 50% to 78%. Over the course of the project, through ongoing student achievement data and a close working relationship with the Rockford educators, we had the opportunity to fine-tune instructional strategies to a degree that would not have been possible without that collaboration.

During the four years of Project PRIDE we gained an even greater appreciation for Louisa Moats' expression, *Teaching Reading is Rocket Science*. On a daily basis we observed that as the human mind acquires the intellectual muscle to learn to read, the teacher must not only know how to carefully teach the sequence of small steps needed for reading at grade level, but also to recognize the missteps that can thwart those efforts. Whether students came to school from high-poverty backgrounds, with no parental support, with learning disabilities or behavior disorders, with medical conditions, from backgrounds of abuse, or without English-speaking skills, most of them were able to learn to read. The research in reading, as described in The Report of the National Reading Panel (2000), provides a clear guide for the use of systematic and explicit instruction to teach the largest number of students to read. In this book we have translated that guide into a detailed blueprint based on 1) explicit, systematic instruction, 2) a multi-tiered teaching approach, 3) data-based decision making, and 4) ongoing professional development.

Project PRIDE was based on the idea that in order to implement effective reading instruction "one size does not fit all." Therefore, we offered student support along a continuum of intensities or instructional tiers. These tiers allowed for maximum access to the general education reading program while providing more intensive instruction on an as-needed basis. The focus in each of those tiers was on skills in the five key areas identified by the National Reading Panel (2000) as essential for learning to read. These key areas include phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle, reading fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.

In the PRIDE model, Tier 1 was delivered by the general education teacher using a whole-class grouping arrangement. Tier 1 instruction was based on the general education beginning reading programs that were used in the project schools including *Harcourt* (Farr, Strickland, & Beck, 2001) in two of our schools and *Open Court* (Bereiter et al., 1995) in one. We added several research-based teaching enhancements that help children who are at risk learn more efficiently and effectively (Kameenui et al., 2002). These teaching enhancements included the use of advance organizers; unison responses; appropriate level of teacher talk; a perky teaching pace; support for new learning using modeling, guided, and independent practice; careful, systematic correction of student errors; teaching to success; and a student motivational system.

Tier 2 consisted of booster or tutoring sessions that provided extra practice for small groups of two to eight students, working on essential reading skills covered in the school reading series. Students entered Tier 2 when their performance dipped below mastery on monthly or bimonthly curriculum-based assessments, but they still remained in the general education reading program. Tier 2 teachers used the same enhancements used in Tier 1 (e.g., unison response and systematic error correction), but at a different time of day in separate pull-out settings with smaller instructional groups. Tier 2 sessions were carried out by a variety of staff, including general education teachers, Title 1 teachers, special education teachers, and paraprofessionals.

Tier 3 was an intensive alternative reading program (*Reading Mastery*) conducted daily in separate pull-out settings with small, skill-based groups of two to six students. Students placed in Tier 3 had failed to make substantial progress on PRIDE assessments despite extra daily help in Tier 2 booster groups. *Reading Mastery* (Engelmann & Bruner, 1995) was designed specifically for at-risk children in need of a more intensive beginning reading program. The phonetically based *Reading Mastery* curriculum is characterized by a carefully designed instructional sequence as well as multiple scaffolds to facilitate student learning. Tier 3 was taught by Title 1, foreign language, and special education teachers plus a few highly skilled paraprofessionals. Children in Tier 3 received their general education classes either during reading when the rest of the students were involved in reading activities that were at a frustration level for these students, or during a subject matter class such as science or social studies. Children in Tier 3 did participate in general education reading activities, such as vocabulary (done orally) and comprehension (as a listening activity).

Students were assigned to the PRIDE multi-tiered system based on their performance on monthly or bimonthly assessments. The assessment results were summarized by the project coordinator, who then convened a meeting of the teachers to discuss tier placements for the subsequent intervention period.

Early literacy performance was measured primarily using the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS; Kaminski & Good, 1996). DIBELS assessments (Good, Gruba, & Kaminski, 2002) have been shown to be an accurate way of identifying children at risk for reading problems and monitoring their progress in phonemic awareness, attainment of the alphabetic principle, and reading fluency. A hallmark of the DIBELS assessments is efficiency, with each measure taking fewer than 5 minutes to give. At a time when the school calendar is increasingly taken up with high-stakes testing, efficiency was an essential quality for us.

Professional development and coaching for teachers and staff who carried out instruction in Tiers 1, 2, and 3 was provided by the two authors of this text. All teachers attended after-school workshops and a series of summer institutes, and received on-site coaching. The after-school workshops and summer institutes were used to introduce various teaching and assessment strategies, allow teachers to observe taped or live models of the strategies, and provide practice for the teachers in small groups using simulated experiences. During on-site coaching visits, data on tier implementation were gathered directly in the classroom; teachers were given feedback on their instruction until they demonstrated competence.

The impetus for writing this text came from the results attained during our four years of PRIDE implementation. Our results showed that all children could make progress toward learning to read when a system of assessments guided staff to identify children who were not responding to instruction, allowing them to meet their individual needs using evidence-based instructional options of varying intensities. The assessment and teaching strategies that were successful in PRIDE are those that occupy the pages of this text. The data shown in Table 1 from one project school and a control school reflect the percentage of children meeting or exceeding standard on the Illinois State Achievement Test.

Note the significant increases from 1999–2000 to 2003–2004, the latter being scores for our first PRIDE cohort. It is interesting that the ISAT scores for our PRIDE school began improving for the 2002–2003 school year, despite the fact that these were students who

TABLE 1 Percentage of Children Meeting or Exceeding Standard on the Illinois State Achievement Test

Third Grade Reading	1999–2000	2000–20001	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004
School 1	31	22	15.2	55.2	68.2
Control	39	40	36.4	28.6	39

were not officially part of the project. We believe that at least part of that increase resulted because the school, seeing that PRIDE was working so well in the early grades, began to implement some of the same practices in the later grades that were not part of the PRIDE project. Note the rise in achievement at the control school for the 2003–2004 school year. This school began to implement the PRIDE model during that year and provided SRA Reading Mastery to all of its students in Grade 3.

It is clear from these results that more children met state standards in reading as a result of Project PRIDE. It is also true that about 30% of the students did not meet state standards. These were largely students who were receiving support in either Tier 2 or Tier 3. Nonetheless, our results showed that even though many Tier 2 and 3 students did not meet standards, they did make significant gains on all of the DIBELS measures (Bursuck, Smith, Munk, Damer, Mehlig, & Perry, 2004). We knew that grouping according to common skill needs had been criticized for exacerbating achievement differences by lowering expectations and watering down instruction, yet our results indicated that children can make progress in small, heterogeneous pull-out groups if the instruction delivered in those groups is evidence-based and delivered with integrity. Systematic, explicit instruction in our Tier 2 and Tier 3 small groups ensured significant progress for students in both of these groups. For example, effect sizes for all three tiers on all of our early literacy measures were all well over .40, the level at which an effect size is considered significant (Forness, Kavale, Blum, & Lloyd, 1997). Small, skill-based groups are not a dead end, if done appropriately.

Another common drawback of having different instructional options for children is that racial minorities tend to be overrepresented in the groups of children who are not responding to instruction. In PRIDE, children were assessed five to six times per year using highly efficient assessments directly tied to curricular goals and objectives. These assessments allowed us to make decisions in the best interest of individual children without being influenced by potentially biasing factors such as race. Our results showed that the proportion of African American children served in Tiers 2 and 3 has been no greater than could be expected given their proportion in our school population at large.

Whatever disagreements exist in the field about how to teach reading, few would argue with the overarching goal of a nation of life-long learners who enjoy reading for information as well as pleasure. We are troubled when educational strategies such as skill-based grouping, pull-out, and drill-practice-and-review are viewed as antithetical to the enjoyment of reading. That criticism is why we surveyed the attitudes of our Tier 1, 2, and 3 children at the end of grades 1 and 2 (McKenna & Kearn, 1990). The results showed that children receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction had positive attitudes toward both academic and recreational reading and that their attitudes were not significantly different from their Tier 1 counterparts. As shown in Figures 1 and 2, all three tiers averaged about 3 on a 4-point scale, with 4 indicating a high positive attitude. Child success, more than where instruction takes place, is what truly matters when it comes to students' attitudes toward reading. We believe we have also demonstrated that drill is one ingredient of an effective reading program for students who are at risk and, if done effectively, can *thrill*—not *kill*.

We know that however positive the results, it is often teacher acceptance of an instructional approach that determines the likelihood that it will continue to be used over time (Polloway, Bursuck, Jayanthi, Epstein, & Nelson, 1996). At the end of each year of the project, we surveyed our teachers to find out their feedback on all aspects of the




FIGURE 1 Attitude Toward Reading Scores by Tier Academic and Recreational Reading PRIDE, Grade 1

PRIDE model. Satisfaction was of particular interest to us because of our emphasis on teacher accountability for the reading achievement of each and every student. Our teacher satisfaction results, shown in Figure 3, have been very encouraging, with acceptance ratings after the first year for all parts of the model being consistently rated over 3 on a 4-point scale, with 4 representing the highest satisfaction. In the words of one of our principals, “It is interesting to watch the teachers’ perceptions of Project PRIDE transition from fear and distrust to such high levels of satisfaction now that they are held




FIGURE 2 Attitude Toward Reading Scores by Tier Academic and Recreational Reading PRIDE, Grade 2




FIGURE 3 Teacher Satisfaction

directly accountable for student growth. I've watched them quickly develop their capacities to serve all of the learning needs within their classrooms after systematic professional development."

At the conclusion of the project, we asked teachers whether they thought their school should continue to implement Project PRIDE the following year. Twenty-nine, or 85%, of our project teachers responded to the question. Of the 29 teachers who responded, 28 (97%) wanted the project to continue.

Project PRIDE, with its emphases on regular progress monitoring of all students and the provision of a range of instructional supports based on need, is consistent with the provisions of the recent No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The results for children in all three of our tiers showed that 95% of the children made reading progress, and that their attitudes toward reading were positive. Our Title 1, general education, and special education teachers found the model acceptable and the model has been continued beyond the funding period. All of these results have encouraged us to write this book so that other teachers can become empowered to teach children to read who have traditionally been left behind.

DVD of Teaching Formats Included with this Book

In our work with teachers, the following concern was repeatedly raised: "Everyone talks and writes about how I should teach reading, but it would be such a help to actually see these skills being taught to children." That concern provided the impetus for producing this companion DVD. The video footage shows a teacher using the reading formats from the book to teach critical reading skills to students in a small group classroom situation. Viewers can refer to the text as they watch phonemic awareness, letter-sound correspondence, word reading, vocabulary and passage reading with comprehension being taught. For easy reference, menus on the DVD identify each format and reference the specific table in the book in which the teaching skill is introduced.

Acknowledgments

Over the years we have had the good fortune of working with and learning from a talented group of educators firmly committed to the proposition that every child can learn to read. Without the contributions of these dedicated professionals, writing *Reading Instruction for Students Who Are at Risk or Have Disabilities* would have been impossible. First, we owe a huge debt of gratitude to all of the people who have provided us as well as our field with a blueprint for success that will continue to have a positive impact on children for many generations to come. Particular thanks are offered here to Doug Carnine and Jerry Silbert for writing our “bible,” and to Diane Kinder for inspiring us to prepare teachers with integrity and passion. We would also like to thank Louisa Moats for impressing on us the importance of foundational information in language to any teacher change effort in reading. Our thanks also to Roland Good for developing a sound, practical set of measures and who, in an act of educational philanthropy of historic proportions, made them available free on the Internet so that the data-based decision making so essential to a multi-tier model could be accomplished. Many thanks to Debbie Holderness and Sonia Martin for their invaluable assistance with the preparation of the manuscript.

We also wish to thank the colleagues who were instrumental in helping with the development and refinement of the many aspects of the multi-tier model, including Shirley Dickson, Rolanda O'Connor, Kelly Bolas, Dennis Munk, Missy Moreno, Libby Noel, and Sara Long. Thanks also to Val Bresnahan and Sue Grisco for their help with the Tier 3 tables.

We are indebted to the federal government for funding Project PRIDE through a Model-Demonstration grant (CFDA 84.324.T; H324T990024). We also owe a great debt of gratitude to the Rockford Public Schools, in particular Kishwaukee School, Lewis Lemon Academy, and the John Nelson School, whose conscientious effort to implement multi-tier instruction showed that we could have a positive impact on children who had previously fallen through the cracks. A particular note of thanks goes to these talented, committed teachers whose belief in the model and commitment to children sustained us: Paula Larson, Nancy Dornbush, Michele Dettman, Sharon Bramel, Sheri Hayes, Carol Gibbs, Joanne Robertson, Mixay Phonthibsvads, Marcia Carlstrom, Susan Vetrano, and Linda Oshita.

Special thanks go to the reviewers of the book whose careful, constructive attention to the manuscript gave us the confidence to proceed while at the same time improving the final product. The reviewers included: Shirley V. Dickson, California State University at Fullerton; Kathleen J. Marshall, University of South Carolina; Pam Matlock, Murray State College; Melinda R. Pierson, California State University at Fullerton; Darren Smith, Arkansas State University; and Vicki Snider, University of Wisconsin. Thanks also to Kurt Lazarof and Kazuko Matsuda for their invaluable help with the final preparation of the manuscript.

A final thanks to teachers everywhere who are willing to do whatever it takes to deliver effective, evidence-based reading instruction to their students. Your efforts will always teach and inspire us as we continue to pursue the vision of helping every child learn to read.

DVD Acknowledgments

Portraying the teaching formats discussed throughout the book would not have been possible without the skill of our master teacher Kelly Bolas, the children of Bluford Communications Magnet school in Greensboro, North Carolina (Brianna Lorrick, Christina Brown, Kamari Purvis, Jaquin Miller, and Paul Gaurdin), and their principal, LaToy Kennedy. Tom Lipscomb and Associates grasped the goals of the video immediately and captured on video everything we wanted and more.

Specifically, students with learning disabilities (LD), who are often characterized as passive readers (Torgesen, 1982), either lack or seldom activate reading comprehension strategies to access information in textual material. Furthermore, they rarely monitor and evaluate their understanding. A percentage of fourth graders and eighth graders with disabilities who scored below the basic level in reading achievement was substantially higher (66% and 63%, respectively) than the percentage of fourth and eighth graders without disabilities. (31. % and 22% [William D Bursuck; Mary Damer] -- "This new text presents strategies for teaching children who are at-risk, including children with learning and behavioral disabilities, children of poverty, and children who speak English as a second ..."

"While the first chapter captures the very essence of teaching reading, the rest of the text is an absolute gold mine of additional research based instructional strategies appropriate for the college student, the first year teacher, and the veteran reading teacher. I wish I had written it!"

-Pam Matlock, Murray State University Recommended Reading from LETRS!

Bursuck, W. D., & Damer, M. (2007). Reading instruction for students who are at risk or have disabilities. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon. "This is a very useful textbook with several unique features. Bursuck, W. D., & Damer, M. (2007). Reading instruction for students who are at risk or have disabilities. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon. "This is a very useful textbook with several unique features."

What Is The Best Time To Begin Reading Instruction For Children Who Are At-risk? How Can I Identify Which Students Are Likely To Struggle When learning To Read? How Can I Set Goals For Them And Monitor Their Progress? What Essential Skills Do Students need To Become Mature Readers? What Does The Research Say About The Most Effective Way To Teach Essential Reading Skills To Children Who Are At-Risk? What Letter Sounds Do Teachers Need To Know To Teach Phonemic Awareness And Phonics Skills To Students Who Are At-Risk?