

## APPENDIX A METHODOLOGY

The analysis for this report had three phases. The first phase involved a protocol to gather information from state education agency contacts and documents on adolescent literacy. The second phase involved a search for professional development or teacher support interventions designed to help content-area teachers increase their focus on reading. The third phase involved a search for evaluation reports and studies on the seven interventions identified to summarize the extent of the evidence base on effectiveness.

### Questions addressed

The study set out to address three sets of questions:

1. *Inventory of state initiatives to set the regional context:* What are state departments across the Southeast Region doing to address the issue of improving adolescent literacy through a focus on reading across the curriculum?
2. *Description of available interventions (curricular or professional development interventions available to help secondary teachers):* What interventions are being used or proposed for use in the Southeast Region states? Nationally, are additional interventions referenced in published research? Are there similar characteristics across interventions? How and in what ways do they differ?
3. *Description of the evidence available on interventions:* What kinds of data have been reported on the interventions' effectiveness?

### Approach used

*Phase one: A summary of state initiatives (such as standards, relevant policies, and planned professional development) under way in the Southeast Region on improving adolescent literacy through a cross-curricular focus.* The information-gathering protocol focused on policy, professional

development, evaluation, and funding for adolescent literacy initiatives. Information on each state's initiatives was gathered from the state education agencies and supplemented with information from the Internet and state publications. Follow-up conversations were conducted with key state agency personnel to clarify and expand on information. Individual state profiles and a cross-state table were drafted to summarize information gathered in the protocols. The profiles and tables were reviewed by state agencies for accuracy.

*Phase two: A search for existing curriculum and professional development interventions on reading across the curriculum.* The Education Resources Information Center database and lists provided by other regional educational laboratories, content centers, research centers and organizations, reading organizations, Southeastern state departments of education, and federally funded literacy projects were searched to identify available interventions.

REL staff attended relevant conferences and used personal communications with researchers and practitioners. Each REL staff member who assisted with the intervention search process followed the same protocol. The summary tables asked for:

- Name of intervention.
- Web site information.
- Audience.
- Whether the intervention addressed reading across the curriculum.
- The focus of the intervention.
- A brief summary.

Once the relevant interventions were identified, interventions that did not address the guiding questions were screened. For example, many interventions focused on helping "struggling readers," which was not the focus. Finally, the list

was narrowed to seven interventions available to support secondary school content teachers.

*Phase three: Description of the effectiveness evidence available on the seven interventions.* Evidence of effectiveness of the seven identified interventions was sought on the developers' web sites, the U.S. Department of Education web site, and in educational journals, other regional educational laboratories, content centers, and research centers. Abstracts were developed for each intervention (see appendix D).

### Phase I: Information-gathering protocol for state education agency context

#### *Background on state focus on adolescent literacy*

- Does your state have an adolescent literacy focus?
  - If not, describe what efforts are taking place concerning literacy in general; what is your state's implicit approach to adolescent literacy?
  - If so, what was the impetus (for example, achievement scores, state board of education, legislators, local education agencies) for the state-wide initiative on adolescent literacy?

#### *Components of state initiative*

- Describe your state's implicit or explicit approach to adolescent literacy.
- Items you may want to include:
  - Is the initiative mandated?
  - Is there a timeline?
  - Who has taken the leadership role (such as state, district, or local education agencies)? Is there a commission or planning committee? If so, who are the members (representatives, teachers, institutions of higher education, parents)?

- On what content areas does the initiative focus?
- Are there standards (for example, Georgia Reading Across the Curriculum Standards 6–12)?
- Are professional development timelines and types provided? What kinds? For whom? Over what time period?
- What curriculum materials are provided?
- Are assessments being used?
- Are there teacher certification/requirements for courses?
- Is there funding? Do they have external funding (such as Carnegie, Striving Readers)?
- Has there been a state-sponsored adolescent literacy conference? If yes, when, audience, number in attendance, overall goals? If not, what plans do you have in the future for a conference?
- Do any local education agencies have a literacy initiative? How many? Have any of these education agencies received state or federal recognition for their adolescent literacy initiatives? If yes, briefly describe.

#### *Approach to identification/selection of interventions to increase teachers' competence across the curriculum in adolescent literacy*

- Is the state planning on recommending specific interventions? If yes, what is the status? If no, why?
- What interventions have they discussed? Please list.

#### *Documents needed*

- State initiative.

- List of interventions being considered by state education agencies.
- Funding information.
- State approved local education agency initiatives and interventions.
- Sources of information.
- Any other information that would give us a complete picture of what is happening.
- Sample professional development materials.
- Data that may be used/collected already on the initiative (if it exists).

REL-Southeast policy analysts provide answers to questions in a detailed brief using the aforementioned questions as a reporting template.

---

#### Phase II: Guidelines for intervention search process

- Conduct structured search of appropriate databases and search engines. Primary search terms and keywords will include: adolescent literacy, middle school literacy, literacy across the curriculum, reading across the curriculum, high school literacy, and others.
  - U.S. Department of Education–Institute of Education Sciences.
  - Regional Education Laboratories.
  - Research centers.
  - Comprehensive centers.
  - Content centers.
  - Florida Center for Reading Research.
  - Alliance for Excellence in Education.
  - National Middle School Association.

- National Council of Teachers of English.
- International Reading Association.
- Identify relevant documents.
- Compile documents into a folder for each intervention.
- Complete summary table items for each potential intervention.

#### *Initial list of interventions*

Below is a list of the interventions we originally identified but that were not included in the final analysis (table A1). The reasons for exclusion are checked. There are many interventions developed for use with struggling readers. These were not included as our focus was on support for content-area teachers across the curriculum.

---

#### Phase III: Guidelines for intervention evidence of effectiveness search process

- Conduct search of appropriate organizations and educational databases for reports on each intervention using:
  - Intervention developer’s web site.
  - Wilson Web (through University of North Carolina, Greensboro Library).
  - ERIC.
  - FirstSearch.
  - JSTOR.
  - Psychology Index.
  - U.S. Department of Education –Institute of Education Sciences.
  - Regional Education Laboratories.

- Research centers.
  - Comprehensive centers.
  - Content centers.
  - Florida Center for Reading Research.
- Identify relevant developer documents, studies, and reports.
  - Compile studies and reports into a folder on each of the seven interventions.
  - Draft intervention abstract including summary about research available.

TABLE A1

**Rationale for interventions not described**

Name	Did not address reading across the curriculum (content-area reading)	Did not address students in grades 4–12	Primarily addressed struggling readers	Not aimed at improving teacher instruction and assessment at the classroom level	Part of CSR model	In early stages of development	Not enough information to determine their purpose, content, audience, desired outcomes as of 8/18/06
Academy of Reading	✓		✓				
Accelerated Literacy Learning		✓	✓				✓
Accelerated Reader	✓						
America's Choice Ramp-Up to Literacy					✓		
Amp Reading System			✓				
Carbo Reading Styles Program	✓		✓				
Collaborative Strategic Reading			✓				
Comprehension Plus	✓	✓		✓			
CREST						✓	
Essential Learning			✓	✓			
Exemplar Center for Reading Instruction							✓
Failure Free Reading	✓		✓				
Fast Forward Language Software	✓		✓				
Fast Track Reading	✓		✓				
Great Leaps Reading	✓						
HOSTS Link Language Arts	✓						
Kaleidoscope	✓						
Language! (3rd Edition)			✓				
Lexia Reading S.O.S.	✓			✓			
Lindamood-Bell Learning Processes	✓						

TABLE A1 (CONTINUED)

**Rationale for interventions not described**

Name	Did not address reading across the curriculum (content-area reading)	Did not address students in grades 4–12	Primarily addressed struggling readers	Not aimed at improving teacher instruction and assessment at the classroom level	Part of CSR model	In early stages of development	Not enough information to determine their purpose, content, audience, desired outcomes as of 8/18/06
My Reading Coach			✓				
Plato Software/ Intermediate Reading Skills			✓				
REACH System	✓		✓				
Read 180			✓				
Read for Real	✓					✓	
Read Naturally			✓				
Read XL			✓				
Reading for Knowledge	✓					✓	
Reading is Fame			✓				
Reading Plus			✓				
REWARDS (Reading Excellence: Word Attack and Rate Development Strategies)			✓				
Second Chance at Literacy Learning							✓
Skills Handbooks				✓			
Soar to Success	✓						
Spalding Writing Road to Reading	✓						
Spell Read P.A.T.	✓	✓	✓				
Success for All Middle School/ Reading Edge					✓		
SuccessMaker Enterprise	✓			✓			
Supported Literacy	✓						
Talent Development High School					✓		
Talent Development Middle School					✓		
Thinking Reader			✓				
Voyager Passport E, F, G			✓				
Wilson Reading System	✓		✓				

## APPENDIX B

### SOUTHEASTERN STATE SUMMARY

Approach	Alabama	Florida
<p><b>Literacy initiatives/ plans</b></p> <p>Does the state have a literacy plan or initiative?</p> <p>Who initiated it?</p> <p>Is there funding?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) is not a program, but an ongoing professional development opportunity for all school faculty. It began in 1998 and was voluntary; now all K–3 schools have to become ARI schools by 2006. The goal is 100% literacy.</li> <li>It was initiated by the Alabama State Board of Education (ALSBE) and Alabama Department of Education (ALDOE), with support from the A+ Foundation, which funded the initiative for the first two years.</li> <li>For 2006, ARI received \$56 million dollars in funding; \$53.5 went back to ARI schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Florida has a K–12 focus on literacy through <i>Just Read, Florida!</i> The goal of this initiative is for all students in Florida to be able to read at grade level or higher by 2012.</li> <li>The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) took the lead in recommending legislation to the Florida Legislature, which adopted the language in its mandated policies.</li> <li>Funding for reading is a permanent priority and was funded in the amount of \$111.8 million for the 2006–2007 school year.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Middle school/high school (6–12) initiatives/ plans</b></p> <p>If the state has a recent initiative or plan, is there a middle school/high school component? Or, does the state have a separate middle school/high school initiative? Is there any funding?</p> <p>Does the state have a literacy across the curriculum/ literacy in the content area initiative?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almost 25% of the ARI schools cover grades 4–12.</li> <li>ARI/ A-PAL (Project for Adolescent Literacy) is a pilot secondary ARI program.</li> <li>ARI/A-PAL focuses on reading across the curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are three main groups working to provide adolescent literacy leadership through a strategic five-year plan: (a) educators to recommend a plan to (b) a group of legislators, superintendents, and (c) representatives from different administrative associations.</li> <li>The planning stage is funded by the NGA/Carnegie Corporation and its \$50,000 <i>Reading to Achieve</i> grant.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Standards</b></p> <p>How do the state standards in the content areas reflect literacy expectations?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARI is aligned with state standards and is set up to support them.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The standards, approved in 1996, were written in seven subject areas, each divided into four separate grade clusters (PreK–2, 3–5, 6–8, and 9–12).</li> <li>The state standards are the basis for state assessments at each grade from 3–10 in language arts and mathematics (<a href="http://www.firn.edu/doe/curric/prek12/frame2.htm">www.firn.edu/doe/curric/prek12/frame2.htm</a>).</li> </ul>

Georgia	Mississippi	North Carolina	South Carolina
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the 2004–05 school year, Georgia began implementing its new standards-based curriculum, the Georgia Performance Standards (GPS).</li> <li>An important innovation within the GPS is the incorporation of Reading Across the Curriculum standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mississippi has goals for all readers and the four goals were laid out in the 1997 Mississippi Reading Initiative, Every Child a Reader.</li> <li>To support this initiative, in 1998 the Mississippi Legislature created a Reading Sufficiency Program of Instruction. This law requires every school district to establish and implement a program for reading reform.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>North Carolina’s “Strategic Plan for Reading Literacy” will be presented to the North Carolina State Board of Education (NCSBE) in March 2007. The plan includes six priority action steps.</li> <li>The effort was initiated by the NCSBE.</li> <li>The state received a National Governors Association (NGA)/Carnegie Corporation grant of \$50,000 to write their plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The South Carolina Reading Initiative (SCRI) was created after Governor Jim Hodges’ Institute of Reading held the South Carolina Reading Summit in 1999. SCRI began its work with K–5 schools.</li> <li>The SCRI model was developed by SC in collaboration with the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE).</li> <li>The General Assembly has allocated a total of \$4.3 million for the initiative, and participating schools receive up to \$50,000 from the Governor’s Institute on Reading.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia added Reading Across the Curriculum Standards as a component of all the Georgia Performance Standards for grades 4–12.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adolescent literacy is also a focus of the 2006 legislation that established an Office of Dropout Prevention within the Mississippi Department of Education.</li> <li>Mississippi received a <i>Reading to Achieve</i> grant funded by the NGA/Carnegie Corporation to assist the state in developing literacy plans and policies to improve adolescent literacy achievement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The North Carolina plan will require a 3-hour literacy credit in a topic from an approved list for teachers in grades 9–12.</li> <li>The North Carolina plan includes steps to creating literacy strategies in each content area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>During the 2003–04 school year SCRI began working with middle schools, utilizing \$1.3 million in funding.</li> <li>In addition, the General Assembly allocated \$1 million to expand the reading initiative into high schools for the 2006–07 school year.</li> <li>SCRI is a voluntary program and the participating districts received \$50,000 from the Governor’s Institute of Reading.</li> <li>High-need districts were given priority for participation in the middle and high school initiative.</li> <li>SCRI is intended to be a literacy across the curriculum program.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia’s Reading Across the Curriculum standards are a component of all of the Georgia Performance Standards for all students grades 6–12 in science, social studies, math, and language arts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mississippi Language Arts Framework 2006 standards, and other curriculum frameworks, contain literacy objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As part of the “Strategic Plan for Reading Literacy,” if the plan is implemented, the standards will include “digital and literacy skills for the 21st Century and to ensure that all students are college and work ready.”</li> <li>Revisions will also align English and Math standards to the American Diploma Project benchmarks and 21st Century Skills.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCRI works to implement the English/Language Arts (ELA) standards through the use of best practices in literacy, which are explicitly addressed in the Proposed ELA Standards for 2007 draft document.</li> </ul>

(continued)

## APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)

### SOUTHEASTERN STATE SUMMARY

Approach	Alabama	Florida
<p><b>Professional development for middle school/high school teachers</b></p> <p>Does the state have professional development in adolescent literacy? If so, what kind?</p> <p>To what extent is the state planning for or providing professional development for content area teachers?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ARI professional development aims to empower teachers with the content knowledge, skills, and strategies necessary to be successful with all students, especially those that challenge them the most—struggling readers.</li> <li>• ARI involves two- week workshops over the summer and follow-up sessions throughout the school year.</li> <li>• Teachers receive ongoing support from literacy coaches.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content area Reading Professional Development (CAR-PD) provides educators with an 150 hour in-service program, which makes them eligible to serve as a reading -intervention teacher in their content areas. However, teachers who are teaching academic reading courses still need the reading endorsement and/or K-12 reading certification.</li> <li>• CAR-PD PLUS will be available soon to provide the reading endorsement.</li> <li>• Each district’s Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan must include PD for teaching reading in the content areas, with an emphasis on technical and informational text.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <p>What are some ways in which states are building teacher capacity (e.g., literacy coaches, online courses, state-developed programs, etc.)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are three secondary school regional coaches that work with ARI high schools.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District plans must include high-quality reading coaches along with PD for teachers on teaching reading in the content areas, and supplemental materials.</li> <li>• The Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence Center (FLaRE) at the University of Central Florida provides site-based support for principals, reading coaches, and teachers at the lowest performing middle and high schools in the state.</li> </ul>

Georgia	Mississippi	North Carolina	South Carolina
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia training on the GPS began during the 2004–05 school year. GA is using a train-the-trainer model, with district and school representatives receiving state training and then redelivering it at the building level.</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LEARN NC is hosting the Adolescent Literacy Project, which includes four online courses. It uses a train-the-trainer model.</li> <li>The NC plan will require a 3-hour literacy credit in a topic from an approved list for teachers in grades 9–12; K–8 already have this requirement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCRI-MG and the High School Initiative is an intensive four-year, staff-development plan that is designed to improve reading skills and strategies for all adolescents across the curriculum. Literacy coaches provide both individual and group professional coaches to teachers.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia is currently in the formative stages of crafting a statewide literacy plan.</li> </ul>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The North Carolina plan includes having literacy/reading coaches in the middle schools. In addition, the plan mentions an expansion of coaches to all elementary and middle schools by 2013. The plan includes a study of the effectiveness of coaches in high schools.</li> <li>Coming from an initiative sponsored by Governor Mike Easley, the state is already funding 100 literacy coaches for the lowest performing middle schools in the state.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District/School literacy coaches work in classrooms to provide support to SCRI-MG teachers and also guide twice-monthly discussion meetings.</li> <li>All coaches participate in summer study and monthly study throughout the year.</li> <li>Regional literacy coaches provide ongoing support to district literacy coaches.</li> </ul>

*(continued)*

## APPENDIX B (CONTINUED)

### SOUTHEASTERN STATE SUMMARY

Approach	Alabama	Florida
<p><b><i>Middle school/high school struggling readers</i></b></p> <p>Does the state have initiatives for struggling adolescent readers and , if so, where are they located?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ARI is intended to help teachers learn strategies to assist struggling students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In middle and high schools, struggling readers are required to have one intervention class, either reading or a content area subject taught by a teacher who has received a reading endorsement.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Research and evaluation</i></b></p> <p>Are there any significant studies underway with regard to literacy initiatives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An AIR report on the ARI was commissioned by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.</li> <li>Bacevich, A., &amp; Salinger, T. (2006, June). <i>Lessons and recommendations from the Alabama Reading Initiative: Sustaining focus on secondary reading</i>. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research (AIR).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The RAND Corporation is to study the impact of reading coaches on student achievement; Florida is one of the study sites.</li> <li>The Columbia Group will conduct a cost analysis of reading coaches in the classroom.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Web site</i></b></p>	<p><b><i>ALSDE Reading Initiative Publications</i></b>  <a href="http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/documents.asp?section=50&amp;footer=sections">http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/documents.asp?section=50&amp;footer=sections</a></p> <p><b><i>AIR Report</i></b>  <a href="http://www.air.org/publications/documents/AIR%20Popular%20Report_final.pdf">http://www.air.org/publications/documents/AIR%20Popular%20Report_final.pdf</a></p>	<p><b><i>FLDOE</i></b>  <a href="http://www.fldoe.org">http://www.fldoe.org</a></p> <p><b><i>Endorsement</i></b>  <a href="http://www.justreadflorida.com/endorsement/">http://www.justreadflorida.com/endorsement/</a></p> <p><b><i>FLaRE</i></b>  <a href="http://flare.ucf.edu">http://flare.ucf.edu</a></p>

Georgia	Mississippi	North Carolina	South Carolina
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia maintains a remedial education program for students in grades 6–12 with identified academic deficiencies.</li> <li>The program operates at the system level, and offers individualized instruction to eligible students using several scheduling models.</li> <li>The program is housed at the state level in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. Information is available at <a href="http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ci_services.aspx?PageReq=CIServRemedial">http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ci_services.aspx?PageReq=CIServRemedial</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new dropout prevention legislation mandates that the Office of Dropout Prevention build in a focus on adolescent literacy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If implemented, the North Carolina plan includes an analysis of the need to provide extra assistance to struggling middle and high school readers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCRI is focused on providing teachers with skills/resources so that they can ensure that all students develop strong skills.</li> <li>As a part of this, South Carolina has developed a remediation plan focused on ensuring that students in grades 3–8 acquire the skills they need to be successful. Information is available at <a href="http://ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/sq/AcademicPlans/index.html">http://ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/sq/AcademicPlans/index.html</a></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Georgia is working with SERVE on this Fast Response Brief on adolescent literacy across the curriculum, to guide planning for further SEA support to local systems and schools in this area.</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Researchers have undertaken an in-depth study of SCRI. It is focused on changes in the beliefs and practices of teachers and on changes in the skills and strategies of students; it also examines the relationship between SCRI and students test scores on standardized tests.</li> <li>South Carolina also collects data from participating teachers and coaches to assess changes in practice and outlook. Interim reports are available at <a href="http://www.ncte.org/profdev/onsite/readinit/groups/110385.htm">http://www.ncte.org/profdev/onsite/readinit/groups/110385.htm</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>GADOE</b>  <a href="http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ci_services.aspx?PageReq=CIServEnglish">http://public.doe.k12.ga.us/ci_services.aspx?PageReq=CIServEnglish</a></p>	<p><b>MS DOE/Reading Curriculum</b>  <a href="http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/ACAD/ID/LAER/goals.html">http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/ACAD/ID/LAER/goals.html</a></p>	<p><b>NCDPI Literacy Proposal</b>  <a href="http://www.ncpublicschools.org/sbe_meetings/0608/0608_hsp/hsp/0608hsp06.pdf">http://www.ncpublicschools.org/sbe_meetings/0608/0608_hsp/hsp/0608hsp06.pdf</a></p>	<p><b>NCTE</b>  <a href="http://www.ncte.org/profdev/onsite/readinit/groups/110385.htm">http://www.ncte.org/profdev/onsite/readinit/groups/110385.htm</a>   <a href="http://www.ncte.org/profdev/onsite/readinit/groups/sc/110387.htm">http://www.ncte.org/profdev/onsite/readinit/groups/sc/110387.htm</a>   <b>SC Dept of Ed</b>  <a href="http://ed.sc.gov/">http://ed.sc.gov/</a></p>

## APPENDIX C

### SOUTHEASTERN STATE PROFILES

The six southeastern states served by the REL-Southeast are currently attending to the need to improve adolescent literacy outcomes. The approaches are varied, but a commonality is that all assume that content area teachers will need support in embedding literacy development more systematically into their curriculum. The work of the six states is described below.

#### Alabama

In the past, Alabama schools have faced a continuing struggle with low literacy achievement among students, as evidenced by National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) scores and other indicators. In November 1996, in an effort to address this issue, the Alabama State Department of Education, in concert with other educational organizations, brought together a panel of business and education leaders. This group met for a two-week working session to envision a statewide plan to ensure 100 percent literacy among Alabama school children. This was the beginning of the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI).

Implemented in 1998, the ARI is a statewide, ongoing professional development program. The initiative is collaborative in that it values innovation in implementation at the local level. Through high-quality professional development based on the support of reading specialists, an intensive two-week workshop each summer, and involvement with a professional community composed of peers, administrators, and university-level mentors, it is hoped that ARI participants will acquire the knowledge, skills, and strategies to support successful literacy learning for all students across the curriculum, with a special emphasis on struggling students. Evaluation of this state initiative in professional development is ongoing, and considerable information is offered at <http://www.alsde.edu/html/sections/documents.asp?section=50&footer=sections>, where Alabama has published the Executive Summary of the *Evaluation Report 2005, Years 7 and 8*.

The ARI was originally supported by the A+ Foundation of Montgomery, which provided the initial funding and assisted in recruiting partners for the first two years of the initiative. As the promise of the program became evident, Governor Don Siegelman proposed state-wide expansion of the program. Funding for the initiative has grown from \$1.5 million in 1998 to \$56 million allocated in 2006 by the Alabama legislature.

Although the initiative was conceived as a K–12 program, initial training and materials were created as “one size fits all,” with a focus on K–3. Teachers and reading coaches in secondary programs adapted materials to meet their needs and had some positive experiences in applying materials to their contexts (Bacevich & Salinger, 2006). However, while some staff support and professional development is available at the secondary level, schools have experienced difficulty in maintaining ARI programs because of funding limitations. As a result of these limitations, state officials determined that Alabama schools are best served by full implementation of ARI in all K–3 schools rather than partial implementation in some K–12 schools. Therefore, implementation in middle and high schools has been delayed. All Alabama schools with K–3 programs were required to be ARI schools by 2006. To move toward implementation in middle and high schools, a state sponsored adolescent literacy conference was held in June 2006, and Alabama has recently developed and introduced A-PAL, a reading initiative targeted at adolescent readers that will build on ARI, offering more support for reading in the content areas. A-PAL will be piloted at a limited number of Alabama schools beginning in 2006/07.

**Contact:** Katherine Mitchell, Assistant State Superintendent of Education for Reading, Alabama Department of Education, [kmitchll@alsde.edu](mailto:kmitchll@alsde.edu), (334) 353-1570

#### Florida

Florida developed a multipronged approach to support adolescent literacy learning as a part of

legislation called *Just Read, Florida!* (JRF). With its goal that all students be able to read at grade level, the effort is funded by law through the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP), a line-item in the state budget for the Florida Literacy and Reading Excellence Center (FLaRE). The state also received a *Reading to Achieve* grant from the National Governors Association.

Districts write a K–12 Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan, which is then approved by the JRF Office at the state department. The plan must focus on struggling readers and provide reading coaches. Students scoring a Level 1 or Level 2 on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) must have an intervention plan, which is required by the A++ Plan to include at least one intervention class, either reading or subject area, taught by teachers who have a reading endorsement. Professional development is available through Content Area Reading Professional Development (CAR-PD), and once completed, teachers are eligible to serve as reading intervention teachers in their subject area (academic reading teachers still need certification or endorsement). Summer institutes are available for principals and literacy coaches.

The CAR-PD consists of 150 in-service hours for content-area teachers. Sixty hours are completed through the Florida Online Reading Professional Development (FOR-PD), a course focused on the basics of reading. Thirty hours are part of a practicum. Finally, 60 hours are obtained through a face-to-face academy to be offered spring/summer 2007. The academy is intended to be a train-the-trainer model where literacy coaches or other interested district educators receive training and, in turn, train content teachers in their districts. The CAR-PD training was created by FLaRE and designed for vocabulary development and comprehension skill development in the higher levels. It is not intended to build decoding or fluency skills.

In addition, FLaRE provides site-based support for the lowest performing middle and high schools. The center works with principals, reading coaches,

and teachers. It is hoped that the combined professional development, along with online logs submitted by reading coaches, will encourage and improve the opportunities for individual growth among teachers and students. The Carnegie Foundation asked the RAND Corporation to study the impact of reading coaches on student achievement and Florida is one of the study sites.

**Contact:** Evan Lefsky, Executive Director, *Just Read, Florida!*, Florida Department of Education, Evan.Lefsky@fldoe.org, (850) 245-0503

## Georgia

Georgia's attention to adolescent literacy emerged as a result of the Georgia Performance Standards, which were presented to the state in 2004/05. An important change from the previous state standards was the integration of Reading across the Curriculum standards, which represent a move toward developing a statewide literacy plan.

The Reading across the Curriculum standards are embedded in the content area standards for grades 6–12 in science, social studies, mathematics, and language arts, providing a reading standards component in each content area. They emphasize such skills as reading in content areas, enhancing students' ability to read and understand content-specific material, developing appropriate vocabulary, and discussing and evaluating material. An important component of these standards is the 25-book requirement, which requires each student to read a minimum of 25 books, or their equivalent, per year across curriculum areas. Content-area teachers are supposed to incorporate the Reading across the Curriculum standards in their classroom practice.

Georgia used a train-the-trainer model to introduce the new Georgia Performance Standards in 2004/05, with district and school representatives receiving training from the state Department of Education and, in turn, providing it to all teachers at school sites. Currently, the state Department of Education is developing a

statewide literacy plan to ensure that teachers have the support they need in teaching to these new Reading across the Curriculum standards. The plan is expected to offer direction to local education agencies on a comprehensive set of plan components. Already, a limited number of middle schools fund literacy coaches through Title I funds, and some have Learn and Serve grants that incorporate literacy training. These changes represent a significant movement toward providing an effective literacy curriculum for all Georgia middle and high school students.

In an effort to provide useful resources and support for secondary content teachers, for whom these new standards may represent a significant challenge, the Georgia state school superintendent asked REL-Southeast to help answer the question, What literacy across the curriculum support interventions might the Georgia Department of Education consider as part of a research-based, comprehensive plan to improve secondary literacy and student achievement? The results of this brief will be used to support the state's work in this area.

**Contact:** Lisa Copeland, Director, Reading and Middle Schools, Georgia Department of Education, lcopeland@doe.k12.ga.us

## Mississippi

Mississippi identified goals for all readers in its 1997 Mississippi Reading Initiative and also developed the Mississippi Reading Reform Model in 1997. The model includes four basic components:

- Well-designed early literacy interventions to ensure reading readiness.
- Prescriptive direct instruction utilizing the essential elements of reading instruction and based upon results of appropriate, valid, and reliable assessments.
- Extended instructional opportunities for children.
- High-quality professional development to improve reading instructional practices of Mississippi teachers, administrators, and support staff.

The state has long had K–3 reading initiatives, including the Barksdale Reading Institute, created from a \$100 million gift given to the University of Mississippi Foundation from Jim and the late Sally Barksdale; Reading Sufficiency, a comprehensive effort to improve the teaching and learning of reading and language arts in Mississippi's classrooms through the support of rigorous reading standards for students; and Reading First, which provides assistance to states and districts to establish research-based reading programs for K–3 students. The state now appears to also be focusing on struggling readers from 4th grade through high school. More specifically, through high school redesign work and the new Office of Dropout Prevention, the state plans to address the needs of adolescent readers. In addition, like Florida and North Carolina, Mississippi received a National Governors Association *Reading to Achieve* grant funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and is developing a more comprehensive policy and plan to improve adolescent literacy achievement.

The National Governors Association *Reading to Achieve* grant will provide funding for the establishment of a state literacy task force that will be responsible for accomplishing the following broad goals (Mississippi Department of Education press release, Feb. 16, 2006):

- Develop a detailed report describing current reading performance.
- Increase public understanding of and support for a literacy focus in Mississippi.
- Build on Mississippi's existing literacy plan with particular emphasis paid to literacy achievement in grades 4–12.
- Make specific research-based recommendations leading to student gains in reading performance.

- Develop a plan for changing classroom instruction based on scientific reading research.

**Contact:** Robin Miles, Bureau Director, Reading, Early Childhood, and Language Arts, Mississippi Department of Education, [rmiles@mde.k12.ms.us](mailto:rmiles@mde.k12.ms.us), (601) 359-3778

---

## North Carolina

Like Florida and Mississippi, North Carolina received a National Governors Association *Reading to Achieve* grant funded by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and used the funds to develop a K–12 plan. Concerned with dropping National Assessment of Educational Progress scores, North Carolina formed a committee of stakeholders to develop a six-priority action-step plan, the “Strategic Plan for Reading Literacy,” which will be presented to the State Board in March 2007. The six priority action steps are:

- Amend the curriculum revision process to include literacy strategies in each content area and a focus on digital reading.
- Develop student assessment processes that provide for open-ended and performance assessments.
- Provide opportunities for leadership development for principals and central office staff.
- Enhance preparation and professional development for elementary, middle, and high school teachers.
- Analyze the need for policy revision and development.
- Develop benchmarks at the school level for each grade and subgroup.

The original literacy plan covered only grades K–8; but the current plan is for K–12. The plan also includes two new strategies that will directly affect adolescent readers—one aimed at teacher

skills and knowledge of reading instruction and the other at struggling readers. The first policy will require all grade 9–12 teachers to get three-hour credits in literacy as part of their licensure renewal. The second strategy under consideration is the revisitation of the Personalized Education Plans.

At this time the plan has not been presented to the State Board for approval, but other actions are being taken to improve adolescent literacy. Already in place are four online courses in reading in the content areas which have been developed by LEARN NC (<http://www.learnnc.org/courses/>) to support teachers. In addition, the Office of the Governor has also funded 100 literacy coaches to be provided to the lowest-performing middle schools.

**Contact:** Louise Burner, English Language Arts Consultant, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, [lburner@dpi.state.nc.us](mailto:lburner@dpi.state.nc.us), (919) 807-3300

---

## South Carolina

In 1999, then Governor Jim Hodges created the Governor’s Institute of Reading (GIR), a partnership of businesses, community organizations, and education organizations to focus on early reading. In December 1999 the GIR sponsored the South Carolina Reading Summit. As a result of this Summit, input from the GIR Task Force and a review of best practices, the South Carolina Reading Initiative (SCRI) came into being and was announced in 2000. The SCRI began with K–5 but has since broadened its scope, initiating work with middle schools during the 2003/04 school year and, more recently, with high schools.

SCRI is a voluntary program funded through the General Assembly, which allocated \$1.3 million to allow the program to expand into middle schools and an additional \$1 million in 2006/07 for expansion into high schools. Participating schools may receive up to \$50,000 dollars from the GIR to support implementation of the initiative’s seven

goals. To participate, schools submit an implementation plan. Because the initiatives have not been fully funded, a competitive grant process is used in some instances to determine which schools will receive funds. However, high need districts are given priority.

The SCRI-MG (middle grades) and the High School Initiative is an intensive four-year, staff-development plan designed to improve reading skills and strategies for adolescents across the curriculum by providing support and resources to teachers. District and school literacy coaches work in classrooms four days each week to provide support to participating teachers, as well as leading SCRI teams in twice-monthly meetings to consider research and practice. Coaches continue to develop their own skills as they work with regional literacy coaches, faculty from the University of South Carolina (USC), state department staff, and the National Council of Teachers of English to build a common knowledge base by participating in summer institutes and monthly study throughout the year. The training was initially developed as

a collaborative effort of the University of South Carolina, South Carolina Department of Education, and the National Council of Teachers of English. Training continues, with USC faculty, regional literacy coaches, visiting instructors from other South Carolina institutions, and national consultants serving as instructors.

South Carolina is evaluating the effects of the SCRI. The SCRI research team has collected data for a three-part study using a variety of criterion-referenced tests in addition to state standardized tests such as the Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test. Data are also being collected related to changes in teacher practices and attitudes.

**Contact:** Allison Norwood (SCRI-HS), Office of Curriculum and Standards, South Carolina Department of Education, [anorwood@ed.sc.gov](mailto:anorwood@ed.sc.gov), (803) 734-2469

Caroline Savage (SCRI-MG), Office of Curriculum and Standards, South Carolina Department of Education, [csavage@ed.sc.gov](mailto:csavage@ed.sc.gov), (803) 734-4770

## APPENDIX D

### INTERVENTION ABSTRACTS

Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI)	
Type of intervention	This program consists of teaching teachers to use multiple cognitive strategies for activating background knowledge, questioning, searching for information, summarizing, organizing information graphically, and structuring stories. These strategies are combined with the multiple motivational practices of using content goals in reading instruction, providing hands-on activities, affording students choices, using interesting texts, and promoting collaboration among school staff in reading instruction. The content area of major focus for the research has been science.
Developer	John Guthrie & Allan Wigfield, University of Maryland
Contact information	John Guthrie & Allan Wigfield (301) 314-8448—General Information jguthrie@umd.edu or awigfel@umd.edu
Brief description	Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction incorporates reading strategy instruction, student engagement strategies, and science inquiry activities in interesting and unique ways for students. The goals of CORI are to increase students' reading comprehension, motivation to read, and science knowledge. The CORI program equips participating teachers with the skills to accomplish these classroom goals through interactive, professional development workshops and established CORI guidelines.
Expected outcomes for teachers	Teachers learn instructional and motivational strategies that can be used to increase students' reading comprehension, engagement in instruction, science knowledge, and motivation to read.
Expected outcomes for students	Students learn numerous reading strategies including how to use background knowledge to inform their reading, form questions about text material, search for information, summarize accurately, organize their new-found knowledge, and monitor their own comprehension of text. Students' written language skills are also targeted for overall improvement.
Grade range	Research on CORI was originally conducted with students in 3rd–5th grades, but CORI has also been adapted for students in 6th–12th grades.
Reading level range	Varied
Materials provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CORI Facilitator Guide</li> <li>• CORI Teacher Guides</li> <li>• CORI Books—<i>Motivating Reading Comprehension: Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction &amp; Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction: Engaging Classrooms, Lifelong Learners</i></li> <li>• Videos/DVDs</li> </ul>
User requirements	4–6 months of planning by 1–3 full-time staff members, 5 days of teacher professional development, and funds to purchase books, manipulatives and portfolios necessary for instruction.
Time commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development for instructors in the CORI model requires a minimum of 10 days in the summer to give instructors an opportunity to adapt existing materials to the curriculum framework.</li> <li>• Each CORI teacher receives a minimum of 5 days of professional development in the summer and 5 days of coaching during the fall.</li> </ul>
Cost structure (as of 3/20/07)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Several independent trainers are available for the 10-day training course.</li> <li>• A trainer charges approximately \$10,000 for the introductory course.</li> <li>• Books for a room of about 20 students can cost approximately \$2,400 for the initial investment.</li> </ul>
R&D summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This program was first developed in 1992 in Maryland as a collaboration between Louise Bennett, an elementary school science teacher, and John Guthrie, a reading and literacy researcher.</li> <li>• Bennett and Guthrie designed CORI to teach students strategies used by skilled readers, increase student engagement in reading and science, and help students develop science inquiry skills.</li> <li>• Numerous quasi-experimental studies on the CORI model have been conducted.</li> <li>• The researchers of CORI have received funds from the U.S. Department of Education and the National Science Foundation to examine the impact of CORI on student achievement.</li> </ul>

Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI)	
Results of R&D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using random assignment of schools, the authors reported that CORI-trained teachers surpassed teachers trained in Strategy Instruction Only in their students' performance on reading comprehension, reading motivation and reading strategy measures (Guthrie, Wigfield, Barbosa, Perencevich, Taboada, Davis, Scaffidi &amp; Tonks, 2004).</li> <li>• Using a quasi-experimental design, CORI-trained teachers surpassed comparison teachers in their students' performance on reading comprehension and reading strategy use (Guthrie, Anderson, Alao &amp; Rinehart, 1999; Guthrie, Van Meter, Hancock, Alao, Anderson &amp; McCann, 1998).</li> <li>• Using a quasi-experimental design, CORI teachers surpassed comparison teachers in their students' performance on reading motivation (Guthrie, Wigfield &amp; VonSecker, 2000; Wigfield, Guthrie, Tonks &amp; Perencevich, 2004).</li> </ul>
References	<p>Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Teaching for literacy engagement. <i>Journal of Literacy Research</i>, 36, 1–30.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Anderson, E., Alao, S., &amp; Rinehart, J. (1999). Influences of Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction on strategy use and conceptual learning from text. <i>The Elementary School Journal</i>, 99(4), 343–366.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., &amp; Davis, M. H. (2003). Motivating struggling readers in middle school through an engagement model of classroom practice. <i>Reading &amp; Writing Quarterly</i>, 19, 59–85.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., &amp; Littles, E. (in press). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. <i>Contemporary Educational Psychology</i>.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., &amp; Perencevich, K. C. (2006). From spark to fire: Can situational reading interest lead to long-term reading motivation? <i>Reading Research and Instruction</i>, 45 (2), 91–118.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Van Meter, P., Hancock, G. R., McCann, A., Anderson, E., &amp; Alao, S. (1998). Does Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction increase strategy-use and conceptual learning from text? <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>, 90(2), 261–278.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scaffidi, N. T., &amp; Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>, 96, 403–423.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Humenick, N. M., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., &amp; Barbosa, P. (2006). Influences of stimulating tasks on reading motivation and comprehension. <i>Journal of Educational Research</i>, 99, 232–245.</p> <p>Guthrie, J.T., Wigfield, A., &amp; Perencevich, K.C. (Eds.). (2004). <i>Motivating reading comprehension: Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction</i>. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.</p> <p>Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., &amp; VonSecker, C. (2000). Effects of integrated instruction on motivation and strategy use in reading. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>, 92(2), 331–341.</p> <p>Lutz, S. L., Guthrie, J. T., &amp; Davis, M. H. (2006). Scaffolding for engagement in learning: An observational study of elementary school reading instruction. <i>Journal of Educational Research</i>, 100, 3–20.</p> <p>Wang, J. H., &amp; Guthrie, J. T. (2004). Modeling the effects of intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, amount of reading, and past reading achievement on text comprehension between U.S. and Chinese students. <i>Reading Research Quarterly</i>, 39, 162–186.</p> <p>Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., &amp; Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. <i>Journal of Educational Research</i>, 97, 299–309.</p> <p>Wigfield, A., &amp; Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology</i>, 89, 420–432.</p>
States used in	Maryland, Iowa, North Carolina, and Utah
Web site	<a href="http://www.cori.umd.edu/">http://www.cori.umd.edu/</a>

<b>CRISS (CReating Independence through Student-owned Strategies)</b>	
Type of intervention	Professional development course designed to help teachers incorporate additional instructional strategies for reading and writing into their regular content instruction.
Developer	Carol Santa and her colleagues in the Kalispell, Montana, School District.
Contact information	Lynn Havens, Project CRISS Director (406) 758-6440—General Information info@projectcriss.com
Brief description	<p>This program began in 1979 and was originally developed as a secondary program (Content Reading in Secondary Schools). In addition, it received federal validation and funding through the National Diffusion Network of the U.S. Department of Education.</p> <p>The purpose is to provide students with reading, writing, and study skill strategies that will help them better organize, understand, and retain information. The CRISS strategies can be incorporated into any existing curriculum and content area.</p>
Expected outcomes for teachers	Teachers learn instructional strategies and assessment techniques to enhance student progress in reading, writing, and in content subjects.
Expected outcomes for students	Students acquire skills to set their own learning goals and use strategies that work best for them. They acquire learning strategies, including meta-cognitive approaches and monitoring of their own learning, to enhance academic progress.
Other expected outcomes (administrative, organizational, curriculum)	Strategies are designed to be adapted and implemented across the curriculum.
Grade range	3–12
Reading level range	Varied
Materials provided	3rd Edition of <i>CRISS Teacher Training Manual</i> (for Level I Training).
User requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local facilitator needed to coordinate the program and periodically observe classes and arrange follow-up sessions 3–6 months after the final training session.</li> </ul>
Time commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level I Training/ Teachers—12–18 contact hours.</li> <li>Level II Training/ Certified District Trainer—28 contact hours.</li> </ul>
Cost structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level I Training/ Teachers—\$45.00/55.00 per person.</li> <li>Level II Training/ Certified District Trainer—\$200.00 per person.</li> <li>A variety of instructional materials are available ranging in price from \$10 for 10 student overviews of CRISS strategies to \$550 for a complete set of classroom materials.</li> </ul>
R&D summary	<p>The developers list the following evaluations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1985—National Validation study, Horsfall &amp; Santa (1985).</li> <li>1993–1994—Validation study (4th, 6th, 8th and 11th grades), Horsfall &amp; Santa (1994).</li> <li>2001–2003—Comparison study, 4th, 7th and High School Students in Utah, O’Neil and Associates (2004).</li> <li>2003–2004—Study in 2 High Schools in Las Vegas, Santa and Vick (2004).</li> <li>Overall, several pre-post-test evaluations with comparison groups are reported using a Free Recall Assessment as the outcome measure.</li> <li>Currently, the REL-Northwest is planning an evaluation of the program using an experimental design.</li> </ul> <p><i>(The O’Neil and Associates (2004) and Santa &amp; Vick (2004) reports were mentioned on the developers website, but we have been unable to obtain a copy.)</i></p>

<b>CRISS (CReating Independence through Student-owned Strategies)</b>	
Results of R&D	<p>The O'Neil and Associates (2004) evaluation findings as reported by the developer were that randomly selected students from a school with teachers trained in CRISS scored better on the Free Recall Assessment (created by the developer) than randomly selected students in schools where the teachers had not been trained in CRISS.</p> <p>In their review of the research on this intervention, the Florida Center for Reading Research points out some of the potential problems with the research conducted to date, "Although in some classrooms, students with <i>CRISS</i> trained teachers showed significantly stronger performance at the posttest, it is questionable whether the differential gains can be attributed to <i>CRISS</i> for two reasons. First, as schools were not randomly assigned to receive <i>CRISS</i> training, pre-existing school differences may have influenced the results. Second, the repeated measures ANOVA procedures used to analyze the data were not able to correct for pretest differences between groups of students (FCRR, 2004, p. 3)."</p>
References	<p>Horsfall, S., &amp; Santa, C. (1985). <i>Project CRISS: Validation report for the Joint Review and Dissemination Panel</i>.</p> <p>Horsfall, S., &amp; Santa, C. (1994). <i>Project CRISS: Validation report for the Program Effectiveness Panel</i>.</p> <p>Santa, C. (1995). <i>Project CRISS: Evidence of effectiveness in Spokane, Washington, and Aurora, Colorado</i>. Technical Report.</p> <p>Santa, C., &amp; O'Neil, R. (2004). Project CRISS: Evidence of effectiveness, constructive accountability: Creating a culture for progress. <i>Utah Association of Curriculum Development</i>, 15, 21–32.</p> <p>Santa, C., &amp; Vick, L. (2004). <i>Project CRISS evidence of effectiveness in Las Vegas Schools</i>. Technical Report.</p> <p>U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (2006). <i>National assessment of Title I Interim Report: Executive summary</i>. Washington, DC: Author.</p>
States used in	Over 43 states (Canada and Norway as well) (based on information from their web site)
Web site	<a href="http://www.projectcriss.com">http://www.projectcriss.com</a>

Literacy First—Middle/High School Content Area Process	
Type of intervention	Literacy First is a comprehensive reform process which aims to accelerate reading achievement through four distinct programs for students in grades PreK to 12th through professional development and onsite coaching and consulting.
Developer	Bill Blokker, President Professional Development Institute, Inc.
Contact information	Literacy First Process 3109 150th Place SE Mill Creek, WA 98012 (425) 745-3029
Brief description	Literacy First Middle/High School Content Area Process is a professional- development and change process that consists of the following: an analysis of the school's current reading program infrastructure and culture in comparison to research-based best practices; development of a customized three-year strategic plan; plan implementation through intensive professional development (28 days); systematic, explicit onsite coaching and consulting (24 days); and monitoring and support of the plan.
Expected outcomes for teachers	With respect to the Middle School/High School Content Area Process, teachers are expected to learn to help students better understand the content information taught in their classrooms. A small cadre of teachers will become secondary reading specialists. These teachers will teach in the Intensive Reading classes.
Expected outcomes for students	Though the intervention includes processes for grades PreK to 12th, the goal of the Literacy First Middle School/High School Content Area Process is to significantly increase achievement of ALL students in all content-area classes, provided they are reading no more than two grades below level.
Other expected outcomes (administrative, organizational, curriculum)	As part of the intervention, Literacy First monitors the support of the program from school and district administrators and holds the leadership team and teachers accountable for effective implementation of the strategic plan.
Grade range	6–12
Reading level range	Varied
Materials provided	Teachers in the content area receive a teacher's manual and three resource books, all of which focus on comprehension skills, strategic reading/thinking tools, metacognitive processes, and vocabulary development.
User requirements	Commitment from the school principal to be an integral part of the change process and implementation is needed.
Time commitment	The intervention entails a three-year process to include reading program analysis, 15 days of professional development, 24 days of onsite coaching and consulting, and unlimited email and phone consultation.
Cost structure	Dependent on the number of schools that participate and what they choose to include as the program customizes their plan to meet the needs of the individual schools.
R&D summary	The Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation contracted with the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) to conduct an independent evaluation of the impact of the Literacy First Process in 29 schools in Oklahoma. SEDL compared the 29 Literacy First schools to 29 non-Literacy First schools with similar demographics. On the nationally normed assessment used in the state, the Literacy First schools increased an average of 9 percentage points on 3rd-grade reading scores compared to a 1 percent increase in comparable schools. During the same time period, the average increase of reading achievement in all Oklahoma schools was 3 percentage points (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 2003). <i>(This report was mentioned on the developer's website, but we have been unable to obtain a copy.)</i>
Results of R&D	In their review of the research on this intervention, the Florida Center for Reading Research noted: "Literacy First cites preliminary data (including surveys, interviews, and observations) that indicated changes in teachers' knowledge and classroom implementation of explicit teaching directed at the students' instructional level. Presently, Literacy First is designing a study to collect more evidence about its impact on cultural change and school reform (FCRR, 2004, p. 2)."

**Literacy First—Middle/High School Content Area Process**

Program research references	(n.d.) <i>Literacy First Comprehensive Reading Reform Process</i> . Mill Creek, WA: Professional Development Institute.  Florida Center for Reading Research (2004, November). <i>Literacy first comprehensive reading reform process</i> . Tallahassee, FL: Author. Available online: <a href="http://www.fcrr.org">http://www.fcrr.org</a>
States used in	Nationwide K–12, 18 states and over 400 schools. See the Literacy First web site for specific details on states involved. Specific school districts with names for references may be contacted from the website.
Web site	<a href="http://www.literacyfirst.com">http://www.literacyfirst.com</a>

ReadAbout	
Type of intervention	A computer-based program meant to complement a core-reading program. This supplemental intervention program is designed to help students develop reading comprehension and vocabulary skills.
Developer	Scholastic, Inc.
Contact information	Scholastic, Inc. Worldwide Headquarters and Editorial Office 557 Broadway New York, New York 10012 1-877-234-READ—General Information <a href="http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/readabout/contact/customer_service.asp">http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/readabout/contact/customer_service.asp</a>
Brief description	ReadAbout is a self-managed reading program that uses technology to personalize literacy and vocabulary instruction. It is designed to help upper elementary students learn to read nonfiction. ReadAbout complements the core reading program; it uses nonfiction content, plus skills instruction, and reinforcement strategies tailored to the interests and reading level of individual students.
Expected outcomes for teachers	Teacher outcomes for those who take part in the introductory training include an ability to use ReadAbout's software to monitor students' reading progress and to use the reports of students' progress to continue differentiating instruction offline.  Teachers who take part in the Scholastic Red online training are expected to learn additional reading instruction strategies for improving student reading comprehension.
Expected outcomes for students	Students are expected to learn vocabulary and expository text structures, to develop graphic organizers and background knowledge, and to practice writing in response to text.
Grade range	3–8
Reading level range	Varied
Materials provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ReadAbout software and software manuals.</li> <li>• Teacher guide, topic planners, and organizer.</li> <li>• Worksheets and answer sheets.</li> </ul>
User requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computers for student and teacher use.</li> <li>• A printer for printing reports.</li> <li>• Teachers available to participate in a 2-day introductory workshop.</li> </ul>
Time commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 minutes, 3 days a week for each student using the program.</li> <li>• 2 days of training on how to use ReadAbout software is provided for teachers for each package of the ReadAbout program purchased.</li> </ul>
Cost structure (as of 10/11/06)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 100 license plan (three classrooms) includes ReadAbout software and materials for 3 classrooms as well as a 2-day training for 3 teachers on how to use the ReadAbout program costs \$11,000.</li> <li>• The 100 license plan plus a Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) program to determine students' reading level costs \$12,000.</li> <li>• The 100 license plan plus Scholastic Red, an online reading instruction course for teachers, costs \$12,350.</li> <li>• The 100 license plan plus both SRI and Scholastic Red costs \$13,600.</li> <li>• 360 licenses plan (12 classrooms/school level) includes ReadAbout software and materials for 12 classrooms as well as a 2-day training course for 13 teachers on how to use the ReadAbout program costs \$23,000.</li> <li>• The 360 license plan plus a SRI program to determine students' reading level costs \$27,500.</li> <li>• The 360 license plan plus Scholastic Red, an online reading instruction course for teachers costs \$34,875.</li> <li>• The 360 license plan plus both SRI and Scholastic Red costs \$30,375.</li> </ul>
R&D summary	The U.S. Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences is studying the effectiveness of reading comprehension programs, and ReadAbout is one of four programs that were randomly assigned to 5th grade classrooms in nine districts across the country (U.S. Department of Education, 2006).
Results of R&D	No results from the USDOE IES study have been reported

ReadAbout	
References	U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences (2006). <i>National assessment of Title I Interim Report: Executive summary</i> . Washington, DC: Author.
States used in	Not provided, but appears to be used in localities throughout the U.S.
Web site	<a href="http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/ReadAbout/index.htm">http://teacher.scholastic.com/products/ReadAbout/index.htm</a>

Reading in the Content Areas	
Type of intervention	This program teaches students reading strategies to guide them in comprehending text material in the subject areas of language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics.
Developer	Globe Fearon
Contact information	Lydia Rainer Sales Representative (Washington, DC) (877)-421-0808 Globe Fearon Dr. Kate Kinsella (Program Consultant) 1-(800)-858-9500 fax: (877)-260-2530
Brief description	The program uses the KWL Plus (Know, Want to Know, Learned), Predict and Confirm, Concept Building, and Cornell Note-taking strategies to increase students' ability to gain subject-area knowledge in language arts, social studies, science and mathematics, literacy comprehension (e.g., understanding of main topics in text material, organizational skills, study skills, and confidence in reading). Teachers take on the role of reading coaches, providing modeling of strategies, and encourage and support students' efforts.
Expected outcomes for teachers	Not explicitly stated in program materials but implied teacher outcomes include improved instructional methods, reading skill-assessment procedures, and methods for motivating students and reducing students' anxiety about academic performance.
Expected outcomes for students	Students will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gain confidence to work with diverse text material.</li> <li>• Increase skills to use various cognitive strategies for the purpose of increasing their academic achievement.</li> <li>• Increase literacy comprehension by using the structures and features of text (e.g., topic sentences and transitional expressions).</li> <li>• Gain skills to organize text material.</li> <li>• Increase skills in using prediction and confirmation strategies to enhance reading comprehension.</li> <li>• Gain skills in logical and critical thinking.</li> <li>• Acquire note-taking strategies to enhance retention of information.</li> <li>• Enhance their vocabulary.</li> </ul>
Other expected outcomes (administrative, organizational, curriculum)	None specified
Grade range	Middle and High School (grades 6–12)
Reading level range	4–7
Materials provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student edition, comprising four progressively more challenging volumes.</li> <li>• Teachers Resource Manual, which provides guidance on strategy instruction, lesson plans/ models, graphic illustrations, and helpful links on the Internet.</li> <li>• Placement Guide for placement of students at the correct program level.</li> <li>• Tips for Helping Students Read to Learn provides motivational tips, tips to enhance students' self-sufficiency, and guidance on assessment of student performance.</li> </ul>
User requirements	None specified
Time commitment	Not specified
Cost structure	\$189.90 for all above-mentioned materials plus 8-10% of the total for shipping and handling of materials.
R&D summary	Program materials, developer website, and literature search did not reveal any research studies supporting the program. However, the program description clearly demonstrates that it is based, at least in part, on the large body of research literature on effective literacy programs (e.g., use of strategy instruction).
Results of R&D	
Program research references	
States used in	Not Specified
Web site	<a href="http://www.globefearon.com">http://www.globefearon.com</a>

Reading Apprenticeship	
Type of intervention	Professional development program focused on enabling teachers to build their understanding of the complexities of reading .
Developer	WestEd’s Strategic Literacy Initiative (SLI) Ruth Schoenbach, Director of SLI Cynthia Greenleaf, Associate Director of SLI
Contact information	Jana Bouc, Program Coordinator of SLI 300 Lakeside Drive, 25th Floor Oakland, CA 94612-3534 Tel: (510) 302-4245 Fax: (510) 302-4354 Email: jbouc@wested.org
Brief description	<p>Initiated in 1995, Reading Apprenticeship is a professional development program that was originally designed and implemented through a cross school network of inter-disciplinary site-based teams involving over 300 middle and high school content-area teachers in the San Francisco Bay area. In contrast to conceptualizing literacy as a collection of basic skills, the program’s instructional framework is based on the dual notions of literacy as a complex cognitive and social process and of teaching as cognitive apprenticeship—i.e., the teacher serves as the “master” reader to his or her student apprentice readers. The framework consists of four integrated dimensions of classroom life that teachers and students explore together: social, personal, cognitive, and knowledge-building. The program features a guided and structured inquiry process, built around “literacy learning cases” that teachers engage with. Accordingly, in a Reading Apprenticeship classroom, the curriculum expands to include <i>how</i> teachers and students read and <i>why</i> they read in the ways they do, as well as <i>what</i> they read in subject-area classes. A course for 9th graders, Academic Literacy, has also been developed.</p> <p>Participation options include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-based teacher professional development—from a one-time, one-day training, to a three-time 7-day training—conducted by SLI staff and consultants.</li> <li>• National Institute in Reading Apprenticeship: A training-of-trainers program offered by SLI to schools and districts around the country. Team members are required to have leadership experience in literacy, subject-area curriculum and instruction, and professional development.</li> </ul>
Expected outcomes for teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers create a classroom environment that is student-centered rather than teacher-directed and that is characterized by high student engagement and self direction.</li> <li>• Instructional practices evidence increased collaboration between and among teachers, including across subject-area divisions, and students.</li> <li>• Teachers and students develop an increased sense of accountability for student learning.</li> </ul>
Expected outcomes for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students’ engagement, fluency, and competency in reading increases.</li> <li>• Student academic performance increases.</li> <li>• Students gain a greater sense of ownership and control of their reading practices.</li> <li>• Students have greater motivation to read and understand the power of literacy to shape their lives.</li> </ul>
Other expected outcomes	None specified
Grade range	Middle and high school
Reading level range	Varies
Materials provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants in the site-based teacher training receive a copy of the SLI’s book, <i>Reading for Understanding: A Guide to Improving Reading in Middle and High School Classrooms</i> as well as comprehensive course materials.</li> <li>• Teams participating in the National Institute in Reading Apprenticeship receive copies of the SLI’s book, <i>Reading for Understanding: A Guide to Improving Reading in Middle and High School Classrooms</i> and a comprehensive set of materials for conducting RA professional development in local education agencies and schools. This includes student and classroom case-study videos and video facilitators’ guides; a binder filled with over 400 pages of readings and reproducible resource materials; and membership in an active online discussion group with access to online updated resource file downloads.</li> </ul>

Reading Apprenticeship	
User requirements	Organizations sponsoring site-based training provide the meeting rooms, audio/visual needs, and refreshments for participants.
Time commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site-based teacher training, the specification of which depends on program design. (See cost structure and options below.)</li> <li>• National Institute in Reading Apprenticeship: 8 days of professional development.</li> </ul>
Cost structure (as of Oct. 2006)	<p>Site-based professional development: Pricing is based on sessions for up to 40 participants. SLI provides two facilitators and covers all of their travel and lodging expenses. Costs are also based on the number of training days and the number of trips that consultants make to a location:</p> <p>Training Days &amp; Trips            1-day, 1 trip: \$ 7,500            2-day, 1 trip: \$15,000            3-day, 1 trip: \$20,000            4-day, 1 trip: \$26,000            5-day, 2 trips: \$32,000            5-day, 3 trips: \$39,000            7-day, 2 trips: \$42,000            7-day, 3 trips: \$50,000</p> <p>National Institute in Reading Apprenticeship: \$4,000/participant plus travel.</p>
R&D summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 1997–2000, SLI researchers examined the impact of RA on teachers' classroom practice related to reading in their content areas.</li> <li>• During 1999–2002, studies collected data on student reading growth in Bay Area and Los Angeles high schools. Student performance was measured using the Degrees of Reading Power (DRP) standardized test of reading comprehension.</li> <li>• There have also been several case studies of high implementation RA classrooms (2001–2003). Student performance was measured using the DRP.</li> <li>• From 2001–2004, case studies were conducted on schools implementing RA as a school-wide initiative.</li> <li>• In 2005, the Institute of Education Sciences awarded WestEd a grant to conduct an experimental test of the effectiveness of Reading Apprenticeship entitled "A Randomized Control Study of the Efficacy of Reading Apprenticeship Professional Development for High School History and Science Teaching and Learning" (full abstract is available at: <a href="http://ies.ed.gov/ncер/projects/tq_reading/fy05_wested_abstract.asp">http://ies.ed.gov/ncер/projects/tq_reading/fy05_wested_abstract.asp</a>).</li> <li>• Overall, numerous implementation and impact studies have been conducted on RA. They have consistently reported pre-post data using state or other commercially available assessments.</li> </ul>
Results of R&D	<p>Teacher outcomes related to participation in Reading Apprenticeship have been the subject of investigation (e.g., WestEd 2004d). Results described included increases in teachers' knowledge about reading instruction, pedagogic content knowledge, and approaches to appraising students' literacy skills and instructional needs as well as teacher acquisition of the repertoires of effective instructional practices, teaching roles, and provision of learning opportunities for students consistent with the RA framework.</p> <p>Student outcomes resulting from teacher participation, including their attitudes toward and achievement in reading, have also been a focus of investigation (e.g., Greenleaf, Schoenbach, Cziko, &amp; Mueller, 2001; WestEd 2004b).</p>

### Reading Apprenticeship

Program research references	<p>Greenleaf, C. L., Mueller, F. L., &amp; Cziko, C. (1997). <i>Impact of the Pilot Academic Literacy Course on ninth grade students' reading development: Academic year 1996–1997</i>. A Report to the Stuart Foundation. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.</p> <p>Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., &amp; Mueller, F. L. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. <i>Harvard Educational Review</i>, 71(1), 79–129.</p> <p>WestEd. (2004a). <i>2001–2004 Increasing student achievement through school-wide Reading Apprenticeship</i>. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.</p> <p>WestEd. (2004b). <i>1996–1999 9th Grade Academic Literacy Course Studies</i>. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.</p> <p>WestEd. (2004c). <i>1999–2002 Studies of student reading growth in diverse professional development networks</i>. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.</p> <p>WestEd. (2004d). <i>1997–2000 A study of teacher learning and student reading outcomes in an SLI professional development network</i>. San Francisco, CA: WestEd.</p>
States used in	National scope
Web site	<a href="http://www.wested.org/cs/sli/print/docs/sli/home.htm">http://www.wested.org/cs/sli/print/docs/sli/home.htm</a>

<b>Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)–Content Literacy Continuum (CLC)</b>	
Type of intervention	CLC is a 3–4-year school-improvement process that focuses on helping secondary schools develop and sustain comprehensive and integrated literacy programs.
Developer	University of Kansas Center on Research and Learning
Contact information	The Strategic Learning Center 3910 California Ave SW Seattle, WA 98116 (206) 760-7650 slc@smarttogether.org www.smarttogether.org
Brief description	<p>The Strategic Instruction Model (SIM) Content Literacy Continuum (CLC) is a 3–4-year school-improvement process focused on helping secondary schools develop and sustain comprehensive and integrated literacy programs. The goal is to create a school-wide approach to improving literacy for all students in secondary schools so that they can meet higher standards. The process to implement the framework is led by a SIM team that works with administrators, teachers, and staff to develop and implement a standards-based plan to improve literacy and content area learning tied to student performance on state assessments. The model uses a variety of strategies, some focused on helping teachers and others on helping students.</p> <p>Components of the SIM Content Literacy Continuum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content Mastery.</li> <li>• Embedded Strategy Instruction.</li> <li>• Explicit Strategy Instruction.</li> <li>• Intensive Skill Development.</li> <li>• Intensive Clinical Intervention.</li> </ul>
Expected outcomes for teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Think about, adopt, and present critical content in a learner-friendly fashion.</li> <li>• Use Content Enhancement Routines to promote content mastery.</li> <li>• Differentiate instruction.</li> </ul>
Expected outcomes for students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn the skills and strategies needed to learn content.</li> <li>• Learn critical content regardless of literacy level.</li> <li>• Value the process of learning how to learn.</li> </ul>
Other expected outcomes ( <i>administrative, organizational, curriculum</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools will develop intensive and coordinated instructional experiences for students who have difficulty reading and those with serious reading deficiencies.</li> <li>• Support personnel and teachers will learn how to provide intensive instruction and strategic tutoring.</li> <li>• Reading specialists and special education teachers will learn skills and strategies to teacher students with disabilities.</li> <li>• Speech-language pathologists learn strategies to assist students.</li> </ul>
Grade range	6–12
Reading level range	Varied
Materials provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidebooks</li> <li>• Success Guides</li> <li>• Manuals</li> <li>• Notebooks</li> <li>• Learning Strategy Curriculum Manuals</li> <li>• CD-ROM</li> </ul>
User requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commit to the 3–4-year process.</li> <li>• Share achievement data with SIM Literacy Specialists.</li> <li>• Identify a site literacy coordinator.</li> <li>• Align goals associated with SIM Content Literacy activities with school-improvement plans.</li> <li>• Provide logistical resources and time for teachers.</li> <li>• Develop appropriate courses and course supports.</li> <li>• Participate in peer evaluations.</li> <li>• Support teachers by providing professional development group time.</li> <li>• Keep SIM Implementation Team informed of evaluation activities and other school initiatives.</li> </ul>
Time commitment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum 3–4-year process</li> </ul>

Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)–Content Literacy Continuum (CLC)	
Cost structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A</li> </ul>
R&D summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Components of SIM, or more precisely, specific “routines” embedded in the elaborate SIM framework (e.g., Bulgren et al., 2000; Bulgren, Lenz, Schumaker, Deshler, &amp; Marquis, 2002) have been subject to research over the past 25 years. With some exceptions (e.g., Mothus &amp; Lapadat, n.d.; Perez &amp; Hughes, 2005), SIM-related research and evaluation has been undertaken by the program developers.</li> <li>• Most SIM research has focused on demonstrating the relevance of SIM to students with learning disabilities.</li> <li>• To date, there has been no study of the efficacy of the SIM–CLC intervention as a whole. However, the National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE) is collaborating with the Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) in sponsoring a rigorous evaluation of supplemental literacy interventions targeting 9th graders and has contracted with MDRC and American Institutes for Research (AIR) to conduct the study, which will contrast two programs selected by a panel of reading experts through a competitive process: SIM and the Reading Apprenticeship program developed by WestEd. Schools participating in the evaluation will be randomly assigned to one of the two programs. The final report is expected in 2009. For more description and study contacts go to: <a href="http://www.aacps.org/aacps/boe/commu/slc/enhanced.htm">http://www.aacps.org/aacps/boe/commu/slc/enhanced.htm</a></li> </ul>
Results of R&D	The FCRR review of SIM (January 2006) reported that research encompassing five separate SIM strategies demonstrated that students were able to learn the steps at a high level of proficiency and were able to implement the steps correctly. However, the FCRR notes that research on how strategy acquisition and utilization impacts reading outcome measures, such as reading comprehension, is less highly developed.
Program research references	<p>Bulgren, J. A., Deshler, D. D., Schumaker, J. B., &amp; Lenz, K. B. (2000). The use and effectiveness of analogical instruction in diverse secondary content classrooms. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology, 92</i>(3), 426–441.</p> <p>Bulgren, J. A., Lenz, K. B., Schumaker, J. B., Deshler, D. D., &amp; Marquis, J. G. (2002). The use and effectiveness of a comparison routine in diverse secondary content classrooms. <i>Journal of Educational Psychology, 94</i>(2), 356–371.</p> <p>Mothus, T. G., &amp; Lapadat, J. C. (n.d.). <i>A strategy intervention to increase the reading comprehension of junior high school students with reading disabilities</i>. Unpublished Manuscript. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED490965)</p> <p>Perez, R., &amp; Hughes, E. (2005). <i>Strategies for Academic Success (SAS) end-of-year report</i>. El Paso, TX: El Paso Independent School District.</p> <p>Woodruff, S., Schumaker, J. B., &amp; Deshler, D. D. (2002). <i>The effects of an intensive reading intervention on the decoding skills of high school students with learning deficits. Research report #15</i>. Lawrence, KS: Institute for Academic Access.</p> <p>(Note: See the SIM Research Report at <a href="http://www.fcrr.org">www.fcrr.org</a> for additional research citations for SIM)</p>
States used in	Connecticut, Florida, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, South Carolina, and Wyoming.
Web site	<a href="http://www.ku-crl.org/sim/index.html">http://www.ku-crl.org/sim/index.html</a> <a href="http://www.smarttogether.org">http://www.smarttogether.org</a>

---

## APPENDIX E ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

---

### Alliance for Excellent Education

[www.all4ed.org](http://www.all4ed.org)

The Alliance for Excellent Education is a policy, research, and advocacy organization dedicated to the support of students in low-performing high schools. In an effort to improve adolescent literacy, the alliance hosts events and develops products focused on this topic. Framework for an Excellent Education is a project initiated by the Alliance to support adolescent literacy improvement by building on Reading First. Their contact for adolescent literacy is Rafael Heller, Senior Policy Analyst, who can be reached at (202) 828-0828 or at [rheller@all4ed.org](mailto:rheller@all4ed.org).

---

### American Institute of Research (AIR)

[www.air.org](http://www.air.org)

At the request of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the American Institute of Research (AIR) conducted a descriptive study of the Alabama Reading Initiative (ARI) based on interviews with those involved in ARI including students, teachers, and administrators at the school and state level, university faculty, and other stakeholders. It documents the struggles and challenges involved in implementing a plan intended to touch every student and teacher in Alabama and offers lessons and recommendations derived as the ARI was implemented. The report also describes the positive outcomes of the program, for both teachers and students, that are expected to result in “steady progress” in academics among students. The report can be accessed at [www.Air.org/publications/documents/ARI%20Popular%20Report\\_final.pdf](http://www.Air.org/publications/documents/ARI%20Popular%20Report_final.pdf)

---

### Center on Instruction

[www.centeroninstruction.org](http://www.centeroninstruction.org)

The Center on Instruction is a partnership of five organizations providing resources and expertise

to Regional Comprehensive Centers in reading, mathematics, science, special education, and English-language learners. The Florida Center for Reading Research ([www.fcrr.org](http://www.fcrr.org)) leads the reading strand, which is divided into four categories—K–3, 4–12, special education, and English-language learners. The 4–12 section contains resources helpful to administrators, policymakers, and educators.

A substantial list of PowerPoint presentations covering topics such as selection of, planning for, and challenges of adolescent literacy programs; skills, knowledge requirements, and instruction; reading standards and assessments; and English-language learners issues are included in the 4–12 section. A DVD is available for a nominal fee that includes details and information from the Adolescent Literacy Workshop held in Boston in 2006.

The web site also includes links to the Vaughn Gross Center for Reading and Language Arts at the University of Texas at Austin ([www.texasreading.org](http://www.texasreading.org)) and the Florida Center for Reading Research ([www.fcrr.org](http://www.fcrr.org)).

---

### Institute of Education Sciences

<http://ies.ed.gov>

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is the section within the U.S. Department of Education charged with supporting rigorous research in education and providing information on evaluation and statistics to educators. IES comprises four units: the National Center for Education Research (NCER), the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), and the National Center for Special Education Research (NCSE). Within this framework IES supports research on several adolescent literacy-related initiatives through competitive grants and the regional education laboratory (REL) system. Through the competitive grant process, IES supports Interventions for Struggling Adolescent and Adult Readers and Writers, an NCER program that

funds projects examining strategies to improve basic reading and writing skills for individuals whose insufficient skills impede their success. IES also supports several ongoing adolescent literacy research projects through the REL system (<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/>).

---

### Learning Points Associates

[www.learningpt.org](http://www.learningpt.org)

Learning Points Associates is a nonprofit, educational organization providing resources and technical assistance on various issues in education. Whereas, this study focuses on a review of professional development and other support for content-area teachers in improving reading outcomes for their classes as a whole, Learning Points has produced a document that provides information on programs for use with struggling adolescent readers.

1. *The Adolescent Literacy Intervention Programs: Chart and Program Review Guide* discusses program characteristics for struggling adolescent readers and includes a chart and review guide to help schools choose programs for students.
2. Adolescent Literacy Web site. This web site is a collection of resources, tools, and information on adolescent literacy and is intended to help educators and policymakers gather and apply knowledge to help all students succeed. The site provides an overview of proposed and authorized legislation, components of successful programs, instructional leadership resources, and additional web sites focusing on adolescent literacy.

---

### National Association of State Boards of Education

<http://www.nasbe.org/>

In *Reading at Risk: The State of Response to the Crisis in Adolescent Literacy* the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Study

Group on Middle and Secondary Literacy emphasized the need for schools and districts to implement practices that researchers have identified as likely to improve adolescent reading achievement. NASBE laid out recommendations for states interested in improving adolescent literacy, including the need for research to guide practice:

- Set state literacy goals and standards, ensuring alignment with curricula and assessments and raising literacy expectations across the curriculum for all students in all grades.
- Ensure that teachers have the preparation and professional development to provide effective, content-based literacy instruction.
- Strategically use data to identify student needs, design cohesive policies, and evaluate the quality of implementation and impact.
- Require the development of district and school literacy plans that infuse research-based literacy support strategies in all content areas.
- Provide districts and schools with funding, support, and resources.
- Provide state guidance and oversight to ensure strong implementation of comprehensive quality literacy programs.

---

### National Governors Association

[www.nga.org](http://www.nga.org)

The National Governors Association (NGA) is a bipartisan organization of the nation's governors that "promotes visionary state leadership, shares best practices, and speaks with a unified voice on national policy." The NGA has developed Reading to Achieve: State Policies to Support Adolescent Literacy, a program dedicated to helping policymakers raise adolescent literacy achievement in their states. The project is supported by the Carnegie Corporation and has provided funding to eight states to help

them develop state plans centered on adolescent literacy. These plans incorporate recommendations from *Reading to Achieve: A Governor's Guide to Adolescent Literacy*, an NGA publication that identifies strategies to improve adolescent literacy.

### Striving Readers

[www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/index.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/strivingreaders/index.html)

Striving Readers is a discretionary grant authorized as part of the 2005 Fiscal Year Appropriations Act under the Title I demonstration authority. Eligible Title I local education agencies serving students in grades 6–12 may apply, or state education agencies may apply on behalf of an eligible local agency. The program supports new

comprehensive reading initiatives or expansion of existing initiatives that improve the quality of literacy instruction across the curriculum; provides intensive literacy interventions to struggling readers; and help build a strong, scientific research base for identifying and replicating strategies that improve adolescent literacy skills. Initiatives include three key components:

1. Supplemental literacy interventions targeted to students who are reading significantly below grade level.
2. Cross-disciplinary strategies for improving student literacy.
3. Strong experimental evaluation components.

---

**REFERENCES**

- American Institutes for Research. (2005). *Reading framework for the 2009 national assessment of educational progress* (Pre-publication ed.). Washington, DC: National Assessment Governing Board. Retrieved from <http://www.nagb.org/frameworks/writing-fw-draft-0508.doc>.
- Anderson, R. C., Nguyen-Jahiel, K., & McNurlen, B. (2001). The snowball phenomenon: Spread of ways of talking and ways of thinking across groups of children. *Cognition and Instruction, 19*(1), 1–46.
- Bacevich, A., & Salinger, T. (2006). *Lessons and recommendations from the Alabama Reading Initiative: Sustaining focus on secondary reading*. Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from [http://www.air.org/publications/documents/ARI%20Popular%20Report\\_final.pdf](http://www.air.org/publications/documents/ARI%20Popular%20Report_final.pdf).
- Berman, I., & Biancarosa, G. (2005). *Reading to achieve: A Governor's Guide to adolescent literacy*. Washington, DC: National Governors Association, Center for Best Practices.
- Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. E. (2004). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report from Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Bottoms, G. (2005). Why we need an across-the-curriculum emphasis on literacy. In *Literacy across the curriculum: Setting and implementing goals for grades six through 12. Site Development Guide #12*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Board.
- Bulgren, J. A., Deshler, D. D., Schumaker, J. B., & Lenz, B. K. (2000). The use and effectiveness of analogical instruction in diverse secondary content classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92*(3), 426–441.
- Bulgren, J. A., Lenz, B. K., Schumaker, J. B., Deshler, D. D., & Marquis, J. B. (2002). The use and effectiveness of a comparison routine in diverse secondary content classrooms. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*(2), 356–371.
- Burney, D., Corcoran, T. B., & Lesnick, J. (2003). *Instructional coaching: A review of research*. Philadelphia, PA: The Learning Partnership Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- Clark, A., Anderson, R., Kuo, L., Kim, I., Archodidou, A., & Nguyen-Jahiel, K. (2003). Collaborative reasoning: Expanding ways for children to talk and think in school. *Educational Psychology Review, 15*(2), 181–198.
- Comprehensive School Reform Quality Center. (2005). *Moving forward: A guide for implementing comprehensive school reform and improvement strategies*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research, CSRQ Center. Retrieved from <http://www.csrq.org/documents/MovingForwardGuideFinal11-09-05.pdf>.
- Davis, D., Spraker, J., & Kushman, J. (2004). *Improving adolescent reading: Findings from research*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.
- Florida Center for Reading Research. (2006, June). *Read-About*. Tallahassee, FL: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.fcrr.org/FCRRReports/PDF/ReadAboutfinalnew.pdf>.
- Florida Center for Reading Research. (2004, November). *Literacy First comprehensive reading reform process*. Tallahassee, FL: Author. Retrieved from [http://www.fcrr.org/FCRRReports/PDF/Literacy\\_First.pdf](http://www.fcrr.org/FCRRReports/PDF/Literacy_First.pdf).
- Franzak, J. K. (2006). Zoom: A review of the literature on marginalized adolescent readers, literacy theory, and policy implications. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(2), 209–248.
- Greenleaf, C. L., Schoenbach, R., Cziko, C., & Mueller, F. L. (2001). Apprenticing adolescent readers to academic literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 71*(1), 79–129.
- Guthrie, J. T., Anderson, E., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. (1999). Influences of Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction on strategy use and conceptual learning from text. *The Elementary School Journal, 99*(4), 343–366.

- Guthrie, J. T., Van Meter, P., Hancock, G. R., Alao, S., Anderson, E., & McCann, A. (1998). Does Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction increase strategy use and conceptual learning from text? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 261–278.
- Guthrie, J. T., & Wigfield, A. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. In M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 403–422). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K.C., Taboada, A., Davis, M.H., Scaffidi, N. T., & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 96*(3), 403–423.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Humenick, N. M., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., & Barbosa, P. (2006). Influences of stimulating tasks on reading motivation and comprehension. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*(4), 232–245.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & VonSecker, C. (2000). Effects of integrated instruction on motivation and strategy use in reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology 92*(2), 331–341.
- Hassel E. A., Hassel, B. C., Arkin, M. D., Kowal, J. M., & Steiner, L. M. (2006). *School restructuring under No Child Left Behind: What works when? A guide for education leaders*. Washington, DC: Learning Point Associates, The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/RestructuringGuide.pdf>.
- International Reading Association. (2006). *Standards for middle and high school literacy coaches*. Newark, DE. Retrieved from <http://www.reading.org/resources/issues/reports/coaching.html>
- Kamil, M. L. (2006, July). *NAEP reading framework 2009 and beyond*. Paper presented at the University of California, Berkeley 2nd Annual Summer Institute in Reading, San Francisco, CA.
- Kamil, M. L. (2003, November). *Adolescents and literacy: Reading for the 21st century*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Kinsella, K. (2000). *Reading in the content areas strategies for reading success: Tips for helping students read to learn*. Parsippany, NJ: Globe Fearon (Pearson Learning Group).
- Lenz, B. K., Ehren, B. J., & Deshler, D. D. (2005). The content literacy continuum: A school reform framework for improving adolescent literacy for all students. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 37*(6), 60–63.
- MacArthur, C., Graham, S., & Fitzgerald, J. (2006). *Handbook of writing research*. New York: Guilford.
- Manouchehri, A. (2001). Collegial interaction and reflective practice. *Action in Teacher Education, 22*(4), 86–97.
- Meltzer, J. (2001). *Supporting adolescent literacy across the content areas. Perspectives on policy and practice*. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University.
- Meltzer, J., Smith, N. C., & Clark, H. (2002). *Adolescent literacy resources: Linking research and practice*. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (2006). *Reading at risk; The state response to the crisis in adolescent literacy* (rev. ed.). Report of the NASBE Study Group on Middle and High School Literacy. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (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*. (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Institute for Literacy. (n.d.). *Facts and statistics: Reading facts*. Retrieved November, 2006, from [http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/facts/reading\\_facts.html](http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/facts/reading_facts.html).
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

- National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development* (rev. ed.). Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.
- Neufeld, B., & Roper, D. (2003). *Coaching: A strategy for developing instructional capacity—Promises and practicalities*. Prepared for the Aspen Institute Program on Education and the Annenberg Institute for School Reform. Cambridge, MA: Education Matters. Retrieved from <http://www.annenberginstitute.org/images/coaching.pdf>.
- Pearson, D. (2006, July). *A new framework for teaching comprehension in the upper elementary grades*. Paper presented at the North Region Summer Conference of America's Choice in Saratoga Springs, NY. Retrieved from <http://scienceandliteracy.org/Presentations/High%20Expectations.ppt>.
- Perie, M., Grigg, W., & Donahue, P. (2005). *The nation's report card: Reading 2005* (NCES 2006-451). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Phelps, S. (2005). *Ten years of research on adolescent literacy, 1994–2004: A review*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- RAND Reading Study Group. (2002). *Reading for understanding: Toward a RAND program in reading comprehension*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Santa, C. M. (2004). *Project CRISS<sup>SM</sup>: A history of reliable, replicable research*. Retrieved from [http://projectcriss.com/prc/pdf\\_research/7-ReplicableResearch.pdf](http://projectcriss.com/prc/pdf_research/7-ReplicableResearch.pdf).
- Schoenbach, R., Braunger, J., Greenleaf, C., & Litman, C. (2003). Apprenticing adolescents to reading in subject-area classrooms. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 82(2), 133–138.
- Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., Cziko, C., & Hurwitz, L. (2000). *Reading for understanding: A guide to improving reading in middle and high school classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwartzbeck, T. D. (2002). *Choosing a model and types of models: How to find what works for your school*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform.
- South Carolina Reading Initiative. (2003). Field Initiated Studies. Retrieved from [http://www.ncte.org/library/files/profdev/onsite/RI/SC\\_Brief.pdf](http://www.ncte.org/library/files/profdev/onsite/RI/SC_Brief.pdf).
- Shake, M. C., & Bintz, W. (2001). *Investigating current problems and practices in teaching reading across the curriculum at the middle school and high school levels: Executive summary*. Retrieved November 2006 from [http://www.kentuckyliteracy.org/middle\\_school.pdf](http://www.kentuckyliteracy.org/middle_school.pdf).
- Shanahan, C. (2005). *Adolescent literacy intervention programs: Chart and program review guide*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved from <http://www.learningpt.org>.
- Snow, C. E., & Biancarosa, G. (2003). *Adolescent literacy and the achievement gap: What do we know and where do we go from here?* Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York, Adolescent Literacy Funders Meeting. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.
- Spraker, J. (2003). *Teacher teaming in relation to student performance: Findings from the literature*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.
- Stevenson, E., & Waltman, K. (2006). *Reading across the curriculum: An investigation of the implementation and impact in secondary schools* (I-ARP Report #001). Iowa City: University of Iowa, Center for Evaluation and Assessment. Retrieved from <http://www.education.uiowa.edu/cea/RecentFindings.htm>
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. (2006). *National assessment of Title I Interim Report: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. (2003). *The nation's report card: Reading highlights 2002* (NCES 2003-524). Washington, DC: Author.
- Walker, K. (n.d.). *Research brief: Literacy across the high school curriculum*. The Principals' Partnership, sponsored by Union Pacific Foundation. Retrieved

November 16, 2006, from <http://principalspartnership.com/literacyacross.pdf>.

- Walter, K. E. (2004). *Making good choices: Sustainable school improvement*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://www.learningpt.org>.
- Whitehurst, G. J. (2004). *Making education evidence-based: Premises, principles, pragmatics, and politics*. Paper presented at the Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.
- Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Tonks, S., & Perencevich, K. C. (2004). Children's motivation for reading: Domain specificity and instructional influences. *Journal of Educational Research, 97*(6), 299–309.
- Wilkinson, I. (2006). *'Thenken talk': A design for discussion to promote high-level comprehension of text*. Paper presented at the University of California, Berkeley, 2nd Annual Summer Institute in Reading, San Francisco, CA.