

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D.
Drcaroltolman@aol.com

Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed.
gbolton@sau29.org

Claudia Burdett-Lerner, B.S.
cburdettlerner@sau29.org

While high school students who are poor readers and spellers present particularly difficult teaching challenges, proper diagnostics coupled with purposeful, systematic, intensive remedial techniques allow significant skill gains to be made. Although we acknowledge that every student is different in his or her reading strengths and weaknesses, below we outline the most common reading disability profiles supported by our research and found within our population. Daily, credited classes are provided for all five subtypes. The results, as you will see, are just amazing.

Phonemic Awareness

Below average scores: Phonemic awareness, word attack, and spelling.

Remediation: *Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech (LIPS), Games and Activities for Readers and Spellers, Sopris West.*

Reading Rate

Below average scores: Rapid naming of letters, numbers, and reading rate.

Remediation: Speed drills at the reading level at which the student breaks down, sound, word, phrase, sentence, and paragraph levels, daily timed readings of passages at independent level (95%+ mastery), and simultaneous read-alouds with the teacher at the student's independent reading level.

Orthographic Processing

Below average scores: Reading real words and spelling.

Remediation: A combination of the following: Visualization techniques, Orton Gillingham based multisensory approaches, *Language!*, *Wilson Reading Program*, *How to Spell*, *Megawords*, *Rewards*, *Concept Phonics*, *Spellography*, *Lindamood: Ending Grid*, *Expectancies*, and *List of Real Words for Reading & Spelling*.

Comprehension

Below average scores: Reading and listening comprehension.

Remediation: *Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension* and *Palincsar's Reciprocal Teaching Methodologies*.

Low Language Learning Disabled

Below average scores: Phonemic awareness, and rapid automatic naming (Double Deficit), but many times including: word attack, word identification, and reading comprehension.

Remediation: *LIPS*, rate training, orthographic expectancies, reciprocal teaching methodologies, Orton Gillingham based multisensory approaches, and visualizing and verbalizing.

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Reading Feedback

Phonemic Awareness

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: _____ Blending Words - Score: _____ Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: _____ Blending Words - Score: _____ Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Rapid Automatic Naming

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: _____ Numbers - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: _____ Numbers - Score: _____

Word Attack

Date: _____ Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form G - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form H - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Word Identification

Date: _____ Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form G - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form H - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Reading Rate

Date: _____ Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Reading Accuracy

Date: _____ Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Reading Comprehension

Date: _____ Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Listening Comprehension

Date: _____ Measure: Extended use of GORT - 3 - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: Extended use of GORT - 3 - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Spelling

Date: _____ Measure: TWS - 4 - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: TWS - 4 - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: Henderson graded word list - Instructional Level: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: Henderson graded word list - Instructional Level: _____ Comments: _____

Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Gray Oral Reading Test - 3 (GORT - 3) Gray Oral Reading Test - 4 [Newer version, now in use] (GORT - 4)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised/Normative Updated (WRMT-R/NU)
Test of Written Spelling (TWS - 4)
Test of Word Efficiency (TOWRE)

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed., Claudia M. Burdett-Lerner, B.S.,
Renée F. Stout, B.S. & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Reading Feedback

Phonemic Awareness

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 6 Blending Words - Score: 4 Segmenting Words - Score: _____ *

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 13 Blending Words - Score: 10 Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Rapid Automatic Naming

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 15 Numbers - Score: 9

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: _____ Numbers - Score: _____

Word Attack

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form G - Score: 95 *

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form H - Score: 112

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Word Identification

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form G - Score: 92

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form H - Score: 96

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Reading Rate

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 5 Comments: _____

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 9 Comments: _____

Reading Accuracy

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 6 Comments: _____ *

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 9 Comments: _____

Reading Comprehension

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 6 Comments: improvements in decoding allow students to become

Date: 6/3/01 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 13 Comments: fast & automatic and improve comprehension.

Spelling

Date: _____ Measure: TWS - 4 - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: TWS - 4 - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: 5/12/00 Measure: Henderson graded word list - Instructional Level: Grade 4 Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: Henderson graded word list - Instructional Level: _____ Comments: _____

* Target Skill Areas

** Scores reported as standard scores; 8 - 12 or 85 - 115 is an average range.

- Student with **Phonemic Awareness** difficulties. (a junior)
- Remediation: *LIPS* one hour per day, two semesters (September - June).
- As a result of these improvements, this student was chosen to be highlighted by the New Hampshire State Department of Education!!
- This student now plans to attend college for architecture!

Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Gray Oral Reading Test - 3 (GORT - 3) Gray Oral Reading Test - 4 [Newer version, now in use] (GORT - 3)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised, Normative Updated (WRMT-R/NU)
Test of Written Spelling (TWS - 4)
Test of Word Efficiency (TOWRE)

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed., Claudia M. Burdett-Lerner, B.S.,
Renée F. Stout, B.S. & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Reading Feedback

Phonemic Awareness

Date: 9/2/01 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 10 Blending Words - Score: 11 Segmenting Words - Score: _____ (very slow responses)
Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: _____ Blending Words - Score: _____ Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Rapid Automatic Naming

Date: 9/2/01 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 2 Numbers - Score: 1 (errors (2))
Date: 1/17/02 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 5 Numbers - Score: 8 (no errors)

Word Attack

Date: 9/2/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form G - Score: 100
Date: 1/17/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form H - Score: 103
Date: 9/2/01 Measure: TOWRE - Score: 77 Comments: Difference between timed and untimed tests. (timed test) *
Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Word Identification

Date: 9/02/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Id, Form G - Score: 97
Date: 1/17/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form H - Score: 104
Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____
Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Reading Rate

Date: 9/2/01 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 2 Comments: _____ *
Date: 1/17/02 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 10 Comments: _____

Reading Accuracy

Date: 9/2/01 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 8 Comments: _____
Date: 1/17/02 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 12 Comments: _____

(Improvements made,
although not target skills areas.)

Reading Comprehension

Date: 9/2/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 12 Comments: _____
Date: 1/17/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 14 Comments: _____

* Target Skill areas

** Scores reported as standard scores; 8 - 12 or 85 - 115 are in the average range.

- Student with significant **Rate** issues. (a sophomore)
- Remediation: Rate work at the word, phrase, sentence and paragraph levels.
1/2 hour per day, one semester (September - January)
- Previously, this student's mother read all class material aloud to him; he now handles all work independently.

Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Gray Oral Reading Test - 3 (GORT - 3) Gray Oral Reading Test - 4 [Newer version, now in use] (GORT - 4)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised/Normative Updater (WRMT-R/NU)
Test of Written Spelling (TWS - 4)

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed, Claudia M. Burdett-Lerner, B.S.,
Renée F. Stout, B.S. & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Reading Feedback

Phonemic Awareness

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 12 Blending Words - Score: 12 Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: _____ Blending Words - Score: _____ Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Rapid Automatic Naming

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 10 Numbers - Score: 9

Date: 1/15/02 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: _____ Numbers - Score: _____

Word Attack

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form G - Score: 96

Date: 1/15/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form H - Score: 99

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Word Identification

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form G - Score: 79 *

Date: 1/15/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form H - Score: 96

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Reading Rate

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 3 Comments: _____

Date: 1/15/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 6 Comments: _____

Rate and comprehension improved

Reading Accuracy

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 4 Comments: _____ *

indirectly as a result of improving

Date: 1/15/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 9 Comments: _____

decoding and word recognition.

Reading Comprehension

Date: 6/11/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 5 Comments: _____

Date: 1/15/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 9 Comments: _____

* Target Skill Areas

** Scores reported as standard scores; 8 - 12 or 85 - 115 is an average range.

- Student with **Orthographic Processing** issues. (a sophomore)
- Remediation: Structured, sequential Orton-Gillingham based phonics work; built work bank with three-by-five cards. Forty-five minutes per day, one semester (September - January).

Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Gray Oral Reading Test - 3 (GORT - 3) Gray Oral Reading Test - 4 [Newer version, now in use] (GORT - 4)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised/Normative Updated (WRMT-R/NU)
Test of Written Spelling (TWS - 4)
Test of Word Efficiency (TOWRE)

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed., Claudia M. Burdett-Lerner, B.S.,
Renée F. Stout, B.S. & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Reading Feedback

Phonemic Awareness

Date: 10/23/00 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 8 Blending Words - Score: 10 Segmenting Words - Score: _____ *This student had previous*

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: _____ Blending Words - Score: _____ Segmenting Words - Score: _____ *LiPS work.*

Rapid Automatic Naming

Date: 6/8/01 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 9 Numbers - Score: _____ *A strength, rapid and automatic.*

Date: _____ Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 12 Numbers - Score: _____

Word Attack

Date: 6/8/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form G - Score: 103

Date: 1/14/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form H - Score: 112

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Word Identification

Date: 6/8/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form G - Score: 86

Date: 1/14/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form H - Score: 90

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Sight Word Efficiency - Score: _____ Phonemic Decoding Efficiency - Score _____

Reading Rate

Date: 6/8/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 8 Comments: _____

Date: 1/14/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 9 Comments: _____

Reading Accuracy

Date: 6/8/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 8 Comments: _____

Date: 1/14/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 10 Comments: _____

Reading Comprehension

Date: 6/8/01 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 1 Comments: *Below first percentile* *

Date: 1/14/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 7 Comments: _____

* Target Skill Areas

** Scores reported as standard scores; 8 - 12 or 85 - 115 is an average range.

- Student with **Comprehension** difficulties. (a freshman)
- Remediation: *Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension & Reciprocal Teaching Methodologies.*
One hour per day, one semester (September - January).
- Comprehension improved throughout all class subjects.

Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Gray Oral Reading Test - 3 (GORT - 3) Gray Oral Reading Test - 4 [Newer version, now in use] (GORT - 4)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised/Normative Updated (WRMT-R/NU)
Test of Written Spelling (TWS - 4)
Test of Word Efficiency (TOWRE)

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed., Claudia M. Burdett-Lerner, B.S.,
Renée F. Stout, B.S. & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.

It's Never Too Late! Teaching Reading in High School

Reading Feedback

Phonemic Awareness

Date: 6/12/00 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 4 Blending Words - Score: 8 Segmenting Words - Score: _____ *

Date: 4/17/01 Measure: CTOPP - Elision - Score: 9 Blending Words - Score: 14 Segmenting Words - Score: _____

Rapid Automatic Naming

Date: 6/12/00 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 5 Numbers - Score: 4 *

Date: 4/17/01 Measure: CTOPP - RAN, Letters - Score: 6 Numbers - Score: 7

Word Attack

Date: 6/12/00 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form G - Score: 92

Date: 6/4/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Attack, Form H - Score: 100

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Word Identification

Date: 9/02/01 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word Id, Form G - Score: 70

Date: 6/4/02 Measure: WRMT - R/NU, Word ID, Form H - Score: 79

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Date: _____ Measure: TOWRE - Score: _____ Comments: _____

Reading Rate

Date: 6/12/00 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 1 Comments: _____

Date: 6/4/02 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 2 Comments: _____

Reading Accuracy

Date: 6/12/00 Measure: GORT - 3, Form A - Score: 5 Comments: _____

Date: 6/4/02 Measure: GORT - 3, Form B - Score: 5 Comments: _____

Reading Comprehension

Date: 6/12/00 Measure: GORT - 4, Form A - Score: 5 Comments: _____ *Improvements in decoding allow*

Date: 6/4/02 Measure: GORT - 4, Form B - Score: 9 Comments: _____ *student to become fast & automatic and improve comprehension.*

* Target Skill areas

** Scores reported as standard scores; 8 - 12 or 85 - 115 are in the average range.

- Student with a **Low Language Learning Disability**. (a sophomore)
- Remediation: Two semesters *LIPS* and rate training, 1 hour per day. (September - June)
One semester Orton-Gillingham based multisensory approach. (September - January)
Daily spelling drills.
Rate, vocabulary, and review 1-1/2 hours per day.

Comprehensive Test of Phonological Processing (CTOPP)
Gray Oral Reading Test - 3 (GORT - 3) Gray Oral Reading Test - 4 [Newer version, now in use] (GORT - 4)
Woodcock Reading Mastery Test - Revised / Normative Updater (WRMT-R/NU)
Test of Written Spelling (TWS - 4)

Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed, Claudia M. Burdett-Lerner, B.S.,
Renée F. Stout, B.S. & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.

Difficulties with Phonology

Diagnostically identified with below average score on:

- CTOPP - Elision
- CTOPP - Blending Words
- CTOPP - Segmenting Words
- CTOPP - Other subtests as needed
- WRMT - Word Attack (for phonology and orthography)

What these students look like:

Students with poor phonemic awareness demonstrate the inability to identify individual sounds and their order within words. Some are as extreme as to be unable to know that /t/ /t/ /g/ equals three sounds, two being the same and one being different. In their reading, a student might identify the beginning letter or two and say the first word that comes to mind. When spelling, letters are often omitted, rearranged or added.

What this class looks like for remediation:

- *The Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program for Reading, Spelling, and Speech (LiPS)*
Patricia and Phyllis Lindamood: pro.ed, Austin, Texas
- *Games and Activities for Readers and Spellers*
Coultas and Whitney, Sopris West, www.sopriswest.com
- Teacher made material
- 1. Climate: Especially important in LiPS, because we go back to the very structure of language. Carefully share test results and research. Work quickly to establish trust.
- 2. Lessons: Follow the sequence of LiPS. We tend to integrate the consonants with the vowels. It is important to track with each new addition. Concentrate on the 'feel' of the sound in the mouth. Play games that reinforce the additions.
- 3. Other: Increase tracking rate by helping the student respond more and more quickly with the blocks, felts, and blocks and felts. Increase ability to sequence by teaching things as simple as days of the week to more complicated songs or poems.
- 4. Beyond PA: Obviously, these high school students do read and write. So we quickly add reading and spelling to new additions of phonemes. Orthographic expectancies are taught. We also incorporate rate work with each set of added phonemes.

Facts about Phonemic Awareness:

- Pure PA can be done in the dark
- PA is the ability to go from the whole word to its parts - the word to individual sounds
- While studying PA, students learn a backup sensory stimulation...articulatory feedback
- PA activities include nonsense words for unlimited practice and no emotional baggage
- Enhanced PA may free up memory and allow for increased comprehension

Difficulties with Orthographic Processing

Diagnostically identified with below average scores on:

- Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Revised, Word Attack and Word Identification sub tests
- GORT-4 Accuracy
- Test of Written Spelling -4

What these students look like:

These students have trouble accurately and fluently processing letters and letter patterns of the English language. Lack of processing speed is an associated issue. Without the fluency required, letters are disjointed and no association or holistic image can be formed.

What this class looks like for remediation:

These students need systematic training in the development of strong orthographic representations that enable them to read fluently and effortlessly. They should be provided with ample opportunities to strengthen representations of all types of words. Extensive time for repeated practice in pattern recognition is often warranted.

Follow the Spelling Scope and Sequence Chart developed by L. C. Moats in collaboration with G. Giveans and teachers from Dresdan School District, Hanover New Hampshire. Be sure to include strategies that stress orthographic rules and the visual patterns inherent in the six syllable types. Expand repertoire to include work on ending grid words, accents, Latin roots and homonyms. Provide ample opportunities for both timed and untimed readings.

References:

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print*, Cambridge, MA: MIT 127-178
<http://www.resourceroom.net/Sharestrats/2002>

Resources for teachers:

Archer, A., Gleason, M. and Vachon, V. (2000). *Rewards: reading excellence word attack and rate development*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West 303 651-2829

Bayrd, P. and Johnson, K. (2002). *Megawords*, Cambridge, MA: Educators Publishing Service.

Bell, N. (1997). *Seeing Stars*. San Luis Obispo, CA: Gander Educational Publishing

Ferlito, S. (2000). *Sort it! Word Activities to Complement the Language! Curriculum*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West

Fisher, P.E. (1994). *Concept Phonics*, Farmington, ME: Orton House

Greene, J.F. (1995-1996). *Language: A Curriculum for at risk and ESL students*. Longmont CO: Sopris West

Lindamood, P. Lindamood P. and Bell, N. (1998). *The Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing program for Reading Spelling and Speech*. San Luis Obispo, CA: Gander Educational Publishing

Difficulties with Vocabulary / Comprehension

Diagnostically identified with below average scores on:

- GORT – 4 Passage Comprehension subtest
- GORT – 4 Silent Reading Comprehension
Listening Comprehension
(extended use of GORT – 4)
- If available, review Vocabulary subtest of WISC / WAIS
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive vocabulary knowledge (optional)
Boston Naming Test expressive vocabulary knowledge (optional)

What these students look like:

Typically referred to as *word callers*, these students comprise a small percentage of the population of reading disabilities. These students decode at grade level or above, yet lack the ability to understand both what they read and what they hear. Associated issues frequently experienced with these students include disciplinary problems and difficulty maintaining and sustaining appropriate relationships.

What this class looks like for remediation:

- *Visualizing and Verbalizing for Language Comprehension and Thinking*
Lindamood Bell Learning Processes: Gander Publishing 1-800-554-1819
- Annemarie Palincsar's Reciprocal Teaching Methodologies
Through the use of interactive dialogue, students are provided with practice in using and self-monitoring effective reading comprehension strategies.

Involves the use of four practiced strategies:

1. Summarizing: identify the gist of the text.
2. Questioning: create, ask, and answer questions about the text.
3. Clarifying: recognize difficulties inherent in the text's vocabulary, sentence structure, and concepts, using appropriate strategies to clarify these discovered difficulties.
4. Predicting: anticipate what is coming next, reading to confirm or disprove their theories.

Palincsar, A.S., and Brown, A.L. (1986). Interactive teaching to promote independent learning from text. *The Reading Teacher*, 39: 771-77.

Palincsar, A.S., and Brown, A.L. (1988). Teaching and practicing thinking skills to promote comprehension in the context of group problem-solving. *Remedial and Special Education*, 9: 53-9.

Palincsar, A.S., Winn, J., David, Y., Snyder, B., and Stevens, D. (1993). Approaches to strategic reading instruction reflecting different assumptions regarding teaching and learning. in *Strategy Assessment and Instruction for Students with Learning Disabilities: From Theory to Practice*, L.J. Meltzer (Ed.), (pp. 247-70). Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Resources for Teachers:

Beck, I., McKeown, M.G., and Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing Words to Life: Robust Vocabulary Instruction*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Carlisle, J.F. and Rice, M.S. (2002). *Improving Reading Comprehension: Research-based principles and practices*. Timonium, MD: York Press.

Klingener, J.K., Vaughn, S., Dimino, J., Schumm, J.S., and Bryant, D. (2001). *From Clunk to Clink: Collaborative Strategic Reading*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Overview of *Reciprocal Teaching* - adapted from Annemarie Palincsar's work

What is *Reciprocal Teaching*?

An instructional approach designed to improve students' reading comprehension skills through interactive dialogues between students and teacher. Originally designed as instruction for those students struggling with reading comprehension, *Reciprocal Teaching* has been adapted for use with partners, small groups of 4 to 6, or whole class practice. The goal is for students to gradually learn to monitor their own learning and thinking processes for reading comprehension.

What are the four main strategies of *Reciprocal Teaching*?

Summarizing: The ability to identify and paraphrase the main ideas of the text.

Questioning: The ability to create, ask, and answer questions about the text through increasingly more difficult questioning techniques. Recalling facts, making inferences, and applying new information to other situations are all modeled and practiced.

Clarifying: The ability to identify potential stumbling blocks to comprehension and implement strategies to clarify these issues.

Predicting: The ability to anticipate what the author intends.

How is *Reciprocal Teaching* best used within a classroom?

We at KHS suggest including 4 to 6 students within this remedial class. Choice of text includes material that is slightly challenging to students' comprehension levels and appropriate to their school materials. Use of paragraph by paragraph reading is initially recommended, increasing the length of material read as students become more proficient.

Steps to take include:

Identify a designated leader (DL); at first this should be the teacher for direct modeling. Eventually this becomes each student, in turn, so that practice and feedback is continually provided.

The DL makes or asks for a prediction about the passage to be read, using title, pictures, and any other available information provided.

Students read the passage aloud or silently. Avoid round robin reading, especially if students are not able to decode the reading material fluently.

The DL begins a dialogue by framing a question about the text, with students answering the question and suggesting other questions to be asked about the passage.

The DL summarizes the passage and takes suggestions for improvements.

The DL addresses the issue of clarification by identifying and resolving confusing portions of the text using pre-taught strategies to do so.

The DL makes predictions about the next passage.

A new person is identified as the DL for the next passage, and the process is continued as described above.

Specific ways in which the strategies of summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting are introduced and reinforced are included within Palincsar's citations.

**Carol A. Tolman, Ed.D., Grace L. Bolton, M.Ed., Tara L. MacIntyre, M.Ed.,
Claudia Burdett-Lerner, B.S., Renee F. Stout, B.S., & Virginia L. Beaudoin, A.S.**

Oral Reading Fluency Norms Grades 1 – 8, 2005

		FALL	WINTER	SPRING
GRADE	PERCENTILE	WCPM*	WCPM*	WCPM*
1	75		47	82
	50		23	53
	25		12	28
2	75	79	100	117
	50	51	72	89
	25	25	42	61
3	75	99	120	137
	50	71	92	107
	25	44	62	78
4	75	119	139	152
	50	94	112	123
	25	68	87	98
5	75	139	156	168
	50	110	127	139
	25	85	99	109
6	75	153	167	177
	50	127	140	150
	25	98	111	122
7	75	156	165	177
	50	128	136	150
	25	102	109	123
8	75	161	173	177
	50	133	146	151
	25	106	115	124

Name _____

Date _____

4-Part Processor Initial Evaluation Summary Sheet

Total Reading GORT _____

