

DR. STIRLING MCDOWELL  
*Foundation*  
FOR  
RESEARCH INTO TEACHING



# **TEACHING AND LEARNING RESEARCH EXCHANGE**

On the Right Track  
with Super Start:  
Filling the Gap Created  
by Differing Levels of  
Readiness Skills

JoAnne Kasper, Jackie Etcheverry, Barb Lilly,  
Lori Rissling and Brenda Sparrow

Project #148  
October 2006

This research was partially funded through a grant from the McDowell Foundation. However, the points of view and opinions expressed in project documents are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Foundation.

The purpose of the Dr. Stirling McDowell Foundation for Research into Teaching is to fund research, inquiry and dissemination of information focusing on instruction (both teaching and learning) in the context of the public elementary and secondary education system. Specifically, it will:

- 1) contribute to knowledge about teaching and learning;
- 2) encourage educational inquiry through a wide range of methodologies;
- 3) support the involvement of practising teachers in active research projects;
- 4) encourage organizations as well as individuals to determine and act in areas of research and inquiry; and
- 5) encourage experimentation with innovative ideas and methodologies related to teaching and learning.

The Foundation is an independent charitable organization formed by the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation in 1991. It is governed by a Board of Directors with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of representatives from the educational and business communities. The selection and evaluation of projects funded by the Foundation is carried out by a teacher-led Project Review Committee. Inquiries concerning research supported by the McDowell Foundation may be directed to the following address:

Research Coordinator  
Dr. Stirling McDowell Foundation  
2317 Arlington Avenue  
Saskatoon SK S7J 2H8  
Telephone: 1-800-667-7762 or (306) 373-1660

*This project was funded through a generous gift from the Estate of the late Dorothy Rutherford Clarke.*

© 2006 by the Dr. Stirling McDowell Foundation for Research into Teaching Inc. Permission is given to use this work for educational purposes, except that authorization from the original source must be obtained for the use of any material that appears in the work with credit to another source.

---

# What It's About

---

*On The Right Track With Super Start* is a compilation of research in response to the question: **How does the systematic, activity based instruction of oral language, letter recognition and phonemic awareness affect the sustained growth in reading skills of Grade One Students?**

The study involved data from a variety of sources. Initial screening tools, standardized tests, teacher anecdotal observations and journals, as well as student interviews, were all compiled to gain insight into the effects of readiness interventions. Current literature regarding best practices in teaching reading was reviewed and influential in creating components to the Super Start program.

Through this research we were able to learn more about what is necessary to give our beginning readers a solid start on their path to literacy.

# Who We Are

---

JoAnne Kasper	Language and Literacy Consultant Living Sky School Div. #202
Jackie Etcheverry	Special Education Teacher Bready School
Barb Lilly	Special Education Teacher Battleford Central School
Lori Rissling	Grade One Teacher Bready School
Brenda Sparrow	Grade One Teacher Battleford Central School

# Who We Acknowledge

---

We appreciate the vision of Anne-Marie Merle, Superintendent of Instruction, and Kate McHarg, Superintendent of Student Services, without whose encouragement this project would never have been created.

Many teachers assisted by sharing their thoughts and concerns with us. Those insights were invaluable. Thanks to Kim Cottini, Lori Hodgins, Tammy Haugen, and Karen Miller for their commitment to our project.

We thank administrators Lyle Brenna, Mel Kozlowski, and George Ridley, under the direction of Ron Ford, Director of Education, Living Sky School Division #202, who gave us continuous support.

We also would like to thank the Dr. Stirling McDowell Foundation for Research into Teaching for providing the financial support for *On the Right Track with Super Start: Filling the Gap Created by Differing Levels of Readiness Skills*.

# Table of Contents

---

What It's About . . . . .	i
Who We Are . . . . .	i
Who We Acknowledge . . . . .	ii
Table of Contents . . . . .	1
What Others Say . . . . .	2
Our Start . . . . .	5
Our Question . . . . .	6
Preparing for the Journey . . . . .	7
Our Journey . . . . .	9
Their Stories . . . . .	11
Roadblocks to Our Journey . . . . .	14
Snapshots of the Journey: What We Learned Along the Way . . . . .	15
The Journey Continues . . . . .	16
References . . . . .	17
Appendices	
A Target Group Identification . . . . .	18
B Gates-MacGinitie . . . . .	19
C DIBELS™ . . . . .	20
D Anecdotal Observation . . . . .	21
E Student Reading Interviews . . . . .	24
F Teacher Journal Questions . . . . .	25

# What Others Say

---

In his poem Alphabet Stew, Prelutsky (1983) writes

*Words can be stuffy, as sticky as glue,  
But words can be tutored to tickle you too,  
To rumble and tumble and tingle and sing,  
To buzz like a bumblebee, coil like a spring.*

Stuffy? Sticky? Hard to decipher? What are the processes involved in helping a young child decipher a word so that it will tingle and coil like spring?

Keith Stanovich (1986) stresses the importance of enabling students to discover the joy that words can bring when he talks of the “Matthew Effect”. The name “Matthew Effect” speaks to the reference in the Bible where Matthew speaks of the rich getting richer and poor becoming poorer. In an educational context, children who come to school somewhat “wealthier” in terms of skills will continue on that path. Those who begin their school career lacking some skills will increasingly struggle if they do not get the necessary instruction to give them those skills.

When we think of a young child entering the doors of Kindergarten and the world of education, we see a child full of promise, ready to grow and delight in the vast amount of knowledge available to them. As they move through the year, we see skills develop and become established, until they are ready to move into Grade One and begin the process of formal reading instruction. Yet, some children are not quite prepared for that formal instruction. Something is missing. It’s crucial that we find a way to give a child the necessary skills to enable them to learn from formal Grade One reading instruction. It will lessen the “Matthew Effect” and launch the student into the exciting world that is revealed by words and their secrets.

Torgesen (1998) states that:

*One of the most compelling findings from recent reading research is that children who get off to a poor start in reading rarely catch up. As several studies have now documented, the poor first-grade reader almost invariably continues to be a poor reader. And the consequences of a slow start in reading become monumental as they accumulate exponentially over time.*

We need to find the most efficient way possible for these little people to enter the world of words. Grade One teachers say one of the most rewarding aspects of their teaching career is when a student achieves an “AHA!” moment.

*My student is so excited about the world of learning, her eyes open wide and she says, “Can I do MORE?”*

*Teacher*

*There is nothing more rewarding than having a student discover the world of rhyme. Instead of saying “What are you guys doing?” and feeling on the outside, they can join the fun.*

Teacher

*All of sudden, in one day it all came together for him. He was so happy to be reading. He was so happy he just kept reading, he laughed, and cried while the words just flowed out him. He was so giddy!*

Teacher

Prelutsky (1983) wants the reader to

*Juggle their letters and jumble their sound,  
Swirl them in circles and stack them in mounds,  
Twist them and tease them and turn them about,  
Teach them to dance upside down, inside out.*

When a student puts alphabetic principles together and can *juggle their letters and jumble their sounds* in order to make meaning from that print, we know they're 'on the right track'. How do we do that?

Again Torgesen (1998) states

*They (at-risk students) will benefit from the same approach to reading instruction as children with normal abilities in this area – structured, systematic, and explicit – but for this at-risk group, such instruction is not just beneficial, it is critical.*

Regie Routman (2003) uses the phrase optimal learning to highlight the importance of scaffolding:

- teacher demonstration (I do)
- shared demonstration and practice ( We do)
- independent practice. (You do)

She writes: *When teachers understand and internalize this model, teaching and learning become more effective, efficient, and enjoyable.*

This is reinforced by point 7, Curriculum Principles, (2002) in the English Language Arts K-5 curriculum.

*Teachers explain and model the needed language skills and strategies, give students opportunities to use and practice these skills and strategies, and provide opportunities for students to apply their skills and strategies.*

In summary, explicit, systematic instruction is necessary for all students to gain specific skills, but especially those at risk of struggling with the reading process. In this particular project, we wanted to look at the skills that were needed to be in place in order for students to readily access the regular Grade One reading program. We wanted students to be able to play with letters and sounds so that those letters and sounds dance upside down, inside out.

In order to ensure that students have the prerequisite skills in place, we need to recognize exactly what those skills are. Phonemic awareness is the ability to recognize individual sounds within words. It focuses solely on the oral aspect of those sounds. Phonological awareness refers to the sounds of words and language, rather than the individual sound within the words. There is a preponderance of research on these skills, but Marilyn Adams (1990) summarizes by saying

*In the end, the great values of research on prereaders may lie in the clues it gives us toward determining what the less prepared prereader needs most to learn. For these children, we have not a classroom moment to waste. The evidence strongly suggests that we must help them to develop their awareness of the phonemic composition of words, and we must also teach them the letters of the alphabet and the phonemic significance of each.*

Neuman and Roskos (1998) summarize their research as follows:

Best Practices for literacy development include:

- Print rich environment
- Integrated language experiences and explorations
- Reading and responding to literature
- Teaching skills and strategies

Catherine Snow et al (1998) state in their report:

*On average, phonological awareness has been about as strong a predictor of future reading as memory for sentences and stories, confrontation naming, and general language measures.*

They go on to say that *[w]hat is most striking about the results of the...studies is the power of early preschool language to predict reading three to five years later.*

Most of the research agrees that there are specific skills and attitudes that the prereader needs to develop as a reader. These skills are:

- Oral language competency
- Phonemic awareness
- Letter and sound recognition

What is the purpose of knowing all the sounds and letters? Prelutsky (1983) sums it up.

*Make mighty words whisper and tiny words roar  
In ways no one ever had thought of before;  
Cook an improbable alphabet stew,  
And words will reveal little secrets to you.*

The main purpose of reading is to gain meaning from words, to have those words *reveal little secrets to the reader*. It is a complex, developmental process for them to work through. We want to help them through that process and to ensure that all students can find the joy that words can bring.

# Our Start

---

In response to concerns expressed by teachers that students were not equipped with the prerequisite skills to begin reading, our division initiated the formation of a committee to develop a program that would help those children who needed those skills.

Based on research, the committee determined that systematic, explicit instruction in the areas of oral language development, letter recognition, and phonemic awareness facilitate success in learning to read.

We then developed a research-based program – Super Start – which was delivered to all Grade One students in the legacy Battlefords School Division in the fall of 2004- 2005, and again in the fall of 2006. Since we are now the amalgamated Living Sky School Division, we have some schools using the program for the first time. Based on the results of a screening tool that looked at letter recognition and phonemic awareness, students were divided into groups and were instructed in either the Super Start (readiness skills) or Pace Cars (beginning writing skills enrichment) program. The Grade One teacher and the Special Education teacher were involved in the delivery of the program. The program ran for one hour every day, in addition to the regular Grade One program, and lasted for about two months. Grade One teachers indicated that their students were supplied with tools to begin the decoding process so integral to beginning reading. The post screen results administered after the program delivery indicated a high degree of improvement.

## *SUPER START TIMELINE*

<b>2003-2004</b>	<b>2004-2005</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>	<b>2006-2007</b>
Super Start creation. Research, writing and printing	Implementation in nine schools in BSD	Continued in 9 schools and implemented in 3	Continued in 11 schools and implemented in 7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Positive results shown from data collected and positive feedback from teachers</li> <li>• Raised deeper questions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous positive results and feedback</li> <li>• Essential question – Does Super Start promote sustained growth?</li> <li>• Dr. Stirling McDowell grant received and action research conducted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. Stirling McDowell Report concluded</li> </ul>

# Our Question

---

Based on the data collected from the first year of implementation, we knew that the immediate results were successful, but were unsure of the sustained benefits of the program. Our discussion began by asking several questions, such as: Does the Super Start program provide enough foundation for regular program instruction? Do the initial successful results lead to long term success? Were there any new strategies or insights gained by the teachers involved in delivering the program? This led to one overarching question to guide our research:

**How does the systematic, activity-based instruction of oral language, letter recognition, and phonemic awareness affect the sustained growth in reading skills of Grade One students?**

# Preparing for the Journey

---

## IDENTIFICATION OF TARGET CLASSROOMS

We aimed for a diverse sample of classrooms – rural, urban, and varying socio-economic communities. Five Grade One teachers volunteered to participate in gathering data and observations.

## IDENTIFICATION OF TARGET GROUP

Students entering Grade One were administered a simple screen on letter recognition and phonemic awareness. Based on those results, they were placed in either the Super Start (readiness) or Pace Car (enrichment) program. Following the delivery of the program the students were given the identical screen. Those students who initially lacked the readiness skills – but indicated substantial growth when provided with systematic instruction – became our target group.

## MONITORING THE TARGET GROUP

### **GATES-MACGINITIE**

This standardized group test provided an indication of the level of a student's vocabulary and comprehension skills. It was administered in the fall, near the end of Super Start delivery, and again in the spring. This allowed us to see not only if the readiness skills were in place, but if they transferred into the reading processes of vocabulary development and comprehension.

### **DIBELS™ NONSENSE WORD FLUENCY**

*This test is a standardized, individually administered test of the alphabetic principle-including letter-sound correspondence and the ability to blend letters into words in which letters represent their most common sounds (Good & Kaminski, 1996). It was administered in October and January.*

### **ANECDOTAL INFORMATION**

We developed a questionnaire for participating Grade One teachers to fill out in November, March and June. The purpose was to indicate the strengths and weaknesses of their readers. This questionnaire was filled out by the classroom teacher and allowed them to look at the child as a whole, and how they fit into the role of school learner.

### **STUDENT READING SURVEYS**

Students were asked for their perceptions about reading and themselves as readers, in October and again in March.

## TEACHER JOURNALS

Participating teachers kept a journal with guided questions in which they recorded their observations. Their responses were collected in October, March and June.

## DATA COLLECTION TIMELINE

	<b>Oct</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>March</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>June</b>
Anecdotal Observations	X		X	X	
Reading Interviews	X		X		
DIBELS™	X	X			
Gates-MacGinitie	X			X	
Teacher Journal	X		X		X

# Our Journey

---

## TARGET GROUP IDENTIFICATION

Refer to Appendix A for Super Start screening scores.

The students who achieved the Super Start benchmarks of success in prereading skills were targeted for further tracking. In this report they are referred to as target students. We followed their progress throughout the year to determine if they were experiencing success in their reading development.

## GATES-MACGINITIE

Refer to Appendix B for Gates-MacGinitie test results.

We focused on the total score, which is a combination of the vocabulary and comprehension scores. Using the spring norms, nine out of sixteen target students were meeting or exceeding grade equivalent expectations, four students were slightly below grade level and three were in an area of concern.

## DIBELS™

Refer to Appendix C for DIBELS™ scores.

This test does not provide a clear benchmark for October's scores. However, it does provide mid year benchmarks of fifty sounds per minute as a goal, with below thirty sounds per minute indicating cause for concern. If we use a score thirty sounds per minute as our initial benchmark in October, our results show that twelve out of eighteen target students fall into this area of concern. The mid year DIBELS™ scores show that seven out of eighteen students met or exceeded the benchmark of fifty sounds per minute, with three out of the eighteen remaining in the area of concern with a score below thirty.

## ANECDOTAL COMMENTS

Refer to Appendix D to see the specific questions asked of teachers.

Even though anecdotal records are subjective and do not give empirical data, common themes emerged.

- Anecdotal comments indicated that as students developed reading skills, finger tracking was replaced by visual sweeping of the eyes.
- Weaker readers didn't realize that they could use picture clues to aid in gathering meaning from the text.
- Teacher comments about phonetic skills show that a gap is widening as the year progresses which impacted fluency.

- Throughout the year target students struggled with realizing that words hold meaning which impeded over all comprehension.
- A common theme is the lack of motivation and disinterest in reading of a few of the target students. The interested students became richer as outlined by the “Matthew Effect”. Teachers mentioned those who lacked interest began to develop survival skills such as fake reading and avoidance behaviours.
- Confidence is an attitude that teachers noticed enabled their students to develop as readers.
- Teachers commented that attention difficulties, home situations, irregular attendance, and level of parental support influenced the development of students.

# Their Stories

---

## STUDENT READING INTERVIEWS

Refer to Appendix E for reading interview questions.

The reading interviews provided insights into students' perceptions regarding themselves as readers as well as reading. Common themes evolved.

- They all could identify a reader.
- They all identified sounding out as the major strategy and could list others.  
*"Sound it out. I love that sounding out thing, except when there's an e at the end."*

*Student*
- They knew about what helped them become a reader – flashcards, etc.  
*"There's no such things as can't, just keep trying."*

*Student*

*"Practice, practice, practice."*

*Student*
- They identified their families as the prime source of learning to read.  
*"After I read my mom says, "Way to go!"*

*Student*

  
*"My mom might teach me to read someday in March when I'm 10 years old."*

*Student*
- Teachers were not identified as a source.  
*"I'll get to be a better reader by reading lessons at someone's house."*

*Student*
- Most students like to read.  
*"I like to read because there is important stuff to know when buying dirt bikes."*

*Student*
- The majority viewed themselves as good readers.  
*"Teacher, you know I'm a genius."*

*Student*

  
*"I try my best but sometimes I'm not that good. I'm better in the morning than at night."*

*Student*

# TEACHER JOURNALS

Refer to Appendix F to see specific teacher journal questions.

Teacher journals showed how much thought and concern they put into their students' growth. Their comments encompassed a wide variety of emotions.

## INSPIRATION

*Students have a strong desire to read. They love to read and listen to stories. They have strong parental support and reading is seen as a valuable skill to have.*

Teacher

*One success is that the students are decoding words not just guessing. They are remembering the little rules we have taught them and applying them to decoding.*

Teacher

*My class's greatest strength as far as learning to read is their desire to learn and their love of books.*

Teacher

## FRUSTRATION

*I still have one little boy who could care less if he ever learned to read. My frustration is that I need to figure out a way to get through to him.*

Teacher

*I am frustrated that some children are so transient. Although this is not something I can control I can only do my best to take these students as far as I can in the time that I have them.*

Teacher

*I'm frustrated that I have a lack of time to listen to each one individually.*

Teacher

## SURPRISE

*I am pleasantly surprised with the level they are at.*

Teacher

*I am surprised about how well my home reading program is going. I expected to be chasing down books everyday but for the most part students are exchanging books daily.*

Teacher

*I am surprised that despite my best efforts I still have 2 non-readers*

Teacher

*By the end of her story, she was reading the majority of the words by herself. She felt really good about herself and wanted to read more (where usually she gives up quite easily). The surprise was in the small amount of effort it took on my part to create a positive feeling on her part.*

*Teacher*

## **WISHES**

*Parents need to understand that they are an important teacher in their children's lives.*

*Teacher*

*Kids need one on one time which I am unable to give.*

*Teacher*

*My greatest concern is that the gap is going to widen and increase between those who can and those who cannot read and I'm afraid I may have to leave some behind in a sense and not fully meet their needs.*

*Teacher*

# Roadblocks to Our Journey

---

As in everything journey, some detours and roadblocks occurred. This project was no different.

1. Our target group was small. It involved twenty-three students and three of those students moved away in the midst of the project. We did not create a comparison group of students who did not receive Super Start to track their reading development.
2. It would have been useful for us to follow students into Grade Two and see if their reading development was proceeding.
3. We realized that we needed to clarify our language in our questionnaires, anecdotal comments and journal question. Not everyone has the exact same understanding of tracking, etc. Reading is a complex process and teachers may focus on different components involved in the process. We needed to be more specific in what information we wanted.
4. There were a few students whose data indicated they needed intervention. We wanted to find an intervention for them so they could be successful, but that was not within the parameters of this project.
5. Amalgamation of our division caused some disruptions.

# Snapshots of the Journey: What We Learned Along the Way

---

There are only so many times you can teach the sounds. It's at this point that students need the intervention of other strategies.

Students can only gain meaning from the text when they have a solid basis with oral language, fluent letter/sound recognition and strong phonemic awareness.

Teachers have influence over students' perceptions of themselves as learners. Confident readers become competent readers. Aggressive readers are risk takers not afraid to try. Most students come to Grade One with an "I CAN" attitude. As the gap widens between readers and non-readers, students begin to compare where they fit and their confidence can begin to wane. Teachers need to be cognizant of their role in the construction or destruction of that confidence.

We were taken aback by the overwhelming indications of the importance of family, almost to the exclusion of the role of the teacher in reading instruction. Over and over again, children talked about how their mom and dad taught them to read and who could help them to read. Their parents would help them when the classroom couldn't.

Children were extremely observant of reading behaviours. Seeing their parents read gave them a purpose for learning to read.

*Mom reads for fun, dad reads papers for work.*

*Student*

If students are identified quickly the interventions may not need to be as intensive. When trying to identify learning disabilities and specific learning difficulties, it often takes a while to peel the layers away. Early identification processes helped peel the layers quicker and allowed intervention to be more focused and meaningful.

When thinking about our research question we learned the following:

- Even though the target students were generally successful, there were students that needed extra support. Despite the systematic instruction provided to them, they were unable to achieve mastery. Simply re-teaching them the letters and sounds again is not enough. Other programs and strategies need to be put in place for them.
- There were students who mastered the sound/symbol relationship skills, but did not transfer that knowledge into the reading process. They are unable to blend and decode words.
- The focus on the phonetic aspect of reading is necessary only in that it assists in making meaning from text. Phonetic instruction must always have that implicit goal in mind. It is one aspect of a comprehensive English Language Arts program.

# The Journey Continues

---

Stuffy? Sticky? Hard to decipher? YES!!!! In order to make *mighty words whisper* and tiny words roar, many processes are involved. Through this research we were able to learn more about what is necessary to provide the ingredients for that *improbable alphabet stew*.

With this in mind, we have come to believe that:

- Strong Kindergarten programs that align with the Grade One program are essential to student success. Alignment of the Kindergarten and Grade One programs will help students *juggle, jumble, and swirl* the letters until they become words.
- Students need different types of texts – maps, nonfiction, pictures. Their unique personalities react to a variety of texts. If we want to get all our students interested and excited about reading, they need exposure to what will excite and interest them.
- Our students show us that they do not all learn in the same way. Some students will need a program based on sight words instead of phonetics. Our professional responsibility is to ensure that we have a strong knowledge of our students and of multiple methods of teaching reading. It is also our responsibility to adapt these methods when necessary.
- There's more to reading than decoding. Students can listen to someone read as they look at the words, they may read a story by actually reading the pictures, or they can truly read the words. Teach ways to read – listen, look, read. Feeling like a reader builds confidence.
- Family is a major ingredient in the reading process. Educators need to recognize that the family is the strongest role model and a major influence in the development of reading attitudes and abilities. Students perceive that it is their families who are the ones who teach them to read and we need to acknowledge that fact. Parents and teachers are allies in the literacy development of their child, our student.

Students deserve the strongest start possible for their learning journey. Along our research journey we have discovered that there are many paths to reading success, not all of them clearly defined. We encourage you to seek a path that will lead your students to find the *little secrets that words reveal*.

# References

---

- Adams, Marilyn J. (1995). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Cowen, John E. (2003). *A balanced approach to beginning reading instruction*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Good III, R. H., Kaminski, R. A. (Eds). (2002) *Dynamic indicators of basic early literacy skills (DIBELS)* (6th ed.). Eugene, OR: Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement. University of Oregon, Oregon: University of Oregon Center on Teaching and Learning.  
Retrieved September 2004  
<https://dibels.uoregon.edu/measures/materials.php>
- Elliot, Barbara A. (1996) *A resource manual for teaching phonemic awareness skills in the early grades*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Barb Elliot.
- International Reading Association. (1999). Using multiple methods of beginning reading instruction: A position statement of the international reading association. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.  
Retrieved September 2005  
[http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1033\\_multiple\\_methods.pdf](http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1033_multiple_methods.pdf)
- Neuman, Susan B. & Roskos, Kathleen A. (1998). *Children achieving: Best practices in early literacy*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Prelutsky, Jack (1983). Alphabet stew. *Random house book of poetry*. Toronto, Canada, Random House of Canada.
- Routman, Regie. (2003). *Reading essentials: the specifics you need to teach reading well*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Saskatchewan Learning (2002) English language arts: a curriculum guide for the elementary level (K-5)
- Snow, C. E., Burns, M. S., & Griffin, P. (Eds).. (1998) *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Stanovich, Keith E. (1986). *Matthew effects in reading: some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy* Reading Research Quarterly 21 (4), 360-407.  
Retrieved September 2005  
<http://leo.oise.utoronto.ca/%7Ekstanovich/pdfs/reading/RRQ86.pdf>
- Torgesen, Joesph K. (1998) Catch them before they fall identification and assessment to prevent reading failure in young children *American Educator* Spring/Summer 1998  
Retrieved April 2006  
[http://www.ldonline.org/ld\\_indepth/reading/torgeson\\_catchthem.html](http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/reading/torgeson_catchthem.html).
- Trehearne, Miriam P. at al. (2004) *Nelson language Arts Grade 1-2 teachers' resource book*. Toronto, ON: Thomson Nelson.

# Appendix A: Target Group Identification

---

Name	Super Start Pretest	Super Start Post test
Letter/sound recognition /52		
<b>Class A</b>		
Student 1	14	50
Student 2	15	43
Student 3	17	50
Student 4	8	28
<b>Class B</b>		
Student 5	26	52
Student 6	23	50
Student 7	17	51
Student 8	12	47
<b>Class C</b>		
Student 9	22	45
Student 10	35	47
Student 11	28	48
Student 12	28	46
<b>Class D</b>		
Student 13	18	52
Student 14	22	50
Student 15	18	51
<b>Class E</b>		
Student 16	25	23
Student 17	30	44
Student 18	29	41
Student 19	21	48

# Appendix B: Gates-MacGinitie

---

Gates-MacGinitie	Fall <i>Level R, Form 3</i>	Spring <i>Level A Form 3</i>		
	GE Total	GE Voc	GE. Comp	GE Total
<b>Class A</b>				
Student 1	1.6	2.5	2.5	2.6
Student 2	K	2.2	2.2	2.1
Student 3	K	2.4	2.6	2.6
Student 4	K	1.2	K	1.2
<b>Class B</b>				
Student 5	1.5	2.5	2.2	2.3
Student 6	1.5	2.1	K	1.7
Student 7	1.5	moved		
Student 8	1.4	3.3	4.8	3.6
<b>Class C</b>				
Student 9	1.1	2.5	1.6	1.9
Student 10	1.3	2.5	2.2	2.4
Student 11	1.2	2.2	1.8	1.8
Student 12	1.4	2.1	2.2	2.1
<b>Class D</b>				
Student 13	1.5	2.1	2.1	1.9
Student 14	1.5	2.1	1.2	1.7
Student 15	1.1	2.5	2.3	2.5
<b>Class E</b>				
Student 16	K	moved		
Student 17	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.6
Student 18	1.1	1.7	K	1.5
Student 19	K	moved		

# Appendix C: DIBELS™

## DIBELS™ Nonsense Word Fluency Grade One

<b>DIBELS™</b>	<b>Benchmark 1 October</b>	<b>Benchmark 2 January</b>
	Score /139	Score /142
<b>CLASS A</b>		
Student 1	19	50
Student 2	11	39
Student 3	33	49
Student 4	1	26
<b>CLASS B</b>		
Student 5	28	59
Student 6	39	44
Student 7	28	37
Student 8	49	59
<b>CLASS C</b>		
Student 9	16	25
Student 10	17	59
Student 11	9	55
Student 12	9	31
<b>CLASS D</b>		
Student 13	21	34
Student 14	32	40
Student 15	26	26
<b>CLASS E</b>		
Student 16	14	34
Student 17	40	60
Student 18	32	34
Student 19	35	moved

\*mid Grade One expectations is 50 sounds per minute, with a core of 30 sounds per minute or below being worthy of concern

# Appendix D: Anecdotal Observations

---

## **ANECDOTAL OBSERVATIONS #1 & 2**

Please make comments on the following skills of the student.

- Tracking
- Picture clues
- Phonetic skills
- Making word sense
- Interest and enjoyment
- Confidence
- Choice in books
- Fluency
- Where have you seen the most growth in this student?
- What are the student's strengths when reading?
- What are the student's weaknesses when reading?
- What steps are being taken to address the weakness?
- Are there any external factors affecting the student's progress, i.e. attendance, attention, illness, etc.?

## **ANECDOTAL OBSERVATIONS #3**

Please make comments on the following skills of the student.

### **Tracking**

By the end of Grade One some student may have developed sufficient skills that make tracking unnecessary. Teachers may emphasize it less. Indicate which stage this student is at.

- tracks with finger to follow print
- visual sweeping with eyes
- tracks with finger to keep on task

*Comments*

### **Picture clues**

Readers use cues in the pictures to solve words and to gain meaning

*Comments*

**Phonetic skills**

Specific skills are taught, but the expectation may vary from teacher to teacher. Indicate which skills are mastered and have been introduced.

	Skill introduced by teacher	Skill mastered by student
Short vowels		
Long vowels		
Blends		
Diagraphs		

*Comments*

**Comprehension**

What are the indicators that this student does or does not understand?

	Always	Sometimes	Occasionally
Reread			
Stops			
Ignores errors			
Substitutes with meaning			
Substitutes without meaning			

*Comments*

**Interest and enjoyment**

What indicates the level of interest and enjoyment in reading?

*Comments*

**Confidence**

*Comments*

**Choice in books**

*Comments*

**Fluency**

- letter by letter
- word by word
- phrases
- sentences

*Comments*

- Where have you seen the most growth in this student?
  
- What are the student's strengths when reading?
  
- What are the student's weaknesses when reading?
  
- What steps are being taken to address the weakness?
  
- Are there any external factors affecting the student's progress, i.e. attendance, attention, illness, etc. ?

# Appendix E: Student Reading Interviews

---

## Reading Interview One

Sample Reading Interview for Emergent/Early Developing Readers  
Saskatchewan ELA curriculum, pg. 145

## Reading Interview Two

A Reading Survey – What Do You Think?  
Assessment Blackline Master 15, pg. 536  
Grade 1-2 Teacher’s Resource Book, Nelson Thomson Learning

# Appendix F: Teacher Journal Questions

---

## **OCTOBER QUESTIONS**

- What's happening in reading today?
- What's going well?
- What needs more work?
- Are there any surprises?
- What is one success you see in your students?
- What is one frustration you feel about your students?
- What is one success you see in your program?
- What is one frustration you feel about your program?
- What is one success you see in your teaching?
- What is one frustration you feel about your teaching?
- What supports do you need to deliver your program?

## **MARCH QUESTIONS**

- What's happening in reading today?
- What's going well?
- Are there any surprises?
- Is there a gap starting to form between those who are “taking off” and those who are at different stages?
- What works well with your class?
- What is a struggle?

## **JUNE QUESTIONS**

- What's happening in reading today?
- Based on your reflective experience, is this class where they should be at this time of year?
- What are the strengths and weakness of the class as a whole when it comes to reading?
- Is there a gap between the “readers” and “non-readers”?
- Where do your target students fit within the spectrum of ability to read?
- Can you give a very brief summary of the make-up of your class including average number of students enrolled and in attendance, as well as a brief outline of the program you use to instruct reading?





**2317 Arlington Avenue  
Saskatoon SK Canada S7J 2H8  
Phone: 306-373-1660  
Toll Free: 1-800-667-7762  
Fax: 306-374-1122  
E-mail: [mcdowell@stf.sk.ca](mailto:mcdowell@stf.sk.ca)**

**[www.mcdowellfoundation.ca](http://www.mcdowellfoundation.ca)**