

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Implementing an RtI Model in Seventh and
Eighth Grade Reading

A Special Project

Presented to

Dr. Gretta Merwin

Heritage University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirement for the Degree of
Master of Educational Administration

Vikki L. Dolman

2010

FACULTY APPROVAL

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Implementing an RtI Model in Seventh and
Eighth Grade Reading

Approved for the Faculty

_____, Faculty Advisor

_____, Date

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this project was to determine the effectiveness of implementing an RtI Model with seventh and eighth grade students in a middle school. Measures of Academic Progress data was collected on students at this middle school from fall of 2008 to winter of 2009 prior to implementation of the RtI Model. After implementation of the model Measures of Academic Progress data was gathered on the same students from the previous year from fall of 2009 to winter of 2010. The results from this data determined the effectiveness of the RtI Model implementation.

PERMISSION TO STORE

I, Vikki L. Dolman, hereby irrevocably consent and authorize Heritage University Library to file the attached Special Project entitled, *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Implementing an RtI Model in Seventh and Eighth Grade Reading*, and make such Project and Compact Disk (CD) available for the use, circulation and/or reproduction by the Library. The Project and CD may be used at Heritage University Library and all site locations.

I state at this time the contents of this Project are my work and completely original unless properly attributed and/or used with permission.

I understand that after three years the printed Project will be retired from the Heritage University Library. My responsibility is to retrieve the printed Project and, if not retrieved, Heritage University may dispose of the document. The Compact Disc and electronic file will be kept indefinitely

_____, Author

_____, Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
FACULTY APPROVAL.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
PERMISSION TO STORE.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
CHAPTER 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background for the Project.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Project.....	2
Delimitations.....	2
Assumptions.....	4
Hypothesis	4
Null Hypothesis.....	5
Significance of the Project.....	5
Procedure.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Acronyms.....	7

	Page
CHAPTER 2.....	8
Review of Selected Literature.....	8
Introduction.....	8
No Child Left Behind.....	9
School Improvement.....	12
Response to Intervention.....	15
Corrective Reading.....	18
Measures of Academic Progress.....	19
Summary.....	20
CHAPTER 3.....	21
Methodology and Treatment of Data.....	21
Introduction.....	21
Methodology.....	21
Participants.....	22
Instruments.....	22
Design.....	23
Procedure.....	23
Treatment of the Data.....	24
Summary.....	24

	Page
CHAPTER 4.....	25
Analysis of the Data.....	25
Introduction.....	25
Description of the Environment.....	25
Hypothesis	26
Null Hypothesis.....	27
Results of the Study.....	27
Findings.....	28
Discussion.....	28
Summary.....	29
CHAPTER 5.....	30
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	30
Summary.....	30
Conclusions.....	31
Recommendations.....	32
REFERENCES	34
APPENDIX.....	36

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 <u><i>t</i>-test of Pre – Post test Results for Students in Tier III Instruction</u> ...	27

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Background for the Project

In 2001 President Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act into law. The act changed the government's role in education by focusing on student achievement. Student achievement was to be measured each year by a state assessment and states were expected to meet Adequate Yearly Progress. Schools not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress for two consecutive years were placed on step one of school improvement. Schools who continued to not meet Adequate Yearly Progress progressed through several steps of school improvement with different consequences at each step. The school used in this project was in step three of school improvement.

Statement of the Problem

The students at the middle school had not made significant growth in reading. At each grade level there were approximately two hundred and fifty students. Of the two hundred and fifty students per grade level, one hundred or more students were two or more years behind grade level in reading. Previous attempts to increase instructional time in reading had not been successful in closing the achievement gap.

Purpose of the Project

As a result of the project the author intended to provide data that showed significant growth for students two or more years behind in reading by the implementation of a Response to Intervention Model using a research-based intervention program, Corrective Reading. The data collected was used to determine the effectiveness of the Response to Intervention Model using the intervention program, Corrective Reading.

Delimitations

The research design was quantitative research. Data was collected over a two year period to determine the effectiveness of the Response to Intervention Model to provide additional instructional time for students two or more years behind grade level in reading.

The middle school was a sixth through eighth grade public school that housed more than 740 students and 43 instructional staff members. The average years of teacher experience at the building were 11.9 years, and 67.4% of the teachers had at least a master's degree. All teachers were highly qualified. The middle school had a diverse population of students: 40% of the students were white, of the remaining 60% of students, Hispanic/Latino students made up 56%. The number of students identified for free and reduced lunch program were 84.2%. The school was a middle school located in Central Washington close to a

nuclear facility. The students who attended the middle school were directly impacted by poverty and from various ethnic populations. The school had also been impacted by a high mobility rate. In addition, the school had been identified for school improvement by the state and had reached step three.

The staff had been proactive in addressing the needs of the school's population by putting into place a block schedule to form small learning communities called prides. Prides were used as the name for teams as the school mascot was a lion cub. Prides existed to give students the needed stability of consistent adult support. The staff was also given flexibility within the pride schedule to make adjustments based on data-driven needs of students. All grade levels had two prides. Each pride consisted of two reading/language arts/history teachers and two mathematics/science teachers. Another of the prides was called the Safari Pride. The Safari Pride staff members provided service to students needing proactive attention in all curriculum areas before entering grade level prides. The Safari Pride was the only group that served students in grades 6th, 7th, and 8th and provided services to the ELL population from the ELL staff. Three Safari Pride teachers and three ELL teachers worked together as a team. In addition to prides there were five exploratory staff members in art, computers, band, orchestra, and choir. The middle school also had two PE/health teachers. The middle school had a main principal and two assistant principals, two

counselors, one school psychologist, four special education teachers, four special education para-educators, and five Title para-educators. Finally, a teacher was dedicated to a pride called The Outback. The Outback was an alternative program for students not successful due to behavior or extenuating circumstances. All prides had mathematics and reading labs that were district-directed programs to give students a required additional class in either mathematics or reading based on test scores.

Assumptions

For the purpose of this study the author acknowledged the following assumptions were true. All of the students understood learning to read was important and wanted to learn. All students did their best on MAPs testing. Each Tier III teacher used only Corrective Reading as their intervention curriculum. The MAPs test was a valid and reliable assessment of a student's reading level. Students were placed appropriately in Tier III intervention classrooms.

Hypothesis

Seventh and eighth grade students who received instruction using the Response to Intervention program with Corrective Reading in all Tier III courses during the 2009-2010 school year demonstrated greater than expected growth than in the 2008-2009 school year.

Null Hypothesis

Seventh and eighth grade students who received instruction using the Response to Intervention program with Corrective Reading in all Tier III courses during the 2009-2010 school year did not demonstrate greater than expected growth than in the 2008-2009 school year.

Significance of the Problem

The significance of this project was to provide a factual base of information to the middle school regarding the achievement gains of seventh and eighth grade students in Tier III reading intervention classes which used Corrective Reading. The results regarding the effectiveness of the implementation of the RTI Model were to be shared by the literacy coach with the building administration as to the success of the implementation of the model. With this information, building administration would know whether to continue to expend resources, such as future trainings and materials, on the program.

Procedure

Data was collected using Measures of Academic Progress scores recorded in an excel spreadsheet for all students receiving additional time in a reading lab prior to the implementation of the Response to Intervention Model. Data was collected in the same manner on the same students after the implementation of the Response to Intervention Model and the use of Corrective Reading as an

intervention for all Tier III reading students. Data was graphed to compare results from the 2008-2009 school year and the 2009-2010 school year to see if significant growth occurred.

Definition of Terms

Adequate Yearly Progress. AYP was a measurement defined by the United States federal No Child Left Behind Act that allowed the U.S. Department of Education to determine how every public school and school district in the country was performing academically according to results on standardized tests.

Measures of Academic Progress. MAP was a computer-adaptive test that resulted in a RIT score for students.

No Child Left Behind. No Child Left Behind was a congressional educational act signed by the Bush presidential administration in 2001 to close the achievement gap of students with emphasis on accountability, flexibility, and choice.

Rasch Unit. The RIT Scale was a curriculum scale developed by NWEA that used the individual item difficulty values to estimate student achievement.

research-based interventions. Research-based interventions were instructional strategies and curricular components used to enhance student learning. The effectiveness of these interventions was backed by experimental design studies that had been applied to a large study sample, showed a direct correlation between the intervention and student progress, and had been reported in peer-reviewed

journals.

Response to Intervention. Response to Intervention was a system used at each school to screen, assess, identify, plan for, and provide interventions to any student at risk of school failure due to academic or behavior needs.

Acronyms

AYP. Adequate Yearly Progress

ELL. English Language Learners

MAP. Measures of Academic Progress

NCLB. No Child Left Behind Act

NWEA. Northwest Evaluation Association

RIT. Rasch Unit

RtI. Response to Intervention

CHAPTER 2

Review of Selected Literature

Introduction

Through the school improvement process a team of administrators, teachers, and staff members researched ways to impact student achievement. Through the research, goals were written to investigate diagnostic tools for reading lab classes and to determine criteria to exit students from reading lab classes. The school improvement team wrote goals to determine best practices for teaching reading. The literacy coach at the middle school was responsible for the research and reported back to the school improvement team that a Response to Intervention Model be implemented in all reading lab classes. The literacy coach researched No Child Left Behind, the school improvement process, the Response to Intervention Model, and Corrective Reading as a research-based intervention. The topics were selected to provide a background for the basis of the implementation of a Response to Intervention Model at the author's middle school building. Additionally, the MAPs measurement tool was reviewed to determine validity and reliability for the purpose of establishing significant growth in reading.

No Child Left Behind

No Child Left Behind stemmed back to Brown v. Board of Education, which was when the U.S. Supreme Court declared that racial segregation in public schools was unconstitutional. This then led to the passage of the Civil Rights act in 1964 and then the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was when the federal, state, and local governments came together to begin addressing the national problem of low performing schools with challenging socioeconomic situations. This was done by providing funding for these schools to improve instruction. Since its implementation in 1965 this law had been reintroduced and reauthorized every four to five years. Under the Bush Administration on January 8, 2002, it was reauthorized again as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. According to the U.S. Department of Education, “No Child Left Behind ensures accountability as well as increased federal support for education. No Child Left Behind continues the legacy of Brown v. Board decision by creating an education system that is more inclusive, responsive, and fair” (2004, p. 7). The No Child Left Behind Act required states to have stronger accountability for results. To have stronger accountability, schools were responsible to give students the services they needed to be successful. The U.S Department of Education stated:

Accountability is a crucial step in addressing the achievement gaps that plague our nation. For too long, the poor achievement of our most vulnerable students has been lost in unrepresentative averages. African Americans, Hispanic, special education, limited English proficient, and many other students were left behind because schools were not held accountable for their individual progress. Now all students count. (2004, p. 9)

In order to provide evidence to this accountability, schools were required to set standards for each grade level achievement, and to develop and administer a standardized test that measured student progress yearly. If a school were not making adequate yearly progress on its state test, it eventually could be required to change its educational strategies in the classrooms, and could be in danger of entering into the school improvement process.

The law also provided freedom in deciding how to allocate federal funding. In the state of Washington this funding was provided to schools in school improvement. Schools identified in school improvement were required to use scientifically proven, research-based programs, as well as highly qualified teachers. Under NCLB all teachers were required to be highly qualified by the 2005-06 school year. According to the U.S. Department of Education, “One of the most important ways to close the achievement gap and provide all children

with a great education is to provide them with great teachers. Studies have shown the single greatest effect on student achievement is teacher quality” (2004, p. 8).

Finally, parents of students who attended a Title I school that had not met adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years had the option of school choice. This meant parents could choose to send their child to a higher performing public school or charter school in their district. In addition to this, NCLB extended school choice beyond just choosing a school. According to Davis, the U.S. Department of Education stated:

Students from low-income families in schools that fail to meet state standards for at least three years are eligible to receive supplemental educational services, including tutoring, after-school services, and summer school. Also, students who attend a persistently dangerous school or are the victim of a violent crime while in their school have the option to attend a safe school within their district. (2010, p. 1)

The Archived: Executive Summary of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 stated:

In addition to helping ensure that no child loses the opportunity for a quality education because he or she is trapped in a failing school, the choice and supplemental service requirements provide a substantial incentive for low-performing schools to improve. Schools that want to

avoid losing students—along with the portion of their annual budgets typically associated with those students—will have to improve or, if they fail to make AYP for 5 years, run the risk of reconstitution under a restructuring plan. (2001, p. 2)

This restructuring plan for schools was referred to as the school improvement process.

School Improvement

Under No Child Left Behind the goal was to have all students on grade level in reading and mathematics by the 2013-14 school year. States were required to set grade level expectations and expectations for performance targets on their state assessment. Schools that did not meet these targets for two consecutive years became schools in need of improvement (McClure, 2005). Under NCLB all schools were required to meet Adequate Yearly Progress. However, only schools identified as Title I schools not meeting AYP were required to follow the school improvement process under NCLB. These schools could be placed in school improvement for four years.

Under the law, year one required that the school develop a two-year school improvement plan. This plan required the inclusion of professional development, teacher monitoring, and parent involvement. During this year schools were required to use 10% of their Title budget for professional

development and students were notified of school choice options. During year two these buildings were still required to offer school choice to its students, but had to set aside 20% of its Title budget for supplemental tutoring and transportation for students taking advantage of school choice. When a building entered year three, it was required to continue to provide the services required in year two and in addition was guided by its district in taking corrective actions. These could include new curriculum, staffing changes, different requirements on school management, and outside expert assistance. Finally, during year four the school was required to undergo restructuring the next school year if AYP was still not met. This restructuring could include the school becoming a charter school, replacing all or most of the school staff, or new administration. The state of Washington believed that all schools within its boundaries should engage in school improvement planning. Under the Washington State Board of Education WAC 180-16-220,

Each school district receiving state basic education funds MUST develop a school improvement plan or process based on a self-review of the school's program for the purpose of annual building approval by the district. The self-review required by the state shall include active participation and meaningful input by staff, students, parents, and community members.

(School Improvement Planning Process Guide, 2005, p. i.)

The state of Washington’s School Improvement Planning Process Guide identified some guiding principles for school improvement planning that were necessary for school improvement to be successful:

The principal must be at the helm of this process—without support and leadership of the principal, the planning process lacks the leverage that is needed for change to occur in a school environment. Students and parents have an important perspective on how schools can improve. Their meaningful participation in the process should be considered from the onset. All members of a school staff should participate and/or be aware of the planning process. The more stakeholders that are “in the loop,” the better the chances the school will achieve 100 percent buy-in by staff for change efforts. A representative group of stakeholders can do the bulk of the work, if results and updates are reported back on a regular basis to the full faculty and other stakeholders. Decisions about school improvement goals and solutions must be based on careful consideration of multiple sources of data and research. School improvement planning is a journey of continuous improvement that demands ongoing monitoring and adjustment of programs and processes at the school. Improvements in student outcomes are directly related to what happens in the classroom. Teachers must be willing to be reflective about their practice and

relentless in attempts to meet the needs of every student. The written plan document is only as good as the quality of thought, effort, and the degree of 'buyin' by staff. (School Improvement Planning Process Guide, 2005, p. 8.)

The difficulty with school improvement was that many experts were concerned that too many schools were entering the school improvement process and would not be able to meet AYP. According to Owens and Sunderman, "We are finding that many schools, once identified as needing improvement, are not moving out of improvement" (2006, p. 1). In addition Owens and Sunderman stated, "Since states are going in opposite directions---some states report a decline in the number of school indentified for improvement while others report an increase---it is difficult to know how much progress has been made improving student performance" (2006, p. 1).

Response to Intervention

In order to decide on the implementation of a Response to Intervention Model, research was done by the school literacy coach. The literacy coach began by researching best practices in reading as directed by the school improvement plan. Time and again the RtI Model was included in the research. RtI started to immerge during the 1970s when researchers began looking for additional ways to identify students with learning disabilities. RtI provided a system of universal

screening to identify students who required an intensive intervention which was provided in the regular education setting. The research-based intervention was implemented before any referral to special education. According to Lohman, “The benefit of RtI, according to the Council for Exceptional Children, is that children do not have to “wait to fail” before they receive help” (2007, p. 1). Under the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, RtI was recognized as a way for schools to identify students with learning disabilities. According to Lohman the federal law stated:

When determining whether a child has a specific learning disability as defined in § 602 (29), a local educational agency shall not be required to take into consideration whether a child has a severe discrepancy between achievement and intellectual ability in oral expression, listening comprehension, written expression, basic reading skill, reading comprehension, mathematical calculation, or mathematical reasoning. In determining whether a child has a specific learning disability, a local educational agency may use a process that determines if the child responds to scientific, research-based intervention as part of the evaluation procedures. (2007, p.2)

According to Canter, Klotz, and Cowan (2008), “RtI is a tiered process of implementing evidence-based instructional strategies in the regular education

setting and frequently measuring the student's progress to determine whether these strategies are effective" (p. 12). RtI involved a three-tiered system. Tier one taught the core curriculum to all general education students. Teacher-created assessments were used to identify students not mastering the required outcomes. Students were provided an intervention in a tier two setting when the required outcomes were not achieved. The intervention was designed to ensure student mastery of required concepts. According to Stepanek, "If the tier two interventions are not successful, students receive more intensive individualized interventions in tier three" (2008, p. 1). Students in a tier three intervention received diagnostic testing to identify their needed intervention. Research-based interventions matched to student needs were used in tier three classrooms. In order to determine the effectiveness of the interventions provided, frequent and ongoing student assessment was essential in all tiers. Universal screening and progress monitoring of students in tiers provided information about a student's learning rate individually and in comparison with other students in the same intervention. This data was used to determine the tier and intervention required for each student, and to assist in determining if additional interventions were required. Students in tier three who did not show progress in their targeted intervention were then referred for evaluation to determine if special education services were needed.

Corrective Reading

Corrective Reading was a research-based curriculum that was often used as an intensive intervention for students significantly behind in reading skills. According to Marchand-Martella, Martella, and Przychodzin-Havis, “The research proves that evidence-based practices in the program make a meaningful difference with struggling readers that is sufficient to close the gap in reading skills” (2009, p. 1). Corrective Reading was designed using three different components. The program was created and structured to ensure students learn how to learn as continued skills and strategies were introduced. Direct Instruction provided a scripted approach to engage poor readers. Complete learning materials were provided with the program to ensure fidelity of instruction. Students were placed into Corrective Reading by the placement tests provided and placed into decoding or comprehension strands. The National Reading Panel recommended that struggling readers receive effective instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency building, vocabulary, and text comprehension (Marchand-Martella et al., 2009). According to Marchand-Martella, Martella, and Przychodzin-Havis:

Twenty-eight studies examining the effects of Corrective Reading have been published in peer-reviewed journals. Twenty-six of the 28 studies found positive, often statistically significant results for students who were

taught using Corrective Reading. For studies using standardized measures, results indicated that most vocabulary and comprehension scores increased from pre- to posttest with similar increases in oral reading fluency. (2009, p.1)

Measures of Academic Progress

The Measures of Academic Progress test was adapted to each child's level in reading by self adjusting the questions to the child's grade level ability. The test was used to monitor students' progress in reading three times per year at the author's school district. The data provided by the MAPs was used to determine placement in strategic or intensive intervention programs in reading. According the Northwest Education Association:

The extensive item bank of questions used on the NWEA Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) tests have been developed over a substantial period of time. This has given staff charged with statistical analysis abundant opportunity to establish the reliability of the tests. The result has been the collection of a significant amount of reliability evidence over time. Test and re-test studies have consistently yielded statistically valid correlations between multiple test events for the same student. Most such studies rely on the methodology of having students re-test within several days. NWEA test and re-test studies have typically looked at scores from

the same students after a lapse of several months. Despite this methodology (which would have the expected result of lowering the correlation figures) the reliability indices have consistently been above what is considered statistically significant. (2009, p. 1)

Due to the reliability and validity of the MAP test, the author used the test as a way to determine significant growth in reading for students placed in strategic and intensive research-based intervention programs.

Summary

With the growing trend to close the achievement gap, schools were faced with the dilemma of what to do to reach academic proficiency as described in NCLB. Through this research during the school improvement process the author made recommendations to the middle school's school improvement team to implement the Response to Intervention Model. In addition, through research by the author for a research-based intervention program, Corrective Reading was chosen.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology and Treatment of Data

Introduction

In order to conduct this research the author used a variety of processes and procedures. First, a thorough background on the problem was done in order to have better background knowledge on the topic. Next, the timeline and assessment tool used for the research was determined along with what statistical treatment was to be used after having collected the data on the student population selected.

Methodology

This study began with some in depth research through the building's school improvement process. Through the research it was determined that a Response to Intervention Model be implemented in all reading lab classes in the building. In order to determine the effectiveness of the intervention the author decided to proceed with a research project which investigated the effectiveness of students who were given additional time in reading in one school year in comparison to when the same students were placed in tiered intervention classes with research-based interventions. The author decided to use quantitative research for the project. "Quantitative Research approaches are applied to describe current conditions, investigate relations, and study cause-effect phenomena," according to

Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009, p. 8). The assessment tool used was the MAP measurement tool, and was reviewed to determine validity and reliability for the purpose of establishing significant growth in reading. The time period for the study was the 2008-2009 school year, when pre and post-test data was collected, and the 2009-2010 school year, when additional pre and post-test data was collected on the same students. The data from each testing period was collected and the amount of growth was tabulated. Then the data was subject to statistical treatment, *t*-test, to determine if there was significance for the project.

Participants

The sample population for this study included 31 seventh and eighth grade students at the author's middle school. Of these 31 students, 16 were seventh graders and 15 were eighth graders. The seventh grade group included 5 females and 10 males. The eighth grade group included 6 females and 9 males. Both grade levels of students had received additional time in reading the previous school year, and had been identified during the current school year as needing a tiered intervention class.

Instruments

One instrument was used and researched by the author in completion of this research project. The Measures of Academic Progress test was adapted to each child's level in reading by self adjusting the questions to the child's grade

level ability. The test was used to monitor students' progress in reading three times per year at the author's school district. Due to the reliability and validity of the MAP test, the author used the test as a way to determine significant growth in reading for students placed in strategic and intensive research-based intervention programs.

Design

Experimental research methods were implemented to investigate the effectiveness of a Response to Intervention Model in comparison to just receiving additional time in reading for the same group of students. Pre and post-tests were used for two consecutive school years. A *t*-test was used with the data collected to determine significance for the project.

Procedure

During the 2008-2009 school year data was collected fall and winter using Measures of Academic Progress scores and recorded in an excel spreadsheet for all sixth and seventh students receiving additional time in a reading lab prior to the implementation of the Response to Intervention Model. Data was collected fall and winter in the same manner on the same students, now in seventh and eighth grade, after the implementation of the Response to Intervention Model and the use of Corrective Reading as an intervention for all Tier III reading students. Data was graphed to compare results from the 2008-2009 school year and the

2009-2010 school year. From those results a statistical analysis of the data using a *t*-test was calculated to determine significance for the project.

Treatment of the Data

The data collected from fall to winter during the 2008-2009 school year from the MAP test was compared to the data collected from fall to winter during the 2009-2010 school year from the MAP test on the same group of students. The amount of growth was determined for each participant. Using the program, Statpak, the statistical *t*-test was used to compare the growth between the same group of students prior to and after implementation of a Response to Intervention Model to determine if significant growth occurred after implementation.

Summary

In this chapter the methodology and treatment of the data related to the problem of determining significant growth for students in seventh and eighth grade after the implementation of a Response to Intervention Model and a research-based intervention program were reviewed. The MAP assessment tool was selected and *t*-test was used to determine significance for the project. The analysis of the data and findings from this study were reported in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

Analysis of the Data

Introduction

The middle school in the study was in year three of school improvement, and an area identified for improvement was the lack of growth in reading. There were 100 or more students at each grade level of approximately 250 students per grade level that were two or more years behind in reading. The middle school in the study had made previous attempts to increase instructional time in reading to close the achievement gap without success.

Description of the Environment

The author used quantitative research. Over a two year period the author collected data to determine the effectiveness of the Response to Intervention Model for students two or more years behind grade level in reading.

The middle school was located in Central Washington close to a nuclear facility. The middle school had more than 740 students at the sixth through eighth grade level and 43 instructional staff members. All teachers in the building were highly qualified in their areas. The average years of teacher experience at the building were 11.9 years, and 67.4% of the teachers had at least a master's degree. At the middle school 40% of the students were white. Of the remaining 60% of students, Hispanic/Latino students made up 56%. The middle school had

84.2% of its population that qualified for free and reduced lunch. A high mobility rate had been a problem identified at this school. In addition, students were directly impacted by poverty and were from various ethnic populations.

The staff at the middle school had been proactive in addressing the needs of the school's population through the school improvement process. They formed small learning communities called prides in a block schedule format. The staff felt that prides gave students the needed stability of consistent adult support. The administration, one head principal and two assistant principals, determined that the staff needed to be given flexibility within the pride schedule to make adjustments based on data-driven needs of students. The district directed that all students below the fiftieth percentile, based on test scores in reading and mathematics, be given an additional class in their area of need, and all prides had mathematics and reading lab classes that satisfied this directive.

Hypothesis

Seventh and eighth grade students who received instruction using the Response to Intervention program with Corrective Reading in all Tier III courses during the 2009-2010 school year demonstrated greater than expected growth than in the 2008-2009 school year.

Null Hypothesis

Seventh and eighth grade students who received instruction using the Response to Intervention program with Corrective Reading in all Tier III courses during the 2009-2010 school year did not demonstrate greater than expected growth than in the 2008-2009 school year.

Results of the Study

Table 1.

t-test of Pre – Post-test Results for Students in Tier III Instruction

Test	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pre	31	1.48	12.31
Post	31	4.45	10.16
df = 30		$t = 1.10$	$p > .05$

The null hypothesis was accepted. The Response to Intervention program with Corrective Reading in all Tier III courses during the 2009-2010 school year did not demonstrate greater than expected growth than in the 2008-2009 school year.

Findings

Although the null hypothesis was accepted and the hypothesis was not supported several findings became apparent. The average score after the Response to Intervention program with Corrective Reading in all Tier III courses during the 2009-2010 school year had been implemented increased 2.97 points. Although this did not show a significant level it did indicate improvement.

Discussion

The research-based intervention used was Corrective Reading. The research noted that the program be taught with fidelity and pacing was an important aspect. In chapter two of this study according to Marchand-Martella, Martella, and Przychodzin-Havis:

Twenty-eight studies examining the effects of Corrective Reading have been published in peer-reviewed journals. Twenty-six of the 28 studies found positive, often statistically significant results for students who were taught using Corrective Reading. For studies using standardized measures, results indicated that most vocabulary and comprehension scores increased from pre- to posttest with similar increases in oral reading fluency. (2009, p.1)

The author believed that significance could have been achieved with a more comprehensive pacing of the program. Students identified in the study received

half as many lessons as they should have prior to post-testing. This interfered with the fidelity of the program. Had pacing been followed, significance may have been achieved.

Summary

The middle school's thirty-one students in Tier III Corrective Reading classes were pre-tested in fall of '08 and winter of '09, prior to the implementation of Tier III, and post-tested in fall of '09 and winter of '10, after implementation of Tier III, to determine growth according to the Measures of Academic Progress test. By having calculated pre-test scores to see where each participant had started and then post-test scores to see where each participant was after implementation of Tier III support, the author was able to calculate the amount of growth over that time. The author's hypothesis was not supported. There was not enough significant growth throughout the course of the study. The data was inconclusive about the advantages of Tier III instruction using Corrective Reading. The *t* score comparing growth between the two school years was close to showing significance at the .01 level but not enough to support the hypothesis.

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

The No Child Left Behind Act changed the government's role in education by focusing on student achievement. Student achievement was to be measured yearly by each state and states were expected to meet Adequate Yearly Progress. Schools not meeting Adequate Yearly Progress were placed in school improvement. The school used in this project was in step three of school improvement for not making Adequate Yearly Progress in reading and mathematics. Previous attempts to increase instructional time in reading at this school had not been successful in closing the achievement gap.

Summary

Through the school improvement process research was done by the school improvement team that showed one hundred or more students at each grade level were two or more years behind in reading. Through the research it was determined by the school improvement team that a Response to Intervention Model be implemented in all reading lab classes in the building. The author decided to proceed with a research project in order to determine the effectiveness of the intervention. In the study students who were given additional time in reading in one school year were compared to themselves when placed in tiered

intervention class with research-based interventions in the next school year. Thirty-one students were identified and placed in Tier III Corrective Reading classes. They were pre-tested in the fall of '08 and winter of '09 while receiving only additional time in reading. Then they were post-tested in fall of '09 and winter of '10, after implementation of Tier III. The Measures of Academic Progress test was used to determine growth. After looking at the amount of growth when the students were only given additional time in reading as compared to when the same students were placed in a Tier III class, the author had concluded that there was growth in reading but not to the level to show significance set by the project. As a result, the hypothesis was not supported and the null hypothesis was accepted. The data does not support the project at the levels needed.

Conclusions

The author concluded that the study was inconclusive as to the level of significance required to show that students receiving Tier III placement with a research-based intervention of Corrective Reading made greater than expected growth than when only receiving additional time in reading. Even though the students made greater gains in Tier III instruction with Corrective Reading it was not at a significant level.

Recommendations

The project's time frame, to show growth in reading of students in Tier III instruction versus students only receiving additional time in reading, was relatively short. Students were first assessed in September but because of time constraints the post-test was administered in January of both school years. The author would recommend the post-test for both school years be administered in April. The author believes giving the students additional time in the Tier III intervention class would help show even greater gains in reading.

In addition, fidelity to the intervention program and following appropriate pacing was noted to be essential to the program's success. Students in the study only completed half the amount of the curriculum that they should have by the time the post-test was administered. Pacing had not been followed due to time constraints in the building schedule. The author would recommend that pacing to the program be followed. The author believes that had the pacing been followed and students in the study had finished the expected number of lessons even greater gains in reading would have been achieved.

Overall, the author believes that extending the length of the study and following the recommended pacing guide for the intervention program would help to show the increase in reading needed to support the hypothesis. Students receiving a Tier III placement using a research-based intervention would make

greater than expected growth than those students only receiving additional time in reading.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archived: Executive summary of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. (2001, January). Retrieved January 16, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/print/nclb/overview/intro/execsumm.html>
- Canter, A., Klotz, M. B., & Cowan, K. (2008, February). Response to Intervention: The future for secondary schools. *Principal Leadership*, 12-15.
- Davis, S. (2010). *History of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Retrieved January 16, 2010, from http://www.ehow.com/about_5085381_history-child-left-behind-act.html
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Lohman, J. (2007, January 17). *OLR Research Report - Response to Intervention plans*. Retrieved January 16, 2010, from <http://www.cga.ct.gov/2007/rpt/2007-R-0067.htm>
- Marchand-Martella, N.E., Martella, R.C., & Przychodzin-Havis, A.M. (Ed.). (2009). *The research base and validation of sra's corrective reading program*. New York: McGraw Hill.

- McClure, P. (2005, March). School improvement under No Child Left Behind. *Center for American Progress*, 1-29. Retrieved January 16, 2010, from <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2005/03/nclb.html>
- Owens, A., & Sunderman, G. L. (2006, October). School accountability under NCLB: Aid or obstacle for measuring racial equity? *The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University*, 1-4. Retrieved January 16, 2010, from <http://www.racialequitytools.org/resourcefiles/owens.pdf>
- Northwest education association. (2009). Retrieved January 16, 2010, from <http://www.nwea.org/>
- School improvement planning process guide*. (2005, January). Retrieved January 16, 2010, from www.k12.wa.us/schoolimprovement/pubdocs/sipguide.doc
- Stepanek, J. (2008). NWREL. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from Response to Intervention: An overview Web site: <http://www.nwrel.org/newdu/14-01/features/rti/php>
- U.S. Department of Education, (2004, October). *A guide to education and No Child Left Behind*. Retrieved January 16, 2010, from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/guide/guide.pdf>

APPENDIX

<u>Student Name</u>	<u>Fall 08</u> <u>RIT</u>	<u>Winter 09</u> <u>RIT</u>	<u>Growth</u>	<u>Fall 09</u> <u>RIT</u>	<u>Winter 10</u> <u>RIT</u>	<u>Growth</u>
Student 1	205	202	-3	202	205	3
Student 2	187	196	9	186	200	14
Student 3	206	199	-7	194	219	25
Student 4	204	195	-9	201	205	4
Student 5	190	194	4	217	206	-11
Student 6	207	206	-1	200	208	8
Student 7	198	200	2	204	202	-2
Student 8	183	204	21	202	206	4
Student 9	199	194	-5	209	204	-5
Student 10	199	230	31	213	213	0
Student 11	208	187	-21	200	209	9
Student 12	211	213	2	201	222	21
Student 13	192	199	7	191	202	11
Student 14	197	200	3	202	201	-1
Student 15	184	187	3	192	189	-3
Student 16	205	197	-8	208	205	-3
Student 17	201	188	-13	194	196	2
Student 18	192	186	-6	193	185	-8
Student 19	207	199	-8	207	206	-1
Student 20	167	177	10	171	181	10
Student 21	204	204	0	210	213	3
Student 22	193	185	-8	170	195	25
Student 23	180	194	14	180	199	19
Student 24	207	199	-8	198	199	1
Student 25	212	213	1	196	213	17
Student 26	191	208	17	207	212	5
Student 27	203	197	-6	198	206	8
Student 28	175	206	31	187	192	5
Student 29	199	209	10	206	204	-2
Student 30	197	180	-17	218	198	-20
Student 31	204	205	1	195	195	0
Averages	197	198	1	198	203	4