Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

5-3-2001

An evaluation of first grade children's progress in reading using the Success for All program

Alphefia L. Blount
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd

⚙ Part of the Disability and Equity in Education Commons

AN EVALUATION OF FIRST GRADE CHILDREN'S PROGRESS

IN READING USING THE

SUCCESS FOR ALL

PROGRAM

by
Alphefia L. Blount

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
2001

Approved by _____

Date Approved_____*May 3, 2001*_____

ABSTRACT

Blount, Alphefia L.

An Evaluation of First Grade Children's Progress in Reading Using the Success for All Program.
2001

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Stanley Urban

This study measured the gains made by students in the Success for All program in the areas of word recognition and reading comprehension. Also, the study examined whether the variables of attendance, student behavior, homework completion and family support effected the results of those gains. The students participated in the Success for All reading program for sixteen weeks. Every eight weeks they were given an assessment to measure progress or regression in word recognition and reading comprehension. The students reading groups were adjusted accordingly. At the end of the sixteen weeks they were administered the Jerry John's Basic Reading Inventory word list to find their independent levels. An analysis of the data collected, revealed that 80% of the students made meaningful gains in word recognition and reading comprehension. Students who completed their homework and attended regularly showed the most progress. Those students who exhibited attendance problems and did not do homework completion did not show meaningful gains in either area.

Mini-Abstract

Blount, Alphefia L.   An Evaluation of First Grade Children's Progress in
                            Reading Using the Success for All Program.
                                         2001
                            Thesis Advisor: Dr. Stanley Urban

This study measured the gains made by first graders in the Success for All

program in the areas of reading comprehension and word recognition. A comparison was

made between the reading levels of achievement on the Success for All and Jerry John's

Basic Reading Inventory word recognition list. Also, the study examined whether the

variables of attendance rates, student behavior, homework completion and family support

effected the results of those gains. The results of the data revealed that 80% of the

students who attended school on a daily basis and completed their homework made

meaningful gains in reading comprehension and word recognition.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Stanley Urban, my advisor, for his gracious guidance throughout the completion of this project.

I wish to thank all the members of my family, co-workers and church for their help, encouragement, and prayers towards completing my degree.

Special thanks to Eugenia Johnson and Sherman Denby, who were a great help to me in completing this project.

Thanks to the One and Only Father, Jesus Christ for giving me the ability to complete the work he has begun in me.

Finally, I dedicate this project in memory of my mother, Cloreda (Selby) Blount, who passed away January 19, 1992. She was one of the greatest mothers who ever lived.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER I

<u>Background</u>

Slavin & Madden (1996) believe that reading is an essential part of life. All children must possess the ability to read to become productive citizens and gain success in society. They succinctly state their beliefs as follows:

"Every child has the capacity to succeed in school and in life. Yet far too many children, especially those from poor and minority families, are placed at risk by school practices that are based on a sorting paradigm in which some students receive high-expectations instruction while the rest are relegated to lower quality education and lower quality futures. The sorting perspective must be replaced by a "talent development" model that asserts that all children are capable of succeeding in a rich and demanding curriculum with appropriate assistance and support."

Within the last few years, there has been an extraordinary movement to transform public schools in America. Programs such as private schools, charter schools, home schooling, and independent private schools are being developed. School vouchers are being offered in place of public school funding. These extraordinary approaches are being taken because of the inability of a large group of students to pass annual standardized tests that are administered throughout their school years. To address high failure rates may schools are adopting whole-school reform models. These models often include professional development training, materials, changes in staffing, family involvement, and other specific components.

One of the whole-school reform models being used in many schools across America is Success for All which it is a comprehensive program that focuses on reading, writing, and language arts. In recent years, this model has been revised with the addition of

science, social studies, and math.

The Success for All program is a schoolwide program developed by Robert Slavin at The Johns Hopkins University in the late 1980s. It has expanded from a single urban elementary school to approximately 300 schools in twenty-three states.

The program's three main goals are as follows: (1) pursue success for every student, (2) prevent learning problems, and (3) *intervene immediately* and *intensively* when problems do occur so that students do not fall farther behind. Success for All serves all elementary students, with or without learning disabilities.

Need for Study

Numerous whole-school reform models exist for schools in America today. Private for profit companies are generating many millions of dollars selling these programs to schools that are promoting an idea of *"success"*. Are they all successful programs? Will every student experience success? How do we really define *"success?"* Every program after implementation can point to some elements of success. The Success for All program suggests that after implementation within the school setting every student will experience a level of success in reading.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the effectiveness of the Success for All program in improving the reading skills of a group of first grade children. In addition, attendance, behavior problems, academic difficulties, and family problems will be examined for each of the subjects.

Value of the Study

Reading failure can be prevented if students receive immediate interventions in the early elementary grades. Data will be collected on first graders to see if progress is made in word recognition and reading comprehension within the first sixteen weeks of participation in the Success for All program.

Research Question

The data gathered in this study will be used to answer the following five research questions:

Question 1: Will first grade children that receive reading instruction using the Success for All model make meaningful gains in word recognition?

Question 2: Will first grade children that receive reading instruction using the Success for All model make meaningful gains in reading comprehension?

Question 3: What is the rate of compliance with the twenty minute per day reading requirement?

a. Is there a differential relationship between compliance with at home reading and word decoding?

Question 4: What is the frequency of involvement with the family support team?

Question 5: What are the attendance rates for each child in this study?

Limitations of the Study

The implementation of any program requires staff development and training. At times, teachers relocate leaving vacant positions within the school and administrators are left scrambling to fill positions at the beginning of the school year. New teachers do not

get the hands-on training they so desperately need to effectively implement the program; therefore they cannot do the job sufficiently.

The Success for All program requires that reading instruction be provided ninety minutes per day. Time restraints will cause the schedule to be altered occasionally. Schedules may be changed due to circumstances beyond the administrators control; for example, delayed openings due to weather conditions, scheduling of assemblies, and class trips.

The students and teachers are required to attend school on a daily basis. Each year the school calendar assigns 180 days for classroom instruction. However, there are conditions that may cause students or teachers to be absent; (i.e.), sickness, doctor appointments, death of a relative and other personal reasons. Teacher absenteeism causes inconsistency in the implementation of the program; because substitutes are not trained to teach the program. Absenteeism is definitely a factor in determining the effectiveness of the program. The Success for All program requires students to read twenty minutes per evening to an adult. Parental participation requires the parent to sign a slip verifying the student completed the homework assignment. The student is required to return the verification slip each day indicating the completion of their homework. Students frequently forget to return their verification slips and complete their homework. These are the limitations that will effect the essential elements of the Success for All program.

Definition of Terms

The following is a list of definitions relative to this study. These definitions will

enhance the comprehension of the study.

1. Success for All whole-school reform model- is a comprehensive program that focuses on reading, writing, and language art in the elementary grades.

(a) "success"- the achievement of something intended or desired.

(b) "all"- includes students with or without learning disabilities.

(c) "at-risk students- children who may live in one or more of the following conditions; single-parent homes, low socio-economic environments, crowded conditions, substance abusive environments, foster homes, inadequate nutrition and health care.

2. Reading Root-a beginning reading program used in Success for All. It emphasizes a balance between phonics and meaning, using both children's literature and a series of interesting, enjoyable stories in which phonetically regular student text is enriched by teacher-read text. Students engage in partner reading and writing activities.

3. Effect size- (ES) the proportion of a standard deviation by which Success for All students exceed controls.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

This review of literature will include the following topics:

first, the purpose and local education agencies designated requirements of "Abbott

Districts", second, the description of Cherry St. School in Bridgeton, N.J. as a school

within an "Abbott District" and third, the description of the " Success for All" program

and review of research on the program.

The Abbott District

Stokely, et. al, (1996) reported children born into poverty particularly those in urban

areas grow up in conditions, which make school learning far more difficult. A poor urban

child is more likely to live in crowded conditions, to witness random acts of violence, to

receive inadequate nutrition and health care, and to have fewer opportunities for

constructive early learning and after school activities. These children come to school on

average two years behind in readiness to learn what the schools have to offer.

The paucity of quality education for under privileged children in poorer urban

districts has been the subject of various court decisions in New Jersey for more than 25

years. It began with the filing of Robinson V. *Cahill* (1970), the New Jersey Supreme

Court had to address the claims of under privileged school children because they were not

receiving quality education at a level sufficient to prepare them to compete in the economy

and to fully join in as citizens in our society.

Poor urban school districts continued to press their claim in the *Abbott* v. *Burke*

case. Filed in 1981, the trial finally took place in 1986-1987 and lasted approximately nine

months. The extended trial record focused on the link between funding and programs and the children's claim that deficient state funding in poor urban districts led inevitably to lower educational quality and the failure to provide a thorough and efficient education.

A little over a year was spent examining the extensive *Abbott* record. In his decision, the judge found for the poor school children on all the crucial points. Later, on June 4,1990, the New Jersey Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the trial judge, determining the State had neglected the provisions of a thorough and efficient education for children attending schools in the poor urban districts as guaranteed by the New Jersey Constitution.

Stokely et. al., (1996) notes that in it's ruling the Court required the state to implement two distinct school funding and program mandates for children attending school in these districts. Both mandates were designed to provide equal and high quality educational opportunity. First, the Court ordered the State to assure that these districts have the same amount per pupil to spend on regular education as is available on average in high performing, wealthier school districts. Such funding was to be provided in order to assure both quantitative and qualitative educational program comparability between richer suburban and poorer urban schools.

In addition to funding parity for regular education, the Court heeded the testimony of educational researchers and experts and ordered the State to develop, adequately fund and implement a "supplemental program" responsive to the special needs poor children bring to school with them everyday.

The "supplemental program" should include the following components:

1. All disadvantaged children should have access to at least one level of preschool and to full day of kindergarten.

2. Class size should be reduced to below 15 for kindergarten through third grade.

3. A research-based instructional intervention program should be installed in elementary schools serving disadvantaged students.

4. Programs for limited English-speaking students should be continued in schools with a sufficient number of language minority students.

5. Parent participation, education, and training programs should be installed at every school serving disadvantaged students.

6. Programs to extend the school day and/or school year are vital for disadvantaged students.

7. School-based Youth and Family Services should be available in all special needs districts.

8. Alternative schools and programs for middle and high schools in urban school districts are critical to the education of children unable to achieve in regular education settings.

9. School-to-Work and School-to-College transition programs are needed to successfully bridge the gap between middle/high school and the next stage in the development of disadvantaged students

The *Abbott v. Burke* decision limits the requirements for a supplemental program to those districts covered by the court order, they identified special needs districts. The final report recommended that the supplemental programs be available to students in any district where 20 or more disadvantaged students are enrolled in any grade.

Cherry Street School, Bridgeton, N.J.

This school is located in Bridgeton, New Jersey, which is an urban city with an population of 18,942. The ethnic representation of the city is follows here 10,365-White, 6,996-Black, 254-American- Indian, 153-Asian/Pacific Islander, 1,174-Other race. There are several factories which provide employment for residents; however, since the early 1970's there has been a significant decline in the number of factory based manufacturing jobs in the city. Within the last five years a state facility, South Woods Prison, and a new Shop-Rite has been built. These businesses have brought some jobs to the area. When visiting Bridgeton you can visually see evidence of the same problems that exist in any other urban city. The major problems that exist are unemployment, drugs, homelessness, a high rate of teenage pregnancy, dysfunctional families, crowded living quarters, school dropouts, etc. Due to the problems that exist in our city the school system is greatly effected; therefore, we are considered an Abbott District.

Cherry Street School is a pre-kindergarten through fifth grade elementary school. It houses approximately 561 students, and has approximately 100 staff members. The ethnic representation of the school is as follows: 423-African-American, 62-Hispanic, 28-Caucasian, 2-American-Indian, and -Asian/Pacific Islander. The language spoken at the school is English. The students are learning conversational Spanish as required by the core curriculum standards. The attendance rate for the year 1999-2000 was at 93% and 91% of students were eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The student mobility rate is 30.9 percent annually, while the teacher mobility rate is 14.8% annually.

Cherry Street School's mission is to provide the best education possible in a safe and

orderly environment.

Cherry Street School staff had to attend a workshop to receive an overview of the Whole School Reform Models. A committee was formed to represent each grade level of the school. A survey was given to all certificated staff to identify the actual needs of our school. The survey was tallied and the most important item addressed was the inability of our students to read on grade level. The Whole School Reform committee visited several programs and chose the most appropriate program for Cherry Street School in accordance with survey results. The staff voted in January of 1999 to adopt the Success For All model with implementation to begin in September of 1999.

Success For All

Success for All is a reading curriculum that incorporates research-based instructional intervention practices. In the early grades K-1, the program emphasizes reading readiness and the development of oral language. Students will become familiar with books, receive practice in the area of phonemic awareness so their auditory discrimination skills can be developed. Students will read high- frequency words independently. Listening comprehension is addressed by having students listen to a story and retell, summarize, or dramatize the story. As students progress to higher levels they receive additional instruction in reading comprehension and writing. Cooperative learning activities are used to improve student's ability to get along with others. They focus on reading orally with a partner, participating in structured discussions, summarization and retelling of stories, vocabulary building, decoding practice, and story-related writing. Students are involved in a Peabody Language Development activity each day, which will help the students develop receptive and expressive language.

Reading groups are homogeneously developed. Students in grades 1-3 (and sometimes 4-5 or 4-6) is regrouped for reading by their reading ability level. A common 90-minute reading period is established across all grades. The average group size is 15 and taught by a certified teacher within the school.

The **program facilitator** is a member of the school staff who is released from regular classroom responsibilities. The facilitator works with the principal in overseeing the details often implementation of the program, including scheduling changes and professional development training. The facilitator has the responsibility of monitoring the implementation of the curriculum in the classroom, and assisting staff with any type of problem. The facilitator will assist with problems that may exist with student behaviors; he/she can act as a liaison between the staff and the family support team.

The training for the program included a three day in-service. The training includes in-class coaching and assistance, and periodic in-service workshops and discussion groups. In the first year of implementation, three days of in-service training are provided for all teachers, tutors, and paraprofessionals at the beginning of the school year. The facilitator and principal are usually trained for a week at a Success For All site. During the school year trainers make frequent site visits during which they make classroom visitations. They conduct classroom observation, meet with staff and make suggestions for improvement. Throughout the year the facilitator will schedule sessions for staff to share information, discuss problems and solutions; also they will collaborate on different ideas necessary to help individual students.

Frequent assessments are conducted every eight weeks, reading teachers will assess student progress using personal observations and curriculum-based and formal measures. The results of the assessments are used to identify students who are failing and may need further assistance by tutoring. Also, students are identified that are progressing quickly and should be placed in a higher group. Teachers may have the ability to identify students who need other types of assistance, such as family interventions or screening for hearing or vision problems.

Reading Tutors are another important element of the program. Tutors provide one-on-one tutoring, this is considered the most effective form of instruction for students with reading problems. Tutors are usually certified teachers with experience as reading teachers, Title 1, or special education teachers. Paraprofessionals can be trained to provide the same services under the direction of a certified teacher. The students that are tutored will receive a 20-minute session per day. They will be pulled out of the classroom individually and this session is not held during math or reading instruction. First grade students are given priority in receiving tutoring this helps prevent problems from developing and fewer students at an older age will need remediation.

The **family support team** consists of the facilitator, parent liaison, guidance counselor, nurse, principal or vice-principal, and any other member of the school when necessary. The teams' function is to promote parental involvement in the school by providing information, organizing school-related activities, and conducting workshops for parents if necessary. They assist teachers with academic and behavioral problems, and help coordinate services with community-based health, social service, and juvenile justice agencies. Madden and Slavin (1989) suggest that there is evidence that reading failure can

be prevented in the first grade. There are several programs that have shown strong positive effects on the reading performance of at-risk first graders.

They all provide one-on-one tutoring to students who have been identified early in first grade as falling behind in reading. Studies have shown that tutoring programs can bring at-risk students up to normal reading levels, (David and Wallach, 1978).

Norman and Zigmond (1980) reported that in many urban districts, retention rates for first graders has exceeded 20% in recent years, and identification of students as being learning disabled has risen. Both retention and special-education placement are largely determined on the basis of reading performance. Slavin et. al (1993) suggested that Success For All is designed to attempt to ensure that every student in a high-poverty school will succeed in acquiring basic skills in early grades. Success is defined as performing in reading at or near grade level by the third grade, maintaining this status through the end of the elementary grades, and avoiding retention or special education. The program seeks to accomplish this objective by implementing high-quality preschool and kindergarten programs, one-on-one tutoring in reading to students (especially first graders) who need it, research-based reading instruction in all grades, frequent assessment of progress in reading, and a family support program.

Slavin et. al., (1990) reported that the Success for All was first implemented in the 1987-88 school year in one inner-city Baltimore school, Abbottston Elementary School, a Pre-K to 5 school with approximately 440 students. Almost all students were black and 75% received free lunch. The school was selected among the category of schools that

receive the most intensive Chapter I resources in the city of Baltimore. In addition, the school had to meet a set of criteria specifying lack of major programs, adequate space, location near Johns Hopkins University, and manageable size. In the spring of 1987, the principal and school staff were given an opportunity to serve as the Success for All pilot site, and they voted unanimously to do so. The intention in the selection process was to locate a school that served a typical inner-city population with a staff that was typical of Baltimore City elementary school teachers but willing and able to work with John Hopkins staff to redefine and implement the model. The program at Abbottston Elementary is being compared to a matched control school. The first year assessment revealed substantially higher student performance on measures of language development in preschool and kindergarten and on measures of reading in Grades 1-3, compared to students in a matched school. Reading gains were especially large for students who had been in the lowest 25% of their grade on pretests. For these students, effects size averaged +. 80 on individually administered measures. Further, there were substantial reductions in the numbers of students retained or assigned to special education.

During the 1988-1989 school year, four additional schools began to implement Success for All. Abbottston Elementary School and City Spring Elementary were referred to as the "high-resource" schools because of their funding received for the program. Evaluations of Success for All have been evaluated each school year. The 1989-1990 assessment (Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan, & Wasik, 1990) found that effects of reading achievement were very positive at Abbottston Elementary in all grades (1-3) in its second year of implementation. Weaker but still positive readings effects were found in City Springs and the low-resource schools (after less than a full year of implementation) in

first and second grades. In all cases, the largest effects were for the students who were in the lowest 25% of their classes at pretest.

Slavin et. al., (1990) reported across five scales taken from the individually administered Woodcock and Durrell reading inventories first graders scored at an average equivalent of 2.0 (50th percentile), in comparison to 1.5 in the control group (28th percentile). Effect sizes ranged from 0.34 to 1.39. Among students that scored in the lowest 25% on the pretests, Success for All students scored at the 32nd percentile, in comparison to the 8th percentile for similar control students. As the figures show, the lowest 25% of the Success for All first graders outscored the average control students

Madden et. al., (1991) found strong positive reading effects for Abbottston at all grade levels, and in this second implementation year for City Springs and the lower-resource schools. Effects were much more positive in first and second grades than they had been after one year, especially for low achievers.

Slavin et. al., (1994) reported that the first school district outside Baltimore to implement Success for All was Philadelphia. Francis Scott Key Elementary School, which serves a population that is composed of majority Southeast Asians mostly Cambodian in orgin has been using the program since 1988. Three more schools began to implement Success for All in 1991. These are all very poor schools that serve primarily African American children, with nearly 100% of the students qualifying for subsidized lunches.

Asian students at Key school exceed those in their control schools by an average of more than a full grade in first grade; Asian students in Success for All were reading above grade level, while their counter parts in the control schools were non-readers, scoring near

the bottom of the scale on all tests. Non-Asian students at Key School outperformed their controls by an average of approximately 3.5 months in first grade, three months in second grade, four months in third grade, and five months in fourth grade.

The results for two of the three Philadelphia schools that began Success for All in 1991 (data on the third school was lost) show that first graders in these schools were Reading above grade level and two months ahead of their controls. The lowest-achieving 25% of Success for All students were reading about at grade level and exceed their controls by 3.5 month.

A study of two schools in Fort Wayne, Indiana, (Smith and Ross, 1993) found strong positive effects of Success for All on student achievement. First graders were reading well above grade level (a grade equivalent of 2.45) and more than three months ahead of controls. The lowest-achieving 25% of students were also reading above grade level and 4.5 months ahead of their control group. Second graders were reading four months ahead of their controls, and the lowest 25% of second graders were almost on grade level and more than four months ahead of their counterparts.

Ross et. al., (1992-1993) reported that two schools in Montgomery, Alabama, had the largest program effects of any first grade evaluation. Success for All first graders were reading more than five months ahead of their peers in the control group. Among the lowest 25%, control students were not reading at all, while Success for all students posted an average grade equivalent score 1.46.

Slavin and Wasik (1992) reports that Pepperhill Elementary School in Charleston began to use Success for All in the 1990-91 school year. Pepperhill is the only Success for All school being evaluated that is not a Chapter I school. Despite a poverty rate much

higher than the national average (40% of students qualify for subsidized lunches and 60% are African-American), Pepperhill does not qualify for Chapter I funding within the Charleston district. However, under the South Carolina Educational Improvement Act, it does receive state funds for compensatory education that pay for the cost of Success for All.

Still, because it is not a Chapter I school, Pepperhill has less money to implement Success for All than do other schools in the program. As a result, Pepperhill is the only school being evaluated that uses para-professionals rather than certified teachers as tutors. The paraprofessionals are of high quality: one is certified to teach in another state, and another has a four-year degree. Moreover, all received significantly more training than is given to tutors who are certified to teach. Pepperhill provides us with the first opportunity to evaluate Success for All in a school that has fewer dollars to spend and a relatively less needy population.

The outcomes for first graders at Pepperhill show a substantial positive effect of the program on student achievement. This school has the highest mean reading level of any Success for All school (a grade equivalent of 2.45), four months ahead of its control school. Effects were also quite positive for students in the lowest 25% of their grade.

Slavin (1996) concludes not only is Success for All designed around research into effective teaching methods, but the program itself has an extensive body of research demonstrating its effectiveness. Statistically significant positive effects have been found on every measure from grades 1 to 5, with especially large gains for students most at risk for failure. These effects have also been shown to be cumulative: while first-grade Success

for All students are about three months ahead of matched control students in reading, by the fifth grade, they outscore control students by an average of a full grade level. The program has also been found to cut special education placements in half, on average, and one study found that the program eliminated the racial achievement gap.

Summary

According to the literature reviewed Success for All if implemented correctly will show substantial yearly gains in reading achievement. The earlier the program is implemented in school the more promising the results. Also, findings from studies show the longer a school is in the program, the greater the effects on the reading performance of students in all grades. As students progress in reading; they will eventually show improvement in other content areas. Success for All helps all students acquire the skills and/or knowledge they need to successfully perform at higher academic levels. It has proven to be effective in raising the academic achievement levels of "at-risk" students in low-performing schools.

Slavin (1996) notes for long-term success, it is critical that young students be provided with a firm academic foundation. The ability to read with fluency and comprehend is the bedrock upon which that foundation is built. This program has proven it can help schools accomplish this goal.

CHAPTER III

<u>Sample</u>

This study will include twenty students from the first grade of Cherry Street School located in Bridgeton, New Jersey. The school setting is in an urban city and has been designated an Abbott District. The total enrollment of first grades is approximately 90 students with 18 students in each class. Most of these students are designated as living in an "at-risk" environment.

Each first grade classroom is staffed with one certified teacher and an instructional assistant. First graders may receive one or more of the following services; speech, occupational or physical therapy. The services of the guidance counselor and social worker are also available too. Some of the students may be receiving one-on-one tutoring through the Success for All program. Reading Recovery is also offered to the lowest 5% of academic achievers in the first grade.

The twenty students involved in this study were chosen randomly. Mrs. P. and Ms. C. both volunteered to share their data they collect daily for the research. Their reading groups are composed of first graders with approximately twelve students in each group.

<u>Instrumentation</u>

The Reading Roots Eight Week Assessment will be used to measure growth in reading for each student every eight weeks. The goal of the assessment is to determine each student's reading mastery level within the framework of the Reading Roots lessons. The students will be asked to read a series of passages and word lists that were written to correspond with the stories and words taught in Reading Roots. Students will continue to read until they reach their highest level or ceiling.

Reading comprehension requires the student to read a passage. After completing the passage, the student must answer three questions. If the student reads the passage and has less than seven word errors and no more than one comprehension error he/she may continue on to the next passage. The student will again continue reading until they reach a ceiling.

Word recognition requires the student to read a list of ten words. They will begin at the same level as they began reading the passages. They can make four errors reading the list; they will continue reading to a higher level until they reach the ceiling or more than four errors. The results are recorded on the Reading Roots Eight Week Assessment Summary Form. All of the information on the summary form as well as teacher observations are used to determine instructional level in reading. If the formal assessment indicates higher performance than that indicated by classroom information, the student is probably ready to move onto a higher instructional level. If the classroom information indicates that the student is keeping up in the classroom, but the formal assessment indicates lower performance, then the student would remain at the current instructional level. If both formal assessment and classroom information indicate lower performance than the current instructional level, the problem should be addressed. The student may move to a lower instructional level. Solutions could involve working with the teacher on instructional methods or classroom management, family support consultation, tutoring, or brief focused reviews.

The Jerry Johns Basic Inventory first grade word list will be given to each student of the 20 students in this study at the end of sixteen weeks. The word list contains twenty words; some words are from the Revised Dolch list. The students will be asked to read the

word lists orally, then they will continue reading to identify their instructional level. The instructional level is reached when a student reads a list of words without getting more than four errors out of twenty words. This will be compared to the word recognition assessment from the Reading Roots Eight Week Assessment.

Research Design and Analysis of Data

The assessments scores will be used to measure gains in student achievement at eight and sixteen week intervals after the program is initiated. The results of the rate of attendance, homework completion, and academic progress in word recognition and reading comprehension will be presented in tabular form. Those students who receive Family Support Services will be identified also. The data collected will be examined thoroughly and an interpretation provided in order to answer each research question.

CHAPTER IV

<u>Introduction</u>

The twenty first graders in the Success For All Program were administered

assessments at the end of the eighth and sixteenth week. The assessments measured the

subjects reading comprehension levels to see if the subjects made meaningful gains.

Next, the rate of compliance of homework completion will be assessed to see if it effects

the word recognition levels and overall performance of the students. Attendance rate will

be calculated to see how it effected the performance of each subject. The involvement of

any subject with the Family Support Team will be discussed.

<u>Results</u>

Word Recognition

Question 1: Will first grade children that receive reading instruction using the Success

For All model make meaningful gains in word recognition?

a. Will the children show meaningful gains on the Jerry John's <u>Basic Reading</u>

<u>Inventory?</u>

A comparison of the word recognition list of Success For All Program indicates

that fourteen of the twenty subjects studied made meaningful gains. Subjects 1, 4, and

14 neither made gains nor regressed. They remained on the same levels for both

assessments. Subjects 12 and 16 regressed to a lower level at sixteenth week than they

were at the eighth week. Subject 9 was unable to decode words. While reviewing the data

from the charts subjects 9, 12, and 16 did not do their homework on a regular basis.

Comparing the Success For All word recognition assessment with the Jerry John's

Basic Reading Inventory results were as follow: nine of the twenty subjects assessed

read at higher levels of the Jerry John's Basic Reading Inventory than the Success For

All assessment. Ten subjects read in very similar levels or the exact same levels in both

assessments. Subject 9's level could not be found on the Success For All list but he read

the Jerry John's Basic Reading Inventory at the Pre-primer level.

Table 1
Results of Success For All Word Lists (N-20)

SUBJECT	8 WEEKS	16 WEEKS
S 1	PP 1	PP 1
S 2	PP 1	PP 3
S 3	PP 1	PP 3
S 4	PP 1	PP 1
S 5	PP 2	1ST READER
S 6	READINESS	PP 1
S 7	1ST READER	2ND LEVEL
S 8	PP 2	1ST READER
S 9	NOT FOUND	NOT FOUND
S 10	PP 1	PRIMER
S 11	PP 1	PP 3
S 12	PP 1	READINESS
S 13	PP 3	2ND LEVEL
S 14	PP 2	PP 2
S 15	PP 1	PP 2
S 16	PP 1	READINESS
S 17	PP 1	1ST READER
S 18	PP 1	PP 3
S 19	READINESS	PP 1
S 20	PP 1	PRIMER

Reading Levels
Readiness   Pre-Primer 3
Pre-Primer 1   Primer
Pre-Primer 2   First Reader
Beginning Second Reader

Table 2
Concurrent Scores of Success For All and Jerry John's
Basic Reading Inventory

SUBJECT	SFA	JERRY JOHNS
S 1	Pre-primer 1	Primer
S 2	Pre-primer 3	Pre-primer
S 3	Pre-primer 3	Primer
S 4	Pre-primer 1	Pre-primer
S 5	First Reader	1st Grade
S 6	Pre-primer 1	Pre-primer
S 7	B. 2nd Reader	2nd Grade
S 8	First Reader	1st Grade
S 9	Not Found	Pre-primer
S 10	Primer	1st Grade
S 11	Pre-Primer 3	1st Grade
S 12	Readiness	Pre-primer
S 13	B. 2nd Reader	2nd Grade
S 14	Pre-Primer 2	1st Grade
S 15	Pre-primer 2	1st Grade
S 16	Readiness	Pre-primer
S 17	First Reader	1st Grade
S 18	Pre-primer 3	1st Grade
S 19	Pre-primer 1	Pre-primer
S 20	Primer	1st Grade

Reading Levels
Readiness   Pre-Primer 1
Pre-Primer 2   Pre-Primer 3
Primer   First Reader
Beginning Second Reader

Reading Comprehension

Question 2: Will first grade children that receive reading instruction using the Success

For All model make meaningful gains in reading comprehension?

Reading comprehension was measured by checking to see if the subjects had an

understanding of the basic story structure. They had to recall major story details, make

predictions with prompts from the teacher and sequence a story's beginning, middle,

and ending. The scoring key used was E-Emergent (Beginning), D-Developing

(Progressing), and S-Secure (Confident).

24

A comparison was made of levels from the eighth week to the sixteenth week.

Seven out twenty subjects progressed from the Developing level to the Secure level. Nine

subjects remained at the same level. Subject 11 regressed from the Secure to Developing

level. Subjects 9, 14, and 19 regressed from Developing to Emerging Level. The

regression of reading comprehension could be due to the level difficulty of the reading

material or the grading discretion of the teacher.

Table 3
Results of Success For All Reading Comprehension (N-20)

SUBJECT	8 WEEKS	16 WEEKS
S 1	D	D
S 2	D	D
S 3	D	D
S 4	D	D
S 5	D	S
S 6	D	S
S 7	D	S
S 8	D	S
S 9	D	E
S 10	D	S
S 11	S	D
S 12	D	D
S 13	D	S
S 14	D	E
S 15	D	D
S 16	E	D
S 17	S	S
S 18	D	D
S 19	D	E
S 20	D	D

Homework

Question 3: What is the rate of compliance with the twenty minute per day reading
requirement?

a. Is there a differential relationship between compliance with at home reading and

word decoding?

The subjects were required to read twenty minutes orally per night on a regular

basis . A specific number of how many homework completions were done in the eighty-

seven days was not given. Subjects were assigned a (Y) for "yes" or (N) for "No" if they

did or did not do their homework completions on a regular basis. Sixteen of the subjects

received "yes" for homework completions and four subjects (#9, #10, #12 and #16)

received N's for homework.

Table 4
Rates of Homework Completion (N-20)

SUBJECT	HOMEWORK	FAMILY SUPPORT
S 1	YES	
S 2	YES	
S 3	YES	
S 4	YES	
S 5	YES	
S 6	YES	
S 7	YES	
S 8	YES	
S 9	NO	FS-B
S 10	NO	
S 11	YES	
S 12	NO	
S 13	YES	
S 14	YES	FS-B
S 15	YES	
S 16	NO	FS-B
S 17	YES	
S 18	YES	
S 19	YES	FS-B
S 20	YES	

Family Support

Question 4: What is the frequency of involvement with the family support team?

The Family Support Team was involved with four of the subjects. Subject 9 was

referred to the team for (FS-O) communication problems and incompletion of assigned

work. Subject 9 was given an action plan that involved a speech-language assessment,

physical from the nurse, and the subject had to use his agenda book for communication

between the teacher and parent. This subject was also involved in the Reading Recovery program, a Buddy System, and group counseling. This plan was put into progress approximately five months ago. The subject was referred to the Child Study Team when Progress was not shown. Subject 9 is classified and is presently placed in a Learning/Language Disabilities program.

Subject 16 was referred for (FS-B) behavior. The subject received counseling within the classroom from the guidance counselor at this time.

Subject 19 was referred to the team for (FS-B) motivation and behavior. Subject 19 has been involved with the team all school year. The subject receives group counseling and one-on-one counseling for thirty minutes per week. This subject's behavior and academic work is regressing, therefore the subject has been referred to the Child Study Team at this time.

Attendance

Question 5: What are the attendance rates for each child in this study?

The attendance rate for each subject is calculated on the attendance chart. Fourteen subjects were present 95% of the time or better. The other six subjects' attendance rates fell between 94% to 89%. Subject 12's rate of attendance rate was 89%, this seemed to affect his overall performance in word recognition and homework completion. Subject 12 regressed in word recognition from Pre-primer level to Readiness level and received an "N" for not bringing in homework on a regular basis.

Table 5
ATTENDANCE RATES (N= 20)

SUBJECTS	POSSIBLE DAYS PRESENT	DAYS PRESENT	PERCENT RATE
S 1	87	84	97%
S 2	87	83	95%
S 3	87	87	100%
S 4	87	84	97%
S 5	87	85	97%
S 6	87	87	100%
S 7	87	86	99%
S 8	87	86	99%
S 9	87	82	94%
S 10	87	80	92%
S 11	87	82	94%
S 12	87	77	89%
S 13	87	85	97%
S 14	87	87	100%
S 15	87	78	90%
S 16	87	86	99%
S 17	87	86	99%
S 18	87	79	91%
S 19	87	82	94%
S 20	87	84	97%

Summary

Meaningful gains were made by 80% of the subjects in word recognition and reading comprehension. The subjects who had the best attendance seem to show the most progress. Those subjects who did not do homework completion on a daily basis regressed in both reading recognition and reading comprehension. Homework completion is a definite variable of whether the subjects progressed or showed regression in both areas. Attendance was another variable that effected progress. Subjects who had attendance problems did not show meaningful gains like other subjects in the study.

The Family Support Team recommended several interventions to subjects before referring them to the Child Study Team.

CHAPTER V

Summary

This study measured the gains made by students in the Success for All

program in the areas, of word recognition and reading comprehension.

Also, the study examined whether the variables of attendance rates, student behavior,

homework completion and family support effected the results of those gains. The

students participated in the Success for All reading program for sixteen weeks. Every

eight weeks they were given an assessment to measure progress or regression in word

recognition and reading comprehension. The students reading groups were adjusted

accordingly. At the end of the sixteen weeks they were administered the Jerry John's

Basic Reading Inventory word list to find their independent levels. An analysis of the

data collected revealed that 80% of the students made meaningful gains in word

recognition and reading comprehension. Students who completed their homework and

attended regularly showed the most progress. Those students who exhibited attendance

problems and did not do homework completion did not show meaningful gains in either

area.

Conclusion

At this point in the implementation of the Success for All program the

overwhelming majority of the children have showed meaningful gains in the sequence of

early reading skills development. Also, students who had excellent attendance were able

to participate in the program ninety minutes per day. The consistency of having reading

instruction for such a period of time shows satisfactory progress can be made in several

29

weeks. Homework completion was an important element of the program and was necessary in the success of the students. Those students who completed their homework daily were successful in progressing to higher levels in reading comprehension and word recognition.

Discussion and Implication

The Success for All program was found to be effective for the majority of the first graders in this school setting. The key to success depends on the availability of the student, the support at home from the adult in charge, and the expertise of the teacher to teach the material in a timely manner. If the program is implemented early in first grade the percentage of students who normally fall behind and are referred frequently to the Child Study Team should decrease in number. There should be more students attaining the normal sequence of reading skill acquisition.

Implications for Further Study

This study could be implemented over a longer period of time in order to gain longitudinal data of program effectiveness. A study of two groups could be completed in order to compare students using Success For All and another reading program. The components of reading comprehension could be measured using the Jerry John's Basic Reading Inventory including independent comprehension level. It would be helpful to have several plans to assist those students who do not come to school regularly with the present plan. A homework completion club may be necessary to assist those who do not complete homework on a daily basis to see its effectiveness for at least a full marking period. Also, an extensive longitudinal study could be completed to see how effective this

reading program is by assessing students who have been in the program up to fifth grade

to see if they are still showing progress. Overall, the initial results obtained in this study

indicates the Success for All program has lived up to its' promise of increasing the

reading achievement of disadvantaged students.

REFERENCES

Education Law Center, Inc., Newark, N.J. (1996) "Wiping Out Disadvantages: The Program and Services Needed to Supplement Regular Education for Poor School Children. 1-37.

Fass-Holmes, Barry (1997). Literature Review on the Success for All Program. *San Diego City Schools: Assessment, Research, and Reporting Team.* 718, 1-9.

Madden, Slavin, Karweit, Dolan and Wasik. (1993). Success for All; Longitudinal Effects of a Restructuring Program for Inner-City Elementary Schools. *American Educational Research,* 30, 123-147.

Nunnery, John., et. al. (1997). Effects of Full and Partial Implementations of Success for All on Student Reading Achievement in English and Spanish. *American Education Research Association.* 143, 1-31.

Ross, Steven., Smith, Lana J., Casey, Jason P. (1998) "Bridging the Gap: The Effects of the Success for All Program on Elementary School Reading Achievement as a Function of Student Ethnicity and Ability Level. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement.* 10,129-150

Slavin, Robert., et.al. (1994) "Whenever and Wherever We Choose: The Replication of Success for All". *Phi Delta Kapppen.* 75, 1-27.

Slavin, R.E. (1990). On Success for All: Defining "success" and defining "all". *Remedial and Special Education.* 11, 60-61.

Slavin, Robert E., Madden, Nancy A., (1999). Roots and Wings: Effects of Whole-School Reform on Student Achievement. *Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.* 30, 1-68.

Slavin, Robert., Madden, Nancy., Dolan, Lawerence., Wasik, Barbara., Ross, Steven., Smith, Lana. (1994). "Whenever and Wherever We Choose: The Replication of "Success for All". *Phi Delta Kappen.* 639-647.

Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Livermon, and Dolan. (1990). Success for All: First Year Outcomes of a Comprehensive Plan for Reforming Urban Education. *American Educational Research Journal.* 27, 255-278.

Slavin, R. E., Karweit, Nancy., Madden, Nancy. (1989). Effective Programs for Student At Risk. Allyn and Bacon. New York, N.Y.

Smith, Ross. and Casey. (1994) Using "Success for All" to Restructure
    Elementary Schools: A Tale of Four Cities. *American Educational Research
    Association.* 25. 30-35.

Townsend, Tony. (1997) Restructuring and Qualility : Issues for Tomorrow's
    Schools. Routledge, New York, N.Y.

Weiler, Jeanne. (1998) Success for All: A Summary of Evaluations. *ERIC   Clearinghouse
on Urgan Education.* 139, 1-6.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

Name: Alphefia L. Blount

Date & Place of Birth: May, 1959
                                         Millville, N.J.

College: Cumberland County College
                                         Vineland, New Jersey
                                         Associate of Science, 1979

                                         Glassboro State College
                                         Glassboro, New Jersey
                                         Bachelor of Arts in Elementary
                                         Education, 1986

Graduate: Rowan University
                                         Master of Arts in Learning Disabilities
                                         2002

Present Position: Learning Disabilities Teacher Consultant
                                         Child Study Team I
                                         Bridgeton Public Schools
                                         Bridgeton, N.J.