

Materials	Reading Style Inventory, colored overlays, multi-leveled Carbo Recorded Books and short stories
------------------	---

Origin/Scope

The Carbo Reading Styles Program (RSP) was developed in 1975 by Marie Carbo, founder of the National Reading Styles Institute. As of June 2002, the program had been implemented comprehensively in 62 elementary and middle schools. Hundreds of other schools have implemented it at a high level, and thousands of schools, including some high schools, have implemented it at a basic level and/or have used reading styles materials with students.

General Approach

The idea behind the Carbo Reading Styles Program is to increase student literacy by making the process of learning to read so easy and enjoyable that students become motivated, confident, fluent readers. The program is designed to provide teachers with a thorough understanding of each student's individual learning style for reading, or "reading style." Teachers also learn a range of reading methods and classroom management strategies that accommodate their students' strongest learning pathways and interests. For example, teachers learn that many poor readers are global, tactile, and kinesthetic, and that hands-on materials and assisted reading are often the most effective methods for such youngsters.

All materials needed to implement RSP are provided to teachers participating in the comprehensive program. For example, teachers receive and learn how to administer the Reading Style Inventory®, which helps identify students' learning strengths and weaknesses and recommends the best ways to teach them. Teachers also receive assessment kits of colored overlays designed to help reduce dyslexia, a classroom library of recorded books and stories, hands-on materials for students, and practical training materials. During training sessions, teachers practice new skills, plan together, and create their own classroom materials, including recordings that use the Carbo Method.

The Carbo Reading Styles Program is designed to be compatible with a variety of reading programs and materials, such as basal readers, that may already be in place in a school.

Results

Independent researchers, program implementers, and the developer have conducted a number of studies of the Carbo Reading Styles Program over the past two decades. In one study, model developer staff members and an independent evaluator compared one-year reading gains of students in classrooms where teachers used the Carbo Reading Styles Program with gains of students in classrooms where teachers used the existing district program. Overall, the study involved 15 matched pairs of teachers from six school districts in six states. Students in the RSP classrooms outgained control students in 30 of 34 comprehension, word analysis, and vocabulary subtests (Barber, Carbo, & Thomasson, 1998).

In another evaluation, 13 classes from two similar schools in the mid-South region of the U.S. were matched on reading ability, aptitude, socioeconomic status, ethnic background, and student-to-teacher ratio. Teachers

use the Carbo Reading Styles Program; teachers from seven comparison classes used the district curriculum. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test was used to evaluate students' reading skills. Over a six-month period, the mean gain for the Carbo group was 10.9 points; the corresponding gain for the comparison group was 6.4 points, a statistically significant difference (Oglesby & Suter, 1995).

The model's impact on special education students has also been evaluated. An independent researcher investigated the impact of Carbo Reading Styles Program on 40 learning disabled students in an elementary school in Washington state, using 48 learning disabled students in a similar school as a control group (LaShell, 1986). Over the nine months of the study, the Carbo group gained 15 months in reading while the control group gained four months, as measured by the Gray Oral Reading Test. This difference was statistically significant.

Reports on comprehensive RSP implementation also show positive results. For example, an elementary school in Texas adopted RSP schoolwide in the 1994-1995 school year. In spring of 1995, 75 percent of students at the school passed the TAAS in reading, compared to 46 percent the previous year (Skipper, 1997).

Little information is available regarding the impact of the Carbo Reading Styles Program on high schools.

Implementation Assistance

- **Project Capacity:** The Carbo Reading Styles Program uses a core group of 10 full-time trainers and 30 part-time trainers.
- **Faculty Buy-In:** A 75 percent staff buy-in is required for the comprehensive program.
- **Initial Training:** Before training for the comprehensive program begins, a building team composed of the principal, two teachers, and a site facilitator (a recommended but not required position) visit an exemplary RSP School and work with the principal and faculty there. Then the team develops its initial school vision, school plan, and timelines for implementation. Teams are further trained at the National Reading Styles Conference and attend strands that accommodate their needs. The entire faculty also participates in four days of on-site training.
- **Follow-Up Coaching:** During the first year of comprehensive implementation, RSP consultants provide eight days of technical assistance, including principal support, team building, individual teacher feedback, and in-class demonstration lessons. Schools receive an additional eight days of technical assistance during the second year and six days during the third year. RSP consultants also train one or more members of the teaching staff to be reading styles facilitators so they can provide ongoing support.
- **Networking:** RSP offers regional seminars, an annual national conference, a Web site (including a discussion forum), and a regular national e-mail newsletter.
- **Implementation Review:** The primary RSP consultant assigned to a school offers continual evaluation of implementation to individual teachers and to the principal, both informally and formally through reports. In addition, a detailed checklist, the Degree of Reading Styles Implementation Checklist, allows teachers and schools to measure their own implementation. The checklist is used as a self-check and also as part of an outside evaluation of the program.

Costs

Costs for the comprehensive program are based on the specific plan upon which participating schools/districts

and RSP agree. Specific costs depend on the number of teachers, number of schools, and level of involvement. Average costs are \$45,000 to \$65,000 for the first year and \$35,000 to \$50,000 for years two and three.

Year one fees cover classroom and training materials, four days of training, eight days of technical assistance, and evaluation. Building teams (the principal, two teachers, and a site facilitator if a school opts to have one) also receive two days of implementation training, registration for the National Reading Styles Conference, and a visit to a model school. Fees for Years Two and Three include training, technical assistance, materials, and registration for the National Reading Styles Conference for 10 staff members. Schools should allow an additional \$10,000 to \$15,000 per year for expenses related to staff travel, substitute teachers, and equipment.

State Standards and Accountability

Carbo Reading Styles Program consultants have analyzed reading standards from many states and identified those that most states have in common. These standards have been incorporated into the Carbo Reading Styles Program classroom materials. Carbo Reading Styles Program consultants use their knowledge of state standards to incorporate these goals into their trainings. In addition, the Carbo Reading Styles Program helps teachers learn how to identify students' weak areas on state and standardized tests and how to strengthen those areas through targeted instruction.

Student Populations

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

The Carbo Reading Styles Program is highlighted in four categories: urban, rural, high poverty, and special education. It offers a number of features for students in each category:

- **Urban:** The program uses multi-sensory materials and multicultural books.
- **Rural:** The program offers flexible training, technical assistance to accommodate low numbers of substitutes, and training videos.
- **High Poverty:** Consultants provide guidance to schools in obtaining low- or no-cost materials and equipment and in setting up after-school reading programs.
- **Special Education:** The Reading Style Inventory can be used to develop Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). A special modification section is provided for mainstream teachers. Trainers work with staff on "push in" and "pull out" methods.

Special Considerations

The RSP program requires the following resources: Reading Style Inventory materials (test booklets and disks), Carbo Recorded Books, one listening center and at least three tape players with headsets per classroom, and one high-quality tape recorder for every five teachers. Teachers are encouraged to create comfortable reading environments for students.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Barber, L., Carbo, M., & Thomasson, R. (1998). *A comparative study of the Reading Styles Program to extant programs of teaching reading*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Oglesby, F., & Suter, W. N. (1995). Matching reading styles and reading instruction. *Research in the Schools*, 2(1), 11-15.

Skipper, B. (1997). Reading with style: How one school district has turned its students low reading scores around. *American School Board Journal*, 184(2), 36-37.

Independent Researchers

LaShell, L. (1986). An analysis of the effects of reading methods upon reading achievement and locus-of-control when individual reading style is matched for learning-disabled students. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 0362.

O'Tuel, F. S., & Holt, S. B. (1992). *Reading Styles Program for fifth and sixth grade elementary students: An evaluation of program development*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	Size	Locale	Race/Ethnicity					Free Lunch	ELL	Stud. with Dis.
			Afr. Amer.	Am. Indian	Asian Amer.	Hisp.	White			
O'Connor Elementary 3402 Bobolink Victoria, TX 77901 361-788-9572 Contact: Sherry Gorsuch	704	mid-size city	12%	0%	0%	72%	15%	62%	8%	13%
Pine Ridge Elementary (K-4) 1200 Mill Ridge Road Livingston, TX 77351 936-328-2160 Contact: Janel Poindexter-Sewell	928	small town	14%	1%	1%	11%	73%	53%	13%	10%
Jeannette Myhre Elementary 919 South 12 Street Bismarck, ND 58504 701-221-3430 Contact: Bill Demaree	433	mid-size city	1%	16%	1%	0%	82%	44%	5%	21%

Oakland Heights Elementary 601 59th Avenue Meridian, MS 39307 601-484-4984 Contact: Kim Benton	477	large town	74%	0%	0%	0%	26%	63%	1%	4%
--	-----	------------	-----	----	----	----	-----	-----	----	----

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing Data

For more information, contact

Carol McLaughlin
Carbo Reading Styles Program
PO Box 737
Syosset, NY 11791
Phone: 800-331-3117 or 516-921-5500
Fax: 516-921-5591
E-mail: staffdev@nrsi.com
Web site: <http://www.nrsi.com>

Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (K - 12)

Accepted for Inclusion 7/1/1999
Description Written 8/1/1999
Re-accepted 12/1/2005
Description Updated 3/1/2006

Type of Model	reading/language arts
Founder	Ethna R. Reid
Current Service Provider	Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction
Year Established	1974
# of Schools Served (5/1/2001)	3,436
Level	K - 12 (with primary focus on K-8)
Primary Goal	teach students to read, write, listen, and speak so they can communicate effectively and achieve at significantly higher levels
Main Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mastery learning approach to language arts instruction • individualized instruction • emphasis on expressive skills (writing and speaking) as well as receptive skills (reading and listening)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • applications to other content areas
Impact on Instruction	three daily instructional components: skills, practice, and backup skills; considerable time devoted to small group and individualized instruction; multi-day schedules are used when time is limited
Impact on Organization/Staffing	educators evaluate possible re-deployment of current staff; key persons serve as site facilitator and certified trainer(s)
Impact on Schedule	educators evaluate current schedules and use of time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes
Parental Involvement	ECRI materials address parent involvement
Technology	no new technology required
Materials	22 teacher texts required; teaching materials and mastery tests that correspond to student textbooks are provided

Origin/Scope

The Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI) has been teaching teachers since 1966 when Granite School District in Salt Lake City received a Title III grant. Ethna R. Reid has been its director since that time. Teachers from thousands of schools (mostly elementary and middle schools) in all 50 states have received ECRI training. Developers estimate that 1,850 elementary and 509 secondary schools have adopted ECRI as a schoolwide reading program.

General Approach

ECRI is a highly structured, teacher directed, mastery learning approach to instruction in language arts. Increased time on task, high expectations, individualized instruction, positive reinforcement, use of overt responses from students, and integrated instruction are all hallmarks of this approach.

Using reading materials currently in place at the school, ECRI-trained teachers follow dialogues, or scripts, as they move students through three daily instructional components: skills, practice, and backup skills. During skills time, teachers use a three-step process to introduce new material: modeling, prompting, and practice. Students sometimes respond in unison and sometimes individually to teacher prompts. ECRI teachers deploy a variety of instructional methods as they teach vocabulary, comprehension, literature, creative and expository writing, and study skills.

Practice time, when students learn to use the skills introduced in skills instruction, is devoted to three primary tasks: small group discussions, individual conferences with students, and individually administered mastery tests (oral or written performance-based tests). Teachers learn to develop mastery tests based on the curriculum and materials in place at the school. Students progress at their own pace as they demonstrate mastery of skills. Students also learn to keep records, diagnose problems, and judge when they are ready for mastery tests.

Backup skills time is reserved for instruction in penmanship, spelling, dictation, and proofreading. Throughout all components of instruction, ECRI stresses that expressive skills (writing and speaking) are more important

than receptive skills (reading and listening). Therefore, ECRI students write and discuss daily.

Although the ECRI approach was designed for language arts instruction, it can be used in other content areas as well.

Content teachers are given units that pre-assess; teach key vocabulary, comprehension and study skills; provide hands-on experiences, and stimulate discussion.

Results

A series of evaluations conducted from 1986 to 1990 demonstrated a significant positive impact of ECRI on student reading achievement. In Morgan County, Tennessee, for example, four schools implemented ECRI (1988-89) as their regular reading program in grades 2 through 7; one school retained its existing commercial reading program and acted as a comparison. All students were pre-tested in spring 1988 using the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), then post-tested in spring 1989 after a full year of instruction. All ECRI grades recorded significant mean gains in reading comprehension and vocabulary, averaging 10.0 NCEs for comprehension and 8.8 NCEs for vocabulary. All comparison group gains, with the single exception of sixth-grade vocabulary, were nonsignificant or negative.

Overall, the studies involved 2,274 students in 11 public schools in grades 1-10 in regular education, special education, remedial education, bilingual education, and Chapter I classes from coast to coast. Regular education students (n=1,733) gained an average of over 8 NCEs in total reading scores. Children with special needs (bilingual, Chapter I, and remedial) showed an average gain of 14 NCEs. Special education students showed an average gain exceeding 19 NCEs. All of these gains were statistically significant when compared with control and normative expectations.

Another series of evaluations conducted from 1990 to 1996 covered grades 1-11 in 6 sites, in five states, involving 1,986 children. In one of the sites, a Chapter I school served as a comparison for two ECRI schools. At all six sites, ECRI students demonstrated significant gains on reading subtests of various standardized achievement tests. Average gains per class across all schools and groups ranged from 5.4 NCEs to over 26 NCEs.

At multiple sites not included in the studies described above (most of them elementary and middle schools), similar results have been demonstrated on a variety of standardized tests over the past 20 years.

Implementation Assistance

- **Project Capacity:** In addition to five full time trainers, ECRI has 58 certified trainers available to offer awareness sessions and seminars throughout the country and to assist teachers as they implement the program. As ECRI staff members work with schools/districts, they encourage educators to develop trainers onsite. ECRI holds an annual Invitational Conference for Teachers of Teachers.
- **Faculty Buy-In:** ECRI sends awareness materials (such as videotapes of ECRI classrooms) and/or offers awareness sessions onsite to interested educators. Names of schools/districts that are implementing ECRI are also provided. Visits to these sites are encouraged. No formal buy-in is required.
- **Initial Training:** A five-day initial seminar with one ECRI staff person for 35-40 teachers is desirable, followed by intermediate and advanced seminars. The seminars include lecture, practice sessions, and

demonstrations with students. ECRI also offers seminars for principals and other district administrators and encourages them to attend the seminars teachers are attending.

- **Follow-Up Coaching:** Periodic visits by ECRI staff to teachers' classrooms to demonstrate, model, and monitor are encouraged. After-school workshops and personal consultations are offered. Teachers also can videotape their teaching and evaluate their proficiency with ECRI-designed proficiency checklists. Local ECRI facilitators and certified trainers are taught to offer these services.
- **Networking:** Through its conferences, newsletter, toll free telephone number, and Web site, ECRI provides information, answers questions, and encourages educators throughout the country to collaborate. ECRI teachers share materials they have developed, schedule visits to each other's sites, and participate in special events at Reid School and Reid Ranch in Salt Lake City.
- **Implementation Review:** During the initial seminar, teachers establish goals and benchmarks and outline steps to achieve them. They are introduced to observation checklists and proficiency evaluations that can be used as they videotape their classrooms. Ninety days following the seminar, teachers complete a self-assessment checklist. Administrators who attend the seminars are provided strategies for assisting teachers and monitoring student progress. Teachers move through four levels of proficiency, depending upon the seminar they have attended: Initial Level, Introductory, Intermediate, and Proficient. The specificity of the ECRI training makes it easy to analyze its implementation.

Costs

Each teacher in the initial seminar uses a set of ECRI texts that cost \$268. A second set is required for the next level of training. For the seminar and additional follow-up days, the school/district pays an honorarium of \$750 per day plus expenses for one ECRI trainer for up to 40 trainees. Schools/districts may also have to cover stipends or release time for teachers during training.

Existing district reading and content materials may be used. Supplies for teachers and students are those usually found in schools. No special staffing or facilities are required to implement ECRI. Awareness materials and a catalogue are available at no cost.

State Standards and Accountability

(We soon will be providing information on the model's support for schools' efforts to meet standards.)

Student Populations

ECRI has been implemented and evaluated in rural, suburban, urban, and Title I schools across the country. Evidence demonstrates the program's positive impact on regular, special needs, bilingual, and special education students.

Special Considerations

There are no special considerations in adopting ECRI except those common to creating change within a school.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

ECRI Project. (1996). *ECRI validation reports*. Salt Lake City, UT: Reid Foundation.

Independent Researchers

Ferguson, C. L., Mangum, J., & Coffey, K. (1998). The South Louisiana Study. *Mastery Learning and the Teaching of Reading*, 16(1), 1, 3, 7.

Reid, E. R. (1986). Practicing effective instruction: The Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction approach. *Exceptional Children*, 52(6), 510-519.

Reid, E. R. (1997). Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI). *Behavior and Social Issues*, 7(1), 19-24.

(The latter two articles report evaluation data compiled by independent researchers.)

Sample Sites

School/Contact	Size	Locale	Race/Ethnicity					Free Lunch	ELL	Stud. with Dis.
			Afr. Amer.	Am. Indian	Asian Amer.	Hisp.	White			
David City School District (stats for grade 7-12 school) 750 "D" Street David City, NE 68632 402-367-3187 Contact: Jerry Phillips, Superintendent	320	small town	0%	0%	1%	4%	95%	33%	0%	7%
Sto-Rox Middle School 298 Ewing Road McKees Rocks, PA 412-287-1416 Contact: Janell Logue-Belden	386	urban fringe of large city	37%	0%	0%	1%	62%	71%	6%	24%
St. Peter's Academy 4250 38th Avenue Vero Beach, FL 32967 772-562-1963 Contact: Ruth Jefferson	103	urban fringe of mid-size city	94%	0%	0%	2%	4%	18%	100%	12%
Reid School 2965 East 3435 South Salt Lake City, UT 84109 801-466-4214 Contact: Dr. Ethna R. Reid	205	urban fringe of mid-size city	0%	0%	2%	1%	96%	0%	2%	14%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics

electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing Data

For more information, contact

Ethna R. Reid
 Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction
 3310 South 2700 East
 Salt Lake City, UT, 84109
 Phone: 801-486-5083 or 800-468-3274
 Fax: 801-485-0561
 E-mail: ereid@xmission.com
 Web site: <http://www.ecri.cc>

Literacy Collaborative (K - 6)

Accepted for Inclusion 12/1/2005

Description Written 3/1/2006

Type of Model	reading/language arts
Founder	Jill Eurich, Irene Fountas, Tina Henry, Charlotte Huck, Andrea McCarrier, Gay Su Pinnell
Current Service Provider	Georgia State University, Lesley University, The Ohio State University, Purdue University
Year Established	Primary (K-2) 1993; Intermediate (3-6) 1999
# of Schools Served (1/1/2006)	
Level	K - 6
Primary Goal	improved literacy achievement by teaching children how to become independent problem solvers through intensive long-term professional development of teachers.
Main Features	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • intensive long-term staff development • developing local capacity for staff development • teaching for strategies to build independent problem solvers • school leadership team
Impact on Instruction	data-driven differentiated instruction
Impact on	full inclusion suggested; release time for literacy

Organization/Staffing	coaching needed
Impact on Schedule	2.5- to 3-hour literacy block with integrated content areas
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	literacy framework with integrated curriculum
Parental Involvement	home-school connection including home support activities and books to promote home reading
Technology	currently developing online professional development support for literacy coordinators; videotaping lessons an optional tool for reflection
Materials	single copies of books for read aloud; multiple copies of leveled books for guided reading and literature discussion; writing materials, phonics materials, professional resources, and training modules for literacy coordinators

Origin/Scope

Literacy Collaborative, formerly known as the Early Literacy Learning Initiative, is a national comprehensive school reform project. The model includes two models: primary (K-2) and intermediate (grades 3-6). Development of the Literacy Collaborative primary model began in 1986 at The Ohio State University with a series of teacher study groups; formal primary literacy coordinator training began in 1993. Lesley University joined the primary-level efforts in 1994. Development of the Literacy Collaborative intermediate model (grades 3-6) began with study groups at Lesley University and The Ohio State University in 1995; formal intermediate literacy coordinator began at Lesley University in 1999 and at The Ohio State University in 2000. Currently, Lesley University is leading a middle-school pilot for grades 6-8. Literacy Collaborative training is currently offered at four university training sites across the country: Georgia State University, Lesley University, Purdue University, and The Ohio State University. All sites offer primary and intermediate training, while district training is offered at either Lesley University or The Ohio State University.

General Approach

The Literacy Collaborative is a long-term professional development program designed to provide comprehensive, schoolwide literacy instruction in the primary grades in order to increase the level of literacy achievement for all students. The Literacy Collaborative is based on a framework for teaching that provides a set of flexible instructional contexts rather than a set of rigid procedures and timelines. The framework is organized as a conceptual tool. When using the framework, teachers need to make instructional decisions about which practice they will choose to teach children to be strategic problem solvers and critical thinkers in reading, writing, and

word study across the content areas. The framework also allows teachers to decide when it is most appropriate to target instruction to the individual child, a small group, or the entire group, flexibly moving between the three types of groups throughout the day.

Implementation of Literacy Collaborative may require teachers taking on new teaching practices and a high level of implementation in an uninterrupted daily two- to three-hour literacy block. Teacher change is supported by the literacy coordinator and the school leadership team and is a long-term commitment for all. The principles on which the Literacy Collaborative operates are based on research on effective school and teacher change, and include the following components:

- **Literacy learning and teaching integrating the content areas.** Students learn literacy skills during authentic reading and writing experiences that include reading aloud to children, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, shared writing, interactive writing, writing workshop, and independent writing. Teachers integrate literacy instruction across all content areas and work with both heterogeneous and homogeneous groups of students depending on students' instructional needs. Reading Recovery is required for first-grade students needing additional help. A parent outreach program includes inexpensive books that children first read in school and then take home for further practice.
- **School-based leadership.** School leaders pledge a five-year commitment to the training and participation of the staff. A trained literacy coordinator works with the school-based literacy leadership team composed of primary/intermediate classroom teachers, Reading Recovery and Title I teachers, and the school principal to develop and implement a plan to support student literacy achievement and the professional development of teachers.
- **Professional development.** Literacy coordinators in training participate in a year-long course that includes eight weeks of training at one of the university or district training sites. After their initial year of training, literacy coordinators attend yearly professional institutes. Each literacy coordinator conducts a long-term school-based program of professional development that provides training and coaching of the teachers as they implement the Literacy Collaborative framework in the primary and intermediate grades.
- **Assessment and research.** Both informal and formal measures are used to facilitate reflective practice and to monitor student progress. All Literacy Collaborative Schools are required to administer specific classroom assessments and to use the information gained from these assessments to inform instruction at the individual student level. In addition, administrators, literacy coordinators, and teachers in Literacy Collaborative schools develop a school-level evaluation plan. Based on this evaluation plan, they collect, analyze, and present their results to provide evidence of effectiveness at the local level. At the national level, internal and external evaluations of Literacy Collaborative implementation are conducted to provide evidence of effectiveness of the Literacy Collaborative model. Resources and support for

Literacy Collaborative schools in developing, analyzing, and presenting their data are provided on the national Web site and by individual university training sites.

Implementation takes place in five phases:

Phase 1—Awareness and Planning. The school staff investigates the Literacy Collaborative model, develops a local plan, and submits an application for literacy coordinator training.

Phase 2—Literacy Coordinator Training and Start-Up. The literacy coordinator trains, the school-based leadership team begins to meet to address implementation issues and to develop an evaluation plan to measure effectiveness.

Phase 3—School-level Implementation. The literacy coordinator provides the year-long training course for teachers, begins the home-school connection, and provides demonstrations, coaching, and analysis of teaching. The school-based team continues to share leadership for the reform efforts.

Phases 4-5—Refinement and Independent Implementation. The literacy coordinator continues to support the teachers in the implementation of the framework through coaching and professional development sessions and the analysis of student data. The school-based leadership team continues to monitor and guide the implementation.

Results

As part of their evaluation of an Indiana Department of Education early literacy grant program, independent evaluators studied the impact of various early literacy interventions, including Reading Recovery, Success for All, Four Blocks Method, and Literacy Collaborative, over a three-year period in about half of the state's elementary schools (N=525). Schools that used Success for All, Four Blocks Method, and Literacy Collaborative produced larger gains in passing rates on the state ISTEP+ reading test than did other schools, with Literacy Collaborative producing the highest effect sizes associated with student passing rates (between .2 and .4). Literacy Collaborative also had the highest effect sizes (moderate effect sizes) associated with changes in student ISTEP+ passing rates among disaggregated low- and high-poverty schools.

Literacy Collaborative model developers engage in fall-to-fall data collection on all of their schools using a variety of reading and writing assessments. A 2003 report compared second-graders' scores on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test across six years for students in 33 representative schools that have consistently participated in the Literacy Collaborative network for at least four years with the same literacy coordinator. NCE scores for Total Reading for 32 of the schools (one school not

grade reveal increasing means from 39.85 (n=450) to 48.00 (n=1862) across six years. Analyses also showed that more students moved out of the lowest quartile and higher percentages of students scored in the other quartiles over time.

In a 2001 report, results were collected over five years on 52 schools with literacy coordinators for at least four years. Again, second-grade students' Gates-MacGinitie Reading test scores were analyzed in 51 schools (one school not tested), showing an increase in means on the Total Reading test from 36.00 to 48.70 NCEs. In this study, subgroups of student data, disaggregated by consistency in instruction (whether students stayed in the same school from kindergarten to second grade) and attendance (whether students were absent less than 20 days during the 1999-2000 year), allowed model developers to assert that consistent and full exposure to Literacy Collaborative produced the highest results. Model developers acknowledge that these results could also be due to family factors correlated with mobility.

An unpublished three-year study of reading achievement in the primary grades, conducted by a Literacy Collaborative district trainer and Ph.D. candidate in Georgia, examined whether students in kindergarten, first grade, and second grade who received three consecutive years of Literacy Collaborative instruction made greater gains in reading achievement than their peers who received more traditional methods of reading instruction. Thirty-two matched pairs of students were formed based on criteria. After two years, students receiving the Literacy Collaborative instruction group achieved significantly higher scores in the reading comprehension subtest of the ITBS and in total reading achievement on the ITBS than control group students. After three years, the Literacy Collaborative group had statistically higher vocabulary and comprehension subtest scores on the Stanford 9.

Implementation Assistance

- **Project Capacity:** Literacy coordinator training is available at four university sites. In addition, 14 district sites train primary literacy coordinators and 11 train intermediate literacy coordinators. District and university trainers provide support to the literacy coordinators during their training and implementation years, continuing for as long as the schools are part of the Literacy Collaborative network.
- **Faculty Buy-In:** Literacy Collaborative requires formal or informal commitment on the part of school faculty (e.g., 90 percent of teachers must approve). The teachers at each school indicate their commitment to the implementation of the Literacy Collaborative model at the time of application for literacy coordinator training. A school literacy leadership teams oversees the program over the years. Eighty percent of the school staff must sign the sheet indicating their commitment to the project for the school to be accepted.
- **Initial Training:** Leadership team training sessions are offered each year to schools interested in the model. A team of school personnel attends five full-day sessions. The school's literacy coordinator participates in a year-long course that includes eight weeks of training at one of the university or

district training sites.

- **Follow-Up Coaching:** Each literacy coordinator conducts a long-term school-based program of professional development that provides training and coaching for the school's kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers as they implement the Literacy Collaborative framework. University or district trainers make at least two site visits per year for the first two years to observe the literacy coordinator teaching students, and teaching and coaching fellow teachers. The literacy coordinator attends yearly professional institutes.
- **Networking:** Literacy Collaborative provides opportunities for participating teachers from multiple schools to observe, learn from, and support one another (annual conferences, scheduled visits to other schools, newsletters, email lists, Web sites, etc.). Open houses prior to implementation allow teachers to visit schools that are implementing the framework before they begin the project. Also, many schools offer site visits to demonstration classrooms for schools interested in seeing the framework in action.

The Literacy Collaborative has published a quarterly newsletter that allows continued learning and highlighting of schools. A list serve established at Purdue University allows all literacy coordinators to network and brainstorm together. Each university hosts a Web site for all school staff to visit. Every university has links to each other's sites so all universities are connected.

Participating teachers may attend the annual National Reading Recovery Conference, in which a number of sessions address the implementation of the Literacy Collaborative framework. All four universities host summer institutes, which provide opportunities for extended learning and networking.

- **Implementation Review:** Literacy Collaborative supports formal efforts to determine how well schools are implementing the model, including on-site reviews and an annual self-evaluation relative to the Literacy Collaborative National Standards. Throughout the year, teachers use a leveling kit and student progress charts to record growth over time in skills. These charts include benchmarks for quarterly high benchmark goals. Writing is scored with a rubric system. The coaching model also uses several assessment tools for charting growth over time in teachers. The teachers complete self assessments and analyze videotapes of their teaching. The coaches use data and a log to analyze teaching before the post conference.

At the end of the second year, the school leadership team prepares an annual school report that summarizes the student data collected at the school. The school's leadership team leads the school faculty in setting new goals for the following year that will ensure greater student achievement in reading and writing.

Costs

Costs per level (primary or intermediate) for 2005-06) are:

- The approximate total cost for training in year one (including all fees and materials) ranges between \$16,775 and \$24,850. In years two through five, the cost ranges from \$2,950 to \$3,600.
- The site visit fees in year one are included (plus cost of travel/lodging, if required). In years two through five, the approximate site visit fees range from \$0 to \$1,800 (plus cost of travel/lodging, if required).
- There are no research and evaluation fees in year one. In years two through five, the approximate research and evaluation fees range between \$100 and \$800, depending on number of students.

Note: This cost information represents the range across the four university sites. Please contact each university for information on costs specific to that site. Also, literacy-coordinator-in-training travel, lodging, and meals are extra. Fees for the optional team planning differ for each site. Finally, in year one, literacy coordinators will need release time to attend the training sessions. Beginning in year two, literacy coordinators need release time to observe and coach classroom teachers as they implement the instructional framework. The school must establish a book room of multiple copies for teaching guided reading.

State Standards and Accountability

Part of the literacy coordinator training requires teachers to plan instruction based on their state standards and record growth over time in achievement. Integrating other content areas into the literacy block provides the opportunity for simultaneous instruction in multiple content areas.

Student Populations

Special Considerations

Literacy Collaborative may require teachers taking on new teaching practices and a high level of implementation in an uninterrupted daily two- to three-hour literacy block. Teacher change is supported by the literacy coordinator and the school literacy leadership team and is a long-term commitment for all.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Scharer, P.L., Desai, L., Williams, E.J., and Pinnell, G.S. (2003). *Literacy Collaborative: A multiyear analysis*. Columbus, OH: Literacy Collaborative at The Ohio State University.

Independent Researchers

Manset, G., St. John, E.P., Simmons, & Indiana Education Policy Center (2000). *Progress in Early Literacy: Summary Evaluation of Indiana's Early Literacy Intervention Grant Program, 1997-98 through 1999-2000 School Year*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Education Policy Center.

Sample Sites

No sample site data available.

For more information, contact

Dr. Andrea McCarrier
The Ohio State University
807 Kinnear Road
Columbus, OH 43212
Phone: 800-678-6486
Fax: 614-688-3980
E-mail: mccarrier.1@osu.edu
Web site: <http://www.lcosu.org>

[Northwest Regional
Educational Laboratory](#)
101 SW Main, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204-3297
Telephone: 503-275-9500

© 2005 [Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory](#)