

**CHARACTERISTICS OF KINDERGARTEN READING INSTRUCTION
AND INTERVENTION ASSOCIATED WITH GROWTH FOR AT-RISK
STUDENTS**

An Undergraduate Research Scholars Thesis

by

ANAIS CHARLEZ

Submitted to the Undergraduate Research Scholars program
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the designation as an

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOLAR

Approved by
Research Advisor:

Dr. Nathan Clemens

May 2016

Major: Interdisciplinary Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	1
DEDICATION	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
NOMENCLATURE	4
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	5
Characteristics related to instruction and intervention	5
Objectives	8
II METHODS	9
Participants	9
Measures	9
III RESULTS	13
Analyses	13
Letter-Sound Fluency Results	13
Phonemic Awareness Results	14
Word Identification Results	15
IV DISCUSSION	18
Results Summary	18
Limitations	20
Implications for Practice	21
Conclusions	22
REFERENCES	23
APPENDIX	24

ABSTRACT

Characteristics of Kindergarten Reading Instruction and Intervention Associated with Growth for At-Risk Kindergarten Students

Anais Charlez
Department of Educational Psychology
Texas A&M University

Research Advisor: Dr. Nathan Clemens
Department of Educational Psychology

This study explored how different characteristics of reading instruction for kindergarten students can affect the development of foundational reading skills for students who enter kindergarten at-risk for reading failure. Study participants included a total of 213 kindergarten students and 37 kindergarten teachers. All participants were located across various parts of Texas and represented a range of ethnicities. Students' reading growth was assessed with tests of phonological awareness, letter-sound fluency, and word identification, and information was gathered on teachers' instructional characteristics using questionnaires and interview forms. Analyses investigated differences in students' rates of growth according to the amount of teachers' reading instruction per week, number of students in instructional groups, type of skills targeted during reading interventions, and methods of instruction used during reading intervention.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my soon-to-be husband, Felipe Gonzalez. Without whom I would not have had the motivation needed to continue working on this project. Thank you for being my support system, taking care of me when I'm stressed, and loving me when I don't love myself. I know that you will continue to treat me like a princess for the rest of our lives and cannot wait to spend forever with you. I love you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Clemens for being the best research advisor that I could have asked for. Without his help and constant patience, no part of this paper would have been possible. I have learned so much about this field through him. I thank him for taking time out of his busy workweek, and sometimes weekends, to coach me through this on-going process. He helped me to realize that writing is a strength of mine and that nothing you write will ever be perfect.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Byrns. She believed I had the potential to produce a thesis all on my own and recommended me for the program. I thank her for always having an open door, for being considerate and kind, and for taking the time to listen to my frustrations when I encountered obstacles inside and outside the classroom. This whole process started with her.

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant Award No. R324A130214 to Dr. Nathan Clemens at Texas A&M University. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent views of the U.S. Department of Education.

NOMENCLATURE

LSF	Letter-Sound Fluency
PA	Phonological Awareness
WID	Word Identification
WRMT-III	Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests – Third Edition

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The National Reading Panel (2000) identified five foundational skills that are essential to learning how to read. These five skills include phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. For kindergarten students, these skills include phonological awareness, the alphabetic principle (linking letters to sounds), and reading words. Students that have trouble acquiring these reading skills are considered to be at-risk for long-term reading failure. Fortunately, research has shown that effective instruction and targeted intervention in kindergarten can improve reading skills and prevent long-term reading difficulties (Cavanaugh, Kim, Wanzek & Vaughn, 2004).

Characteristics related to instruction and intervention

There are several characteristics related to instruction and intervention that may impact acquisition of kindergarten reading skills. This study investigated three variables associated with kindergarten reading instruction and their impact on the growth of reading skills for at-risk students: (1) amount of time spent in supplemental instruction, (2) group size used for supplemental instruction, and (3) the skills targeted in supplemental instruction.

Instructional time

The amount of time dedicated per day to general reading instruction can have an influence on students' reading performance. Simmons et al. (2007) compared the amount of time spent on phonemic, alphabetic, and orthographic instruction by providing students with either fifteen or

thirty minutes of specified instruction. Findings indicated that although the fifteen-minute time period produced the same results as the thirty-minute period in the areas of phonological awareness, the shorter time period was not as effective in increasing other aspects such as word reading.

The amount of time allocated to supplemental reading interventions is also important. According to O'Connor, Fulmer, Harty, and Bell (2005), students who spent ten to fifteen minutes in small group instruction three times a week “increased in participation, response accuracy, and appropriate application to reading and writing task demands” (p. 446). Further, Cavanaugh et al. (2004) found that interventions that occurred at least two to three times per week for at least eight weeks were associated with greater growth. Therefore, one would expect that providing students at-risk with only whole class instruction is not enough. For these students to succeed, teachers must follow whole class instruction with supplemental instruction that is targeted towards the particular skill being learned.

Group size

In today's classrooms, teachers are changing the ways in which they deliver instruction. There are essentially two different methods a teacher can use: whole class and small group. Whole class instruction is the traditional form of teaching, where the teacher engages the whole class in his/her lesson at the same time. In small group instruction, the teacher divides the class into smaller groups and delivers instruction to one group at a time. O'Connor et al. (2005), found that teaching in smaller groups of ten students allowed teachers to monitor individual progress more efficiently and provided more opportunities for student participation.

Size of intervention groups can also have an effect of students' progress. Many kindergarten teachers provide interventions to their students in small groups of two to five students. For those students who require a more intense intervention, teachers provide one-on-one instruction. Cavanaugh et al. (2004) looked at interventions for students that occurred in whole class, small group, and individual settings. The whole class model for interventions was determined to be unsuccessful since many of the students did not require intervention. The small group interventions included groups of students ranging from two to seven and three to five. The studies that utilized these small group interventions yielded significant increases in reading growth. As for the individual interventions, results displayed positive outcomes as students continued to make significant growth towards reading on grade level.

Targeted Skills

The early literacy skills and curricula that teachers use for reading instruction with young students can vary widely between schools, districts, and states. Not only does the curricula being used vary, but the content of said curricula changes. Many of the educational programs in use focus on first learning the alphabet then learning the sounds of each letter. From there, students move onto blending and segmenting sounds and, eventually, being able to read words. These programs use skills such as the alphabetic principle, phonics, letter-sound fluency, and phonemic and phonological awareness.

One of the skills a student will learn in kindergarten is naming speed, being able to quickly and correctly name letters, colors, and even digits. Research has suggested that being able rapidly

name objects and letters with automaticity in kindergarten is a predictor of future reading outcomes. In 2005, the National Early Literacy Panel reported a connection between comprehension and early literacy skills with rapid letter naming, phonological awareness, and decoding words. Cavanaugh et al. (2004) found that kindergarten instruction that emphasized phonological awareness was associated with greater reading growth than instruction that did not.

Thus, although studies have observed how differences in, instruction, group size, and targeted skills can impact kindergarten students' reading acquisition, research is limited. Additional research is needed to investigate differences in reading curricula and instructional characteristics occurring in Texas schools and the separate and combined consequences on students' early reading growth.

Objectives

This study investigated how characteristics of kindergarten reading intervention are associated with growth in three types of foundational reading skills (phonological awareness, letter-sound fluency, and word reading) for kindergarten students at-risk for reading difficulties. Based on previous research, it is hypothesized that the total amount of time spent in supplemental reading instruction, the number of students in the supplemental instruction groups, and the skills targeted in supplemental instruction will affect reading growth for students in the sample. The results of this study are expected to provide educators with a better insight into the intervention characteristics associated with stronger reading growth among kindergarteners with reading difficulties.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

This section discusses the participants and measures that were used in this study.

Participants

This study utilized data that were collected as part of a larger ongoing project. Kindergarten students ($N = 213$) were recruited from 10 schools in rural, suburban, and urban areas of Texas. Students were determined to be at-risk for reading difficulty at the start of kindergarten. Risk status was based on (a) students that were nominated by their teachers as experiencing difficulty in early literacy, and (b) scoring below the 40th percentile on either the phonological awareness test or letter identification test of the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests – Third Edition (WRMT – III). The group was comprised of 54.7% male and 45.3% female students. The demographic makeup of the sample was 51.6% Hispanic/Latino, 25.8% African American, 19.7% White, 1.2% Asian, and 1.6% other/multiple ethnicities. A total of 37 teachers participated in the study. These teachers were generally responsible for general classroom instruction and implementation of interventions.

Measures

Students' reading skills were assessed as part of the larger project across the kindergarten school year. Students were assessed in the fall, winter, and spring of kindergarten. Four measures were included: letter sound fluency, phonological awareness, word identification, and an instruction

interview form. Of these four measures, the phonological awareness and word identification tests were taken from the WRMT-III.

Letter-sound fluency

Letter-sound fluency (LSF) is part of the AIMSweb, a system of assessments. On LSF students are prompted to say the sounds of letters within one minute (Pearson, 2012). LSF measures a student's ability to name the most common sounds associated with printed letters within one minute. According to the AIMSweb Technical Manual (2012), the reliability of the LSF ranges from .82 to .83. When used to predict scores on the Broad Reading and Reading Skills composites of the Woodcock-Johnson-Revised, the validity of the LSF ranges from .58 to .72 (Pearson, 2012). The LSF measure was administered every two weeks, however, for the purpose of this paper, only data from the fall, winter, and spring will be used.

Phonological awareness

The Phonological Awareness (PA) subtest from the WRMT-III is designed to measure a student's awareness of phonemes and syllables. The test is divided into five sections: first-sound matching, last-sound matching, rhyme production, blending, and deletion. The first two sections, first-sound matching and last-sound matching, are administered in a similar manner. The examiner points to a stimulus picture and gives the name for that object. The examiner then points to and names three items. The student must then state the object name or point to the picture that has the corresponding first-or-last-sound as the stimulus picture. In rhyme production, the student is asked to produce a real or made-up word that rhymes with a given word. For the blending section, the student must combine phonemes that the examiner has given

in order to produce the correct word. In the last section, deletion, the student must produce a word without a phoneme or syllable of the stimulus word. All items within the phonological awareness test are scored with a 0 or 1. The first-sound matching, last-sound matching, and rhyme production subtests have no ceiling, meaning that the entire section must be given to the student. The last two sections, blending and deletion are stopped once the student has incorrectly answered four consecutive questions. Alternate-form reliability is reported at .78 (Pearson, 2011). Validity correlations range from .53 to .82 among other tests of reading readiness (Pearson, 2011). PA was administered once in the fall, winter, and spring.

Word identification

Word Identification (WID) is a subtest from the WRMT-III. During the word identification test, students are required to name words in the stimulus book (Pearson, 2011). The items increase in difficulty as the student progresses. The examiner must be aware of all possible pronunciations for the items given. All items are scored with a 0 or 1 and the test ends after four consecutive scores of 0. Alternate-form reliability is reported at .91 (Pearson, 2011). Validity correlations range from .71 to .84 among other tests of reading readiness (Pearson, 2011). WID was administered once in the fall, winter, and spring.

Instruction interview form

An instruction interview form developed for the project recorded the types of instruction each student received, who delivered the instruction, the group size, and the number of minutes per week spent on that form of instruction. Teachers also provided the percent of time they spent teaching reading skills (alphabetic/phonological awareness, word study/phonics, reading

connected text, comprehension, writing, and other). Information from teachers was collected during the fall and spring semesters of kindergarten. A sample of the instruction interview forms used can be found in the Appendix.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Analyses

Pearson pairwise correlation analyses were conducted to investigate the relations between growth in Letter-Sound Fluency (LSF), Phonological Awareness (PA), and Word Identification (WID) and the intervention and instructional variables. Before running the analyses, it was necessary to first calculate the amount of growth participants made in LSF, PA, and WID for both the fall and spring semesters. Growth scores were calculated for each subtest by subtracting the students' final score from their initial score. Separate growth scores were calculated for the fall and spring semesters because teacher interview data were collected in separate occasions during the fall and spring. Using Pearson correlations, the growth scores were then correlated with the number of intervention minutes per week participants received, the size of the intervention groups, and the percentage of time that intervention targeted the skills associated with LSF, PA, and WID. Results for the fall and spring are reported in Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Letter-Sound Fluency Results

Results of the analyses with the fall intervention variables and LSF growth are reported in Table 1. As stated in the table, no correlation was observed between LSF growth during the fall and the amount of time students received in supplemental intervention ($r = .04$), suggesting that the amount of time devoted to additional support in the fall semester was not associated with greater LSF growth during the fall. Furthermore, the correlation between LSF fall growth and the

intervention group size ($r = .15$) as well as the percentage of time teachers reported that they targeted alphabetic and phonological awareness skills ($r = -.14$) during the fall was not statistically significant, therefore no relation can be inferred between these two variables for the fall semester.

Results of the analyses with the spring intervention variables and spring LSF growth are reported in Table 2. As conveyed in Table 2, spring LSF growth was correlated with group size at .27, which was statistically significant ($p < .01$). This correlation suggests that the amount of time dedicated to additional support in the spring semester was associated with greater LSF growth during the spring. Spring LSF growth was correlated with group size at -.05 for the spring semester, indicating no observed relation between intervention group size and LSF growth during the spring. The correlation between LSF spring growth and the percentage of time teachers targeted alphabetic and phonological awareness skills during the spring was not statistically significant ($r = -.14$), thus no relation can be gathered between these two variables for the spring.

Phonemic Awareness Results

Table 1 reports the results of the analyses with the fall intervention variables and fall PA growth. No correlation was observed between PA fall growth and the amount of time students received supplement intervention ($r = .07$). This indicates that the amount of time spent giving additional support in the fall was not related with PA growth during the fall. PA growth was not correlated with group size ($r = -.01$) for the fall semester, meaning that there is no observed relationship

between the two. Similarly, there was correlation between fall PA growth and the amount of time teachers spent targeting phonemic awareness skills ($r = .07$).

Table 2 reports the results of the analyses with the spring intervention variables and spring PA growth. No correlation was observed between PA spring growth and the amount of time students received supplement intervention ($r = .08$). This implies that the amount of time spent giving additional support in the spring was not related with PA growth during the spring. Spring PA growth was not correlated with spring intervention group size ($r = -.02$) or the amount of time teachers spent targeting phonemic awareness skills ($r = -.14$), therefore, no relation was observed.

Word Identification Results

Results of the analyses for fall intervention variables and WID growth are shown in Table 1. No correlation was observed between the amount of time students received supplemental intervention and WID growth ($r = .14$). Fall WID growth was not correlated with fall intervention group size ($r = .04$) or the amount of time teachers spent targeting sight-word reading ($r = .05$).

Results of the analyses for spring intervention variables and WID growth are depicted in Table 2. As seen in Table 2, no correlation was observed between WID growth during the spring and the amount of time student received in supplemental intervention ($r = -.06$), suggesting that the amount of time devoted to additional support in the spring semester was not associated with greater LSF growth during the spring. In contrast, spring WID growth was correlated with group

size at $-.19$ for the spring semester, which was statistically significant ($p < .05$). Despite the fact that the correlation was weak, it being statistically significant in the negative direction suggests that as the size of the intervention group decreased, it was associated with, to some degree, greater WID growth during the spring. On the other hand, there was no correlation between WID spring growth and the amount of time teachers spent targeting sight-word reading ($r = -.09$).

Table 1 – Pearson Correlations among Intervention Variables and Fall Growth in Early Reading Skills

Growth Variable	Intervention Minutes/Week	Intervention Group Size	Percent Time Skill Targeted
LSF Fall Growth	.04	.15	-.14
PA Fall Growth	.07	-.01	.07
WID Fall Growth	.14	.04	.05

Note: LSF – Letter-Sound Fluency; PA – Phonological Awareness; WID – Word Identification; Percent Time Skill Targeted – The percentage of time teachers indicated that they targeted alphabetic and phonological awareness skills (for correlations with LSF and PA growth), and percentage of time they targeted sight-word reading (for correlation with WID growth).

Table 2 – Pearson Correlations among Intervention Variables and Spring Growth in Early Reading Skills

Growth Variable	Intervention Minutes/Week	Intervention Group Size	Percent Time Skill Targeted
LSF Spring Growth	.27**	-.05	-.14
PA Spring Growth	.08	-.02	-.14
WID Spring Growth	-.06	-.19*	-.09

Note: LSF – Letter-Sound Fluency; PA – Phonological Awareness; WID – Word Identification; Percent Time Skill Targeted – The percentage of time teachers indicated that they targeted alphabetic and phonological awareness skills (for correlations with LSF and PA growth), and percentage of time they targeted sight-word reading (for correlation with WID growth).

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed)

** $p < .01$ (two-tailed)

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of three variables on reading growth for kindergarten students who were considered at-risk for reading failure. Specifically, these three variables were (1) amount of time students spent in supplemental group instruction, (2) the size of the intervention groups, and (3) the percentage of time teachers spent targeting specific reading skills. It was hypothesized that the total amount of time spent in supplemental reading instruction, the number of students in the supplemental instruction groups, and the teaching methods and skills targeted in instruction would affect reading growth.

Students were assessed using four different measures: the AIMSweb Letter-Sound Fluency (LSF), the Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests – Third Edition’s Phonological Awareness (PA) subtest and the Word Identification (WID) subtest, and a project developed instructional interview form. LSF was administered bi-weekly throughout the fall, winter, and spring. PA and WID were each administered once in the fall, winter, and spring. The teacher interviews were conducted once in the fall and spring semesters.

Results Summary

During the fall semester, the amount of time that students spent in supplemental group instruction, the size of students’ intervention groups, and the percentage of time teachers spent targeting alphabetic and phonemic awareness skills had no noticeable correlation with the amount of growth that students made in LSF or PA. Additionally, the intervention time and

group size variables, as well as the amount of time that teachers reported dedicating to word reading instruction, was not correlated with growth in WID. The analyses yielded no significant correlations between the intervention variables and growth in the early literacy skills across the fall semester. There may be several reasons why the fall instructional variables were not observed to be correlated with growth in reading skills during the fall. Teachers may have spent a small amount of time delivering supplemental instruction in the fall. In addition, students may have spent a majority of their time in a form of supplemental instruction that was not considered in this study.

However, data during the spring semester yielded some findings worth noting. Both intervention minutes per week and the size of the intervention group yielded weak, yet statistically significant correlations with spring LSF growth and spring WID growth, respectively. Specifically, when more time was spent in intervention groups, students generally demonstrated greater growth scores for LSF in the spring semester. The findings from this study support those reported by Simmons (2007) and Cavanaugh (2004). In 2007, Simmons et al. conducted a study in which it was found that the amount of time spent on specific skills was correlated with greater reading growth. Additionally, Cavanaugh et al. (2004) found that increased intervention time and frequency lead to reading growth. Therefore, by spending more time in intervention groups, teachers were able to target the skills that students were struggling with and, in turn, increase growth scores.

Likewise, smaller intervention groups were also associated with greater growth for WID in the spring semester. O'Connor et al. (2005) established that teaching in groups of ten or fewer

students allowed teachers to better monitor student progress and provided more room for individual participation. Cavanaugh et al. (2004) found that small group interventions consisting of seven or few students yielded significant reading growth while individual groups, one-on-one instruction, displayed a greater growth towards grade level reading goals. Smaller intervention groups allow teachers to focus on one particular skill that everyone in the group is struggling with, rather than lightly touch on two or three skills. As a result, teachers are also able to differentiate instruction more to suit the individual needs of students.

It was hypothesized in this study that the total amount of time spent in supplemental reading instruction, the number of students in the supplemental instruction groups, and the teaching methods and skills targeted in instruction would positively affect reading growth. Thus, these hypotheses were partially supported.

Limitations

Several limitations should be noted. First, although this study analyzed the amount of time specific reading skills were targeted, the curricula or materials that were used were not included in the analyses. Since the materials that were used during supplemental instruction were not considered, it is difficult to know whether or not the materials were ideally matched to students' needs in order to improve growth.

Second, the percentage of time in which skills were targeted was based on teachers' self-report. Project staff did not perform direct observations of classes and, therefore, had no data available to verify the reported time allocation. Teacher's schedules are often interrupted due to school

assemblies, fire drills, field trips, etc. The amount of time used for miscellaneous school activities were not factored into what teachers reported, which may have resulted in the self-reported percentages to be imprecise. The lack of verified observation time may explain why there were no significant findings for the fall semester.

Third, levels of instructional individualization for struggling students as well as the quality of the teachers' instruction were not evaluated. Small group time is where students are able to receive intervention that targets their individual needs. Often, students who need extra help are afraid to participate in class because they are embarrassed. In small groups, students can participate in activities that are at their skill level without fear of ridicule. Further, data were not collected on whether or not the teachers were considered highly qualified or on how the teachers differentiated instruction. Researchers should take these limitations into consideration when planning future work in this area.

Implications for Practice

When planning for small group instruction, teachers should pay attention to the size of the groups and the amount of time allotted to differentiated instruction. As this study and previous studies have shown, students are able to achieve greater growth when they are in smaller groups or receive one-on-one instruction. Amount of available time also plays a role in student achievement. More supplemental time is ideal for a group of any size, however, if there is only fifteen minutes available for intervention, teachers should maximize that time by spending it with a smaller group of students.

Conclusions

Overall, this study found that the amount of time in supplemental group instruction and smaller intervention group size had some effect on reading growth for kindergarten students who were at-risk for reading difficulties. The amount of time spent in supplemental instruction reflects the intensity of the intervention. As more time is allotted toward the intervention, teachers can better target the skill that needs to be mastered. Smaller group size allows for more instructional differentiation and individualization based on students' needs. Although many of the correlations were weak, it is important to note that more time spent in smaller groups yielded more growth for students. This finding should be considered when leading supplemental instruction. Thus, the results provide some support for the delivery of intensive, small-group interventions for kindergarten students that experience difficulties in learning to read.

REFERENCES

- Cavanaugh, C. L., Kim, A., Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (2004). Kindergarten reading interventions for at-risk students: Twenty years of research. *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 2(1), 9-21.
- Foorman, B. R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical elements of classroom and small-group instruction promote reading success in all children. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 16(4), 203-212.
- Kamps, D., Abbott, M., Greenwood, C., Wills, H., Veerkamp, M., & Kaufman, J. (2008). Effects of small-group reading instruction and curriculum differences for students most at risk in kindergarten two-year results for secondary-and tertiary-level interventions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 41(2), 101-114.
- Lonigan, C. J., & Shanahan, T. (2009). *Developing Early Literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel. Executive Summary. A Scientific Synthesis of Early Literacy Development and Implications for Intervention.* National Institute for Literacy.
- National Reading Panel (US), National Institute of Child Health, & Human Development (US). (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups.* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health.
- O'Connor, R. E., Fulmer, D., Harty, K. R., & Bell, K. M. (2005). Layers of Reading Intervention in Kindergarten Through Third Grade Changes in Teaching and Student Outcomes. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38(5), 440-455.
- Pearson. (2012). *AIMSweb Technical Manual.* Bloomington, MN. Pearson Incorporated.
- Pearson. (2011). *Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests – Third Edition Manual.* Bloomington, MN. Pearson Incorporated.
- Simmons, D. C., Kame'enui, E. J., Harn, B., Coyne, M. D., Stoolmiller, M., Santoro, L. E., ... & Kaufman, N. K. (2007). Attributes of Effective and Efficient Kindergarten Reading Intervention An Examination of Instructional Time and Design Specificity. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 40(4), 331-347.

APPENDIX

ELM Project: Instruction and Curriculum Interview Form- Part 1

Teacher: _____ Class Size: _____ Interviewer Initials: _____ Date: _____

Regarding the instructional language(s) used in your classroom:

➤ Is your classroom considered bilingual/ELL/second language/dual immersion? ____Yes ____No

If Yes: What percentage of *total classroom instruction* is in English? _____ in Spanish?_____

What percentage of *reading/literacy instruction* is in English? _____ in Spanish?_____

Regarding whole-class reading instruction (*all students*) provided in your classroom:

➤ Do you use a published reading curriculum for whole-class reading instruction? ____Yes ____No

If No: Describe the nature and content of whole-class reading instruction and any resources.

Interventionist Key

CT = classroom teacher

RT = reading teacher

ST = sped teacher

ESL = ESL Teacher

A = Aide/Para

C = computer-based

O = other

Student:			
Source of Literacy Instruction	Context		
Whole Class/Core Reading:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Additional Programs not indicated above:</i>			
Literacy-Related Computer Time:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			

Student:			
Source of Literacy Instruction		Context	
Whole Class/Core Reading:	Tchr	Group	Min/Wk
Additional Programs not indicated above:			
Literacy-Related Computer Time:		Tchr	Group Min/Wk
Program(s):	C		
Program(s):	C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:		Tchr	Group Min/Wk
Program(s):			
Program(s):			
Program(s):			
Student:			
Source of Literacy Instruction		Context	
Whole Class/Core Reading:	Tchr	Group	Min/Wk
Additional Programs not indicated above:			
Literacy-Related Computer Time:		Tchr	Group Min/Wk
Program(s):	C		
Program(s):	C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:		Tchr	Group Min/Wk
Program(s):			
Program(s):			
Program(s):			

Student:				
Source of Literacy Instruction		Context		
Whole Class/Core Reading:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Additional Programs not indicated above:</i>				
Literacy-Related Computer Time:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>		C		
<i>Program(s):</i>		C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>				
<i>Program(s):</i>				
<i>Program(s):</i>				

Student:				
Source of Literacy Instruction		Context		
Whole Class/Core Reading:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Additional Programs not indicated above:</i>				
Literacy-Related Computer Time:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>		C		
<i>Program(s):</i>		C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>				
<i>Program(s):</i>				
<i>Program(s):</i>				

Student:			
Source of Literacy Instruction		Context	
Whole Class/Core Reading:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Additional Programs not indicated above:</i>			
Literacy-Related Computer Time:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			

Student:			
Source of Literacy Instruction		Context	
Whole Class/Core Reading:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Additional Programs not indicated above:</i>			
Literacy-Related Computer Time:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:		<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			

Student:			
Source of Literacy Instruction	Context		
Whole Class/Core Reading:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Additional Programs not indicated above:</i>			
Literacy-Related Computer Time:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
<i>Program(s):</i>	C		
Other Targeted Literacy Interventions:	<i>Tchr</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Min/Wk</i>
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			
<i>Program(s):</i>			

ELM Project: Instruction and Curriculum Interview Form- Part 2

Teacher: _____ Interviewer Initials: _____ Date: _____

Regarding all of literacy-related instruction that Project ELM students receive throughout the day from you, allocate the approximate proportion of time your instruction targets the following general areas. Next, in the last column use a checkmark to indicate each of the target skill areas within each category that you address.

Types of Reading-Related Skills	Time Allocation	
	General Area	Target Skill
Alphabetic/Phonological Awareness	%	
letter names		
letter sounds		
phonological awareness		
Word Study/Phonics (Individual Words)	%	
decoding words		
sight words		
spelling		
Reading Connected Text	%	
guided oral reading		
choral reading		
Comprehension	%	
retelling/discussing/responding to questions about text		
vocabulary study		
Writing	%	
writing/copying letters or words		
writing connected text		
Other	%	
Total:	100%	