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ABSTRACT

Elementary school students walk single file to their respective classrooms where literacy should miraculously transpire. For literacy to occur, some schools adopt reading programs provided by their local district or state, while others utilize externally developed program designs. This multiple-case qualitative inquiry examined the externally developed program, *Success for All*, a program designed to benefit high poverty schools, founded by Robert Slavin and Nancy Madden as well as their cohorts at Johns Hopkins University. This research study examined the variances among seven teachers implementing the SFA reading program, “Reading Wings,” in three schools in two school districts in Louisiana. It addressed the following questions: (a) To what extent do the teachers follow the “prescribed teaching methods” required by the *Success for All* reading program? (b) What are the attitudes and beliefs of the teachers toward the implementation of the *Success for All* reading program? (c) How do the teachers perceive themselves as reading teachers when utilizing the reading program? (d) What components of balanced reading instruction are implemented within the *Success for All* reading program?

Several findings were forthcoming from the questions. First, none of the teachers followed the SFA requirements each day in the exact same manner; they deviated in use of time and activities. Second, many of the teachers considered the program to be a source of stress; they felt they never had enough time to complete either the paperwork or their regular duties.
Third, the teachers felt that they were not allowed the creativity or autonomy to teach through their own methodology. Finally, the reading instruction was comprised of many of the components of balanced reading instruction; however, the oral reading necessary for the teacher to monitor decoding skills, as well as explicit phonics instruction, were omitted.

Implications for further study were abundant. Behavior concerns, area specificities of programs, and correlation of material taught with material tested on standardized tests were determined to be future considerations. However, the findings provided insights into variances that could conceivably be controlled, thereby providing a more consistent implementation of SFA, thus, having a positive impact on instruction.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
Statement of the Problem

With all the various reading methods in use today, every child should have the prospect of becoming literate and enjoying the best today's life has to offer. However, something seems amiss. According to Michael Karol (1995) in the article, "Literacy holds the key to print's future," "The sad, the scary fact of the matter is that more than 40 million American adults cannot read the above paragraph, or, if they can, will only make sense of certain facts or phrases" (p. 72). Why has this happened? Why does it continue to happen when teachers have been unceasing in their efforts to teach the individual elements of reading in order for all students to become literate as indicated by the profusion of basal reading series flourishing throughout almost each and every school system in the nation. Many high poverty schools continue to score poorly on standardized tests. As Slavin states, "...there is a continuing crisis that still requires immediate and forceful action: their wide gap in achievement between white and minority students, especially African American and Hispanic students." (Slavin, 1998, p. 2). Even with the implementation of restructuring programs such as Success for All, schools in Louisiana still fall short of the "mark" as schools have continued to "earn" the derogatory title, "Academically below average." SFA's founders contend their program is effective, but is it implemented in the same manner across teachers or schools or even districts? As Paul Brock (1998) states,
"Yet just in recent months in the United States we have witnessed the orchestrated attack in California and Texas upon any approaches to the teaching of reading in kindergarten other than direct systematic decontextualized phonics as delivered through basals’ books. ‘Textbooks have been banned which do not trumpet the phonics approach’” (p.20).

This re-entry into the “phonics age” of reading instruction illustrates the frustration which seems to pervade the entire community of reading teachers and others who are unable to discover the “magic cure” for proficiency in reading. The Success for All reading program proposes to provide phonics instruction as well as comprehension instruction in order for children to better understand what is read. “Success for All, a comprehensive reform program for elementary schools serving many children placed at risk...provides schools with innovative curricula and instructional methods...curriculum emphasizes a balance between phonics and meaning...,” (Slavin, 1998, p. 14). To what extent is it balanced?

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of the variances of seven teachers implementing the Success for All reading program in schools with economically disadvantaged students and to describe the characteristics, attitudes, and perceptions of the teachers participating in this program. "Variance" was defined as any change or difference that manifests itself from classroom to classroom or teacher to teacher in the implementation of the SFA reading instruction within the classroom. There have been many studies related to provision of reading instruction to economically disadvantaged students; each study striving to discover the approach that will lead each and every child
to success in reading. Robert Slavin, the founder of the *Success for All* reading program states, "Yet the reforms of the past 15 years, often undertaken particularly in the name of low-income and minority students, have hardly dented this gap" (Slavin, 1998, p.2). Through many research studies, Slavin has determined that implementation of the school-wide program, *Success for All*, can place every child on the road to success in reading, thereby preventing many of the children previously "overlooked" from remaining on the road to illiteracy and becoming mainstreamed. As Robert Slavin (1996) states,

"In particular, a certain number of children of normal intelligence will fail to learn to read. After a while these children are very likely to be retained, assigned to long-term remedial services, or labeled as having specific learning disabilities and provided with special education services.

By the time these services are rendered, most of the children will already have realized that they have failed at their most important task-learning to read...

Evidence is accumulating that it is in fact possible to ensure the success of almost all children in the early elementary grades-at least in reading..." (pp. 4-5).

This study extended the findings of the research conducted by Amanda Datnow and Marisa Castellano (1999) in California entitled "An 'Inside Look' at the Implementation of *Success for All*: Teachers' Responses to the Reform." This qualitative study described the day-by-day implementation of *Success for All* in seven classrooms in Louisiana using the SFA reading program and focused on the techniques and strategies utilized by the teachers of these classrooms as well as the perceptions of the teachers of themselves as reading teachers.
Ethnographic principles guided this study through the utilization of case studies exploring three schools considered academically below average by the state of Louisiana based on information from the 1998-99 school year. This ethnographic study provided information on the implementation of the program by the teachers and to what extent they veered away from or remained true to the “prescribed” methods of instruction of the Success for All reading program.

This study also examined the incorporation of components of a balanced reading approach within the Success for All program, since Slavin (1998) in Show Me the Evidence states, “The curriculum emphasizes a balance between phonics and meaning in beginning reading and extensive use of cooperative learning throughout the grades” (p. 14). The use of word identification and comprehension strategies within the program was applied throughout the week. As stated in the Roots and Wings Participant’s Training Book, “Reading Together includes: story-related activities, direct instruction in reading comprehension, two-minute edit...Word strategies include: sound it out, look for word parts I recognize, read on to see what makes sense, and ask my partner,” (pp. 18, 65). Therefore, the study should have suggested the presence of some elements of a balanced reading approach within the reading program.

Extensive research has determined the elements of a balanced reading approach to be somewhat elusive as each teacher determines his/her own philosophy of the approach. However, a tentative consensus has been reached by experts in the field of reading instruction by the acceptance of a balance...
between any and all aspects of reading instruction. As Jill Fitzgerald (1999) in the article, “What is this thing called balance?” states,

“In sum, a balanced approach to teaching reading arises from a philosophical perspective about what children should know about reading (including how different kinds of knowledge are weighted relative to each other), who has the knowledge and how the different kinds of knowledge can be learned,” (p. 103).

A balanced reading approach no longer means only a balance between phonics and language-based teaching, it relates to a teacher’s philosophical perspective of teaching.

This study examined the elements of a balanced reading approach contained within the parameters of the Success for All program as well as the aspects of the balanced reading approach, if any, omitted from the program. The study also sought to reveal how these components were implemented by each teacher and how the entire aspect of variances among the teachers’ instruction impacted the Success for All program.

The Setting

The Districts

There were 59 schools implementing the Success for All reading program in Louisiana as of September, 2000. The settings for this study were three elementary schools each of which was classified as “Academically below average” by the State of Louisiana. The districts (parishes) differed in the implementation of the SFA program. For example, in one district, the majority of the schools were SFA schools. One of the districts also requires an end of the book test consisting of over 50 questions for all students. The other district
has schools that are allowed to administer an end of the book "test," but the test may consist of less than 10 questions.

**The Schools**

The settings were also comprised of three classrooms within each of two schools and one classroom in the third school. All three of the schools implemented *Success for All* as their reading instructional program.

Each of the schools had been implementing *Success for All* for at least two years (by the end of the Spring, 2000 semester) and had a student population consisting of more than 50% students on free or reduced lunch (1999). The schools also ranged from approximately 40% to 90% in minority students.

**Significance of the Study**

This study explored the methods utilized by the teachers within the classrooms and the extent to which the mandated structure of the *Success for All* reading program was followed, thereby enhancing or reducing the impact of the *Success for All* program on the reading achievement of the students. The study also examined the teachers' perceptions of themselves as reading teachers as they implemented the program.

Since both of these schools are classified, "Academically below average," after one and two years of *Success for All* intervention, the reading instructional methods are of paramount importance. Through the identification of teaching methods which may veer from the prescribed program and the adaptations which the teachers may or may not have implemented, the studies
provided enormous insight into the realities of teaching through a “prescribed reading instructional program.”

The case studies provided thick, rich descriptions of the teaching methods, interactions, and behaviors of the teachers as they actively implemented the Success for All program. The observations, open-ended interviews, surveys, and reflections on their attitudes toward the SFA program, as well as the teachers’ ideas of self-perception, contributed essential information regarding the continued below level reading scores of the students. They also suggested reasons why the schools remained “Academically below average” even after implementation of the program. Through the analysis of the data gathered from the observations, as well as the perspectives of the teachers, facilitators, and principals, this study has revealed several insights into the reasons for the lack of success that educators of other economically disadvantaged students might experience.

Research Questions

This study explored the impact of the differences in teaching methods within the implementation of the Success for All program as well as the attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions held by the teachers, facilitators, and principals concerning implementation of the program.

a) To what extent do the teachers follow the “prescribed teaching methods” required by the Success for All program?

b) What are the attitudes and beliefs of the teachers toward the implementation of the Success for All reading program?
c) How do the teachers perceive themselves as teachers when utilizing the *Success for All* program?

d) What components of balanced reading instruction are implemented within the *Success for All* program?

The following "Folk Term" section is included to facilitate easier reading and understanding of the terminology utilized by the SFA teachers in their classrooms. The terms are not exact SFA definitions, but they are definitions conceptualized as observations were made and interviews were conducted.

**Folk Terms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mind Movie-</td>
<td>manner in which a sentence appears as a scene in the mind of a student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Walls-</td>
<td>cardboard partitions set up on desks and used to prevent cheating by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Formation-</td>
<td>desk arrangement in which all desks face forward during tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Sentence-</td>
<td>sentence possessing all the required criteria in order to be meaningful to the student and allow the student to discern the meaning of the vocabulary word included in the sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Wall-</td>
<td>a poster or other means by which the vocabulary words for the reading selection are displayed in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF sheet-</td>
<td>a piece of paper containing space for the students and the students' partners to initial when specific tasks are completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Sheet-</td>
<td>a piece of paper on which the students are supposed to keep track of the points they earn for appropriate behavior or work completed in a certain timeframe or manner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partner Read- two or three students take turns reading to each other

Two Minute Edit- a two minute segment of time in which students correct some type of writing (I have abbreviated it as 2ME throughout most of the study)

LC- the listening comprehension portion of the ninety minute block of time in which the teacher reads a selected piece of literature and facilitates a class discussion of the reading concept intended to be internalized

RC- reading comprehension—the reading portion of the ninety minute block of time in which the students participate in different reading and writing activities

Story Test- a test included in the SFA materials which tests students on the story read during the week

Words Out Loud Test- a test administered to the students by requiring them to read the vocabulary words out loud to the teacher

Teams- groups of four or five students who work together to complete selected reading tasks

Think, Pair, Share- a strategy by which students stop to think, work with their partner, and share the results with their classmates and the teacher

Book Club- a time at the end of the ninety-minute block in which a student shares his/her interpretations of a book through an activity such as a poster, book report, etc., with his/her classmates

Pink Cards- a card which gives strategies for discussions with their partners

Test Booklets- booklets included in SFA materials containing tests to match the reading materials
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Treasure Hunt</strong></th>
<th>questions in the SFA student’s book correlated with the reading text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSR</strong></td>
<td>sustained silent reading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

What are the components of the *Success for All* (SFA) program? What do its founders contend about its effectiveness in providing reading success for all students? What are the findings and concerns of non-affiliates of the SFA program? What are the components of balanced reading instruction? These questions were addressed in a review of the literature and are discussed within the following topics: (a) affiliates of the *Success for All* reading program, (b) non-affiliates of the *Success for All* reading program, and (c) the balanced reading perspective.

**Affiliates of Success for All**

In *Show Me the Evidence*, Slavin, one of the developers of *Success for All*, and Olatokunbo (1998) discuss different school reform programs but report that very few programs address the entire school. SFA is one of the programs which does address reading in a holistic manner. These programs must not only touch upon the academic aspect of reading, but must also reach beyond the school curriculum. "Whole school designs must be adapted to local circumstances, resources, and needs, but they are designed to be replicated across a broad range of circumstances," (p. 12). Each school has a unique culture based upon its location and the population which reside within its district boundaries. Through incorporation of the entire school network, the program seeks to involve not only the students and faculty, but also the parents and staff in the execution of the program.
By utilizing a school-wide approach, SFA has been able to implement its program through the utilization of Title I funds. This is of great benefit to SFA since it serves those schools with limited financial and community resources. “Already, Title I school-wide projects are by far the largest users of whole-school designs...and it is among such schools that the most rapid growth in program adoptions is taking place,” (1998, p. 13). Schools may also apply for grants to help fund this program.

Slavin (1998) states that the students who participate in the Success for All reading program reap benefits for years after completing the program. The students presumably benefit into middle school. “Follow-up studies have found that this difference maintains into sixth and seventh grades, after students have left the program schools,” (1998, p. 15).

Slavin promotes his program and provides information and data in various articles. He discusses the program as well as the research conducted on his program in the article, Success for All: A Summary of Research (Slavin, et al., 1996, pp. 41-74). He maintains that, “The Success for All program is built on the assumption that every child can read. We mean this not as wishful thinking...but as a practical, attainable reality,” (1996, p.43). The program consists of varying elements depending on the schools’ implementation of the program.

In the “Reading Roots” section of the program, phonics is explicitly taught through phonetic “minibooks and emphasizes repeated oral reading to partners as well as to the teacher,” (1996, p. 45). After students reach the
primer level, "Reading Wings" is employed. In the "Wings" section, students are taught reading comprehension and work in cooperative groups. "Reading Wings" uses cooperative learning activities built on story structure, prediction, summarization, vocabulary building, decoding practice, and story-related writing," (1996, p. 45). The components also include eight week reading assessments, reading tutors, preschool and kindergarten, a family support team, a program facilitator, teachers and teacher training, advisory committee, special education, and relentlessness. Slavin contends that, "The results of evaluations of 23 Success for All schools in nine districts in eight states clearly show that the program increases student reading performance," (1996, p. 72).

Slavin states the objectives of "Roots and Wings" in the article, "Roots and Wings: inspiring academic excellence," (1994, on-line article).

"Roots and Wings has two objectives:
1. To guarantee that every child, regardless of family background or disability, will successfully complete elementary school, achieving the highest standards in basic skills such as reading and writing,... (the roots).
2. To engage students in activities that enable them to apply Everything they learn so they can see the usefulness and interconnectedness of knowledge (the wings). (p. 2).

Slavin is convinced that even schools with high poverty rates can achieve success through the SFA program. He further states that the "WorldLab" portion of the program, which integrates all subjects, incorporates simulations within content areas in an effort to maintain high student involvement and success.
In “Neverstreaming: preventing learning disabilities,” Slavin (1996) believes that many special education students can succeed the first time they are taught and can be prevented from having to undergo special education or mainstreaming. “Obviously, students fare better when they succeed the first time they are taught, thereby avoiding both special education and mainstreaming,” (p. 4). He furnishes more information on preventive measures and again stresses the program’s success.

Amanda Datnow and Marisa Castellano, also from Johns Hopkins University, in their article, “An ‘Inside Look’ at the Implementation of Success for All: Teachers’ Responses to the Reform,” (1999), address Success for All and its components along with the teachers’ affective attitudes toward implementation of the program within their schools. The program consists of three major sections: the Kindergarten section called the “Early Learning Program”, “Roots” for the primary grades and “Wings” for the older elementary students.

The SFA reading program strives to allow students to achieve success rather than be remediated. The program consists of a 90-minute block of time devoted to reading instruction based on the Success for All model (1999, p. 3). The students are ability grouped and work with other students of their same ability regardless of age or grade placement. If a third grader is reading on a second grade level, he/she is placed in a classroom in which the second grade level is taught. Although books, workbooks, and other materials are provided for kindergarten and some of the lower primary grades, the materials for the
upper elementary grades are designed to complement the major reading series used in today’s schools. The program is implemented within strict time frames: 90 minutes per day, every day, and specific components for days one through five.

Datnow and Castellano (1999) indicate that eighty per cent of the staff must accept the program by secret ballot for the program to be implemented within the school. Through this process, the teachers supposedly have a stake in the program and thus have a vested interest in following the structured format of the SFA program. “If teachers are involved in planning and implementing reform, they will assume responsibility for it, rather than attributing it to others,” (p. 7).

Their research centers on the teachers in two California schools and the teachers’ beliefs about the program. Datnow and Castenello considered one school experiencing success with the program and one experiencing problems with SFA. They examined the elements leading to the success or failure of the program, especially the teachers who seemed to be the main cause of the program’s problems with attaining success. They administered surveys, interviews, and surveyed the teachers to determine how supportive they were of the program. They found that some teachers were proponents of SFA, but the majority were ambivalent.

Even after receiving more information from SFA staff, the teachers at both schools voted for it more from the lack of another choice than because of a firm commitment to a reading instructional program they felt would work. Some
of the teachers left the schools after one or more years of implementation because of the program. The problems seemed to stem from teachers wanting more flexibility in their teaching methods. Datnow and Castellano discuss the structured teaching of the SFA program, "Teachers are expected to follow SFA lesson plans closely...Each activity has a particular time allotment as do particular lessons," (p. 3).

Their observations indicated that the administration allowed some freedom to experienced teachers who chose not to implement SFA in the rigid manner in which it was designed to be taught. "The leadership typically attempted to appease these teachers by allowing them some additional freedom to adapt the program to fit their needs and desires," (p. 26). Datnow and Castellano stated, "Her adaptations appeared fairly major and also involved the use of other completely different materials and activities," (p.27). They also determined several major themes were present throughout the two schools related to the teachers and their beliefs: adaptations of the program, reservations about the program, and support of the program because of benefits for the students (pp. 28-32), all of which could problematic regarding the implementation of the program.

In Robert Cooper's (1999) article, "Success for All Schools, One at a Time," the focus centers around the components of the Success for All program and the unique way in which it involves the entire school and staff as well as the implementation of the program. According to Cooper, "SFA has been implemented in over 1,100 schools, 300 districts, and 44 states nationwide,"
He reported on a study that was conducted over three years and determined the extent to which SFA was beneficial to educationally disadvantaged students. The study was “based on the responses of more than 550 educators, including more than 350 principals, representing elementary schools across the U.S....”  

The findings suggested that implementation of SFA resulted in the majority of the students being on level by the end of the third grade. According to Cooper, several of the characteristics which led to the success of the program were: “the reading curriculum, the secret ballot, one-on-one monitoring, family support team, and the school site facilitator,” (1999, p.2). This program also facilitates assisting teachers who do not have as much experience or do not possess the attributes leading to a productive classroom. In this situation there are other personnel who are willing to give assistance when needed. “SFA is good teaching strategies....designed so that if you have teachers who are not as strong, all the pieces are in place for them...” (1999, p.2).  

Cooper (1999) further states that the program is designed to allow teachers to imprint their own teaching trademarks to the implementation of the basics of SFA. “After mastering the model and understanding how the components work together, teachers must be encouraged to be creative in augmenting and personalizing the program,” (1999, p. 3). This comment conflicts with a statement made earlier within the same article, “In addition, the program challenges educators not only to deliver instruction and curriculum in a
highly prescriptive manner..." (p. 2). The manner in which SFA is implemented is of paramount importance in determining the reasons for success or failure of SFA's improvement of students' reading abilities.

The teachers provide reading instruction for 90 minutes each day, and the facilitator ensures the reading block is not interrupted. The facilitator is crucial for the program to function properly. As Cooper states, "The school-site facilitator is the linchpin that holds the program together...the strength of his/her interpersonal, organizational, and communication skills.... create opportunities for collegiality and cooperation..." (1999, p. 3).

**Non Affiliates of Success for All**

In reviewing the literature related to those not affiliated with the SFA program, there were few articles that addressed the program. Herbert Walberg and Rebecca Greenberg (1999) stated in their article, "The Diogenes Factor," that, "Despite many reports of success, we find few objective evaluations conducted by independent investigators," (p. 127). They discussed the SFA designers' interests in the financial aspects of Chapter I/Title I money that may be received by schools utilizing whole school programs. "With such huge amounts of money at stake, program developers, administrators, and evaluators have strong financial interests in showing success," (1999, p. 128). The curriculum is then instituted within the schools for implementation of the "best" method of reading instruction, regardless of the individual needs of the students. "Government agencies, foundations....are often thought to be superior in knowledge...They however, are increasingly driven by monetary and
political pressures, which are not necessarily in the public or students' interest,” (1999, p. 128).

Walberg and Greenberg further discuss the findings of Venezky of the University of Delaware who “...carried out a Success for All evaluation in Baltimore, where the program originated...the average Success for All student failed to reach grade-level performance by the end of grade 3...By the end of 5th grade, they were almost 2.4 years behind,” (1999, p. 128). Since the primary focus of SFA is to have all children on level by the end of the 3rd grade, these figures reflect a disconcerting aspect of the SFA system. They concluded that the Chapter I/Title I funds that can be used for SFA should be better spent on programs that may actually reflect an increase in test scores. “Yet federal funds continue to support the promulgation and biased evaluation of failed programs. This is worse than doing nothing. It wastes vast resources, obscures the problem, and delays productive solutions,” (1999, p. 128).

On the other hand, Bruce Joyce (1999) refutes the Walberg and Greenberg conclusions in “The Great Literacy Problem and Success for All,” stating that these literacy enigmas are problems which “we have to address cooperatively, not combatively,” (1999, p. 129). He denies that SFA possesses more negatives than positives and that with students scoring lower than they should, programs have to be implemented which will benefit the students and raise the scores. He states, “The current ‘manufactured crisis’ is based on the allegation that achievement in literacy has gone down, it hasn’t. It just hasn’t risen for 70 years,” (1999, p. 129). He is adamant that these programs should
be viewed as at least providing needed assistance and should not be designated for some minimal limitations. "It's remarkable enough that they track the implementation and effects of many of their large-scale disseminations," (1999, p. 130). He states that there may be extenuating circumstances which cause students to fall further behind in later years other than the short-lived effects of SFA. "A child...might have learned to read to an 'average' level...and then might decline in absolute as well as relative achievement because of the effects of later educational environments," (1999, p. 131). Joyce suggests that all programs can benefit from research into the literacy aspect of each program. "Personally, I believe that further incorporation of studies of literacy can improve the Success for All curriculum substantially—as well as the curricula of many other programs that are currently being assimilated," (1999, p. 131).

Walberg and Greenberg (1999) respond that, "Program designers who evaluate their own programs, however, may have conflicting interests," (p. 132). They suggest that Joyce should examine some of the other comments made concerning SFA, especially the teachers' comments. Walberg and Greenberg specifically suggest that he could examine "the Internet site www.alt-sfa.com, especially the section titled 'Broken Promises,'" (1999, p. 132).

Walberg and Greenberg then provide evidence about the lack of positive impact on students' scores after exceptional amounts of money were spent. "...Miami-Dade's independent evaluation showed that SFA did no better than
other programs. In fact, for second-graders, phonics-based direct instruction did better than SFA,” (1999, p. 133).

An exploration of www.alt-sfa.com revealed that the teachers who responded criticized the program for lack of creativity and valuation of their teaching methods since they were given a “canned” program to teach with little or no adaptation permitted.

Pogrow (2000) states that the research conducted by Robert Slavin and others connected with his program may not be taking an objective view of the situation since much of the research has been conducted by Slavin himself, thereby, causing the results to appear as though Success for All is the only truly effective program. Pogrow states, “However, the problem is that both the rationale and the underlying research that support moving away from open competition among methods and programs to a focus on schoolwide models have been furnished largely by Slavin and others in and associated with his research center” (2000, p.596).

Pogrow further discusses the progress of the students who have been involved in the Success for All program. He raises the issue of doubt concerning the effectiveness of the program. Pogrow insists that many of the students who presumably had “succeeded” were really still lacking in their reading ability. He states, “What Slavin and his associates did not report was that the SFA students were not doing well—even after five years in the program. Indeed, they would enter the sixth grade reading approximately three years below grade level,” (2000, p. 597). He questions the reasoning of the
U.S. Dept. of Education in continuing their provision of financial assistance to
Slavin and his cohorts when outside researchers have not seemed to determine
the true effectiveness of Slavin's program. Pogrow states, "In other words,
funding for research and policy analysis about SFA in particular and about
schoolwide models in general keeps going to the same few people who have
affiliations to Slavin's research center,...and they continue to use the same
flawed data," (2000, p. 597). Researchers continue to develop new models, as
does Pogrow, but Slavin's program seems to maintain its hold on a large
portion of funds distributed to developers of schoolwide programs. He states,
"In turn the lion's share of new grants go to Slavin and his associates...That's
31% of the first-year total...The rest of the funding was spread over five other

Pogrow continues by discussing the need for professionals to seek other
alternatives to provide excellent reading instruction, notably efficient teachers.
He states, "The most important element in producing achievement gains is
high-ability teaching," (2000, p. 598). He goes on to state that a curriculum
which maintains consistency on the part of the student as well as conversations
with the students in which they begin to understand the need for reading is
essential to any successful program. Pogrow states, "...a focused and aligned
curriculum that provides a high level of time on task...the third element is
developing a sense of understanding in disadvantaged students after the third
He reports that the adoption of SFA by many schools may reflect the nature of
principals needing to provide a research-based program which has been approved in order to foster reading success. "The popularity of SFA often reflects a lack of curricular expertise on the part of school administrators who are under pressure to raise scores but don't know how to bring direction and coherence to their school's curriculum and instruction," (Pogrow, 2000, p. 598). He states the need for professionals to seek new programs based on validated research in order to provide the needed support to disadvantaged students. As Pogrow states, "We must reopen competition and true experimentation between models and approaches, with evaluations conducted by independent researchers," (2000, p. 599).

**Balanced Reading Perspective**

Although the Balanced Reading Perspective was first determined to consist of a "balance" between phonics and holistic instruction, it now reflects a balance among all the components of reading instruction.

Rona Flippo (1997), in her article, "Sensationalism, Politics, and Literacy: What's Going On?" states, "We know that decisions about reading instruction should not be set up as extreme 'either/or' positions. We know that phonics and other necessary skills instruction can be taught by teachers who have whole language philosophies," (on-line article, p.3). No longer is it sufficient for the "reading wars" to get in the way of good teaching. Teachers should use the best of both types of instruction. "Teachers must have the latitude to use many approaches for their reading instruction in order to meet the needs and strategies of each child," (1997 p. 4).
She conducted a study over ten years and discussed reading instruction with many experts in the field. She found there were approximately eleven items making reading instruction problematic and eight items making the instruction effective. The whole project concluded with the findings that no certain method or approach to reading instruction is best. The "best" way to teach reading is to consider each individual child and teach according to that child's style of learning, not according to the mandates of "people in power."

"Please understand that I am not saying... just one appropriate position or approach...decisions about reading instruction must be situational and should be based on the needs of the particular child and on the context," "(1997, p. 6).

The Reading to Learn Institute at the San Diego Office of Education (1996) issued an article appearing on-line, "A Balanced Reading Program," which states the structure of a balanced reading approach as well as elements causing it to be effective. This article states that a classroom leading to a student's independence in reading including strategies, cooperative activities, and activities based on prior experience leads to more proficient reading. "A solid body of educational research confirms the necessity of providing a combination of modeling successful strategies, guiding each student using a repertoire of strategies while reading for meaning, and providing opportunities to gain independent practice and experience," (p. 1). The article also provides information on the "components which together comprise a daily reading/language instructional program: Read Aloud, Shared Reading, Guided Reading and Independent Reading," (p.2).
Reading aloud to students on a daily basis causes the students to internalize a model of reading as the teacher reads different types of literature. Shared reading involves the students reading along with the teacher as he/she demonstrates vocabulary and grammar usage within the text. Guided reading guides the students through the strategies needed to obtain meaning from their reading experiences. "During guided reading the teacher can observe the reading strategies that children are using, demonstrate reading strategies and language skills and develop individual children's competence in using those strategies and skills," (p. 2). Sustained silent reading is also a necessary part of a balanced reading instructional program as the students choose the texts to read and further develop their strategies and skills through independent reading.

Steve Zemelman, Harvey Daniels, and Marilyn Bizar (1999) state that balance within a classroom is the most favorable method or approach to reading instruction. Their studies have also determined there are conflicts among those who favor either the phonics based or whole language based reading instruction. "Some educators working in troubled urban schools advocate a highly restrictive skill-and-drill approach...Yet whole language advocates observe again...that these approaches work," (on-line article, p. 6).

Even though the three authors are committed whole language educators, they state that whole language also includes a "balance." "One of the most frustrating aspects of the debate is that whole language is mischaracterized as merely turning children loose...with no support or guidance from the
teacher...Whole language is, in fact, a balanced and mainstream approach to teaching..." (1999, p. 6).

Just as Flippo suggested, Zemelman, Daniels, and Bizar also regard the “situation” as critical to the teaching aspect of reading instruction. The child must be the focus of the instruction, not the approach itself. “Good teachers who ‘balance’ instruction know that one of the most important aspects of teaching is to be a good ‘kid watcher,’” (1999, p. 6).

Dorothy Strickland (1997), is a true proponent of balanced reading instruction. “As the debate continues between phonics and holistic approaches to reading instruction, a method called whole-part-whole strikes a welcome balance,” (p. 1). She stresses that parents as well as educators have been concerned about the issues surrounding reading instruction and have constantly searched for a way to effectively teach their children and students the skills and strategies necessary for proficiency in reading.

Strickland provides a model of the whole-part-whole instructional method, which she believes falls between phonics and whole language instruction.

The model known as whole-part-whole instruction provides a balanced conceptual framework for thinking about and planning skills instruction. It addresses the need for teaching that (1) is grounded in fundamental understandings about whole texts such as stories, informational books, and poems; (2) allows for in-depth focus on specific skills; and (3) includes planned practice within the context of meaningful reading and writing (1997, p. 1).

Furthermore, Strickland suggested a variety of methods by which the whole-part-whole approach can be implemented in the classroom. These
include starting with whole text, focusing on knowledge about the parts of language that may be useful for reading and writing, and returning to whole texts for application and practice, (1997, p. 2). She has found that few teachers teach totally toward one specific reading instruction method but continuously teach through a variety of approaches. "My experience suggests that these differences are much less apparent in the classroom than they are in the debate," (1997, p. 4). She also states, "Many educators are feeling increasingly uncomfortable with the growing polarization and politicization of issues," (1997, p. 5). Most teachers desire the reading instruction that is suitable for each and every child, even if it means selecting activities that reflect various approaches.

The manual, "Guided Reading: A Practical Approach for Teachers," (1995) by the Wright Group provides a background of a balanced reading program. The Wright Group also identifies seven components of a Balanced Reading Program. They are:

1. Reading Aloud to Children
2. Shared Reading
3. Guided Reading
4. Paired Reading
5. Independent Reading
6. Language Exploration
7. Writing and Reading: The Balanced Writing Program
(1995, p.2)

Individual students benefit from various methods of instruction. Through the components of a balanced reading program, the students are empowered with skills and strategies essential to proficiency in reading.
Balanced Reading, however, no longer simply means a balance between phonics and whole language. Today, the term incorporates much more. Dixie Lee Speigel, in Chapter 1, "The Perspective of the Balanced Approach," of the book, *The Balanced Reading Program*, gives information about what does and does not constitute a balanced reading program. She provides a meaningful view about reading instruction stating that "we sometimes swing from one extreme to the next, searching for the way to educate children," (1999, p. 8). By gaining a glimpse into what balanced reading instruction is not, we gain valuable information into what it actually is. Spiegel states, "A Balanced Approach is: Built on Research, Built on a Comprehensive View of Literacy, Flexible, and Built on a Realistic Picture of the Variety of Learners, Teachers, Curricula, and Schools," (1999, p. 12). She presents a comprehensive view of balanced reading instruction that incorporates many different approaches within one classroom. She states, "A balanced approach is a decision-making approach through which a teacher makes thoughtful decisions each day about the best way to help each child become a better reader and writer. A balanced approach requires and enables a teacher to reflect on what he or she is doing and to modify instruction daily based on the needs of each individual learner. The modifications are drawn from a broad repertoire of strategies and a sound understanding of children, learning, and the theoretical bases of these strategies" (1999 p. 13). Spiegel also delves into the reasons behind the need to continue the "reading wars." She states that some educators still feel that one program or the other will eventually provide the answer. Spiegel states also that there are various other reasons for continuing the need to teach "one way or the other." "A balanced approach requires a clear understanding of a variety of
approaches, strategies, and viewpoints," (1999, p. 18). Unless the teachers possess a knowledge base of various approaches, they will be reluctant to try a new one. "Without a clear understanding of what they are accepting, without reflection, they buy wholesale an approach or a philosophy just because it is new or appears to be new," (1999, p. 19).

Constance Weaver (1998) in her book, *Reconsidering a Balanced Approach to Reading*, provides teachers with needed background and theory as well as information on phonological awareness so that teachers will have a basis for providing a truly balanced reading instruction. By reading to the children, furnishing students with skills and strategies in order to read, and the ability to read various material so they will be exposed to a variety of genre, we are furnishing the students with power. "Each time we pick up a book to read to the class, we are making a decision about what voices will be heard, about what perspectives will be honored... and accept that literacy offers the possibility of empowerment but does not guarantee it," (Weaver, 1998, p. 98).

Jill Fitzgerald (1999) states, "Rather, balance is a philosophical perspective about what kinds of reading knowledge children should develop and how those kinds of knowledge can be attained," (p. 100). She states in her article, "What is this thing called ‘balance?’ that there are many conflicting views constituting the definition of ‘balance.’ She presents prior views of balanced reading perspectives and furnishes three common themes permeating the various programs that she has reviewed. Fitzgerald states,

"First, in most discussions of balance there is a focus on equal weighting of something... Second, there is usually a focus on the
method of doing the classroom program... The third commonality is not immediately evident, and this commonality is, I think, the most critical one. Beneath the methodological layer of how to provide balance there is generally an inferable shared perspective on what aspects of the reading process are the most important,” (p. 101).

She further states that knowledge is a key to understanding the balanced reading perspective. “Balance is a philosophical perspective because it revolves around knowledge, or epistemological issues,” (1999, p. 102). Fitzgerald reports that there are three major components of which teachers need to be aware when providing reading instruction. She states, “The quintessential philosophical outlook in a balanced perspective is that these three broad categories of knowledge—local knowledge about reading, global knowledge about reading, and love of reading—are equally important...” (1999, p. 102). Therefore, teachers must be cognizant of rules governing the balance perspectives. She asserts,

“A teacher who holds a balanced philosophical perspective of reading is likely to use at least three general principles to design a classroom program... The first principle has to do with the curricular goals of the reading program... A second principle of balance is that instructional methods sometimes considered to be opposites or contrasts are used so that the positive features of each, especially those features not present in the other way of teaching, can permit the fullest array of possible learning to occur... A third principle of balance... deals with the kinds of reading materials that would be used in the classroom,” (1999, p. 104).

Fitzgerald continues to state the need for teachers and administrators to understand the meaning of balance in order to gain a balanced perspective on reading instruction. The teachers must contemplate their own reading philosophies before they can gain a balanced view. As Fitzgerald contends,
“Teachers might find the process I used to examine balance useful for reflecting on their own individual philosophical stances toward reading instruction.” (1999, p. 106). Through this insight, teachers will be better able to determine their own views of reading instruction.

Penny Freppon and Karin Dahl (1998) continue the discussion of conflicts surrounding the concept of a balanced reading perspective in their article, "Balanced instruction; Insights and considerations." They consider various conceptions, present information about each one, and furnish information gained from interviews. The interviews with the authors, teachers, and teacher educators further documented the conflicting views held by those in the teaching field.

Freppon and Dahl state after reviewing material, "...a balanced reading program provides separate, explicit skill instruction and language-rich literature instruction,” (1998, p. 241). Throughout the article, they stress the need for an interweaving of skills and literature-based learning thereby teaching skills within the literature. They also stated the necessity for the students’ backgrounds, culture, and motivation to be included in a truly balanced view of reading instruction.

R. Wharton-McDonald, M. Pressley, J. Rankin, J. Mistretta, L. Yokoi, and S. Ettenberger (1997) state in their article, “Effective primary-grades literacy instruction=Balanced literacy instruction,” “These teachers demonstrated the integration of explicit skills instruction and authentic reading and writing experiences that the surveyed teachers had described,” (p. 520). The authors
stress the necessity for a balance between a skills-based perspective and a holistic perspective as well as a need for integration of all skills. "Highly effective teachers were able to integrate multiple goals into single lessons and could weave together strands from different lessons to form coherent, meaningful patterns of instruction," (p. 520).

Along with the balance between skills-based and whole-language based instruction is the necessity for high expectations, both in academic areas and behavior, and the knowledge of what the teachers plan to accomplish in the classroom. Wharton-McDonald et.al., provide the following "characteristics of highly effective first-grade literacy teachers:"

"Instructional balance
Instructional density
Extensive use of scaffolding
Encouragement of self-regulation
Thorough integration of reading and writing activities
Masterful classroom management
High expectations for all students
Awareness of purpose," (p.520).

Wharton-McDonald, et. al., state the obligation of teachers who will provide effective teaching to take all aspects of learning into consideration when exhibiting a balanced perspective to reading instruction. The essential elements cannot be overlooked if teachers are to provide literacy within the classroom. One of the major components is high expectations. The authors state, "In contrast, less effective teachers were more likely to lower their expectations for certain students—particularly those whose parents were not involved in school," (p. 520). Regardless of the students or their parents, the teachers must expect a high level of achievement.
Summary

SFA is an externally developed program design that incorporates many components critical to appropriate implementation. There are many articles by Robert Slavin and his cohorts that contend the program is effective and replicable. The affiliates of SFA also assure success for all students, especially for those students who are from minority and high poverty groups.

In researching the literature, there appear to be very few articles by outside researchers (those not affiliated with Johns Hopkins University or the Success for All Foundation). The literature written by affiliates of Success for All typically support and encourage entry into this reading program. The existing literature by these affiliates of Success for All has overwhelmingly determined the program will provide success for all children. But does it? The literature existing outside the Success for All Foundation does not treat the program so favorably.

The proponents for a balanced reading perspective state the necessity of a balance of both phonics and language based teaching as well as a balance among all the components of education. Providing disadvantaged students with success in reading is the goal of all, both those affiliated with Success for All as well as those affiliated with other programs or approaches. However, the literature provides no significant analysis by researchers external to the SFA Foundation of the Success for All reading program related to its implementation within the classroom.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Case Study Approach

"In other words, you would use the case study method because you deliberately wanted to cover contextual conditions—believing that they might be pertinent to your phenomenon of study" (Yin, 1994, p. 13). The case study allows the researcher the means to research the "whole" of the phenomenon, not simply one or two elements. "...the case study as a research strategy comprises an all-encompassing method—with the logic of design incorporating specific approaches to data collection and to data analysis," (Yin, 1994, p. 13).

Through the case study method, not only were observations conducted of the teachers and components of the Success for All program, but also the ways in which they interacted and interconnected. Since case studies may be used to explain, describe, illustrate, explore, and "meta-evaluate," (Yin, 1994, p. 15), the case study provided the means by which explorations as well as descriptions could be discovered of all the interactions inherent within each of the classrooms.

The case study was exploratory and based on naturalistic inquiry in order to determine to what extent the teachers, either knowingly or unknowingly, followed or veered from procedures as required by the implementation staff of Success for All and what impact the adherence to or deviation from necessary components of Success for All had on the reading instruction of students in seven elementary classrooms. The variances would need to be observed,
recorded, and analyzed for patterns. "In contrast, naturalistic inquiry evaluators focus on capturing process, documenting variations, and exploring important individual differences in experiences and outcomes," (Patton, 1990, p. 43).

**Multiple Cases with Embedded Units of Analysis**

Following the *Case Study Research* by Yin (1994), a Type 4 design was utilized since there were multiple cases with embedded units of analysis. "Thus, for the case study strategy, the four types of designs are (a) single-case (holistic) designs, (b) single-case (embedded) designs, (c) multiple-case holistic designs, and (d) multiple-case (embedded) designs." (p. 38). Although the overall *Success for All* program was explored, observations were also conducted of the teacher’s instructional methods as the teacher and his/her instruction have an impact on reading instruction. Since Type 1 and 2 involve only a single case study, and Type 3 is holistic in its design, Type 4 was chosen since the focus was on the teachers' instructional methods and how their variances impacted the entire reading program. As Yin (1994) states, "This occurs when, within a single case, attention also is given to a subunit or subunits," (p. 41).

The nature of the research required that it be based on multiple cases. Because the focus was on the implementation of the *Success for All* program with its required components, one classroom would be unable to adequately provide information. Yin (1994) states, “Here, a major insight is to consider multiple cases as one would consider multiple experiments—that is, to follow a replication logic," (p.45). Since the *Success for All* program requires certain
procedures to be followed on a consistent basis, it was expected that many of the procedures would be followed consistently in each of the classrooms. However, because of the very nature of individuals possessing different personalities, the determinations of the extent (if any) to which these variances in personality or teaching instruction caused the program to be adapted to meet the teachers' styles was crucial.

**Qualitative Study**

The research design was based on the desire to know what attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions were held by the teachers, facilitators, and principals concerning the implementation of the *Success for All* program as well as the extent to which each teacher implemented the program as it was intended by the founders of the program. The study was also designed to determine what components of balanced reading instruction were incorporated into the reading program. The study focused on seven classrooms. There were two second grade classrooms and one third grade classroom in school number one and two third grade classrooms and one second grade classroom in school number two. There was only one second grade classroom in school number three. All three of the schools utilized the *Success for All* reading program.

Since the determination of the impact of the teachers' variances on the SFA reading instruction was the objective of the research, a qualitative approach was selected. Therefore, through qualitative research, thick, rich descriptions of the teachers' instruction, attitudes, and beliefs about the
program as well as their perception of themselves as reading teachers were gained.

In order to obtain information regarding the consistency of instruction in multiple classrooms, observations were made in three schools (two in one district and one in the other) in order to determine the extent of consistent instruction being practiced not only within seven classrooms, but within three schools. Yin (1994) suggests that each case be chosen carefully so that it "(a) predicts similar results (a literal replication) or (b) produces contrasting results but for predictable reasons (a theoretical replication)" (p. 46). These three schools should have yielded similar results since they were schools with similar student populations and school ratings and should provide a lateral replication. However, in observing two classrooms at the same grade level, one of which exhibited significant growth, and one which did not, contrasting results were expected; these results would yield a theoretical replication.

Selection of Participants

The cases were selected according to Patton's purposeful homogeneous sampling. This type of sampling allows the study to be focused, "reduces variation, and simplifies analysis," (Patton, 1990, p. 182). Through this type of sampling, three schools were observed which had the same basic properties: academically below average ratings, similar school performance scores, free and reduced lunch populations over 50%, and somewhat similar minority student populations (See Figure 3.1). It was crucial that all of the schools were homogeneous in order for the data to be representative of the program and not
outside variables. Through this sampling technique, more accurate results were obtained.

Within the three schools, reliance on reputational criterion sampling was necessary as names of teachers were obtained from the principals and facilitators of the Success for All program in determining one class with significant growth in reading scores over the previous semester, and one class with opposing criteria. In two of the schools, observations were conducted in two classrooms of the same grade level and one classroom of a different grade level. Within the two classrooms consisting of the same grade level, one classroom was determined to be a classroom with significant growth in reading by the students over the previous semester and one was determined to be a classroom with little or no significant growth. The third classroom in each of the two schools, as well as the classroom at the third school, was chosen by the principal and information related to the student growth the previous semester was unavailable. The status of growth was to be determined at a later date based on the characteristics of the classes with significant growth.

Ethics

Each of the principals, facilitators, and teachers was given assurance that confidentiality would be maintained. Therefore, letters of consent and permission forms to each of the participants were distributed assuring them of their anonymity and informed consent was received from each of the participants. To this end, the crucial, unique information about each school was
mimimized and approximations were instead provided. Pseudonyms were utilized to protect the participants,' schools,' and districts' identities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th># of second grade classrooms under study</th>
<th># of third grade classrooms under study</th>
<th># of years school utilizing SFA</th>
<th>% on free or reduced lunch</th>
<th>School performance score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*60</td>
<td>*60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*90</td>
<td>*60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>*60</td>
<td>*70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1-Sampling-Schools and Criteria

Data Collection

"Fieldwork is not a single method or technique....Multiple sources of information are sought and used because no single source of information can be trusted to provide a comprehensive perspective on the program," (Patton, 1990, p. 244). In order to conduct an extensive study and to facilitate triangulation of data sources, a combination of sources is necessary. This study incorporated multiple sources of data ensuring a complete view of the implementation of the program by seven classroom teachers through utilization of a) multiple and persistent observations of the teachers within their classrooms over each of the five days of SFA implementation, b) interviews with each of the seven teachers, three facilitators, and three principals, and c) written documentation.
Initial Procedures

In order to begin the study, several preliminary activities were required.

The Application for Exemption from IRB (Institutional Review Board) Oversight for Studies Conducted in Educational Settings LSU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (See Appendix A) was completed and submitted to the authorized reviewer in the Dean’s office. The application was reviewed and approved.

Other activities were also required. In order to establish a relationship that would lead to a productive study, each of the principals was phoned to determine their receptability to the study. After discussing the essential aspects of my study with each of the principals and obtaining verbal approval, written requests were mailed to each of the districts and approval was received from both of them on February 28, and March 1, 2000 respectively (See Appendices B-C). Times were arranged to meet the teachers and facilitators, and then schools were visited in order to obtain the required signatures of each participant (See Appendices D-F).

Data Sources

The data sources consisted of teacher surveys, questionnaires, observations, interviews, photographs and documents. These data sources were of assistance in determining what was actually occurring in the classrooms. Since surveys can be helpful to the researcher, the surveys were constructed so they would be as unbiased as possible.

The questionnaires were completed after the interviews and observations had been conducted. Several of the respondents provided
extensive information about certain areas or activities and realization that more information needed to be obtained from the rest of the respondents in order to have information concerning certain topics from all of the teachers, facilitators, and principals involved in the study became apparent. Through this method, data gathering and complete results were obtained.

Observations

At the beginning of the study, observations were planned around each of the teachers, but it became quickly evident that the study would be far more complete and comprehensive if observations were made of each of the seven teachers over each of the five days of SFA lessons. Observations were based on Spradley’s Descriptive Question Matrix within his Developmental Research Sequence (DRS) methodology. The observations started with a “grand tour” of the classroom and the events within, and then “mini-tours” were conducted in which data was obtained about each of the accompanying areas deemed important within the larger context. Determination was then made of the domain analyses, and focused observations and taxonomic analyses were completed. Finally selective observations were made, thus leading to componential analyses in which categories, comparisons, and constraints could be revealed.

In order to facilitate the observations, a lesson plan book for each of the schools was utilized. With the grids already integrated into the lesson plan books, documentation of the events observed as well as domain analysis, taxonomic analysis, and componential analysis were easy to format. Through
the use of at least one lesson plan book for each school, maintenance of a
calendar type of documentation enabled awareness at all times of
the observations made and those still needing to be accomplished. Since the
grid was four by four, space was maintained for observations on each of the
lesson days and yet still there was room to place questions that came up as
observations were made within the seven classrooms. Notes were taken in the
first two columns, and other relevant material as well as questions that arose as
they were observed were written in the next two columns.

Interviews

The same DRS method was followed with the interview questions,
starting with descriptive questions, and the domain analyses; then structural
questions were asked leading to taxonomic analyses; and finally contrast
questions were asked which allowed the componential analyses to be
formulated. Patton's "general interview guide approach" was utilized which,
"involves outlining a set of issues that are to be explored with each respondent
before interviewing begins." (Patton, 1990, p. 280). Through this method of
interviewing, respondents were asked the same basic topic questions, and yet
they were still left room in which to elaborate (See Appendix G). Although
specific topics were essential, the respondents needed the freedom to provide
as much information as they deemed necessary.

Patton's questioning format was also employed. The
*experience/behavior questions, opinion/values questions, feeling questions,
knowledge questions, sensory questions, and background/demographic
questions,” (Patton, 1994, p. 290) were pursued with the teachers, facilitators, and principals (See Appendix H). Dichotomous questions were omitted since information rich answers were required, not just an affirmation or negation. Presupposition questions were also utilized since information in their possession was desired. Patton states in his information on interviewing, “Presuppositions are particularly useful in interviewing because the interviewer presupposes that the respondent has something to say,” (Patton, 1994, p. 303). Singular questions were asked so the respondents would sure of the question being asked.

The teachers’ stories were particularly critical. “Most important is the collection of stories, anecdotes, and myths... These data indicate what is important and unimportant, how people view each other, and how they evaluate their participation...,” (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982, p.110).

The interviews with the facilitators and principals provided answers to questions that led to even more questions. Although the questions were phrased somewhat differently, the questions were very similar. The principals’ and facilitators’ questions were related to the program implementation rather than classroom implementation.

**Written Documentation**

In order to gain an understanding of the program, documents were an integral part of the study. “Document analysis, however, provides a behind-the-scenes look at the program that may not be directly observable and about which the interviewer might not ask appropriate questions without the leads
provided through the documents,” (Patton, 1990, p. 245). Written documents were analyzed to determine the paperwork involved as well as the activities and grading procedures of the students’ work during implementation of the SFA program.

**Data Analysis**

Since observations were conducted with seven teachers, each one was approached as a single case; however, as each was analyzed, classified, and categorized, the study was completed as a multiple case analysis of all seven teachers across three schools and two school districts. As Yin states, “Thus each site might be the subject of an individual case study, and the study as a whole would have used a multiple case design,” (Yin, 1990, p. 44).

Patton’s homogenous sampling was utilized, as well as stratified purposeful sampling by relying on reputational criteria from the facilitators and principals within two of the schools. “The purpose of a stratified purposeful sample is to capture major variations rather than to identify a common core, although the latter may also emerge in the analysis,” (Patton, 1990, p.174). The stratified sampling allowed a view of one teacher whose students had above average growth and another whose students had little or no growth. In utilizing the samplings along with the interview guide, the content questions, as well as the presupposition and singular questions, information was obtained that fit into Spradley’s Developmental Research Sequence. The information fell within Spradley’s cultural domains. “A cultural domain is a category of cultural meaning that includes other smaller categories,” (Spradley, 1997, p. 88). 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
After compilation of the domain analysis, focused observations were then made and focused interviews were requested. Specific domains were then scrutinized and information was revealed.

Several of the respondents were reinterviewed and a new questionnaire was developed in order to complete the data gathering (See Appendix I). However, since questions that needed to be asked of the remaining participants were known in advance, all respondents did not have to be reinterviewed. Taxonomic analyses were then completed based on the focused observations and interviews.

Selected observations and interviews were conducted in order to gain comparisons and contrasts among all the data gathered. The selected observations and interviews then led to the formulation of componential analyses.

Since the study was designed to determine the impact of variances, a multiple case scenario was designed to discover patterns within the data. In determining how the variances impacted the reading instruction, the focus was placed on the major components of SFA as they surfaced during the observations. As observations were made throughout each of the five days of SFA lessons, the major foci were “Listening Comprehension (LC),” “Reading Comprehension” (including vocabulary, reading comprehension lessons (RC), team practice, meaningful sentences, and the two minute edit), and “Additional Skill, Book Club, and SSR.”
Since all teachers were observed for each of the five-day lessons, their methods of regulating student behavior, as well as their philosophies of teaching and modes of grading became apparent. Some of the teachers seemed to gravitate more toward the phonics or skills-based end of the continuum while others gravitated toward the holistic or language-based end. Still others were somewhere in the middle, thereby exhibiting a balanced perspective to their reading instruction.

Rigor

Trustworthiness

Credibility

Trustworthiness, including credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability were of paramount importance within this study. To ensure credibility, an extensive amount of time was spent within each of the classrooms. Each of the teachers was observed for ninety minutes on each of the five days of the SFA lesson thereby providing prolonged engagement in the field. Through this method, misinformation was kept to a minimum as the observers became aware of all the interactions and interrelationships within the classroom. As Tashakkori and Teddlie state, "The purpose of prolonged engagement is to provide 'scope' for researchers by making them aware of the multiple contextual factors and multiple perspectives of informants at work in any given social scene," (1998, p. 90).

Since determination of the impact of variances, defined as any change or difference that manifests itself from classroom to classroom or teacher to teacher within the implementation of the Success for All reading program, was
the crucial element in this study, the teachers were observed tenaciously over
the course of the study. Through persistent observation, an in-depth view of the
implementation was acquired. “The purpose of persistent observation is to
provide ‘depth’ for researchers by helping them to identify the characteristics or
aspects of the social scene that are the most relevant to the particular question

“Triangulation is a powerful solution to the problem of relying too much
on any single data source or method, thereby undermining the validity or
credibility of findings because of the weaknesses of any single method,”
(Patton, 1990, p. 193). The use of multiple data sources: observations,
interviews, questionnaires, photographs, and multiple independent observers
significantly strengthened the study. “Observations provide a check on what is
reported in interviews: interviews, on the other hand, permit the observer to go
beyond external behavior to explore the internal states of persons who have
been observed,” (Patton, 1990, p. 245). Three independent observers
observed each of the teachers for the ninety minute sessions. One observer
observed three teachers, and each of the other two observers observed two
teachers. Through multiple observations, insight regarding the behavior
actually exhibited by the teachers in the classrooms was provided, while
through interviews, information was gained concerning the teachers’ feelings
and beliefs. Through all of the data sources, the attitudes and beliefs of the
teachers were able not only to surface, but to be credible in the process.
In determining the components of balanced reading instruction provided within the SFA program as it was implemented, various sources were also required. Through observations of the teachers' implementations, interviews with the teachers, and photographs of the classrooms, the credibility of this information was verified. The varied use of sources substantiated more accurate and convincing conclusions. As Yin states, "...the most important advantage presented by using multiple sources of evidence is the development of converging lines of inquiry, a process of triangulation," (Yin, 1994, p. 92).

After all componential results had been compiled, a meeting was then arranged with the independent observers to be certain complete, accurate information had been provided. Peer debriefing was accomplished as three peers sorted through the gathered data and analyzed the conclusions and inferences of the researcher. As results of the analysis surfaced and were scrutinized, the "process contributed to the credibility of an inquiry by exposing the researcher to searching questions from the peer aimed at probing biases and clarifying interpretations," (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998, p. 91). The results and conclusions of the study matched their observations and perceptions of the data.

Member checks contributed to the credibility by providing the affirmation of findings from the data. The teachers and facilitators, when asked about the domains and conclusions, agreed with the information. As Tashakkori and Teddlie state, "If the informants or audience members agree with the
interpretations of the investigators, then this provides evidence for the credibility of the results," (1998, p. 92).

**Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability**

Crucial to the study are transferability, dependability, and confirmability. Through thick description, the transferability from one area to another could be determined, although the similarities of the areas would have a tremendous impact on whether the study was transferable. Through use of a specific process, the dependability of a study would be determined, especially as a reflexive journal would allow a view of how the researcher made changes to the inquiries or methods. Confirmability was determined by the results and findings of the analysis being supported by the data. Through establishment of transferability, dependability, confirmability, and credibility, trustworthiness was ascertained.
CHAPTER FOUR
CASE STUDIES

Introduction

Observations began without any prior knowledge of what would be found other than activities involving the *Success for All* reading program. As each teacher was observed in order to ascertain the impact of their variances on reading instruction within the SFA program, questions began forming. Questions were developed based on the observations and conversations with the teachers and in turn, even more questions emerged that required an answer. Questions about their experiences and behaviors, their opinions and values, feeling questions, knowledge questions, sensory questions, and demographic questions were asked in order to discern their attitudes, beliefs, and self-perceptions of themselves as reading teachers while implementing the SFA program. Although each of the teachers was implementing the SFA program according to her own interpretation of the requirements of the Success for All Foundation, interpretations varied.

As each of the teachers was observed implementing the SFA program as well as mediating disagreements, constantly modeling strategies, and perusing the SFA day chart as if reading a menu, identities began to form and each of the teachers' names began to be determined. Each of the teachers exhibited unique personalities and traits, answered questions, taught in an individual manner, and left an underlying impression. The teachers became the stewardess, scientist, executive, waitress, comedienne, referee and model while the facilitators acted as nurses, keeping an eye on the pulse of SFA
making certain no foreign substances invaded the program. The principals also created impressions that left an indelible print; they acted as police officers, each one trying to maintain some semblance of law and order in their schools while trying to ensure the correct implementation of the SFA program and therefore reading instruction. Each individual sought to impart reading comprehension, and although they had all been trained for at least 16 hours and were all presumably teaching in the manner required by SFA, each one exhibited distinct techniques, instructional methods, materials, activities, and a definite teaching style.

All of the teachers were asked to complete a demographic form and provided information concerning their experience. Each of the teachers had earned a bachelor's degree and all of the teachers were certified to teach elementary education. Each of the teachers had at least minimal training in the SFA system of instruction, but only one had no opportunity to observe a peer implementing the SFA program. The teachers' experiences ranged from novices to veterans and all the teachers had the required number of reading courses, and many had attended various workshops. Of the seven teachers observed, four have returned this year to teach at their respective schools (See figure 4.1).

As observations and interviews were conducted, photographs taken, and questionnaires concluded, the following primary topics were considered as relevant to the study: the identity and introduction to the classroom of each teacher, listening comprehension (LC), reading comprehension (RC), additional
skills/book club/sustained silent reading (SSR), behavior, philosophy of teaching, and grades. The identity and introduction to the classroom provided clues to the personalities of the teachers as well as an introduction to the atmosphere and setup of the classroom. The listening comprehension topic consisted of information gained during time spent by the students listening to the teacher read and answering any questions posed by the teacher. The reading comprehension topic covered all remaining time spent in the classroom in which the students read independently, together, or discussed what was read. In addition, reading comprehension also included the writing activities as they were written, read, edited, and revised by the students. The additional skills/book club/SSR topic was considered relevant as at least one of these activities is prescribed by SFA to occur on a daily basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher/ Grade/ Present this year?</th>
<th>Approx. # years teaching</th>
<th>Degrees held</th>
<th>Areas of Certification</th>
<th>Approx. # of Reading Courses Taken</th>
<th>Years in SFA</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Train. Hrs. in SFA</th>
<th>Hrs./peer obs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unknown growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Executive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Elementary/ Reading and Admn./Super.</td>
<td>&gt;5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Significant Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1-Demographic information of teachers (con'd.)
Although behavior, philosophy of teaching, and grades are not portions of the SFA lessons, they constituted an essential component of the study. Behavior was a topic that surfaced often, both in observations and interviews and was deemed important by SFA as well since points were required to be given on a daily basis. In addition, the discussion of a teacher’s classroom would not be comprehensive without an acknowledgement of the teacher’s philosophy of teaching and her determination of grades.

Ms. Stewardess (Unknown Growth)

Introduction to the Classroom and Teacher Identity

Upon entering Ms. Stewardess’s 2.2 SFA reading level classroom, it was easy to follow her smooth transition from one activity as she “took off” with the Listening Comprehension and eventually “landed” with dismissal. Ms.
Stewardess "flew" from one activity to the other and one end of the room to the other and was always ready to begin on time.

She had everything needed for her flight into the heights of reading instruction and sat patiently waiting for takeoff at the precise time of departure. There were never any "delayed flights" in her classroom.

Ms. Stewardess was always dressed appropriately in a neat and professional manner and ready to begin at exactly the right time. Her classroom was always organized with each item in a particular place, and the room always smelled like perfume. The first time an observation was made in her classroom, the smell was an overwhelming aspect. The source was determined to be four plug-in air fresheners placed strategically around the classroom. She always had her materials ready, even a music cassette which she played during times when the eleven second grade students were to be working independently.

Her walls were organized for maximum efficiency of movement. Blank posters for one activity were placed in one area for future use, while posters she would need for another activity were in another area. She had seven of the required SFA signs posted including the LC sign placed right outside the classroom door, but no requisite Bloom's taxonomy signs were in evidence. Her starred words and definitions were preprinted and easily visible to the students.

She constantly walked the classroom, from one end to the other, consistently asking questions or reinforcing skills and she carried her "tray" of
positive comments, language corrections, and helpful suggestions with her as she circulated among her students offering support and help to first one, and then another. As she worked with the children, she constantly reminded them to speak and write in complete sentences. Each activity was preceded by an explanation of what the students were going to do and what was expected. Specific directions, such as “Turn to p. 24,” were seldom given only one time. The directions were often stated frequently 3-4 times in succession. Following Ms. Stewardess’ procedure from one activity to the next was effortless as she asked the children to sign off on the ARF sheet under the correct section which she named after every activity (ex. “Sign off under meaningful sentence practice”). She closely followed the SFA manual that was correlated with the reading textbooks, which specified the comprehension questions to be asked and used many of the materials included in the SFA kit.

**Listening Comprehension**

When the students walked into her room, there was no talking; they simply put their things on their desks and went to sit in the front of the room quietly and wait for class to begin at 8:30. There was never a day during the observations that Ms. Stewardess had to sit or ask a student to sit after 8:30. It was obvious that the students knew what was expected of them, and they complied obediently. Ms. Stewardess sat quietly and may have asked students questions about their personal lives, but the children never became loud or moved out of position. The children sat in groups, but with their partners as they were asked over and over during LC to “Think, pair,...,now share.”
LC questions appeared to be spontaneous. Only once did she have the questions written in advance. The students were told to speak in complete sentences on a daily basis as most of their answers were in complete sentences. Ms. Stewardess taught this portion of the day as a combination of her ideas and those of SFA. She chose her books based on the students' needs, but was not sure if the listening comprehension portion had produced a positive impact on her students' learning.

Ms. Stewardess would also have the students elaborate on their answers; if one of the students gave her an answer that could have been more complete, she never failed to ask for more information. She also repetitively stated the skill to be learned from the listening comprehension portion of the lesson and utilized the dry erase board where a storybook house was located. She would review the characters, setting, problem, and solution at the end of the listening comprehension lesson and place these on the storyboard.

Reading Comprehension

As the students moved to begin the reading together portion of the day, the children moved to one of four tables. Ms. Stewardess used tables instead of desks; therefore, tampering with the students' possessions was avoided. There were four or five students seated at each of the tables during any activity that required them to be seated at a "desk." Each story in the reading comprehension portion of the SFA lesson was "served" by the teacher utilizing story motivation and stating the exact directions the students were to follow.
Her story motivation always involved asking the students questions to interest them in the story or to give them some needed information.

As the students began the vocabulary, definition, and meaningful sentence portion, she would state, "We're going to do my turn, your turn," and then the starred words would be pronounced by the teacher and the students would echo the pronunciations. Ms. Stewardess would then have the students orally read the definitions of the starred words, so the definitions could be used for meaningful sentences." During the five days, she used a web, boxed in words, found clues, and also asked the students to find the starred words in the textbook readings. Again, she incorporated the reading together portion of the day as a combination of her ideas and those of the SFA program. Although uncertainty surrounded a positive impact of the LC portion on the students' learning, she felt the RC (reading comprehension) portion positively impacted their learning by addressing and improving the students' comprehension strategies.

For the silent reading and partner reading portions of the lesson, Ms. Stewardess allowed the students to leave the tables and read in various areas of the classroom. Each pair would sit so that one student faced one direction and the other student faced the opposite direction. The cassette player (containing instrumental selections) would then be activated, and the teacher would stroll through the classroom asking questions of selected students. During the partner reading, the teacher made certain the students alternated so that each student would read orally. Ms. Stewardess felt the partner reading
had improved her students' cooperative behavior and comprehension strategies. During class discussion of the questions, the students were asked where they found the answers, the exact page on which they found the answers, and then they were asked to read the section containing the answers.

During writing of meaningful sentences and "Adventures in Writing," Ms. Stewardess constantly reminded the students to write in complete sentences and had dictionaries placed on each desk. All topics for meaningful sentences and Adventures in Writing were webbed before the students began writing. Seldom were the students told to use the dictionaries; they seemed to comprehend their necessity and used them independently. The students were encouraged to remember to include the starred word, two situations in which the starred word would be used, and synonyms for the starred word. Ms. Stewardess stated the MS practice had improved the students' word identification strategies and writing skills.

Ms. Stewardess would use proofreading marks as the students stated the corrections and the sentences reflected corrections based on material read by the students. Although the two minute edit was used each day during the SFA portion only, the teacher believed it improved the students' proofreading skills, writing skills, and also caused the writing to improve in other areas.

Additional Skill/Book Club/SSR

During the five days of observations, Ms. Stewardess had sustained silent reading (SSR) on two of those days and an additional skill the remaining days. She introduced the additional skill to be taught and played a game to
reinforce the skills. For antonym practice she played "Silly Simon" and had the students do the opposite of what Silly Simon said to do (ex. "Raise your right hand," The students were to raise their left hands.)

**Behavior**

"One, two, three," stated Ms. Stewardess as the children stood and quietly walked to their seats. "Give yourselves five points for going back to your desks quietly," was a familiar sound in her room. Every student walked quietly from one area to the next, no matter which activity was in the act of completion. The students knew what was expected of them. If a question was asked, a raised hand always preceded the question. Approximately 50% of the original group of reading students placed in Ms. Stewardess' classroom was kept all year, and Ms. Stewardess felt that having the students remain in a basically intact group all year caused improved behavior. Ms. Stewardess always referred to the students by their team names and numbers (ex. Chipmunks, Number 4). The students were told exactly what would be needed for the activity (ex. "Get your journal, Treasure Hunt book, and bookmark."), exactly what they were to do (ex. "You're going to read pages 164-168."), and how they were to complete the activity (ex. "Hold your books in your lap, and put your hands down when you finish.").

High expectations were evident in her classroom as work was expected to be done with a minimum of movement and a maximum of efficiency. Although she tried to follow the program, adaptations sometimes had to be made. The students were to complete five meaningful sentences each week,
but only three were able to be completed since the students were only in second grade. She believed in oral reading and would have preferred to see that component added to the SFA reading program.

Philosophy of Teaching

Although she had been teaching for less than five years, Ms. Stewardess' philosophy resembled a balanced perspective since most of her choices for teaching methods were typically situated between the phonics perspective and the whole-language perspective. The classroom was a mixture of skills and literature-based instruction, teacher and student centered learning was included, and equal amounts of whole group and small group instruction. She favored the current view of balanced instruction in which there is a balance among all components of teaching and learning. A determination was made not to have any students fall behind because only one method of teaching was utilized. Based on the questionnaire, parents were somewhat involved in her classroom, outside resources were used, activities were chosen by teacher and students alike, and teacher made or textbook created tests were used in combination with other methods of assessment.

Grading

Grades were based on students' work, but the students were allowed to talk to the teacher during the tests and be prompted to check "wrong" answers. Ms. Stewardess would also walk around during the tests and "encourage" students to look again at a question or to ask themselves questions such as: "Where would they go?" while completing Meaningful Sentences. She stated
that she was not sure if they were inflated, but grades were given to the students based strictly on the SFA grades.

Ms. Scientist (Unknown Growth)

Introduction to the Classroom and Teacher Identity

As the 24 second grade students walked into the 2.2 reading level SFA classroom while the teacher checked to see if homework had been completed, the identity of Ms. Scientist became apparent; she took one experiment or event at a time and moved on to the next when the previous experiment was completed. If one activity was finished ahead of time, the students were quickly transitioned into the next activity. Because of the time constraints, efficiency was of utmost importance. If the lessons were behind schedule, more effort was placed trying to accomplish the next activity at a faster pace or the activity was delayed until the next day. Time was made up at some point. Ms. Scientist always had the instructional microscope ready, adjusted to find even the most minute teaching moment. Motivational materials for listening comprehension, the first activity, were prepared and ready to be used at a moment’s notice. The time limits were acknowledged, but the main emphasis was placed on accomplishing the activity correctly rather than simply “getting it done.”

The walls, chalkboard, bulletin boards, and blinds were used for displaying the results of the hypotheses and conclusions: student generated work that exhibited learning. “Book Talk” results were readily visible: two worksheets representing book reports, three handmade posters illustrating
books read by students, and one shoebox diorama. There were also other displays of the students' work. In addition to the students' work, there were sixteen SFA signs distributed about the room and the five requisite Bloom's taxonomic signs along with her "Word Wall," which were comprised of sets of preprinted vocabulary words clipped to the blinds.

The students sat at desks that were situated as they had been when the homeroom students had been in the room. Ms. Scientist moved from one set of desks to another, stopping frequently to ask a student what was meant by an answer as well as monitoring the progress of a student whose behavior would have constantly disrupted the class except for the unique way the teacher maintained the behavior. The student would be "quarantined" in locations within the classroom that would not openly affect the other students such as the teacher's desk or the floor, the place he seemed to prefer. Ms. Scientist was consistently experimenting to discover methods of cajoling him into completing work, and rewarding him with thinking puzzles when work was eventually completed. Ms. Scientist moved through the room constantly eliminating one variable after another, thereby solving one problem and then another as they surfaced.

Motivational activities preceded each activity through hypothesis formulation, critical questioning and experiential comments. Sentences such as, "Why would I choose this book?" and "Why do we look up words in the dictionary?" encouraged the students to think critically. The students' ideas were considered important, and the students responded positively. When
students brought books at a higher reading level than those students typically read, the teacher quickly prompted the students to read the books.

She followed the SFA manual closely requiring that the students sign their ARF sheets as each activity was completed, but no discouragement was evident if one of the components had to be put off until another day because of the time factor.

**Listening Comprehension**

Each student walked into the classroom, placed anything they might have on their desks, and moved quietly to the front of the room where a group would form, but the students would sit so they could “pair” with their “buddy” when needed. The RC (reading comprehension skill to be discussed that day) would be discussed and the students would reply to questions relating to the reading comprehension skill. The students were encouraged to think of words that would make better mind movies, and the LC was incorporated exactly as SFA prescribed. Books were chosen from a suggested SFA list as well as others she selected. Ms. Scientist felt the LC portion had positively impacted some of the students in oral reading; expression and fluency as well as listening comprehension was enhanced, but she was unsure about the impact on others in the classroom.

**Reading Comprehension**

When discussing one comprehension skill, Ms. Scientist was observed combining a lesson in phonics or other skill that could be incorporated into the lesson. When the SFA book was needed for reading comprehension, she
placed a number such as RC2D5 on the board. Although it was near the end of
the year, the location of the page apparently caused some problems since
several students asked questions about where to find the page. The discussion
of how to locate the current lesson wasted valuable time. Although there were
problems with locating lessons, Ms. Scientist felt that some, though not all of
her students, gained improvement in comprehension strategies and word
identification skills from the RC lessons.

When the students were silent or partner reading, chairs were placed in
various places throughout the room. When partner reading, one student faced
one direction and the other student faced the opposite direction. The teacher
stated that she now uses partnering in other areas of teaching as well, not just
SFA.

When completing meaningful sentences, Ms. Scientist placed great
emphasis on determining the meaning of the word through using context
analysis. Students would be asked questions such as, “What helps us know
the meaning of...?” and state information such as, “Look for another clue. It is
not in the definition, but when would you ...?” Students would also be prompted
to revise their sentences on a constant basis. The use of colored markers to
write and correct the meaningful sentences on the chart paper allowed the
sentences to become vividly visible. In the discussion of the starred words used
in writing the meaningful sentences, the students were given information about
determining the parts of speech.
When beginning to write the meaningful sentences, each student would write a simple sentence using the starred word. The students would then give the sentence to their partner and ask the partner to add to the sentence. In this manner each of the students was able to add his/her own ideas and thereby increase the likelihood of diversification of sentences and ideas. When the words were verbs, the students would be asked, “Who would do this?” and, “When would someone do this?” As the students wrote, Ms. Scientist circulated throughout the room and asked questions such as, “Did she tell you how to add more clues?” Demonstrations were given on how to add a clue to their sentences.

Each day, Ms. Scientist would place one sentence or title containing four or five errors on the board for the students to correct. At the beginning of the observations, proofreading marks were not utilized, but as the months progressed, the students were taught how to place proofreading marks under and over the words in the sentences. She felt improved proofreading skills were, in part, due to the daily two minute edit. Only once during the five days of observation did she omit the two minute edit correction. The two-minute edit was now being utilized by the teacher in language and content area work as well as SFA.

**Additional Skills/Book Club/SSR**

On four out of the five days observed, Ms. Scientist allowed the students to give book talks, but one of the day’s last few minutes was spent on an additional skill. Multiple meanings of many words were discussed, and the
students were given examples such as: turn, can, and drink as both nouns and verbs, and ball as a noun in two different ways. Each of the students then chose one of the words with which to write a meaningful sentence and was told the reader should be able to determine the definition from the sentence.

The book talk (book club) consisted of the student moving to the front of the room and providing the audience with a summary of the characters, setting, and plot in the books the student had read along with some type of handmade product to accompany the talks. The student would state the title, characters, setting, and then give four or more events from the story. Then, after providing a conclusion, the student would show his/her accompanying product to the class. The teacher would then have the class raise one finger if they thought the book was fiction and two fingers if they thought the book was non-fiction.

During the five days in which Ms. Scientist was observed, there was no SSR time, although the end of each of the days was spent on additional skills or book talks.

Behavior

Ms. Scientist had excellent control of the classroom without ever raising her voice. She circulated throughout the room and simply made hand movements to encourage the students to lower their voices. When asking the students to move to the next activity, the teacher would state, “1, get ready; 2, get supplies; 3, stand behind your chair; and 4, move.” The students seemed to know the steps in each “experiment” or activity. Each time the students earned a reward, a type of cheer was performed, such as a raindrops cheer or
fireworks cheer. Praise and reinforcing activities were constantly forthcoming since activities such as cursive writing and good behavior were desired. She postulated that classes of children such as hers, who maintained more than 75% of the original reading class all year had improved behavior. However, she had no information on which to base an opinion about whether the behavior would deteriorate if older students were placed in the room with second graders, since no older students had been placed in the class. Improved behavior was determined to be in part a product of challenging material constantly being introduced.

When administering a test, students were asked to place “test walls” on their desks. These were three sided cardboard partitions that would prohibit students from looking at their neighbors’ answers. Through this method, behavior and test security were maintained during testing.

When behavior seemed to be lacking, listening comprehension time was spent reviewing the signs spread throughout the room. Terms were constantly used to reinforce the desired behavior such as active listening, cooperative learning, and assigned points consistently. The students would be reminded to use kind words and kind voices.

When assigning points to students, points would be assigned to each group and the group would move to their acquired points by a clothespin on a hanging card that hung above each set of desks. Each activity would be assigned the same number of points, and, although one student was observed
moving a clothespin when the teacher was not looking, this seemed to be a one
time occurrence.

Philosophy of Teaching

Ms. Scientist's philosophy became quickly apparent as many types of
materials such as charts, manipulatives, motivators, varied methods of
introducing and teaching reading, and different styles of teaching were
integrated. A story was once introduced by bringing in different objects and
having the students predict the elements of the story based on the students'
observation of the objects. Another day, she and another teacher read two-
voiced poetry to introduce characterization.

A combination of basal materials and literature were utilized in order to
teach reading. Cooperative grouping was employed even when not teaching
SFA, and although there was a mixture of teacher centered and student
centered activities, she preferred teacher directed learning rather than student
centered. Ms. Scientist also stated that now the program did not permit
creativity. The material taught always had to be related to "this" or "that" topic.

Novels were utilized in SFA teaching during the last two days on which
observations were made. The basal had been finished, and since the students
were not allowed to start the next basal, the teacher and facilitator had the
students begin reading trade books. Ms. Scientist felt this was extremely
beneficial to the students and expressed concern that they did not use trade
books all through the year as the students were much more motivated when
reading trade books.
Grading

Prior to SFA, a combination of worksheets and other methods to teach as well as a combination of assessment procedures in assigning grades had been utilized, but now assigning grades which she considered to be inflated, were determined through words out loud tests, story tests, RC tests, "Adventures in Writing," MS tests, unit tests, book talks, and homework bonus points. Grades were inflated by allowing the students to correct papers and tests until the tests were basically correct, having too many grades, permitting the grades to be too subjective on the part of the teacher, and receiving bonus points for homework and team participation. She stated, "The students were allowed to go back and revise, revise, and revise."

Ms. Model (Significant Growth)

Introduction to the Classroom and Teacher Identity

As the students entered Ms. Model's 3.2 SFA classroom containing eleven third graders and two special education students, the teacher checked the students' homework. Each student walked in the classroom and modeled good behavior. During the time of the observations, Ms. Model's expertise as a "model" became apparent. Correct behavior was constantly modeled, from teaching a skill to speaking correctly. This particular day was begun with discussion of the RC problem and solution. The students were told they would look at a picture so they could predict, and the student who answered was rewarded with verbal praise when the student told Ms. Model she had found evidence for her prediction. Ms. Model also read with expression and thereby
provided yet one more avenue through which the students could gain reading comprehension strategies.

The classroom walls were always neat and characterized the components of the SFA program. The number of teams (3) and their names were listed along with their status: good, great, or super. The SFA day chart was prominently displayed along with a chart addition allowing the students knowledge of where to sit during each activity. There were ten SFA signs as well as the required “Word Wall” which contained words neatly written and placed on laminated construction paper. Ms. Model also had the starred words and definitions which were pre-printed, displayed so they were easily observable by the students. The listening comprehension book along with the reading comprehension skill were written neatly on the dry erase board and enhanced through the use of large patterned note paper placed on the left of each item. All five Bloom’s taxonomic signs were hanging in the classroom and the questioning techniques listed were used during listening comprehension as well as other times.

Listening Comprehension

Listening comprehension was incorporated in her classroom with moderate adherence to SFA guidelines. The students were required to sit in a large group, but also sat in pairs within the group so they could “think, pair, and share.” Questions were answered by students as they raised their hands and were acknowledged. LC books were chosen by the teacher based on the skills covered that week during reading comprehension and the skills to be covered...
on the end-of-book test. Ms. Model utilized at least one question from each of
the six levels from Bloom's taxonomy during LC and felt the listening
comprehension had positively impacted the students' learning in the areas of
listening comprehension, word identification skills, and cooperative behavior.

Listening comprehension time lasted approximately 20 minutes every day, then
the students moved.

**Reading Comprehension**

During the "reading together time," the students went back to their desks
which remained as the homeroom students left them for seatwork, but were
allowed to move to different areas of the classroom for partner reading. During
this activity, the students sat in groups of two or three with one student facing
one direction and the other one or two facing in the opposite direction. All the
desks were placed in groups of four and five, which although required by SFA,
had positively impacted her teaching for the rest of the day. Although Ms.
Model felt the RC component had not positively impacted her students'
learning, the partner reading was thought to have had a positive impact by
improving cooperative behavior, comprehension strategies, and word
identification strategies.

Meaningful sentence (MS) practice was taught using the overhead.
Black markers were used to write the sentences, but then a blue marker was
used to box in the starred word and underline the clue words. The MS
consisted of context clues and the teacher worked diligently to have the
students determine who, what, where, etc., the meaningful sentence was about.
These words were then added above words of the MS. The MS had improved the students' word identification strategies, and the MS was also employed in her spelling lessons with her homeroom. Approximately ten to eighteen minutes per day were spent on MS activities including the MS test. Handwritten multi-colored student generated sentences were visible within the classroom.

Tests were given with no rearrangement of students or desks except for one student who occasionally needed additional help with questions. When this situation occurred, the student was placed at the back table so she could coach him without interrupting the other students. As the students finished their tests, they took them to Ms. Model for discussion and modeling of some of the strategies they should be using in order to ensure their sentences were the best they could be.

The two-minute edit lasted from two to three minutes each day. Ms. Model would place one sentence with three errors on the board each day for her two minute edit and modeled the proofreading marks for the students as the sentences were being corrected. The two minute edit had improved her students' proofreading skills, but the teacher still used it only once a day, during SFA time. The two-minute edit was skipped only once during the five days in which she was observed.

Additional Skills/Book Club/SSR

Ms. Model, during the five days of observations, taught an additional skill one day, had a book club presentation on one day, and had the students
perform SSR on one day. The additional skill consisted of a lesson on classification.

The book club was presented by a student who was then questioned by the class. Ms. Model had prepared cards containing questions which other students could ask the student presenting the book club. The students became very involved and raised their hands excitedly to be one of the students to ask the questions.

Behavior

Behavior management in the classroom took place through the use of the SFA signals and rewards of points. A card was placed on each set of desks with a moveable clothespin to signify the points earned by the team and a variety of points were given for each activity. During the observations, no discipline problems were evident. Ms. Model had over 75% of her original reading class all year and concluded that since her class was over 50% intact, the behavior had improved. She felt that the inclusion of older students would cause a negative impact in behavior on the part of the older student if he/she were included in a class with younger children.

Philosophy of Teaching

Ms. Model's philosophy of teaching differed from what she actually had to teach in the classroom. She had been using thematic units and now taught exclusively from the SFA program, which emphasizes a wide regimen of activities.
Grading

Since she prompted students until they stumbled upon the right answer, and since there were too many grades, Ms. Model concluded the grading system was inflated. After the end-of-the-book test, she stated, "They're retesting them next week. The very same test. This program is for the independent learner. She also stated of the SFA grading system, "It's such a gimme. It's not valid to what they know...I expected the students to use mechanics, grammar. All the people from the 'Great Cult of SFA' came down and said, 'You're grading too hard.' Basic goals are to know more words, develop vocabulary, rather than using grammar." Since unit tests from the basals do not match the testing provided by SFA, and there were only thirty minutes per week allocated for additional skills instruction, she also considered the grades "bogus." She stated, "If the students do not master the skills, the teacher has to move on anyway." She had no idea where she was supposed to find the time to reteach if a student made poor grades and did not understand the information.

Ms. Waitress (Little or No Significant Growth)

Introduction to the Classroom and Teacher Identity

Upon entering the 2.1 SFA reading classroom of Ms. Waitress, the homeroom students were just leaving to go to their own reading classes. The class consisted of three first grade students, eleven second grade students, four third grade students, and two fourth grade students. She welcomed the students to the class and asked them by group names to sit at the back of the
room where she would “serve” the LC. That day was begun by a review of
events which had transpired in the novel the previous day.

The walls contained the usual SFA signs such as: what to do while
waiting; before, during and after reading; reading with expression; and nine
more. A bulletin board contained the names of the three SFA teams named
after animals and military personnel. Another bulletin board contained many
“book report” type forms such as a flower shape containing the name of the
book along with other pertinent information. There were seven of the “flower”
book reports, eleven of another type of “worksheet book report,” and seven of a
two page handmade variety of book reports. The SFA day chart was hanging
from the chalkboard like a menu containing the daily selections available that
she would review periodically during the course of each observation. The
“Word Wall” consisted of words handwritten on chart paper and placed below
the teams on one of the bulletin boards close to the listening comprehension
area. Student generated “Adventures in Writing” activities written in pencil were
also visible.

Listening Comprehension

Ms. Waitress always started her listening comprehension with a review
of the previous day’s reading. The LC portion of the day was incorporated as a
combination of SFA’s and the teacher’s ideas. The students sat in a large
group at the back of the room for LC but did not sit as pairs of students. LC
were chosen by Ms. Waitress and questions were asked of the whole group.
The students who raised their hands were then called on to answer. The
teacher was unsure whether the LC had produced a positive impact on the students and felt no results were provided from teaching the LC lesson to her students.

**Reading Comprehension**

Although the students went back to their desks for RC and needed to work as partners and teams, the seating arrangement had a negative impact on the students with whom she worked. The seating arrangement was like most of the other SFA classrooms: groups of four and five students. It also negatively impacted her teaching for the rest of the school day after SFA ended. Ms. Waitress asked her homeroom students to turn the desks around so that the opening in the desk faced away from the SFA reading student. When asked to explicate the reasons for the desk turning, she replied (as did two other teachers) that the SFA students who come in, especially the older ones, had a tendency to take items from the desks if they were not turned.

Meaningful sentences posed a problem for Ms. Waitress as they did for several of the teachers. Although the definition of the word was needed in the sentence and descriptive words were needed to describe, uncertainties were always present about the exact method to write a meaningful sentence. As Ms. Waitress stated, "Sometimes I get confused on the meaningful sentences myself."

The RC in the classroom consisted of a combination of both SFA ideas and the teacher's ideas, and Ms. Waitress was skeptical of the impact of the RC on her students. She stated, "Since the teacher does not read the basal story
to the students, the students are never assured of hearing the story read properly." A suggestion was made that teachers should read the basal story the first two days of LC and then read different books on the other three days. The need for phonics instruction was also suggested. Even though phonics is taught in the "Roots" portion of SFA, the "Wings" program provides no specific teaching of phonetic analysis. Ms. Waitress stated, "They teach phonics in the 'Roots' program, and I don't know how they taught it, so I can't refer back."

Although the students stayed at their desks, paired up, and read as partners when partner reading was required, Ms. Waitress felt the partnering in her classroom had a negative impact in that it weakened cooperative behavior. The teacher expressed concern that most of the time spent in partner reading is wasted as the students are either not reading or skipping words if they do not know how to pronounce them. She stated, "SFA wants all of it to be teamwork, but sometimes students are rude to their teammates who are not doing what they are supposed to be doing." As noted in the componential analyses of days 1-5 (See figures 5.3.1-5.3.5), there were inconsistencies regarding the time factors of each of the components.

The two minute edits were developed as the class progressed; they were not placed on the board prior to the SFA lesson. The sentences related to the story or the students' lives. They contained four or five errors and took two to seven minutes to correct. Proofreading marks were utilized during two of the edits, and during the five observations, two of the five edits were omitted (See figure 5.4.1).
Additional Skills/Book Club/SSR

During the time in which Ms. Waitress was observed, there were no additional skills "served," no book club reports given, and no SSR. (See 5.3.1-5.3.5).

Behavior

Behavior was a problem in the class since several students had to be moved at various times to a "special desk" where the student would have a "time out session" away from the other students. Ms. Waitress had kept only 25% of the original students from the beginning of the year and stated that when students move frequently, behavior deteriorated. She was adamant about the older students having a negative impact when included with the younger students in the reading classroom. She stated she did not use the point system; it did not work for her.

Philosophy of Teaching

Ms. Waitress' philosophy became clear as she struggled to maintain the integrity of the SFA program and still incorporate various methods of teaching within her classroom. Meaningful sentences would be assigned and students would be given a sheet of paper containing lines and an area above the lines on which to draw, and although time constraints were a constant problem, the students were told to illustrate their sentences. The ability to foster creativity in the classroom had been lost; the menu was being searched for a dish that was no longer available: thematic units. She stated, "I don't teach my own class to
read, therefore I'm not able to integrate all of the skills like reading spelling, phonics, and language.

Grading

The grading system had also changed as a combination of teacher and textbook created tests along with other assessment procedures had been used before the advent of SFA. This past year only the SFA book test, "Adventures in Writing," meaningful sentences, and RC tests had been used, all of these considered too subjective by Ms. Waitress, thereby, causing inflation of the grades. She stated, "They (the grades) reflect what they do in class, but it does not reflect what they know."

Ms. Referee (Unknown Growth)

Introduction to the Classroom and Teacher Identity

Upon entering the 3.1 reading level SFA classroom, Ms. Referee's name was determined; there was a constant struggle to maintain discipline. Although the class was arranged as all the other SFA classes, four or five desks placed together to make five "teams," the students possessed no self-control. When the bell rang for the children to be dismissed, it was like the bell signaling the end of a boxing match. A constant but futile effort was made to keep the two second grade students, eleven third grade students, 6 fourth grade students, and 3 special education students focused on the material, but the "match" could never be over fast enough.

The students went into the class and after placing any materials on the desks, they moved slowly to the back of the room where LC would take place.
They sat in a group, but no pairing was ever evident; there was no think, pair, share portion of the lesson.

The walls seemed similar to other SFA teachers with nine SFA signs placed around the room, and the five Bloom's taxonomic signs were also in evidence. The listening comprehension sign was always up, but the story was never the one she was reading and the day was always incorrect; the day said "Day 3," but she was on "Day 1." The SFA day sheets were hung in the back of the room and a clothespin was placed on the sign so it could be moved from one activity to the other. It was moved twice during the time of the observations, but it did not seem to serve any real purpose; it simply took extra time to go to the back and change it.

**Listening Comprehension**

The LC portion of the lesson was begun by asking the students about previous events in the novel being read at that time; she was reading a novel that normally appeals to students of that age: *The Indian in the Cupboard*. The students were encouraged to discuss how the characters felt and the teacher tried to add experiences of her own so the children would better understand characterization. As new British words were encountered by the students, they were added to a chart containing a list already approximately fifteen words long. A discussion ensued and the teacher integrated as much experiential knowledge as the students could add. The students raised their hands in order to answer questions and the books were selected by the teacher based on the students' needs. Bloom's taxonomic questions were addressed only once or
twice during a day's lesson; if two questions were asked, both were from the same level. The LC had positively impacted the students' learning through their added enjoyment of books.

**Reading Comprehension**

When the students began the vocabulary review, the students turned and faced the teacher at the back of the room where the oral review of the vocabulary, definitions, and meaningful sentences would commence. When the students went back to their desks, the teacher spent several minutes creating order out of chaos and had to repeat directions three to four times before the students would comply.

When students began silent reading, there was much mumbling as the students read the story to themselves. The students also had difficulty as they tried to sign their ARF sheets. The teacher admonished them not to simply sign "all the way down the form," as many were doing, but to sign off on each activity as it was completed. The teacher walked the classroom, from one side to the other, told one pair of students not to take a nap together, and wrote a referral.

Ms. Referee told me she felt the RC lesson has not positively impacted the students' learning; however, the partner reading did have a positive impact by improving comprehension strategies. The teacher commented there was a lack of phonics in the "Wings" component, especially at the 2.1 level.

The meaningful sentences included the correct usage of the starred word, three key words to identify meanings, proper situations or settings, and a "mind movie." To begin the meaningful sentence portion, the starred word
would be webbed. Paper with a drawing area at the top would then be
distributed and the students would write the sentence at the bottom after
webbing it at the top. For the meaningful sentence test, items to be included
were the starred word, correct context, boxed in word, and two clues to add
meaning.

Ms. Referee's two-minute edit lasted for two minutes and only one two-
minute edit was corrected during my five days of observation. Proofreading
marks were not utilized. Although the two-minute edit was not frequently
observed, the activity had impacted her students in a beneficial manner by
improving proofreading skills. The two-minute edit was conducted less than
three times per week. There were inconsistencies noted in the implementation
of many components during the five days of observation (See figures 5.3.1-
5.3.5).

Ms. Referee noted also the omission of oral reading of the basal story.
More modeling should be provided in order for the students to be able to read
the story. She stated, "How do they learn to read? We do read out loud, but
not their story (the story from the basal). Sometimes for motivation, I read the
first page and get predictions."

**Additional Skills/Book Club/SSR.**

During the observations of Ms. Referee, there was no evidence of
additional skills, book club talks, or SSR (See figures 5.3.1-5.3.5).
Behavior

Ms. Referee had to continually monitor and control the classroom. There was one day in which punishment work was assigned to the students. The vocabulary words were to be copied 25 times each during the ninety minute implementation of SFA. Although the teacher utilized a point system and points were dispensed, the teacher and the students kept track of them.

Ms. Referee found the seating arrangement to be a problematic area within the classroom. The arrangement of four or five desks per group mandated the methods of teaching for the rest of the day. In addition, the seating caused some of the students to constantly have their backs to the teacher which, in turn, lead to talking among the students. She stated, "Then because its SFA, we’re required to have our desks like this all day long. You could change but it’s a mess trying to get them back and forth. I tried doing that and it’s just more of a headache."

Different grade levels within the classroom made a large difference in the behavior of the students. The teacher felt that the second graders in the classroom were still very immature and tended to aggravate the older students, especially the students classified as special education students. She stated, "I don’t think it’s fair when I have three special education students and no aide. I can’t grade them like I do others."

When the students took a test, the students got in test formation that consisted of turning all the desks to face forward. After the test, the students moved them back into place.
Philosophy of Teaching

Her philosophy of teaching was both holistic and teacher centered. Literature was included and students' experiences were related to material being taught. Although the philosophy was holistic, there were few student generated products in the classroom. The one set of book reports consisted of book report worksheets that had been filled out by six students. There was no observation of any student centered activities; only teacher directed activities.

Grading

She believed the SFA grades were inflated because of subjectivity. She stated, "Sometimes the students can read and not comprehend or vice versa."

The students' grades were determined by the story test, meaningful sentence test, RC test, and "Adventures in Writing. The meaningful sentence test was to be graded easily with no emphasis on spelling. Punctuation and capitalization were to be included but as the teacher stated, "They have to be successful, so you have to be more lenient. People have been complaining all year. This is the first year we're allowed to give F's on report cards, and only to those children who do nothing."

Ms. Comedienne (Little or No Significant Growth)

Introduction to the Class and Teacher Identity

Upon entering Ms. Comedienne's 3.2 classroom, her name immediately evolved. She was talking and joking with each of the 13 third grade students in the classroom. Seldom were any of the children called by their names.
Rhyming words were added to complement their names or they were playfully called "goombahs." "Come on in and look at the chart." The teacher stated, "Quit eating my pen, "Billy Goat Crow!"

Ms. Comedienne would also reverse the schedule of activities at a moment's notice. On one day of observation, the students were told LC would be switched to the end of the class time. Work would be completed first and then LC would commence. Comedy was constantly provided when discussing material with the students. When students were questioned, comical antics were required, such as touching their nose or shoulder when they possessed the answer.

The walls were strewn with nine of SFA's signs, and only two of Bloom's required taxonomic signs. Team signs were hanging from the ceiling signifying the three teams in the classroom, and Ms. Comedienne's bulletin board was covered with a printed fabric on which was placed the teams and their status along with starred words and definitions. Some of the starred word posters were simply folders opened up with starred words written upon them. Other posters were preprinted. SFA day signs were hanging from the side of the bulletin board and had labels signifying where the students were to sit during the various activities. The room was inundated with books, papers, and other materials, and Ms. Comedienne made frequent comical references to her lack of organizational skills. If she could just find the LC book......
Listening Comprehension

"Guess what?! I know where the book is!" Ms. Comedienne's LC began with a discussion with the students of what had happened so far in the novel chosen. The LC is incorporated into the classroom through her ideas as well as those of SFA. LC had helped her students by improving their writing skills. Students were asked if they could write about something they had not lived through, and then a discussion ensued about the author. Discussions also informed the students how to start writing their "Adventures in Writing," stories should pertain to something they knew about. The students started talking about restaurants, and Ms. Comedienne commented they were off task and started reading again.

The teacher then made the comment, "Next week if SFA comes and you're not sitting next to your partner will it matter? No, just get next to two others. A triad is okay. Guys, we're five minutes past—I just love reading (in a sarcastic manner of speaking)—It's day 3.________, go flip the chart to day three." What's after Listening Comp? What does it say? The student replied, "Reading Together," and the teacher said, "under that?" "Rapid reading," replied the students so Ms. Comedienne started in on rapid review of the vocabulary. When discussing several of the words, students would be asked to raise their hands if they were in agreement. Realistic problems were also posed—"Ms. Comedienne is going to build a house—my kitchen table won't fit into the kitchen—so what is the solution?" The students all became involved in the discussions. She stated, "I want you to think about your problems—hush;
your mouth doesn’t think, your brain does. A problem-solution event about one of the students not wearing a uniform shirt was then initiated. Student involvement was a key issue.

When teaching the LC portion of the lesson, experiential knowledge was of paramount importance and was frequently interjected. She often moved quickly to the opposite side of the room where the world map hung and asked the students how many of them had been to Europe. Comical retellings of personal adventures in Europe where the character of the novel was located at that moment were common. Discussion and oral reading of the novel was then renewed. When a word was encountered which she thought the students would have trouble decoding, she would pretend not to know how to sound it out…..and wait! They would be off on a race to determine the pronunciation of the word.

**Reading Comprehension**

Responsibility was a major concern in journal writing of the meaningful sentences. Students were encouraged to assume responsibility for their materials and to have all materials needed in class. Discovery of three missing journals led to a discussion of responsibility. Once students had written in their journals, they were encouraged to seek advice from the teacher and to revise their work. As work progressed, two of the students walked to the teacher’s desk, two others walked to the dry erase board and still two others were walking around the room although the students had been told to complete SSR
(sustained silent reading) when they were finished with their meaningful sentences. Only two students read silently.

For one of the two-minute edits, one of the student’s sentences was taken and placed on the board to edit. She stated, “Behind those three sheets is the student’s sentences. If you can handle it, and chuckle to yourself—if I were the student’s partner, what sign would I use to let her know the word is misspelled?” The sentences were then edited with proofreading marks. As noted in the componential analyses of days 1-5, however (See figures 5.3.1-5.3.5), there were inconsistencies throughout the components.

Additional Skill/Book Club/SSR

During the observations, an additional skill was taught on prediction; students were asked to predict different events, skills were taught on sequencing and students sat down with scissors in the front of the room and cut out items to sequence. A book club in which one of the students brought a book talk on “Getting Married” was also conducted. The student brought props although the student had problems retelling the story so the teacher told her to bring in the book the next day. The students were also asked to perform SSR on one of the observation days, but the task proved almost impossible. The students preferred to do anything except read.

Behavior

Behavior was of major concern to Ms. Comedienne since she had several students who did not perform in class as expected. Since more than 75% of the original reading students remain in the class, however, fewer
problems have been experienced. She stated, “You get them rolling smooth and someone says its time to change. After four months you finally figure out the idiosyncracies of each—they’ve all started out at level that provides a challenge—They’re frustrated.” Problems were also voiced about cooperative grouping and behavior. Students cannot manage the turn-taking skills needed for cooperative work. Although the teacher dispenses points, the points are tallied on the dry erase board.

**Philosophy of Teaching**

“I’m so tired of the dog and pony show!” Her philosophy of reading included instruction that is developmentally appropriate and balanced between skills based (basal) and language based (whole language). The philosophy was easy to assess since she integrated so many of her experiences as well as the students’ experiences and ideas into daily lessons. Co-ownership of the classroom was valued by the teacher and students alike, but promotion of cooperative grouping outside of SFA was difficult. Students were consistently encouraged to participate and give voice to the class.

**Grading**

When asked if SFA grades are inflated, it was answered with an emphatic, “Yes! The grades are inflated by all means!” She stated the grades are too subjective, there are too many grades, and students are allowed to correct papers and tests until tests are basically correct. Points are given for homework and group work. She stated, “This is where I have a big problem! They get 5 points for anything they write down.” Concern was expressed that
the SFA tests did not correlate with material tested in either the end-of-book tests or standardized tests. She commented, "ITBS does not test same as SFA. There is such a discrepancy between RC and unit tests. Has to be 'Success for all!' Our two classes have eight out of ten who have F's on all. Three out of thirteen have passed so far. Three students did take their time and scored 71, 76, and 75. I went to the facilitator—look at this—She said, 'Did you break it into two days?' I replied, 'No,' so she said, 'Go back, do it again.'"

Ms. Executive (Significant Growth)

Introduction to the Classroom and Teacher Identity

Upon entering Ms. Executive's 2.2 reading level SFA classroom, her need to watch the clock became extremely noticeable. Every few minutes, her face would crease into a fearful look of being behind schedule as if she had an important board meeting waiting to begin. She would not be late for any "appointments" with the SFA activities, if she could possibly prevent it.

Her nine second graders, seven third graders, four fourth graders, and four special education students walked quietly into her classroom during each observation, and it was apparent she was able to maintain the illusion of adhering to a schedule by putting aside many activities until later. Attempts were made to remain on schedule, but she did not have enough time to actually teach the students to web their meaningful sentences or "Adventures in Writing."

The walls were hung with the "executive signs" signifying SFA and Bloom's taxonomy. The students' desks faced outward with the open portion
facing the student during homeroom, but when it was time for SFA, the teacher and students were observed turning the desks around so the open portion was facing away from the SFA students coming into the classroom. When asked about this, she replied, "We have to turn them because the other children will take the homeroom students’ things."

**Listening Comprehension**

The students were called by groups to the front of the room where they would sit in a group but with partners. Students were asked questions to which they would respond, and Ms. Executive constantly included experiential information with which the children would be familiar. Favorite television and cartoon characters were discussed as well as daily activities and character traits. When rudeness was observed, a discussion of rudeness would follow. Ms. Executive stated, "Days 1-3 are LC days and 4-5 are RC days." On days one through three, she discussed a listening comprehension skill with the students such as characterization, and on days four and five, a reading comprehension skill such as cause and effect was taught. Books were utilized which fostered learning of the desired skill.

Picture books were used to teach the skills in the classroom, therefore forming questions meeting each of Bloom's taxonomic levels was difficult. Instead of asking questions from each of the levels each day, she stated, "I work on a different level each week." During observations, the teacher was observed scanning the taxonomic signs for suggested questions from the level being taught that week. She would have the children sit in a large group at the
front of the room, but she placed them so they could think, pair, and share while responding to questions from LC. She believed the LC had impacted the students in a positive manner through improvement in listening comprehension, comprehension strategies, word identification skills, and cooperative behavior. Modeling of reading strategies was of paramount importance for the students during the LC as the teacher modeled reading with expression, decoding of words, and other specific tactics.

**Reading Comprehension**

The reading comprehension or RC time consisted of several components, one of which was story motivation. The students were motivated to read the story through her questioning and comments to the students. Ms. Executive read orally to the students every day in RC. When completing any other activities, she would read the story so the students could complete the “Team Consensus.” The students were provided with strategies as the teacher walked through the aisles of her “office” and coached them to use the correct strategies such as finding the main idea. She asked, “If we look for main idea where do we look first?” Allowing the students to answer, “first sentence,” then “last sentence,” and finally “second sentence,” provided them a chance to actually practice the strategies as a story was read.

Partner reading consisted of students sitting at their desks or in various locations in the classroom with one student facing forward and one student facing the opposite direction. The partner reading, she believed, had a positive impact on the students. It had improved cooperative behavior, improved
comprehension strategies, word identification strategies and increased self-esteem.

Additional Skills/Book Club/SSR

A discussion of becoming acquainted with customs and languages from another country was the focus of an additional skill as the students were asked how they would feel if a student from another country lived with them. The students were encouraged to determine what they could learn from the student living with them. A discussion was held concerning the possibility of learning to play games from another country. Feelings were also discussed with the students. During the observations, the additional skill was the only extra component. There were no book clubs or SSR, although there were references made to them.

Behavior

Although Ms. Executive has “frequent movers” in and out of the executive “suite” of a schoolroom, and may not know who the students are at a moment’s notice, she relied on the teamwork philosophy to achieve her objectives of reading instruction. A student would simply be called by his team name and number such as: “Chipmunk, #4.” She believed that even though the students moved frequently, the behavior improved.

Furthermore, she also believed the inclusion of older students had a positive impact on the classroom. The older students had a positive impact on the students and a positive impact on the teacher’s ability to teach the rest of the class.
Philosophy of Teaching

Her philosophy of reading instruction consisted of developmentally appropriate lessons, language based reading instruction, balanced reading instruction between language based and whole language based, learner centered, and co-ownership of the classroom by the teacher and students alike. She stated, "On Fridays in the past, the students would choose a story of the five they had done all week and would develop the two skills they had covered as well as present it. Now we don't have time." Ms. Executive believed that although all students benefit from SFA, the ones who benefit most were the below average and above average students.

Grading

Ms. Executive stated, "This is not an 'I've got you' type program. We have a baseline score of 50 for each test. No child scores below 50. Each child should experience success." The grades were believed to be inflated because the grades were too subjective and they varied from teacher to teacher. Grades for the students came from the SFA grades that were worth 100 points each.

Teacher Summary

The teachers' identities, modes of implementation, attitudes and beliefs, as well as philosophies became apparent as the observations, interviews, and written documents were recorded, sorted, classified, and analyzed. Each teacher had an individual view and interpretation of the implementation of the SFA program. The data revealed that the teachers had specific views on many...
different aspects of the SFA program relative to listening comprehension, reading comprehension, additional skills/book club/SSR, behavior, philosophy, and grading (See figure 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Philosophy of Teaching</th>
<th>Positive Impact of LC</th>
<th>Inc. of RC</th>
<th>Positive Impact of RC</th>
<th>Impact of Seating</th>
<th>Partner Reading</th>
<th>Impact of MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1/ Developmentally appropriate, balanced, learning centered, co-ownership of classroom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>ICB, ICS</td>
<td>ICS, IWIS, IWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #1/ Developmentally appropriate, holistic, skills based, language based, balanced, teacher centered, learner centered, &amp; co-ownership of classroom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>ICB, ICS, IWIS</td>
<td>ICS, IWIS, IWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee/ Holistic, teacher centered</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>IWIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Executive/ Developmentally appropriate, language based, balanced, learner centered, and co-ownership of classroom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>ICB, ICS, IWIS</td>
<td>ICS, IWIS, IWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Waitress/ Balanced</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>WCB</td>
<td>ICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #2/ Developmentally appropriate, balanced, learner centered, and co-ownership of classroom</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SFA/ C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>ICB, ICS, IWIS</td>
<td>Improved Sen. Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #2/ Balanced</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>ICS, IWIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2-Educators' philosophies of reading instruction and views of components of SFA (con'd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Developmentally Appropriate</th>
<th>Balanced</th>
<th>Learner Centered</th>
<th>Co-Ownership of Classroom</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>N/SFA</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Pos</th>
<th>ICB</th>
<th>ICS</th>
<th>IWIS</th>
<th>IWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stewardess</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>IWIS</td>
<td>IWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Comedianne</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I/EFF</td>
<td>IWS</td>
<td>IWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Model/</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>S/SFA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>IWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Scientist/</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>IWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-principal</td>
<td>ICB</td>
<td>improved cooperative behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N#-facilitator</td>
<td>ICS</td>
<td>improved comprehension strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-teacher</td>
<td>IWIS</td>
<td>improved word identification strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-yes</td>
<td>N/SFA</td>
<td>not as written by SFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-no</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOW</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFA</td>
<td>S/SFA</td>
<td>somewhat as mandated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- combination</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>below average students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of your ideas</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and SFA's ideas</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>above average students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>struggling readers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>I/EFF</td>
<td>ineffective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos</td>
<td></td>
<td>positive impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER FIVE
DATA ANALYSIS

Observations of the seven teachers were begun by observing each of them at specifically scheduled times. However, since SFA is primarily composed of five-day lessons with different activities on each day, a decision was made to observe each of the seven teachers on each of the five days in order to obtain a more comprehensive view of the implementation. By observing on each of the five days, a determination of whether the teachers followed the prescribed schedule and procedures as stated by SFA on a consistent basis was formed.

Three principals, three facilitators, and the seven teachers were interviewed using open-ended questioning methods to obtain more in-depth data concerning their attitudes, beliefs, and self-perceptions. An interview guide approach was utilized since it was essential that the teachers, facilitators, and principals respond to specific topics; it allowed for flexibility in questioning and yet permitted the participants to expound upon the subject. “Topics and issues to be covered are specified in advance...increases the comprehensiveness of the data...interviews remain fairly conversational and situational,” (Patton, 1990, p. 288).

Observations were conducted in each of the classrooms and data were gathered. Observations included field notes taken while observing each of the seven teachers as well as descriptive, focused and selected observations. Since observations for long periods were deemed necessary in each of the classes, awareness of the total situation in the classrooms as well as the ability...
to acquire in-depth information was possible. Multiple sources of data were used and assistance from peer debriefers was utilized in determining an accurate representation of the activities in each classroom. By prolonged engagement, persistent observation, use of triangulation techniques, peer debriefing, and member checks, credibility was established (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998, pp. 90-92). Keeping a reflexive journal indicating daily or weekly information about the determinations to have taken place, as well as how the methods and modes of inquiry were adjusted as well as the reasons behind them, ensured trustworthiness. "Reflexive journal. This technique provides information for all four criteria of trustworthiness (i.e., credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability)," (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 1998, p. 93).

After observing and interviewing approximately one-third of the teachers, facilitators, and principals, more questions emerged from answers which the previous observations and interviews had produced (See Appendix I).

For data analysis, Spradley's (1997) Developmental Research Sequence (D.R.S) model was used. This allows for an overall view to begin the research and then to narrow so that specific items, events, or situations can be observed, and then return again to an overall view at the conclusion of the research. "The D.R.S. steps began with a wide focus, then with Step 7 begin to narrow for intensive investigation...toward the end of the project the focus expands again to make a holistic description...," (Spradley, 1997, pp. 103, 135).

A cross-case analysis was performed in order to group data to analyze the instruction of the seven different teachers. As Patton (1990) states,
“Evaluation syntheses are not an end in themselves but a means of generating powerful insights about effective program practices and processes across multiple experiences and cases,” (p. 428). By examining seven different classrooms, an evaluation of whether the replication of the Success for All instruction had occurred was possible.

**Developmental Research Sequence**

**Domain Analysis**

Descriptive observations were begun in order to make a domain analysis. Since obtaining data on the consistency of instruction across seven classrooms as well as the various components of balanced reading instruction inherent in the Success for All program was the primary research objective, Spradley’s (1997) descriptive question matrix was selected for beginning observations of the instruction (pp. 82-83). The matrix provided questions that could be used to help determine exactly what was transpiring in the classroom. As Spradley (1997) states, “Analysis is a search for patterns,” (p. 85), and patterns did indeed emerge as observations were made of each of the seven teachers. Observations were begun by examining space. The decision was made to describe all the places within the classroom, as well as, analyze all the ways in which activities incorporated objects. By observing the teachers as they implemented the SFA program, information was gathered regarding the way in which the teachers were involved in activities.

A domain analysis was then begun in an effort to find all the cultural domains and semantic relationships possible. The classroom was an excellent
place to disclose strict inclusion. There were many strict inclusion relationships, such as: "kinds of" activities, signs, and written work. Spatial relationships were also evident, such as: "places in" the classroom. Sequential relationships, such as: "steps in" teaching the SFA reading program were also apparent.

In completing the domain analyses, associations were made among many items and events disclosing relationships which indeed led to patterns. In completing the strict inclusion domain analyses, there were "kinds of" SFA activities such as: LC, meaningful sentence construction, Adventures in Writing, two minute edit and RC (see Figure 5.1.1). The cover term was SFA activities, the semantic relationship was "is a kind of" and the included terms consisted of all the activities listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFA Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventures in Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two minute edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1.1-Domain analysis-Semantic relationship/strict inclusion

Since SFA focuses so closely on performing certain activities on certain days at specific times, a decision was made to focus mainly on the time element. There were sequential semantic relationships including steps in providing instruction through the SFA program as well as developing writing competence. In the first case, the cover term was the SFA program, the
semantic relationship was "steps in" and the included terms concerned the overall aspect of the days one through five (See figure 5.1.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Success for All Reading Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a step in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Day 1
Day 2
Day 3
Day 4
Day 5

In the second case, the cover term was developing writing competency and the included terms contained items such as: writing meaningful sentences, "Adventures in Writing," and answering "Treasure Hunt" questions. By determining the domains, many relationships were discovered and then a focus was begun on each of the included terms (See figure 5.1.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing Writing Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a step in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Writing meaningful sentences
Adventures in writing
Answering "Treasure Hunt" questions

Pathon's questioning format was also utilized in conducting ethnographic interviews. "The experience/behavior questions, opinion/values questions, feeling questions, knowledge questions, sensory questions, and
background/demographic questions,“ (Patton, 1990, p. 290) were necessities in order to assess the teachers' self-perceptions. Singular questions were asked so the teachers, principals, and facilitators would understand the questions being asked. These questions provided valuable information with which to further complete the domain analysis. Cause-effect semantic relationships were found. Skipping activities, finishing activities the next day, or combining activities were "results of" running out of time (See figure 5.1.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Running out of time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a result of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipping activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing activities the next day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.1.4-Domain Analysis-Semantic relationship/cause-effect

**Taxonomic Analysis**

Since observations were conducted in seven classrooms, similarities were expected to be found among the instructional methods and the teachers’ perceptions over the five days. Although a vague idea these similarities existed at the beginning of the study, there were many that were not expected. However, as Spradley (1997) states, “In fact, once the similarity is recognized, it helps to solve a problem,” (p. 116).

After completing the domain analyses to determine the variances and type of reading instruction taking place within the classrooms, focused observations were arranged. As Spradley (1997) states, “...you have probably
become keenly aware that even the simplest social situation is imbued with a large number of cultural meanings," (p. 100). There were so many activities that the extent of the research was limited to focused observations that narrowed the research relating to the impact of the teaching across the seven classrooms on the reading instruction of the students. Structural questions were asked such as, “What are all the steps in days one through five?” since a determination had already been made that the days were steps in the completion of the five day lesson in the implementation of the Success for All program. After comprising categories and subcategories, a taxonomic analysis of the data was initiated (See figure 5.2.1).

Componential Analysis

Selected observations and interviews were begun to determine not only the similarities, but the differences among the consistency, attitudes, and beliefs of the teachers, facilitators, and principals who were participating in the Success for All program. After compiling the data and making the taxonomic analysis, there were areas in which contrast questions were necessary. Dyadic contrast questions inquiring how two things were different and triadic contrast questions that included determining how two events or situations were similar and yet different from a third were asked. As many contrasts as possible were explored so the “dimensions of contrast,” would be revealed (Spradley, 1997, p. 127).

The componential analyses were then completed by “searching for contrasts, sorting them out, grouping some together as dimensions of contrast,
Figure 5.2-Taxonomic Analysis of SFA Days 1-5
and entering all this information onto a paradigm,” (Spradley, 1997, p.133).

Contrasts were found that had at least two parts so that “dimensions of contrasts that had binary value,” as well as “multiple values,” were identified (Spradley, 1997, 135). This provided a paradigm of categories indicating the similarities and differences among all the items listed.

As a perusal began of the descriptive observations, domain analyses, focused observations, taxonomic analyses, and selected observations, all the similarities as well as differences among the teachers became apparent.

The first componential analysis concerned the two minute edit (See figure 5.4.1). The differences were obvious, and the need for comparing the teachers and their methods along with the time concept were of critical importance. However, after creating that particular analysis, it became apparent that the utilization of time used by each teacher on days one through five had not been thoroughly examined. Therefore, a componential analysis of the time was initiated (See figures 5.3.1-5.3.5). The following tables contain the teachers’ initials: “R” represents Ms. Referee, “E” represents Ms. Executive, “W” represents Ms. Waitress, “St.” represents Ms. Stewardess, “M” represents Ms. Model, “C” represents Ms. Comedienne, and “Sc.” represents Ms. Scientist. The principals are represented as “P” #1, 2, and 3, since they serve as police officers constantly maintaining a balance of instruction and security at their respective schools, and the SFA facilitators are represented as “N” #1, 2, and 3, since they serve as nurses keeping their fingers on the pulse of the SFA program as it is implemented throughout the schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher and Grade</th>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>LC and Story Motivation</th>
<th>V/D/MS</th>
<th>Silent Read</th>
<th>Partner Read</th>
<th>Partner Discussion</th>
<th>Writing Activity</th>
<th>Class Discussion</th>
<th>Two-minute Edit</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Book Club</th>
<th>Add Skill</th>
<th>Dismissal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*-teachers observed by independent observers
^extra five minutes added to dismissal at this school
Entrance-time spent entering SFA reading class
LC-listening comprehension time
Story Motivation-time spent motivating students to read
V/D/MS-time spent orally practicing vocabulary words and definitions of starred words as well as oral discussion and practice of meaningful sentences
Silent Read-time spent in silent individual reading
Partner Read-time spent reading with partner
Partner Discussion-time spent in partner discussion
Writing Activities-time spent answering questions in writing
Class Discussion-time spent in class discussion of questions
Two-minute edit-time spent correcting sentence/s or other written work in two minute edit
Transition-time spent in transition from one activity to another; ex. Giving directions
Book Club-time spent in book club presentations
Add. Skill-time spent in additional skill instruction
Dismissal-time spent dismissing students from SFA classroom

Figure 5.3.1-Day one=90 minutes: number of minutes per activity (con'd.)
### Day Two = 90 Minutes
Number of Minutes Per Activity

| Teacher and Grade | Entrance | LC and Story Motivation | V/D/MS | Review and # of minutes | Silent Read | Partner Read | Partner Discussion | Writing Activity | Class Discussion | MS Practice | WOL Practice | Two-minute Edit | Transition | AS/BC/SSR | Dismissal |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------|--------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------|
| R                 | 3 0      | 15 0                    | 5/40   | TH-3                    | 0 0         | 0 0          | 27 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| E                 | 2 0      | 20 5                    | 3      | 0 4                     | 14 12 22    | 0 5 0 5 0 5 0 0 0 0 |
| W                 | 2 0      | 11 0                    | 9      | 0 10 9 9 6 11 18 0 7 0 0 0 0 |
| St.               | 2 0      | 20 3                    | 7      | TH-12 8 5 8 5 2 6 4 5 2 7^ 1 |
| *M                | 3 0      | 20 15                   | 15     | 2 8 8 4 0 10 10 0 0 0 10 5^ |
| *C                | 3 5      | 15 3                    | 15     | 0 5 5 5 1 0 10 0 2 0 15 5^ |
| Sc.               | 2 0      | 15 10                   | 12     | ST-5 8 - 10 0 7 8 3 - 2 10 0 |

* - teachers observed by independent observers
^ - five minutes added to these class times for dismissal
E - time spent entering SFA reading class
LC - time spent in listening comprehension
Story Motivation - time spent motivating students to read
V/D/MS - time spent orally practicing vocabulary words and definitions of starred words as well as oral discussion and practice of meaningful sentences
Review and # of minutes - time spent on review of skills or material
Silent Read - time spent in silent individual reading
Partner Read - time spent reading with partner
Partner Discussion - time spent in partner discussion
Writing Activities - time spent answering questions in writing
Class Discussion - time spent in class discussion of questions
MS Prac - time spent practicing meaningful sentence construction
WOL Prac - time spent in orally practicing vocabulary words in preparation for "Words Out Loud Test"
Two-minute edit - time spent correcting sentence/s or other written work in two minute edit
Transition - time spent in transition from one activity to another; ex. Giving directions

Figure 5.3.2-Day two = 90 minutes: number of minutes per activity (con'd.)
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### Day Three=90 Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher and Grade</th>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>LC &amp; Story Motivation</th>
<th>WOL Practice</th>
<th>V/D/MS</th>
<th>Story Review</th>
<th>Adventures in Writing Preview and Students' Writing</th>
<th>WOL Test</th>
<th>MS Writing Practice</th>
<th>AS/BC/SSR</th>
<th>Two-minute Edit</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Dismissal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - teachers observed by independent observers

^5 - five minutes added to these class times for dismissal

**Entrance** - time spent entering SFA reading class

**LC** - listening comprehension time

**Story Motivation** - time spent motivating students to read

**WOL Practice** - time spent in orally practicing vocabulary words in preparation for "Words Out Loud Test"

**V/D/MS** - time spent orally practicing vocabulary words and definitions of starred words as well as oral discussion and practice of meaningful sentences

**Story Review** - time spent reviewing the story and its elements

**Adventures in Writing Preview** - time spent by the teacher in preparing students to write

**Students' Writing** - time actually spent by the students in writing stories

**WOL Test** - time spent testing students on the oral pronunciation of the vocabulary words

Figure 5.3.3-Day three=90 minutes: number of minutes per activity (con'd.)
MS Writing Practice-time spent in the students' writing of meaningful sentences
AS/BC/SSR-time spent in additional skill instruction, book club presentations, or sustained silent reading
Two-minute edit-time spent correcting sentence/s or other written work in two minute edit

T-time spent in transition from one activity to another; ex. Giving directions
D-time spent dismissing students from SFA reading class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher and Grade</th>
<th>Entrance</th>
<th>LC and Story Motivation</th>
<th>V/D/MS Skills</th>
<th>Team Consensus</th>
<th>Team Mastery</th>
<th>Story Retell</th>
<th>Story/MS Test</th>
<th>Adventures in Writing Preview/Student Writing</th>
<th>Two Minute Edit</th>
<th>Add. Skill/Book Club/SSR</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Dismissal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*teachers observed by independent observers
^five minutes added to these class times for dismissal
^administered "words out loud test" at this time also
*administered "words out loud test" at this time

Entrance-time spent entering SFA reading class
LC-listening comprehension time
Story Motivation-time spent motivating students to read
V/D/MS-time spent orally practicing vocabulary words and definitions of starred words as well as oral discussion and practice of meaningful sentences
Skills-direct instruction skills based instruction
Team Consensus-time spent in students coming to a "team consensus" or team agreement on answers to selected questions
Team Mastery-time spent in students' team mastery of skills
Story Retell-time spent in students asking questions or retelling parts of stories to partner

Figure 5.3.4-Day four=90 minutes: number of minutes per activity (con'd.)
Story/MS test - time spent in students' taking of story test and meaningful sentence test
Adventures In Writing Preview - time spent by the teacher in preparing students to write
Students' Writing - time spent by the students in writing stories
Two-minute edit - time spent correcting sentence/s or other written work in two minute edit
AS/BC/SSR - time spent in additional skill instruction, book club presentations, or sustained silent reading
Transition - time spent in transition from one activity to another; ex. Giving directions
Dismissal - time spent dismissing students from SFA reading class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day Five=90 Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Minutes Per Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher and Grade</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>RC Review</th>
<th>RC Test/Correct Story Test</th>
<th>MS Test</th>
<th>Adventures In Writing</th>
<th>Checkout</th>
<th>Team Consensus</th>
<th>Team Mastery</th>
<th>Two minute edit</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>AS/BC/SSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☆E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☆W</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - teachers observed by independent observers
☆ - class was only 60 minutes long
* - no RC test with prediction skill
LC - listening comprehension time
RC Review - time spent reviewing reading comprehension skill
RC Test - time spent in students taking reading comprehension test
Correct Story Test - time spent correcting the story test from the previous day/days
MS Test - time spent writing meaningful sentences for test grade
Adventures In Writing - time spent writing stories
Checkout - checkout time

Figure 5.3.5-Day 5=90 minutes: number of minutes per activity (con'd.)
Team Consensus-time spent in students coming to a “team consensus” or team agreement on answers to selected questions
Team Mastery-time spent in students’ team mastery of skills
Two-minute edit-time spent correcting sentence/s or other written work in two minute edit
Transition-time spent in transition from one activity to another; ex. Giving directions
AS/BC/SSR-time spent in additional skill instruction, book club presentations, or sustained silent reading

Emerging Themes

By utilizing Spradley's D.R.S. Method, along with Patton's questioning techniques, the analysis began to reveal commonalities. The data concerning the consistencies of the Success for All instruction, as well as the attitudes, beliefs, and self-perceptions of the teachers and students fit nicely into Spradley’s method. The data was then analyzed for emerging themes that surfaced as the analysis evolved.

Adaptations

The first theme to emerge was the adaptation of the materials or activities being taught by all the teachers observed, which extended the findings of Amanda Datnow and Marisa Castellano in their article, “An 'Inside Look' at the Implementation of Success for All: Teachers Responses to the Reform.” As they state, “Rather, almost all teachers made adaptations of one type or another.” (1999, p. 28). Many of the teachers implemented the majority of the components of the SFA program, but all of them adapted the program to some degree. One teacher adapted the program by offering to give her students a free fun Friday—free RC, etc. if they continued doing well.
As the teachers were observed, each taught the two minute edit in a different way from the others (See Figure 5.4.1). Some taught the edit in two minutes, some four, and some even eight minutes. These variances were quite obvious, simply because of the name of the activity, "two-minute edit." The teachers also varied in their number of sentences used for the two-minute edit; some had the students correct one sentence, and some two; one teacher even had the students correct a title rather than a sentence. The teachers also differed on the type and number of errors the students were expected to correct in the sentences. There was no set criteria for the two minute edit observed during the gathering of data although after all the observations were made, the SFA manual required the two minute edit to last only two minutes and consist of one sentence. As Datnow and Castellano state, "Inevitably, teachers close the doors to their classrooms and make adaptations to the program, some of which appeared to be major, and some of which were minor," (1999, p. 35). There were no exact requirements listed for the language-based content to be taught in the activity other than it should reflect the students' mistakes made during their writing activities (Madden, et.al, p. 51).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher and Grade</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time (in min.)</th>
<th>Errors</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Source of Sentences</th>
<th>And # of Sentences</th>
<th>Student Answers</th>
<th>Proofreading Marks</th>
<th>Language Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B, 1</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>PP, SV, P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.1-Variances in two minute edit (con'd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Executive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SW, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Waitress</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stewardess</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>B, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TE, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TE, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TE, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Comedienne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TE, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>SW, 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figure 5.4.1 con’d.)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (in min.)</th>
<th>Amount of time spent on the two minute edit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of errors</td>
<td>Number of errors to be corrected during the two minute edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility</td>
<td>Visibility of sentence before two minute edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source and number of sentences</td>
<td>Source of sentences and number of sentences to be corrected in two minute edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Answers</td>
<td>Way in which students were asked to correct sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Yes if proofreading marks were used; none if no marks were used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*teacher observed by independent observer

**Teacher and Grade**-teacher observed and grade taught

**Day-specific day of days 1-5 of Success For All instruction**

**Time (in min.)**-amount of time spent on the two minute edit

**# of errors**-number of errors to be corrected during the two minute edit

**Visibility**-visibility of sentence before two minute edit

**Source and number of sentences**-source of sentences and number of sentences to be corrected in two minute edit

**Student Answers**-way in which students were asked to correct sentences

PM-yes if proofreading marks were used; none if no marks were used

**LC**-language concepts covered in two minute edit

- =two minute edit not performed

T =transparency

CB =chalkboard or dry erase board

AT =sentence written at time of two minute edit

TD =team discussion

SW =students' writings in classroom

B =taken from textbook or relating to story read that day

TE =teacher created sentence

S =called on one student to answer

TA =called on team to answer

TS# =called on one specific student from each team: ex. Chipmunks #2

CO =other students calling out answers without permission

C =context

SV =subject-verb agreement

PP =possessive pronouns

P =punctuation

SP =spelling

PO =possesses

PN =proper nouns

Cap =capitalization marks

Con =contractions

Frag =sentence fragment

Ten =tense

PL =plurals

---

4 0 - - - - - - -
5 0 - - - - - - -

Ms. Scientist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>TE,</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Sp, Cap, SV, P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>PD, TS#</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Cap, SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>1 title</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>PN, SV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Differing Interpretations of Components

Yet another theme emerging throughout the study was the lack of consensus of what constituted the various components of the SFA reading program. One principal even stated that they have asked the implementation staff each time they have visited the school to provide them with accurate information related to meaningful sentences, and they have received different answers each time. Each of the teachers has a differing view of a meaningful sentence (See 5.4.2). There is no coherent view of the components of what, how, or how many meaningful sentences to teach as observed in the classrooms. Even when answering the questionnaire that asked for their definition of what constitutes a meaningful sentence, the teachers had differing views. As observations were conducted in the classrooms, the meaningful sentences were incorporated into the lesson with varying degrees of implementation.

There were also differing views on the number and types of questions that should be asked from Bloom's Taxonomy on a daily basis. Even the principals and facilitators had differing views on the number of questions which constitute the correct implementation of Bloom's Taxonomy as required by SFA (See figure 5.4.2).

Creativity and Autonomy

As in Datnow and Castellano's article, teachers were found to believe the program curtailed their creativity and autonomy in the classroom. As Datnow
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Job Description</th>
<th>Components of MS</th>
<th>Facilitation Impact</th>
<th>Teachers' Statements of their Methods of Teaching MS Construction</th>
<th>To what extent do you (or should you for principals and facilitators) incorporate Bloom's Taxonomy during LC?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1</td>
<td>Context sentence vocabulary word used correctly At least 2 parts that directly relate to word are included in sentence</td>
<td>ICS, IWIS, IWS</td>
<td>Use overhead and model with whole class, Students then work with partner to create their own sentence during partner practice</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.2-Educators' interpretations of Meaningful Sentences and Bloom's Taxonomy (con'd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N #1</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Meaning—what does it mean in kids' language? Synonyms—what other words can mean the same? Application—how can I apply it to me so it makes sense? Location—when I read this word in the basal did it mean the same as I thought?</th>
<th>ICS, IWIS, IWS</th>
<th>Introduce the word. Write a sentence using synonyms to help clarify its meaning. Box in the word being defined. Underline the synonyms. Then draw a circle with 4 or 5 lines for the who? What? Where? Why? Etc., listing words/phrases under each. Then we (teacher/class) write a draft, to be revised the next day.</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>Word used correctly, 3 key words to identify meaning, proper situation or setting, makes a mind movie</td>
<td>IWIS</td>
<td>Web</td>
<td>Very little</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figure 5.4.2 con'd.)
| Ms. Executive | T | Tells the reader that the writer understands the meaning of the word Starred word (boxed) Context sentence—at least 2 parts (synonyms, words close in meaning) etc. that tell about the starred word Word has been webbed (who, what, when, where, why, how) Creates a mind movie | ICS, IWIS, IWS | Webs, variety of these Model, model, model Scaffolding should be used expectations increase as children become more proficient Quality over quantity | Somewhat |
| Ms. Waitress | T | Starred word Other words to describe them Makes a mind movie Descriptive words to describe the word | ICS | Map-who, what, when, where, why, how | Substantially |
| P #2 | P | Answer: who, what, when, where? Keywords used 2 clues Vocabulary word Good mind movie | Improves sentence writing | Graphic organizers Model meaningful sentences-teacher created and student generated | Substantially |
| N #2 | F | Starred word, Box, underline clues, Use checking strategy to check sentence, Revise sentence, Review with partner | ICS | Model, Facilitate information from students to create sentences, Go through procedures that the students use | Extensively |

(Figure 5.4.2 con'd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Stewardess</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Synonyms Two situations Starred word</th>
<th>IWIS, IWS</th>
<th>No answer</th>
<th>Extensively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Ms. Comedienne | T | Teacher webs with children gradually progressing to independent webbing Students web one day, write, rewrite, and publish (one day each) The need to include context clues and/or synonyms in order to prove their understanding Teacher models sentences | IWIS, IWS | As best I can | Substantially |

| Ms. Model | T | Context clues to show they know meaning Box and underline Label who, what, etc. see, smell, etc. | IWIS | Context clues Box and underline Who, what, etc. see, smell, etc. | Somewhat |

| P #3 | P | Includes starred word, Must have details to meaning of vocabulary, Includes clues such as, where, what, why, etc. Creates mind movie | ICS, IWS | As outlined by SFA | Substantially |

(Figure 5.4.2 con'd.)
and Castellano state, “The majority of teachers commented on the constraints the program placed on their autonomy and creativity and, in some cases, on their overall enjoyment of teaching,” (1999, p. 32). These teachers also stated that they were not able to teach according to their philosophy. The teachers made several comments suggesting their desire to return to the use of thematic units.
Benefit to Students

Another theme that surfaced contrasted with the findings of Datnow and Castellano. Six of the respondents in this study did not agree that the below average students were the ones who benefited most from the program (See figure 5.4.3). One teacher stated, "This program is for the independent learner," and another stated, "I like it (SFA) for my own child because she is not a challenged reader. This program's original goal was to provide success for those who were not successful readers." However, Datnow and Castellano stated that, "Ironically, teachers' comments about their lack of autonomy and creativity in implementing SFA were often accompanied by strong statements that the program was working well for the students," (1999, p. 32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Job Description</th>
<th>Which students benefit most from SFA?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1 P</td>
<td>Below average, average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #1 F</td>
<td>Average, above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee T</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Executive T</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Waitress T</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #2 P</td>
<td>Below average, above average,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>struggling readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #2 F</td>
<td>Average, above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stewardess T</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Comedienne T</td>
<td>Above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Model T</td>
<td>Average, above average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #3 P</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #3 F</td>
<td>Below average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Scientist T</td>
<td>Below average, struggling readers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-principal  
F-facilitator  
T-teacher  
BS-below average students  
AS-average students  
AAS-above average students  
SR-struggling readers  
NS-not sure

Figure 5.4.3-Teachers' views on the students who benefit most from SFA
**Omitted Components**

"It is also important to observe what does not happen in the program....is when the evaluator's basic knowledge of and experience with programs suggests that the absence of some particular activity or factor is noteworthy,” (Patton, 1990, p. 235-236). Another theme which emerged from the data analysis was the teachers' realization that two major components were lacking in the program: oral reading by the students and explicit phonics instruction: both considered essential for the reading programs in Louisiana. According to the K-3 Reading and Math Initiative in its definition of "The Components of an Effective Reading and Math Initiative in Grades K-3,"

Research based programs for beginning reading and math instruction in kindergarten, first grade, second grade and third grade provide balanced within a program as well as programs within a school...  
**Each program must:**
provide a balanced approach to reading...
Reading programs should include phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, morphology, syntax, and comprehension skills (1999, p. 15).

The preceding explication of the K-3 Initiative is a mandatory component of an effective reading program for students in grades K-3. Although the teachers may or may not have addressed a word during listening comprehension, there was no attempt to include direct phonics instruction. One teacher’s comment was, “Phonics, it’s a big problem—you don’t get it in ‘Wings,’” and another teacher commented, “We call attention to it (phonics) as we do vocabulary and we have some references and connections to it, but there is no real teaching of phonics.” Several of the teachers made comments
that the oral reading and phonics components were taken care of in “Roots,” but there was no oral reading or phonics component taught explicitly in “Wings.”

The Louisiana “K-3 Initiative” states, “Instruction for children who have started to read independently, typically second graders and above, should be designed to encourage children to sound out and confirm the identities of visually unfamiliar words they encounter in the course of reading meaningful text, recognizing words primarily through attention to their letter-sound relationships,” (1999, p. 13). As the students read, only their partners could hear them, and did the partner know whether the student mispronounced the word? Although the SFA Reading Wings Teacher’s Manual does state that the teacher may include a component entitled, “Chiming in,” (Madden, et. al., p. 23), and states, “In this technique, you read a sentence or two, then cue the group to pick up where you left off and read the next few sentences aloud together.” However, this is offered as an optional accommodation and not a structured component of the program.

This was one of the concerns of the teachers participating in the SFA program. One of the principals stated that some of the teachers had complained that it (SFA “Wings” program) did not address certain skills, but many circumvented that impediment. During the observations, several of the teachers added the oral reading and phonics components, thus emphasizing oral reading so the teacher could hear the students read and emphasizing the need for explicit teaching of phonics in a reading program (See figure 5.4.4).
Stress

Yet another theme pervading the data was stress. At two of the three schools, Success for All is known as "Stress for All." At one point in the interview session with two of the teachers, one of the teachers stated, "We said the kids were doing well in Meaningful Sentences so they (SFA implementation staff) said start playing with the minutes," and the other teacher replied, "God, stress me out some more! I have learned to look at the clock so well between ___ and ___ (a.m.)." (Times are left out, although they reflect ninety minutes, in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFA component</th>
<th>Reading Aloud to Students</th>
<th>SRSO</th>
<th>SRVO</th>
<th>Paired Reading</th>
<th>Independent Reading</th>
<th>Language Exploration</th>
<th>Writing and Reading</th>
<th>Variety of Genre</th>
<th>Explicit Instruction of Phonics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary, Definitions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningful Sentences</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Reading</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Reading-Partner Discussion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Discussion</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 minute edit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Skill</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.4-Components of balanced reading instruction as incorporated within the Success for All reading program (con’d.)
One teacher stated that teachers have retired or moved to other parishes because of the stress. When asked what caused the stress, she replied, "the fast paced schedule, amount of material to be covered and the paperwork."

She stated, "there are approximately 75 papers to grade each week!" She also stated, "They (SFA) see a big picture of happy readers and good results, but they don't see the blood, sweat, and tears; it is a puzzle but many pictures shy of the whole puzzle."

---

| Book Club | - | - | - | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - |
| SSR | - | - | - | - | ✓ | - | - | ✓ | - | - |
| Story Motivation | ✓ | - | - | - | - | - | - | ✓ | - | - |
| Treasure Hunt | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| Words Out Loud | ✓ | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | ✓ | - | - |
| Adventures in Writing | - | - | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| RC Skills | ✓ | - | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| Team Consensus | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| Team Mastery | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| Story Retell | - | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| Story Test | - | - | ✓ | - | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |
| MS Test | - | ✓ | - | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | - | - |

SRVO - student reads vocabulary with teacher
SRSO - student orally reads story to teacher
GR - guided reading (students are given purpose for reading)
Time Constraints

One theme that was evident in each district, school, and classroom as well as every component was time. There never seemed to be enough time for the teachers to teach a component, reteach a skill or complete paperwork, and there seemed never to be enough time for students to complete one activity before they were rushing on to the next. One teacher was observed constantly scanning the time as she tried desperately to complete meaningful sentence practice before going to silent reading. She would even tell the students not to close their test booklets; she would circulate around the room and do that for them so they could go on to the next activity. She stated, "We've got to catch up." She said, "Personally, I don't have time. Most of it is spent on trying to cover skills and discipline."

Another teacher went to the Day 4 chart and stated that they could steal time from other areas in order to polish skills needed. "We get so caught up in the 2, 3, and 5 minutes."

Grade Inflation

"Here's the deal. These students in third grade—if a child above or below level—nowhere on report card to show below level and receive an A or above level and receive a C. Consequently, you have someone who is a brilliant student having a C and someone below with an A. We prompt and prompt and prompt until they have no choice but to give the answer—as a directive from SFA, but we have never been trained on correct way to prompt."

The comments were continually forthcoming. Of the thirteen people interviewed, ten felt the grades were inflated and did not reflect the accurate
performance of the students (See figure 5.4.5), and many of the teachers had comments about the inflated grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Job Description</th>
<th>Grade Inflation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1 P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #1 F</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee T</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Waitress T</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #2 P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #2 F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Stewardess T</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Comedienne T</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Model T</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #3 P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #3 F</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Scientist T</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P-principal
F-facilitator
T-teacher
Y-yes
NS-not sure
SW-somewhat

Figure 5.4.5-Teachers' determination of grade inflation

**Movement of Students**

The movement of SFA reading students emerged as a theme as the data began to be categorized and componential analyses made. Several issues concerning movement of students were observed: rearrangement of desks, improvement or deterioration of behavior of all students, inappropriate handling of students' materials by other students, limited recognition of students, and inclusion of older students with younger students.

As an observation was made of a student handling items in another student's desk while participating in the SFA reading class, it became obvious why two teachers had their homeroom students turn their desks so the opening
was facing away from the SFA reading students. Items had been and were being taken on a regular basis when the desks were not rearranged.

Regulating behavior was a concern of the teachers as they attempted to teach. Some of the teachers responded that the behavior improved when the students moved frequently, while others responded exactly the opposite. An interesting observation, however, is that most of the teachers who retained less than 25% of their original students all year were the ones who stated that frequent movement of the students lead to deteriorating behavior (See figure 5.4.6).

During the observations, the teachers had difficulties remembering the names of the students. Many of the teachers simply solved this problem by calling the students by a team name and number. Example: Chipmunk, #5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Job Description</th>
<th>What per cent of original reading students kept all year?</th>
<th>Impact on behavior by movement of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Executive</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Waitress</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.6-Teachers' views on impact of movement of students in and out of SFA reading classes (con'd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Job Description</th>
<th>Impact of inclusion of students of higher age</th>
<th>Number of students taught in grades 1-5 plus Special Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1</td>
<td>PS/PT</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 Sp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N #1</td>
<td>NS/NT</td>
<td>- 11 6 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>- 2 11 6 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Executive</td>
<td>PS/PT</td>
<td>- 9 7 4 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Waitress</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>3 11 4 2 - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.7-Impact of movement of students in SFA reading classes (con'd.)
Depends on student
No Impact
No Impact
N/A
NS/NO impact on Teacher
NS/NT
N/A
NS-negative impact on students
NT-negative impact on teacher's ability to teach
PS-positive impact on students
PT-positive impact on teacher's ability to teach
Sp-special education
S/T-student/teacher relationship
N/A-not applicable

Summary

Through the utilization of Spradley's Developmental Research Sequence as well as, Patton's questioning techniques, the analysis of the data began to reveal patterns about the teachers and their "job descriptions." Many of their variances had emerged (See Figure 5.4.8). As the variances and implementation emerged, so did the realization that although there were some similarities as well as differences among the classrooms with and without significant growth over the previous semester, the attitudes and beliefs of the teachers played a significant role in determining the success of a teacher and her students. The commitment to incorporating as many components as possible as well as the interpretation of each of the components was of primary importance in determining classrooms with growth. Both Ms. Stewardess's and Ms. Scientist's classrooms were determined to be classrooms with significant growth as they implemented the activities they thought were important in a
consistent manner, even if the consistency was based on their own interpretation of what should have been included. Ms. Referee, however, was deemed to lack significant growth and exhibited inconsistencies in all areas, especially implementation of the SFA program. The inclusion of specific SFA components were not as important as simply consistent implementation, regardless of the components.

Through descriptive observations, questions, and domain analyses; focused observations, structural questions, and taxonomic analyses; as well as selective observations, contrast questions, and componential analyses, the cultural themes emerged. And, as the themes emerged, so did the personalities, philosophies, and interpretations of the teachers as well as a composite perspective of the Success for All program as it was implemented within the classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSROOM VARIANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Referee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4.9-Classroom variances (con'd.)
| Ms. Executive | HM | FB, FF | Y | N | 0 | 7 | BB | 5 | HM Words/ Black Def./ Black | HM/Chart paper Sentence/ Black Clues, Box/black | 5 |
| Ms. Waitress | HM | FB, FF | Y | Y | WS 18 HM 7 | 10 | BB | 3 | HM Words/ Black Def./ Black | HM/Chart Paper Sentence/ Black Clues, Box/black | 0, 5 |
| Ms. Stewardess | HM | N/ A (T) | N | Y | OR 1 HM 4 | 6 | BB | 3 | PP Words/ Black Def./ Black | HM/OH Sentence/ Black Clues, Box/red | 0 |
| Ms. Model | HM | FF | N | Y | HM 5 | 10 | BB | 3 | PP Words/ Black Def./ Black | HM/OH Sentence/ Black Clues, Box/blue | 5 |
| Ms. Comedienne | HM | All | N | N | 0 | 11 | BB & C | 3 | HM, PP Words/ Black Def./ Black | HM/OH | 2 |
| Ms. Scientist | PP | FF | N | Y | WS 2 HM 4 | 16 | W | 6 | HM Words/ Black Def./ Blue | HM/Chart paper Sentence/ each one Different color Clues, Box/black | 5 |

**Word Wall**- manner in which vocabulary words for story are displayed

**Position of desks**- direction in which desks face

- BC- book club
- Type of book club work- work required by teachers for book report
- SFA signs- signs provided by SFA which are displayed
- Team signs and #'s- location and number of team signs
- Starred words and Def./Color- medium and color of selected words on which students will be tested and their definitions
- MS/Medium/Color- medium and color of meaningful sentences

**Bloom's signs**- # of Bloom's taxonomy signs displayed in classroom

| HM= handmade by teachers | N= no |
| PP= preprinted | Y= yes |
| FB= facing backward | W= wall |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>facing forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>oral book report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def.</td>
<td>definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>bulletin board</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER SIX
FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

An exploratory cross-case analysis was used to examine the variances within SFA among the seven teachers observed as they implemented the Success for All reading program. Not only were observations made in classes with significant growth in students' reading, but observations were made in classrooms with little or no significant growth in reading. In addition, observations were conducted in classrooms with unknown growth, and the observations provided insights into commonalities among the classrooms with and without growth.

While interviewing teachers and making observations in classrooms with and without growth, observations were conducted in three different schools and two school districts. During the study, the following questions guided the inquiry of this study:

a) To what extent do the teachers follow the "prescribed teaching methods" required by the Success for All program?

b) What are the attitudes and beliefs of the teachers toward the implementation of the Success for All program?

c) How do the teachers perceive themselves as teachers when utilizing the Success for All program?

d) What components of balanced reading instruction are implemented within the Success for All program?
Findings

Teachers implement reading programs daily in classrooms throughout Louisiana. Approximately sixty schools are implementing the Success for All reading program. Having chosen the SFA program, the school districts expected the program to be implemented adhering to SFA guidelines. And, within the three schools included in this study, it was; however, the program was implemented based on the teachers' interpretations of how the implementation should occur. As addressed in Chapter Four, there are certain criteria provided by the SFA Foundation which indicate to the teachers whether they are implementing the program in an appropriate way.

Question A

To what extent do the teachers follow the "prescribed teaching methods" required by the Success for All program?

By utilizing the criteria provided by SFA to determine exactly what the "prescribed teaching methods" were, the observations indicated that the teachers implemented the "Listening Comprehension" and "Reading Together" portions of the program on a daily basis although the components and component times for each varied widely as illustrated in the various componential analyses in Chapter Five (See figures 5.3.1-5.3.5).

Listening Comprehension

There were variances in time prescribed by SFA for the listening comprehension portion of the lessons. The LC portion should have lasted twenty minutes and been comprised of questions that were prepared in advance and correlated with the different levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. There
was only one instance in which the questions had been prepared in advance of the lesson. The teachers stated that they created them "off the tops of their heads" as they taught the lesson. For each listening comprehension session, the students were seated close to the teacher, but they were seated in various arrangements: some in a large group with no pairing and some in a large group with pairs. Teaching objectives were, for the most part, identified and connections were made between the listening comprehension, story, and reading comprehension skills. All of the teachers utilized graphic organizers, such as webbing, in their lessons, though not on a daily basis.

Only certain teachers utilized the think, pair, share technique. In those instances, the students had been seated so they could pair with one another even if they were seated in a large group. The "turn to your partner" was used so infrequently, it was never determined to be a major component by the observers.

Picture books, biographies, chapter books, and poetry were read by various teachers at various times with the second grade teachers tending to read more "picture books" and the third grade teachers reading more chapter books.

**Teaching Group**

In determining the extent of the teachers' adherence on day one to the prescribed methods, the teachers all used prediction. All of the teachers modeled the pronunciation of the vocabulary words and used the strategies for word identification when needed in the vocabulary portion of the lessons.
The definitions for the starred words were read by the teacher and students alike as were the teachers' examples of meaningful sentences. The teachers also varied in their instruction and modeling of the meaningful sentences. Two of the teachers would place the words "when," "where," or the letters "CC," above some of the words in the meaningful sentences in order to facilitate the students' understanding of the process of writing the sentences. However, the SFA Teacher's Manual states that the length of vocabulary activities should be from 10 to 15 minutes on day one (Madden, et al., 1997, p. 22). Actual time for completion of the vocabulary/definitions/meaningful sentence activities on day one ranged from 5-20 minutes.

Two minute edits, also considered to be a teaching group activity, varied immensely as noted in figure 5.4.1 in Chapter Five. Although a two-minute edit is required each day according to SFA, the teachers varied in their implementation of this activity. Each teacher omitted at least one two-minute during the extent of the observations, and one teacher omitted all but one edit. Criteria for the two minute edit includes preparing the two-minute edit in advance according to the SFA Participant's Training Book (p. 69). Although most of the two-minute edits were prepared in advance, two of the teachers wrote their sentences to be corrected on the board at the time of the edit.

The edits also varied greatly in their composition including number of sentences, use of items other than a sentence, number of errors, and manner in which the sentences were corrected. The manner of correction included
whether answers were required of individual students or teams as well as whether proofreading marks were utilized.

During story discussion, most of the time is spent on Treasure Hunt questions to enable the students to pass the story test later in the week, rather than higher level questioning as mandated by SFA.

**Team Practice**

During days one, all of the teachers and on day two, 6 of the 7 teachers had the students read silently with the time ranging from 0-10 minutes. The students would then partner read with the time varying from 0-15 minutes. While partner reading, the teachers varied in their placement of the students. Some teachers allowed students to sit in various areas around the classrooms, and other teachers had their students sit at their desks with their chairs turned in opposite directions (partner position). Although the teachers did circulate through the classroom as the students completed activities during team practice, the teachers frequently had to prompt students repeatedly in order to have students remain on task.

When composing meaningful sentences on days two and three, the students spent from 0-27 minutes actually composing meaningful sentences (only one teacher omitted meaningful sentence composition on day three), although the teachers continued to model meaningful sentences on those days. The teachers varied in their activities incorporating the meaningful sentences. Five of the teachers required the students to write the sentences on lined paper, one teacher required the sentences to be written on half lined and half unlined
paper, and one teacher asked the students to write and illustrate the sentences on unlined paper. All seven teachers required the starred words to be webbed first. The teachers also varied in the number of sentences that constituted the activity. Some teachers required three sentences and some required up to five sentences. Although the meaningful sentences are peer edited and revised, only a minute amount of peer interaction relating to this activity occurred during the observations. The teachers experienced great difficulty with many students being unable to complete this activity as designed. The meaningful sentences test illustrated more variances since one teacher required one sentence, one teacher required two sentences, three teachers required three sentences, one teacher required four sentences, and one teacher required five sentences to be written.

Although Words Out Loud (WOL) practice is scheduled for day two in the manual (SFA Teacher's Manual, p. 142), only two of the teachers had the students practice on day two. All the teachers had the students practice the WOL on day three; however, on day three, two of the seven teachers observed did not begin administering the WOL test as prescribed by SFA.

The Assignment Record Form, also known as the ARF sheet, was utilized by some of the teachers, but not by others on a continuous basis. Two of the teachers constantly directed the students to sign their ARF sheets. One teacher had to caution her students, however, not to simply sign down the sheet before the activities were completed.
On day three, Adventures in Writing began with more variances noted. The teachers spent from 1-15 minutes in previewing and/or modeling the activity. On day four, two of the teachers included 3-8 more minutes previewing and/or modeling Adventures in Writing. The students then spent 0-15 minutes on day three and 0-37 minutes on day four in composing their Adventures in Writing. On day five, Adventures in Writing took an additional 0-15 minutes with one teacher combining Adventures in Writing with the meaningful sentence test and checkout and using a total of 48 minutes. The teachers believed that there was not enough time for editing. They were not able to have the students peer edit much of the time. As in the writing of the meaningful sentences, the Adventures in Writing posed problems for student generated compositions.

On day four, story retell took from 0-13 minutes, with only one teacher failing to provide the activity. Day four was used for the story test with teachers providing variances in their times and methods of testing. Time ranged from 11-32 minutes, but the teacher who used 32 minutes administered the Words Out Loud test at that time.

Day five seemed to be used as a "wrap-up" time as teachers worked feverishly to finish the meaningful sentence tests, Adventures in Writing, and to administer the RC test. The testing procedures also provided variances as observations were made of students placing test walls on their desks or getting in "test formation."
Additional Skills/Book Club/SSR

The additional skills/book club/SSR activities were relegated to time that might be left over after everything else was completed. On day one, four of the seven teachers had an additional activity: two teachers had students present book reviews, and two of the teachers taught an additional skill. On day two, five of the teachers either taught an additional skill, or provided time for book clubs or SSR. On day three, there were four activities, day four provided for three activities, and day five provided three additional activities.

Read and Respond

Although Read and Respond is another component which the students complete at home, very few students completed the work. Only three of the teachers checked for homework in their SFA classrooms; three of the teachers stated they check homework in their homeroom classes rather than the SFA reading classrooms.

Implementation

The teachers' interpretations of SFA implementation clearly emerged as they implemented the SFA program. The SFA Foundation implementation staff have specific criteria by which to assess the teachers' implementation of the program by: the "Reading Wings Self-Assessment Checklist," as well as the "Reading Wings" checklist found in the Success for All: Roots and Wings, Reading Wings Participant's Training Book (1997, 139-142, 146) utilized by the Success for All facilitator. The books were provided to each teacher. However, none of the teachers referred back to the implementation checklist.
The data analysis helped to determine whether their implementations correlated with the criteria.

**Question B**

What are the attitudes and beliefs of the teachers toward the implementation of the *Success for All* reading program?

The teachers wanted to provide effective reading instruction which would lead to success for the students; however, they did not like the “dog and pony show,” as characterized by one teacher. Since *Success for All* is also openly called “Stress for All” at two of the schools, there was an undercurrent of stress associated with the implementation of the program.

Many of the teachers complained of the inordinate amount of paperwork that had to be completed on a weekly basis and the lack of time available for this component. One teacher simply stated, “I don’t do half of it (paperwork) because I think it’s a waste of time.” Moreover, the lack of time caused a problem in other teaching areas as the teachers indicated they no longer had time to sufficiently prepare for other subjects. Time seemed to be a major factor in their lack of satisfaction with the program.

Another belief that surfaced was the belief that SFA benefited the average and above average students. The teachers expressed the conviction that the independent learner was the one who could profit most from this program, since the students complete so many activities on their own. The teachers had multiple problems in trying to ensure the completion of the meaningful sentences and Adventures in Writing. The independent learner
could accomplish these on his own. Even two of the facilitators were in agreement that the average and above average students would benefit. However, the three principals, who had never taught a complete SFA lesson, felt the program would benefit the below average child (See figure 5.4.3).

Six of the thirteen respondents (including the three principals and SFA facilitators) believed the average and above average students would benefit from this program and not the below average; however, this program is intended for those who are disadvantaged and unsuccessful, not the students who are already experiencing success. As noted in Chapter Five, one teacher commented, “This program is for the independent learner,” and another commented, “I like it for my own child because she is not a challenged reader.”

Yet another belief that emerged was the conviction that the grades were inflated and, as one teacher stated, “bogus.” The teachers felt the grades did not reflect what the students were able to accomplish on their own. Their belief that there was too much teacher prompting repeatedly surfaced. Ten of the thirteen respondents stated the grades were inflated (See figure 5.4.5).

The story test is an example of inflated grades; the story test is taken, the teacher examines it, and, the next day, has the student correct it. Still another example is the meaningful sentence test; one teacher had her students simply copy already composed meaningful sentences for the meaningful sentence test instead of creating new sentences. Although points are removed for prompting, no grade below 50 is to be given. The teachers believed the SFA story tests and RC tests did not match the unit tests and end-of-book tests.
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provided by the basal textbook series. One teacher commented, "I know I can prompt. Points off are a call on the teacher!" The teacher was referring to the necessity of prompting; teachers are expected and required to prompt. If they do not prompt and the students lose points, the low scores reflect poorly on the teachers.

**Question C**

How do the teachers perceive themselves as teachers when utilizing the *Success for All* program?

When implementing the SFA program, the teachers believed they had lost the ability to teach as they deemed appropriate according to their philosophy of teaching. They reported that they had lost their creativity and autonomy. Many of the teachers preferred to teach using thematic units, although they believed this was an impossibility because of SFA implementation.

As noted in the variances, the teachers adapted the program to fit their interpretations of what constituted appropriate reading instruction. They made the program fit their philosophies as much as possible. The teachers stated that since they did not teach reading to their own homeroom classes, they could "not integrate all the skills like reading, spelling, phonics, and language." Another stated, "On Friday we had done the story and they (the students) would choose one of the stories out of all five. Then they would develop the two skills they had been doing. They would act it out or make a presentation. Now we don't have time." Another teacher discussed the need to be much more
creative, but as she stated, "If you're teaching main idea and you want to make spiders and publish in the hallway—To do that with SFA—2 or 3 weeks—to get extra things done."

As one of the teachers remarked, "You have to be allowed to do your own procedures or it stumps your teaching growth and their learning. That's why we have a lot of bad problems." Another teacher commented, "There's not enough fun in the reading. I like the structure, but it leaves out major skills so when I have an opportunity to integrate whatever skill I can, I do. I want to demand a little more than what the program demands."

**Question D**

What components of balanced reading instruction are implemented within the *Success for All* program?

Many of the components of balanced reading were included (See figure 5.4.4), such as reading aloud to students, paired reading, guided reading, independent reading, language exploration, incorporation of writing and reading, and a variety of literature. The teachers read aloud to the students during LC on a daily basis and incorporated a variety of books in the process as the teachers read to the students from various books. The students incorporated paired reading as they partner read and answered questions. Teachers guided the students' reading during the implementation of SFA by giving the students purposes to read, and independent reading occurred during silent reading time. Language exploration was employed during the meaningful sentence construction, as was the integration of writing and reading. Two
components, however, were omitted from the program, oral reading and explicit phonics instruction.

As noted in Chapter Five, the Louisiana K-3 Initiative stresses the need for students in grades K-3 to read orally so the words can be monitored and also stresses the need for explicit phonics instruction. Although the oral component does exist within the SFA implementation, it exists within the framework of partner reading only. The teacher never heard the students read the basal story unless the component was added on an individual basis. At least two of the teachers were observed adding the components. As observations were conducted, a search was made of students reading orally to someone other than a student's partner, especially the teacher, and, as one teacher stated, "Half the time of partner reading, not doing it—other half, skip words if they don't know instead of following the rules." As reported in Chapter Five of this dissertation, Patton also agrees that omissions play an important role in determining the totality of a program. The SFA program allows for an additional component called "Chiming In," (Madden, et al., 1997, p.226), but this is optional and none of the teachers were observed implementing this component.

The other omission, explicit phonics instruction, is a crucial element in balanced reading instruction as suggested in Chapter Two. Although phonics instruction is an important element in the "Roots" portion of the SFA program, phonics is not taught as a skill in the "Wings" portion of the SFA program. One teacher commented, "They teach phonics in the 'Roots' program and I don't
know how they taught it so I can't refer back." Another teacher felt that the lack of phonics instruction was a weakness in the SFA program; if the students did not receive phonics training in "Roots," they did not get it in "Wings." The lack of these two components caused great concern to the teachers involved in this study and was believed by the teachers to be one of the reasons for the lack of success on the part of the disadvantaged and unsuccessful readers.

This study extended the existing literature by providing an unbiased perspective of the implementation of the SFA program conducted by an outside observer in three schools containing economically disadvantaged students. The following questions were explored: (a) To what extent do the teachers follow the "prescribed teaching methods" required by Success for All program? (b) What are the attitudes and beliefs of the teachers toward the implementation of the Success for All reading program? (c) How do the teachers perceive themselves as teachers when utilizing the Success for All program? (d) What components of balanced reading instruction are implemented within the Success for All program? The attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, and instructional methods of the teachers as they implemented the SFA program were observed. Both principals and SFA facilitators were included in the study since they were responsible for supervising the three school sites observed. A related purpose of this study was to examine the components of a balanced reading perspective contained within the Success for All reading program. It also addressed the possibilities as well as the
limitations of the Success for All reading program as it was implemented within two Louisiana school districts and three schools.

**Implications for Further Study**

During the analysis of the data, the one consistency that was evident was the creation of more questions from each question answered. As the analyses increased in number, so did additional issues. Although the study was exploratory and naturalistic in its inquiry, quantitative issues continued to manifest themselves as questions were answered and data was sorted, classified, and analyzed. Frequent moves was an issue which was believed to cause behavior improvement in one classroom and behavior deterioration in another (See figure 5.4.6). Several of the teachers also believed that the inclusion of older students in the SFA reading classrooms caused behavioral problems. Insights into the reasons behind these issues would be beneficial to the program (See figure 5.4.7). A possible cause/effect relationship could be addressed more definitively through a quantitative study.

One issue that could be explored is the compatibility of a program to an area. Area specific or cultural issues that would result in success or failure of the SFA program could be examined.

Since the majority of the respondents felt the grades were inflated (See figure 5.4.5), grading procedures could be scrutinized to determine if a realistic reflection of the students' abilities within the implementation of the SFA program was discerned. The teachers believed there were too many chances for the students to succeed through prompting and that every child does indeed
succeed, but only on paper and at the expense of a true realistic assessment of a student’s abilities.

Ways in which the teachers could become more autonomous and creative in their own classrooms, maintain ownership of their classrooms, and still adhere to the structure of a program such as SFA could be explored. A qualitative study could be conducted examining the incorporation of thematic units and other teaching methods into the SFA instructional framework.

During the interviews, as well as during the compiling and categorizing of the data, the principals’ views differed dramatically from those of the teachers and facilitators. The administrators of the schools were asked if they had taught any SFA lessons (See figure 6.1). An exploratory study could be conducted to ascertain the benefits for the teachers and the schools if the principals had successful experience as SFA teachers. The study could focus on the schoolwide and classroom SFA implementation before and after the principals were furnished with the teaching time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>SFA lessons or days taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P #1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #2</td>
<td>Portion-<em>Roots</em> lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P #3</td>
<td>Portion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1-SFA lessons taught by principals

Limitations

The teachers observed in this study implemented the program as they deemed appropriate, and their instructional techniques, attitudes, and beliefs were described in this research design. However, this study may or may not be representative of that found in other classes with similar characteristics. These
are typical procedures followed by the teachers only in these particular \textit{Success for All} reading program classrooms, schools and districts. Although results have been determined based on the observations made in these classrooms, it is not known if the same results would be transferrable to different classrooms, schools, and/or districts.

Since the intent of this study was to determine the impact of the variances of the implementation of the \textit{Success for All} reading program and was based on observations of teachers, the terms and definitions have reflected the teachers' use of terminology within the classroom and do not necessarily reflect exact SFA definitions or terminology. Furthermore, the study does not assume that the titles and descriptions of activities necessarily reflect the daily SFA activities as mandated by the program but are the observed activities as implemented within these seven classrooms.

Since the length of data collection extended over three months, more data could be gathered and more pertinent information gained if the study were begun at the beginning of the school year. A study of greater duration could possibly reveal transformations or adaptations to the implementation of the program that would be more definitive.

\textbf{Epilogue}

Although this study revealed several positive influences of the \textit{Success for All} reading program, there were indications of demoralization among the teachers' ranks. There was some sense of frustration as the teachers discussed the difficulty of teaching and/or grading in a system that frequently
conflicted with their personal philosophies of teaching. Prior to SFA implementation, the teachers believed that they knew what the students needed and customized their teaching accordingly. This decision making process is critical to effective instruction. Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman (1996, p. 704) postulated that: “In the sphere of the classroom, curriculum implementation and change occurs as teachers make decisions.”

Although the teachers deemed teaching and reteaching of skills essential elements of reading instruction and grades to be reflectors of students’ abilities, there was little time to teach many additional skills or reteach skills the students had missed. The teachers believed that the grades were inflated, but were unable to instigate any changes. As one teacher stated in discussing the SFA grading system, “It’s not valid to what they know… I expected the students to use mechanics, grammar. All the people from the ‘Great Cult of SFA’ came down and said, ‘You’re grading too hard.’” The teachers lacked autonomy in their classrooms.

However, despite the necessity of following the prescribed structure of the SFA program, the teachers’ personalities and teaching styles were prominent as they made their own unique adaptations to the program. “Special strategies can only succeed if they are implemented well,” (Stringfield, et al., 1997, p. 11-8). But was the program implemented well since variances were abundant throughout the observations of the SFA lessons; times, activities, and methods varied greatly and reflected each of the teachers’ teaching styles? The mandated two-minute edit varied from 2-8 minutes, and each teacher
omitted it at least once during the observations. Although the teachers were required to teach within the parameters of the SFA program, they adapted the program to fit their interpretations. There was significant difference between the prescribed implementation and the actual implementation as well as significant differences among the teachers' adaptations. Robert Donmoyer (as cited in Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, and Taubman, 1996, p. 56) states,

"why scholars continue to complain that most curriculum theory and research are unusable; why those who look 'behind the classroom door discover that even when a curriculum theory has been adopted and translated into official policy it normally is not implemented by classroom teachers, and why even when teachers sincerely espouse a particular curriculum theory, the gap between their espoused theory and their theory-in-use often remains wide."

In this study, the research questions that were explored and the data gathered provided a detailed examination of the implementation of the SFA reading program within seven classrooms, three schools and two school districts. Many questions were answered, but they only produced more questions that could be explored. Tyack and Cuban (1995) state, "One place to start is to ask teachers what bothers them the most and to begin reforms there," (p. 139).
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**APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM IRB OVERSIGHT FOR STUDIES CONDUCTED IN EDUCATIONAL SETTING LSU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This study will be conducted in an established or commonly accepted educational setting (schools, universities, summer programs, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This study will involve children under the age of 18.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This study will involve educational practices such as instructional strategies or comparison among educational techniques, curricula, or classroom management strategies.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. This study will involve educational content (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement).</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. This study will use data, documents, or records that existed prior to the study.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This study will use surveys or interviews concerning content that is not related to instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. This study will involve procedures other than those described in numbers 3, 4, 5, or 6. If yes, describe:</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. This study will deal with sensitive aspects of subjects' and/or subjects' families' lives, such as sexual behavior or use of alcohol or other drugs.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Data will be reported so that the subjects cannot be identified by anyone other than the researcher.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Informed consent of subject (18 and older) and/or of the parent/guardian of minor children, will be obtained.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Assent of minors (under age 18) will be obtained. (Answer if #2 above is YES)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Approval for this study will be obtained from the appropriate authority in the educational setting.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attach an abstract of the study and a copy of the consent form(s) to be used. If your answer(s) to numbers 6 and/or 7 above are YES, attach a copy of any surveys, interview protocols, or other procedures to be used.
ASSURANCES

As the principal investigator for the proposed research study, I assure that the following conditions will be met:

1. The human subjects are volunteers.
2. Subjects know that they have the freedom to withdraw at any time.
3. The subjects are guaranteed confidentiality.
4. The subjects will be informed beforehand as to the nature of their activity.
5. The data collected will not be used for any purpose not approved by the subjects.
6. The data collected will not be disclosed to persons other than those involved in the research and authorized by the subject.
7. All questions will be answered to the satisfaction of the subjects.
8. Volunteers will consent by signature if over the age of 18.
9. If minors are to participate in this research, valid consent will be obtained beforehand from parents or guardians.
10. The procedures detailed above will be reviewed by the Office of the Dean and the University's Human Subject Committee in writing of any significant changes in the procedures detailed above.

Principal Investigator Statement:
I have read and agree to abide by the standards of the Belmont Report and the Louisiana State University policy on the use of human subjects. I will advise the Office of the Dean and the University's Human Subject Committee in writing of any significant changes in the procedures detailed above.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 2/17/00

Faculty Supervisor Statement (for student research projects):
I have read and agree to abide by the standards of the Belmont Report and the Louisiana State University policy on the use of human subjects. I will supervise the conduct of the proposed project in accordance with federal guidelines for Human Protection. I will advise the Office of the Dean and the University's Human Subject Committee in writing of any significant changes in the procedures detailed above.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 2/17/00

Reviewer recommendation:

☒ exemption from IRB oversight. (File this signed application in the Dean’s Office.)

☒ expedited review for minimal risk protocol. (Follow IRB regulations and submit 1 copies to the Dean's Office.)

☒ full review. (Follow IRB regulations and submit 12 copies to the Dean's Office.)

Name of Authorized Reviewer (Print): [Name]
Signature: [Signature]
Date: 3/1/2000
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March 24, 2000

Parish School Board

Louisiana 70508

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to request permission to conduct a study at ____________________ Elementary. I am an educator, but at the present time I am on sabbatical leave in order to complete my residency requirement for my Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction from Louisiana State University. I have discussed the matter with ____________________, the principal, and he/she has given her permission for me to conduct the study.

Enclosed you will find an abstract of the study as well as copies of permission letters to be sent to the principals, teachers, and families (if needed). I have also included copies of surveys and interview guides (subject to change as the study evolves).

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you. If you need to speak with me, I can be reached at __________ (home), __________ (digital phone), or __________ (leave a message with the staff at LSU).

Sincerely,

Karen Guillot
Memo To: Karon Guillot, Graduate Student  
Louisiana State University  
From:  
Subject: Permission to Conduct Research  

February 28, 2000  

Your request to conduct research at [redacted] is approved. We appreciate your interest in the Success for All program that is in place there and look forward to your research findings.

Please be aware that there should be no disruption of testing during the month of [redacted]. We appreciate your inclusion of parent permission letters and your respect for the anonymity of participants in your study. Refer all questions about campus protocol to the principal.

Thank you for your interest in our school system.

Cc: [redacted]
To whom it may concern:

I am writing to request permission to conduct a study at... I am an educator, but at the present time I am on sabbatical leave in order to complete my residency requirement for my Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction from Louisiana State University. The principal has given her permission for my study to be conducted; therefore, I am enclosing a written proposal of the study. Thank you for consideration of my proposal. I look forward to hearing from you. If you need to speak with me, I can be reached at... (home);... (digital phone);... (leave a message with the staff at LSU).

Sincerely,

Karen Guillot

Approved
To whom it may concern,

I am writing to request permission to conduct a study at [redacted] in addition to my study being conducted at [redacted], which has already been approved by your office. I have discussed the matter with [redacted] the principal, and she has given her permission for me to conduct the study. Thank you for consideration of my addition to the study. I look forward to hearing from you. If you need to speak with me, I can be reached at [redacted] or [redacted]. I have a message with the staff at [redacted].

Sincerely,

Karen Guillot

[Signature]
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PRINCIPAL CONSENT FORM

Dear Principal,

I am a student at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana studying for a Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction. As part of the requirements for my degree, I would appreciate the opportunity to conduct research at your school. Your school was chosen since it is participating in the Success for All reading program and teaches economically disadvantaged students.

I will be studying the ways in which your teachers implement the Success for All reading program. To obtain information about the way in which reading is taught at your school, I will take notes and photographs while I observe in two of your fourth grade classrooms. I will also interview you, the teachers, and the students as well as ask each of you to complete surveys. I will collect samples of the students' work and will analyze documents which existed prior to my study.

All administrative staff, teachers, students, and any other personnel participating in the study will remain anonymous and any information about you, the teachers, the students, as well as their work will remain confidential. I will need your permission in order to study the two fourth grade classrooms at your school as the students learn to become better readers. Please complete the form and return it to me as soon as possible.

Please call me at [number] or Dr. Earl Cheek at Louisiana State University at [number] if you have any questions. I appreciate this opportunity to work with you, your teachers, and your students.

Sincerely,

Karen Guillot

I, [principal's name], agree for my school to be the site for Mrs. Guillot's study and for its teachers and students to participate in the study. I understand she will observe and talk with the teachers, students, and me; collect work samples from the students; ask the teachers, students, and me to complete surveys; audiotape; take photographs; and write a report on her findings. I understand my identity as well as those of my teachers and students will remain anonymous.

Principal's Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________

February 28, 2000
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February 28, 2000

Dear SFA Facilitator,

I am a student at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, studying for a Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction. As part of the requirements for my degree, I will be conducting research at your school. The school board as well as your principal has given me permission to conduct my study at your school.

I will be studying the ways in which the Success for All reading program is implemented. To obtain information about the way in which reading is taught at your school, I will interview you as well as the participating teachers and principals.

All teachers, students, and any other personnel participating in the study will remain anonymous and any information about you will remain confidential. I will need your permission for audiotaped, oral interviews, as well as questionnaires in order to study the implementation of Success for All as students learn to become better readers. Please complete the form and return it to me tomorrow.

Please call me at ____ or Dr. Earl Cheek at Louisiana State University at ____ if you have any questions. I appreciate this opportunity to work with you.

Sincerely,

Karen Guillot

I __________________ agree to participate in Ms. Guillot's study. I understand she will audiotape and take notes as I am interviewed and write a report on her findings. I understand my identity will remain anonymous.

SFA Facilitator Signature ______________ Date ______________
APPENDIX F
TEACHER CONSENT FORM

February 28, 2000

Dear Teacher,

I am a student at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, studying for a Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction. As part of the requirements for my degree, I will be conducting research in your classroom. Your classroom was chosen since it is a second-grade classroom utilizing the Success for All reading program. The school board as well as your principal has given me permission to conduct my study at your school.

I will be studying the ways in which you implement the Success for All reading program. To obtain information about the way in which reading is taught at your school, I will take notes and photographs of work samples, bulletin boards, charts, etc., as I observe in your classroom. I will also interview you as well as the students. Ask you and the students to complete surveys, and look at the work the students do in class.

All teachers, students, and any other personnel participating in the study will remain anonymous and any information about you, the students, and your work will remain confidential. I will need your permission in order to study your classroom as your students learn to become better readers. Please complete the form and return it to me tomorrow.

Please call me at [redacted] or Dr. Earl Cheek at Louisiana State University at [redacted] if you have any questions. I appreciate this opportunity to work with you.

Karen Guillot

[Teacher's signature]

[Date]

I agree to participate in Ms. Guillot's study. I understand she will observe and talk with my students and me collect work samples, ask my students and me to complete surveys, take photographs, and write a report on her findings. I understand my identity as well as those of my students will remain anonymous.

[Teacher's signature]

[Date]
Interview Guide for Principals

1. If I had been in your school before the implementation of Success for All, what would I have seen in the classrooms concerning reading instruction?

2. What do you think about the Success for All program?

3. What are the components of Success for All incorporated within your school?

4. To what extent do your teachers follow the prescribed methods of Success for All?

5. How do you perceive the teachers' perceptions of themselves as reading teachers?

6. To what extent has the Success for All program impacted the students' perceptions of themselves as readers?

7. What does the implementation staff from Johns Hopkins University ask or look for when they evaluate your progress in the Success for All program?

8. To what extent do the results of the Success for All program justify the costs?

9. What would you like to see happen as far as reading instruction is concerned at your school?

10. What aspects, if any, would you like to see changed?

11. To what extent do you feel confident about your teachers' abilities to provide appropriate reading instruction?

12. What constitutes your educational background? Your teaching and/or administrative experience?

13. What are your plans for the future?
Interview Guide for Teachers

1. If I had been in your classroom before the implementation of Success for All, what would I have seen concerning the reading instruction in your classroom?

2. If I followed you through a typical day, what would I have seen you doing concerning the integration of reading across the curriculum?

3. What do you think about the Success for All program?

4. What are all the components of Success for All incorporated within your school?

5. What are the rules and regulations of the Success for All program as you see them?

6. To what extent do you think you follow the prescribed teaching methods for Success for All?

7. To what extent do you think the students are happy with the reading program?

8. What emotions do you think constitute the students' perceptions of themselves as readers?

9. To what extent does the academic or social behavior change before, during, and after reading instruction each day?

10. What does the implementation staff from Johns Hopkins University ask or look for when they evaluate your progress in the Success for All program?

11. To what extent do the results of the program justify the costs?

12. If I followed you tomorrow throughout the day, what would I see you doing concerning the integration of reading across the curriculum?

13. What would you like to see happen as far as reading instruction is concerned at your school?

14. What aspects, if any, would you like to see changed?

15. To what extent have you incorporated the Balanced Reading Approach into your teaching?

16. To what extent have you thought about teaching at a different grade level?
17. To what extent do you feel confident about your ability to provide appropriate reading instruction for your students?

18. What constitutes your educational background? Your teaching experience?

19. What are your plans for the future?
APPENDIX H
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRES

School___________________________________________ Principal __________

Phone number if I may contact you:______________________________________________

Gender: 1 Male  2 Female

Race: 1 African-American  2 Caucasian  3 Other_____________________________________

Total # of years teaching experience, including this year_____________________

Total # of years teaching SFA_________________________________________________

Other reading instruction experience___________________________________________

Highest degree earned:

1. B.S., B.A
2. M.E.D., M.S.
3. Ed.S.
4. Ed.D., Ph.D.

Areas of certification:

1. Elementary
2. Elementary and Early Childhood
3. Elementary and Reading Specialist
4. Elementary and Special Education
5. Elementary and Gifted Talented
6. Other_____________________________________________________

Approximate # of college COURSES taken (not hours) in reading____________________

Approximate # of college COURSES taken (not hours) in Special Education_____________

Other specialty reading courses taken outside of college___________________________

Approximate # of hours trained in Success for All_______________________________

Approximate # of hours spent in observation of other teachers implementing Success for All____________________

What was your position before becoming principal?________________________________

Grades taught at your school:___________________________________________________

Please total the amount of time designated for teaching reading and language arts each day:

________ total MINUTES for Reading Instruction

________ total MINUTES for Language Arts instruction
School ___________________________ SFA facilitator ___________________ 

Phone number (if I may contact you) __________________________________________

Gender: 1. Male 2. Female


Total # of years teaching experience, including this year ________________

Total # of years teaching SFA ____________________________

Other reading instruction experience __________________________________________

Highest degree earned:

1. B.S., B.A
2. M.Ed., M.S.
3. Ed.S.
4. Ed.D./Ph.D.

Areas of certification:

1. Elementary
2. Elementary and Early Childhood
3. Elementary and Reading Specialist
4. Elementary and Special Education
5. Elementary and Gifted/Talented
6. Other ________________________________

Approximate # of college COURSES taken (not hours) in reading ______________

Approximate # of college COURSES taken (not hours) in Special Education __________

Other specialty reading courses taken outside of college _________________________

Approximate # of hours trained in Success for All ______________

Approximate # of hours spent in observation of other teachers implementing Success for All __________

What was your position before becoming the SFA facilitator? __________________________

Do you have any duties other than SFA facilitator? _________________________________

Grades taught at your school: ________________________________________________

Please total the amount of time designated for teaching reading and language arts each day: __________

total MINUTES for Reading instruction
__________________________________________ total MINUTES for Language Arts instruction
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School____________________________ Teacher __________________________

Phone number (if I may contact you) _____________________________________

Gender: 1. Male 2. Female


Total = of years teaching experience, including this year ______________

Grade you are teaching this year __________________________

Total = of years teaching this grade __________________________

Total = of years teaching SFA ______________________________________

Other reading instruction experience ________________________________________

Highest degree earned:

1. B.S., B.A.
2. M.Ed./M.S.
3. Ed.S.
4. Ed.D./Ph.D.

Areas of certification:

1. Elementary
2. Elementary and Early Childhood
3. Elementary and Reading Specialist
4. Elementary and Special Education
5. Elementary and Gifted/Talented
6. Other ________________________________

Approximate = of college COURSES taken (not hours) in reading ___________

Approximate = of college COURSES taken (not hours) in Special Education ___________

Other specialty reading courses taken outside of college __________________________

Approximate = of hours trained in Success for All __________________________

Approximate = of hours spent in observation of other teachers implementing Success for All ___________

Number of students in your reading classroom __________________________

Number of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch program in your reading class ___________

Number of students in your reading classroom in the:

1. 1st grade ______________
2. 2nd grade ______________
3. 3rd grade ______________
4. 4th grade ______________
5. 5th grade ______________
6. Special Ed. ______________

Grades taught at your school: ________________________________________________

Please total the amount of time designated for teaching reading and language arts each day:

__________________ total MINUTES for Reading instruction
__________________ total MINUTES for Language Arts instruction

If possible describe the total minutes in the previous question by listing the number of minutes per day
devoted to each of the following:

_____ minutes per day on reading instruction/activities
_____ minutes per day on writing/spelling instruction/activities
_____ minutes per day on oral language instruction/activities
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For the following questions, please circle ONE number that best describes your classroom instruction outside of SFA. Feel free to add explanatory comments, if desired.

### A. Grouping strategies
- **Approximately equal amounts of whole group and small group instruction**
- **Primarily small group instruction**

### B. Errors
- **During oral reading, errors are rarely corrected**
- **During oral reading, errors are sometimes corrected**
- **During oral reading, errors are usually corrected**

### C. Literature
- **Basics used extensively in other subject areas**
- **Combination of basics and literature used in other subject areas**
- **Literature used extensively in other subject areas**

### D. Cooperative grouping
- **Students sometimes work in cooperative groups**
- **Students do not work in cooperative groups**

### E. Critical thinking
- **Critical thinking questions are asked frequently in other subject areas**
- **Critical thinking questions are asked sometimes in other subject areas**
- **Critical thinking questions are not asked in other subject areas**

### F. Student learning
- **Mixture of student centered and teacher directed learning**
- **Teacher directed learning**

### G. Technology (computers, overhead projectors, televisions, VCR's, etc.)
- **Technology utilized extensively in instruction**
- **Technology somewhat utilized in instruction**
- **Technology not utilized in instruction**

### H. Culture
- **Culture somewhat included in instruction**
- **Culture not included in instruction**

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parental Involvement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parents involved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extensively in my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parents somewhat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involved in my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parents not</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involved in my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outside resources (speakers, field trips)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside resources used</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extensively in instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside resources used</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>somewhat in instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside resources not used</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities chosen by</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities chosen by</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activities chosen by</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior to SFA (all remaining questions pertain to your teaching PRIOR to SFA)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading taught through skills-based approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading taught through combination of skills and literature-based approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading taught through literature-based approach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading taught through combination of other methods for assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M. worksheets used</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extensively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>combination with other methods of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no worksheets used</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N. teacher made or textbook created tests in combination with other methods for assessment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>only portfolio assessment used</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>used for assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****Please list all other methods of assessment utilized within your classroom****
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APPENDIX I
QUESTIONNAIRES FOR PRINCIPALS, FACILITATORS,
AND TEACHERS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS OF SUCCESS FOR ALL

1. How is the LC incorporated into the classrooms?
   a) as prescribed exactly by SFA  
   b) somewhat as prescribed by SFA  
   c) incorporated according to teacher's beliefs  
   d) combination of teacher's ideas along with SFA's ideas  
   e) other

2. How should the teachers have the students sit for LC?
   a) in a large group  
   b) in a group but separated into pairs  
   c) at their individual desks  
   d) other

3. How should the teacher require answers to questions for LC?
   a) ask questions of the whole group and students who wish to answer raise their hands  
   b) use the "think, pair, share" technique with students sitting as partners  
   c) ask team members to discuss the question and determine an answer  
   d) other

4. How should a teacher choose the LC books?
   a) the SFA suggested list of books to use  
   b) a list of your choosing the students' needs  
   c) your own choice based on  
   d) other

5. Has the LC positively impacted the students' learning at your school?
   a) yes  
   b) not sure  
   c) no  

6. If the answer is yes, which areas of reading instruction have been positively affected? Circle all that apply.
   a) oral reading  
   b) writing skills  
   c) listening comprehension  
   d) comprehension strategies (main idea, etc.)  
   e) word identification skills (phonics, etc.)  
   f) cooperative behavior  
   g) other

7. How should the RC component incorporated into each classroom?
   a) exactly as mandated by SFA  
   b) somewhat as mandated by SFA  
   c) combination of your ideas and SFA's ideas  
   d) your own ideas  
   e) other

8. Has the RC component positively impacted the students' learning?
   a) yes  
   b) not sure  
   c) no
9. If your answer is yes, which areas of reading instruction have been positively affected? Circle all that apply.
   a) oral reading          d) comprehension strategies
   b) writing skills        e) word identification skills
   c) listening comprehension f) cooperative behavior
   g) other ____________________________

10. How has the seating arrangement within the classrooms impacted the students' learning?
    a) Positively          c) no impact
    b) Negatively          d) other __________________________

11. How has the seating arrangement impacted the teachers' teaching for the rest of each day?
    a) no impact            c) positive impact
    b) negative impact      d) other ____________________

12. How are the desks placed in your school's classrooms when reading is ready to commence?
    a) desks are left exactly as the "homeroom" students will use them
    b) students take initiative and turn desks around so that the open portion is facing away from the students who will be seated in them
    c) teachers take initiative and ask students to turn desks around so that the open portion is facing away from the students who will be seated in them
    d) other ____________________________

13. How has the partner reading within your school impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
    a) improved cooperative behavior       e) caused no impact
    b) weakened cooperative behavior      f) other ____________________________
    c) improved comprehension strategies  
    d) improved word identification strategies

14. How should partner reading be implemented within your school?
    a) sit at desks, both students facing the same way
    b) sit at desks, one student facing one way, and the other student facing the opposite way (one turns the chair to face the opposite direction from his partner)
    c) sit at areas around the room with both students facing the same way
    d) sit at areas around the room with one student facing one way and the other facing the opposite direction
    e) partnerships of three may also appear
    f) use a combination of sitting around the room and at desks
    g) other ____________________________
15. What are the components of a meaningful sentence as you understand them?
   a) ___________________________________________________
   b) ___________________________________________________
   c) ___________________________________________________
   d) ___________________________________________________
   e) ___________________________________________________

16. How has the teachers' facilitation of the students' development of meaningful sentences impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved comprehension strategies
   b) improved word identification strategies
   c) improved writing skills
   d) caused no impact
   e) other __________________________

17. How should the teachers teach the development of meaningful sentences?
   a) graphic organizers
   b) ___________________________________________________
   c) ___________________________________________________
   d) ___________________________________________________
   e) ___________________________________________________

18. How has the two minute edit utilized within your school impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved proofreading skills
   b) improved writing skills
   c) has caused improvement to be carried over to other writing
   d) caused no impact
   e) other __________________________

19. How often should a teacher utilize the two minute edit?
   a) once a day, during SFA reading time
   b) more than once a day
   c) less than five times but more than three times per week
   d) less than three times per week

20. How have *Success for All* management signals impacted your school? Circle all that apply.
   a) Positively
   b) Negatively
   c) no impact
   d) We use them only during SFA.
   e) We use them throughout the day.
   f) other __________________________

21. To what extent should you incorporate Bloom's taxonomy during LC?
   a) extensively (more than 2 questions from each of the six levels)
   b) substantially (at least one question from each of the six levels)
   c) somewhat (at least one question from three of the six levels)
   d) very little (may include only one or two questions, one or both from the same level)
   e) other __________________________
22. In your opinion, would you characterize yourself as
   a) uncommitted to the program  c) committed to the program
   b) somewhat committed to the program  d) intensely committed to the
   program
   f) other ________________________________

23. In your opinion, would you characterize the teachers at your school as
   a) uncommitted to the program  c) committed to the program
   b) somewhat committed to the program  d) intensely committed to the
   program
   d) other ________________________________

24. How would you characterize your philosophy of reading instruction? Circle all
   that apply
   a) developmentally appropriate
   b) holistic
   c) skills based
   d) language based
   e) balanced between skills based (basal) and language based (whole
      language)
   f) teacher centered
   g) learner centered
   h) co-ownership of classroom by teacher and students
   i) other ________________________________

25. How should grades be determined in each classroom for each of the
   students? Circle all that apply.
   a) SFA grades alone
   b) SFA grades along with skills sheets from basal
   c) SFA grades along with whole language activities (language-based)
   d) Your grades only
   e) Unit tests from basal
   f) End of book tests from basal
   g) Placement tests (if used, please list)_________________________
   h) Other________________________________________________

26. In your opinion, are the grades inflated through any means?
   a) yes  b) not sure  c) no
27. If answer was yes, how are the grades inflated? Circle all that apply.
   a) Grades too subjective
   b) Not enough grades
   c) Too many grades
   d) Questions too easy
   e) Students allowed to correct papers and tests until tests are basically correct
   f) Not enough balance between grades given through SFA means and basal based grades
   g) Other

28. How do most teachers determine the students' grades in their classrooms?
   a) _______________________________________________________
   b) _______________________________________________________
   c) _________________________________________________
   d) _________________________________________________
   e) _______________________________________________________

29. In your opinion, are the students moved according to their needs?
   a) yes  b) not sure  c) no

30. If your answer was yes, what criteria are met by students to move up to the next level? Circle all that apply.
   a) success on SFA tests
   b) success on basal tests
   c) oral reading capability
   d) other

31. If your answer to 29 was no, what are the reasons for the students' movement?

32. How many of the original group of reading students have most of the teachers kept all year?
   a) approximately 25%
   b) approximately 50%
   c) approximately 75%
   d) more than 75%
   e) less than 25%
33. How does the behavior seem affected in each class by students remaining or moving into and out of groups?
   a) when groups remain basically intact (more than 50% for the entire year), behavior improves
   b) when groups remain basically intact, behavior deteriorates
   c) when students move frequently, behavior improves
   d) when students move frequently, behavior deteriorates
   e) other ____________________________

34. How is the behavior of an entire class affected by the inclusion of students of a higher age group in your class with younger students? Circle all that apply.
   a) no impact on students
   b) positive impact on students
   c) negative impact on students
   d) no impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
   e) positive impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
   f) negative impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
   g) other ____________________________

35. How should discipline be handled during the SFA reading block?
   a) ________________________________
   b) ________________________________
   c) ________________________________
   d) ________________________________

36. How should the point system be managed in the classroom? Circle all that apply.
   a) I do not use the point system
   b) I use a card on each table with a clothespin attached to keep track of the points
   c) I give a variety of points for each activity
   d) I give the same number of points for each activity
   e) After points are earned, rewards are given by me
   f) After points are earned, rewards are given by someone else
   g) other ______________________________
37. How efficiently are the students in each classroom able to walk into the classroom, pick up materials, pass out materials, and record grades on team score sheets?
   a) students are able to accomplish all of the tasks with no problem
   b) students are able to accomplish approximately 75% of the tasks with no problems
   c) students are able to accomplish approximately 50% of the tasks with no problems
   d) students are not able to accomplish 25% of the tasks

38. How should the teachers require students to come into their classrooms and prepare to begin the reading lesson?
   a) sit in a group for LC
   b) go to desks and be called in groups to LC
   c) go to desks and be called as a class to LC
   d) stay at desks for LC
   e) other________________________________________

39. Do you require the book clubs to be completed at home or at school?
   a) no, there are not enough materials at home
   b) no, there is not enough help at home
   c) no, there is not enough time at school to complete these activities
   d) yes, students are able to borrow any needed supplies from school
   e) yes, students are able to obtain help at school to complete the activity
   f) other___________________________________________________

40. What materials do your teachers utilize other than those required by SFA?
   a) none
   b) computers
   c) music
   d) other___________________________________________________

41. What plans do the teachers leave in the event a substitute is needed?
   a) complete, extensive plans so the sub will be able to follow the plan exactly
   b) somewhat complete so that the sub will be able to complete the major potions of the program for that day
   c) lesson plans for all subjects so the sub can understand and follow them
   d) other___________________________________________________

42. Who benefits the most from the Success for All program?
   a) below average students
   b) average students
   c) above average students
   d) independent readers
   e) struggling readers
   f) other___________________________________________________
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43. Have you ever taught SFA reading?
   a) yes, a portion of a lesson
   b) yes, an entire lesson. Day ________
   c) no, I have not been trained in SFA
   d) other______________________

   *Please describe your lesson.

Thank you so much for your cooperation.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SFA FACILITATORS OF SUCCESS FOR ALL

1. How is the LC incorporated into the classrooms?
   a) as prescribed exactly by SFA
   b) somewhat as prescribed by SFA
   c) incorporated according to your beliefs
   d) combination of your ideas along with SFA's ideas
   e) other ___________________________________________________

2. How should the teachers have the students sit for LC?
   a) in a large group
   b) in a group but separated into pairs
   c) at their individual desks
   d) other____________________________________________________

3. How should the teacher require answers to questions for LC?
   a) ask questions of the whole group and students who wish to answer raise their hands
   b) use the "think, pair, share" technique with students sitting as partners
   c) ask team members to discuss the question and determine an answer
   d) other____________________________________________________

4. How should a teacher choose the LC books?
   a) the SFA suggested list of books to use
   b) a list of your choosing
   c) your own choice based on the students' needs
   d) other___________________________________________________

5. Has the LC positively impacted the students' learning at your school?
   a) yes
   b) not sure
   c) no

6. If the answer is yes, which areas of reading instruction have been positively affected? Circle all that apply.
   a) oral reading
   b) writing skills
   c) listening comprehension
   d) comprehension strategies (main idea, etc.)
   e) word identification skills (phonics, etc.)
   f) cooperative behavior
   g) other_________________________________________________

7. How should the RC component incorporated into each classroom?
   a) exactly as mandated by SFA
   b) somewhat as mandated by SFA
   c) combination of your ideas and SFA's ideas
   d) your own ideas
   e) other_________________________________________________

8. Has the RC component positively impacted the students' learning?
   a) yes
   b) not sure
   c) no

181
9. If your answer is yes, which areas of reading instruction have been positively affected? Circle all that apply.
   a) oral reading
   b) writing skills
   c) listening comprehension
   d) comprehension strategies
   e) word identification skills
   f) cooperative behavior
   g) other

10. How has the seating arrangement within the classrooms impacted the students' learning?
   a) Positively
   b) Negatively
   c) no impact
   d) other

11. How has the seating arrangement impacted the teachers' teaching for the rest of each day?
   a) no impact
   b) negative impact
   c) positive impact
   d) other

12. How are the desks placed in your school's classrooms when reading is ready to commence?
   a) desks are left exactly as the "homeroom" students will use them
   b) students take initiative and turn desks around so that the open portion is facing away from the students who will be seated in them
   c) teachers take initiative and ask students to turn desks around so that the open portion is facing away from the students who will be seated in them
   d) other

13. How has the partner reading within your school impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved cooperative behavior
   b) weakened cooperative behavior
   c) improved comprehension strategies
   d) improved word identification strategies
   e) caused no impact
   f) other

14. How should partner reading be implemented within your school?
   a) sit at desks, both students facing the same way
   b) sit at desks, one student facing one way, and the other student facing the opposite way (one turns the chair to face the opposite direction from his partner)
   c) sit at areas around the room with both students facing the same way
   d) sit at areas around the room with one student facing one way and the other facing the opposite direction
   e) partnerships of three may also appear
   f) use a combination of sitting around the room and at desks
   g) other
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15. What are the components of a meaningful sentence as you understand them?
   a) ________________________________________________________
   b) ________________________________________________________
   c) ________________________________________________________
   d) ________________________________________________________
   e) ________________________________________________________

16. How has the teachers' facilitation of the students' development of meaningful sentences impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved comprehension strategies
   b) improved word identification strategies
   c) improved writing skills
   d) caused no impact
   e) other______________________________

17. How should the teachers teach the development of meaningful sentences?
   a) graphic organizers
   b) ________________________________________________________
   c) ________________________________________________________
   d) ________________________________________________________
   e) ________________________________________________________

18. How has the two minute edit utilized within your school impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved proofreading skills
   b) improved writing skills
   c) has caused improvement to be carried over to other writing
   d) caused no impact
   e) other______________________________

19. How often should a teacher utilize the two minute edit?
   a) once a day, during SFA reading time
   b) more than once a day
   c) less than five times but more than three times per week
   d) less than three times per week

20. How have Success for All management signals impacted your school? Circle all that apply.
   a) Positively
   b) Negatively
   c) no impact
   d) We use them only during SFA.
   e) We use them throughout the day.
   f) other______________________________

21. To what extent should you incorporate Bloom's taxonomy during LC?
   a) extensively (more than 2 questions from each of the six levels)
   b) substantially (at least one question from each of the six levels)
   c) somewhat (at least one question from three of the six levels)
   d) very little (may include only one or two questions, one or both from the same level)
   e) other______________________________
22. In your opinion, would you characterize yourself as
   a) uncommitted to the program  c) committed to the program
   b) somewhat committed to the program  d) intensely committed to the
      program
   f) other____________________________________________

23. In your opinion, would you characterize the teachers at your school as
   a) uncommitted to the program  c) committed to the program
   b) somewhat committed to the program  d) intensely committed to the
      program
   d) other____________________________________________

24. How would you characterize your philosophy of reading instruction? Circle all
    that apply.
   a) developmentally appropriate
   b) holistic
   c) skills based
   d) language based
   e) balanced between skills based (basal) and language based (whole
      language)
   f) teacher centered
   g) learner centered
   h) co-ownership of classroom by teacher and students
   i) other____________________________________________

25. How should grades be determined in each classroom for each of the
    students? Circle all that apply.
   a) SFA grades alone
   b) SFA grades along with skills sheets from basal
   c) SFA grades along with whole language activities (language-based)
   d) Your grades only
   e) Unit tests from basal
   f) End of book tests from basal
   g) Placement tests (if used, please list)_________________________
   h) Other________________________________________________

26. In your opinion, are the grades inflated through any means?
   a) yes                      b) not sure                    c) no
27. If answer was yes, how are the grades inflated? Circle all that apply.
   a) Grades too subjective
   b) Not enough grades
   c) Too many grades
   d) Questions too easy
   e) Students allowed to correct papers and tests until tests are basically correct
   f) Not enough balance between grades given through SFA means and basal based grades
   g) Other

28. How do most teachers determine the students' grades in their classrooms?
   a)
   b)
   c)
   d)
   e)

29. In your opinion, are the students moved according to their needs?
   a) yes  b) not sure  c) no

30. If your answer was yes, what criteria are met by students to move up to the next level? Circle all that apply.
   a) success on SFA tests
   b) success on basal tests
   c) oral reading capability
   d) other

31. If your answer to 29 was no, what are the reasons for the students' movement?

32. How many of the original group of reading students have most of the teachers kept all year?
   a) approximately 25%
   b) approximately 50%
   c) approximately 75%
   d) more than 75%
   e) less than 25%
33. How does the behavior seem affected in each class by students remaining or moving into and out of groups?
   a) when groups remain basically intact (more than 50% for the entire year), behavior improves
   b) when groups remain basically intact, behavior deteriorates
   c) when students move frequently, behavior improves
   d) when students move frequently, behavior deteriorates
   e) other_________________________________________________

34. How is the behavior of an entire class affected by the inclusion of students of a higher age group in your class with younger students? Circle all that apply.
   a) no impact on students
   b) positive impact on students
   c) negative impact on students
   d) no impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
   e) positive impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
   f) negative impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
   g) other_________________________________________________

35. How should discipline be handled during the SFA reading block?
   a) _______________________________________________________
   b) _______________________________________________________
   c) _______________________________________________________
   d) _______________________________________________________

36. How should the point system be managed in the classroom? Circle all that apply.
   a) I do not use the point system
   b) I use a card on each table with a clothespin attached to keep track of the points
   c) I give a variety of points for each activity
   d) I give the same number of points for each activity
   e) After points are earned, rewards are given by me
   f) After points are earned, rewards are given by someone else
   g) other_________________________________________________
37. How efficiently are the students in each classroom able to walk into the classroom, pick up materials, pass out materials, and record grades on team score sheets?
   a) students are able to accomplish all of the tasks with no problem
   b) students are able to accomplish approximately 75% of the tasks with no problems
   c) students are able to accomplish approximately 50% of the tasks with no problems
   d) students are not able to accomplish 25% of the tasks

38. How should the teachers require students to come into their classrooms and prepare to begin the reading lesson?
   a) sit in a group for LC
   b) go to desks and be called in groups to LC
   c) go to desks and be called as a class to LC
   d) stay at desks for LC
   e) other__________________________________________________

39. Do you require the book clubs to be completed at home or at school?
   a) no, there are not enough materials at home
   b) no, there is not enough help at home
   c) no, there is not enough time at school to complete these activities
   d) yes, students are able to borrow any needed supplies from school
   e) yes, students are able to obtain help at school to complete the activity
   f) other__________________________________________________

40. What materials do your teachers utilize other than those required by SFA?
   a) none
   b) computers
   c) music
   d) other__________________________________________________

41. What plans do the teachers leave in the event a substitute is needed?
   a) complete, extensive plans so the sub will be able to follow the plan exactly
   b) somewhat complete so that the sub will be able to complete the major portions of the program for that day
   c) lesson plans for all subjects so the sub can understand and follow them
   d) other__________________________________________________

42. Who benefits the most from the Success for All program?
   a) below average students
   b) average students
   c) above average students
   d) independent readers
   e) struggling readers
   f) other__________________________________________________
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TEACHERS OF SUCCESS FOR ALL

1. How is the LC incorporated into your classrooms?
   a) as prescribed exactly by SFA  c) incorporated according to your beliefs  
   b) somewhat as prescribed by SFA  d) combination of your ideas along with SFA's ideas  
   e) other ____________________________  

2. How do you have the students sit for LC?
   a) in a large group  
   b) in a group but separated into pairs  
   c) at their individual desks  
   d) other ____________________________  

3. How do you require answers to questions for LC?
   a) ask questions of the whole group and students who wish to answer raise their hands  
   b) use the "think, pair, share" technique with students sitting as partners  
   c) ask team members to discuss the question and determine an answer  
   d) other ____________________________  

4. How do you choose the LC books?
   a) the SFA suggested list of books to use  
   b) a list of your choosing based on the students' needs  
   d) other ____________________________  

5. Has the LC positively impacted the students' learning in your classroom?
   a) yes  
   b) not sure  
   c) no  

6. If the answer is yes, which areas of reading instruction have been positively affected? Circle all that apply.
   a) oral reading  d) comprehension strategies (main idea, etc.)  
   b) writing skills  e) word identification skills (phonics, etc.)  
   c) listening comprehension  f) cooperative behavior  
   g) other ____________________________  

7. How should the RC component incorporated into your classroom?
   a) exactly as mandated by SFA  c) combination of your ideas and SFA's ideas  
   b) somewhat as mandated by SFA  d) your own ideas  
   other ____________________________  

8. Has the RC component positively impacted the students' learning?
   a) yes  
   b) not sure  
   c) no
9. If your answer is yes, which areas of reading instruction have been positively affected? Circle all that apply.
   a) oral reading  
   b) writing skills  
   c) listening comprehension  
   d) comprehension strategies  
   e) word identification skills  
   f) cooperative behavior  
   g) other__________________________________________________________

10. How has the seating arrangement within the classrooms impacted the students' learning?
   a) Positively  
   b) Negatively  
   c) no impact  
   d) other__________________________________________________________

11. How has the seating arrangement impacted your teaching for the rest of each day?
   a) no impact  
   b) negative impact  
   c) positive impact  
   d) other__________________________________________________________

12. How are the desks placed in your classrooms when reading is ready to commence?
   a) desks are left exactly as the "homeroom" students will use them  
   b) students take initiative and turn desks around so that the open portion is facing away from the students who will be seated in them  
   c) teachers take initiative and ask students to turn desks around so that the open portion is facing away from the students who will be seated in them  
   d) other__________________________________________________________

13. How has the partner reading within your classroom impacted the students' learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved cooperative behavior  
   b) weakened cooperative behavior  
   c) improved comprehension strategies  
   d) improved word identification strategies  
   e) caused no impact  
   f) other__________________________________________________________

14. How should partner reading be implemented within your classroom?
   a) sit at desks, both students facing the same way  
   b) sit at desks, one student facing one way, and the other student facing the opposite way (one turns the chair to face the opposite direction from his partner)  
   c) sit at areas around the room with both students facing the same way  
   d) sit at areas around the room with one student facing one way and the other facing the opposite direction  
   e) partnerships of three may also appear  
   f) use a combination of sitting around the room and at desks  
   g) other__________________________________________________________
15. What are the components of a meaningful sentence as you understand them?
   a) ________________________________________________________
   b) ________________________________________________________
   c) ________________________________________________________
   d) ________________________________________________________
   e) ________________________________________________________

16. How has your facilitation of the students’ development of meaningful sentences impacted the students’ learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved comprehension strategies  d) caused no impact
   b) improved word identification strategies  e) other __________________
   c) improved writing skills

17. How should you teach the development of meaningful sentences?
   a) graphic organizers _________________________________________
   b) _________________________________________________________
   c) _________________________________________________________
   d) _________________________________________________________
   e) _________________________________________________________

18. How has the two minute edit utilized within your classroom impacted the students’ learning? Circle all that apply.
   a) improved proofreading skills  d) caused no impact
   b) improved writing skills  e) other ______________________
   c) has caused improvement to be carried over to other writing

19. How often should you utilize the two minute edit?
   a) once a day, during SFA reading time
   b) more than once a day
   c) less than five times but more than three times per week
   d) less than three times per week

20. How have Success for All management signals impacted your classroom?
    Circle all that apply.
    a) Positively  d) I use them only during SFA.
    b) Negatively  e) I use them throughout the day.
    c) no impact  f) other ________________________________

21. To what extent should you incorporate Bloom’s taxonomy during LC?
    a) extensively (more than 2 questions from each of the six levels)
    b) substantially (at least one question from each of the six levels)
    c) somewhat (at least one question from three of the six levels)
    d) very little (may include only one or two questions, one or both from the same level)
    e) other ________________________________________________
22. In your opinion, would you characterize yourself as
   a) uncommitted to the program
   b) somewhat committed to the program
   c) committed to the program
   d) intensely committed to the program
   f) other______________________________________________

23. In your opinion, would you characterize the teachers at your school as
   a) uncommitted to the program
   b) somewhat committed to the program
   c) committed to the program
   d) intensely committed to the program
   d) other ______._________________________________________

24. How would you characterize your philosophy of reading instruction? Circle all that apply.
   a) developmentally appropriate
   b) holistic
   c) skills based
   d) language based
   e) balanced between skills based (basal) and language based (whole language)
   f) teacher centered
   g) learner centered
   h) co-ownership of classroom by teacher and students
   i) other _______________________________________

25. How should grades be determined in each classroom for each of the students? Circle all that apply.
   a) SFA grades alone
   b) SFA grades along with skills sheets from basal
   c) SFA grades along with whole language activities (language-based)
   d) Your grades only
   e) Unit tests from basal
   f) End of book tests from basal
   g) Placement tests (if used, please list)_________________________
   h) Other________________________________________________

26. In your opinion, are the grades inflated through any means?
   a) yes
   b) not sure
   c) no
27. If answer was yes, how are the grades inflated? Circle all that apply.
   a) Grades too subjective
   b) Not enough grades
   c) Too many grades
   d) Questions too easy
   e) Students allowed to correct papers and tests until tests are basically correct
   f) Not enough balance between grades given through SFA means and basal based grades
   g) Other__________________________________________________

28. How do you determine the students' grades in your classroom?
   a) _________________________________________________________
   b) _________________________________________________________
   c) _________________________________________________________
   d) _________________________________________________________
   e) _________________________________________________________

29. In your opinion, are the students moved according to their needs?
   a) yes  b) not sure  c) no

30. If your answer was yes, what criteria are met by students to move up to the next level? Circle all that apply.
   a) success on SFA tests
   b) success on basal tests
   c) oral reading capability
   d) other___________________________________________________

31. If your answer to 29 was no, what are the reasons for the students' movement?

32. How many of the original group of reading students have you kept all year?
   a) approximately 25%
   b) approximately 50%
   c) approximately 75%
   d) more than 75%
   e) less than 25%
33. How does the behavior seem affected in each class by students remaining or moving into and out of groups?
a) when groups remain basically intact (more than 50% for the entire year), behavior improves
b) when groups remain basically intact, behavior deteriorates
c) when students move frequently, behavior improves
d) when students move frequently, behavior deteriorates
e) other ________________________________

34. How is the behavior of your class affected by the inclusion of students of a higher age group in your class with younger students? Circle all that apply.
a) no impact on students
b) positive impact on students
c) negative impact on students
d) no impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
e) positive impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
f) negative impact on teacher's ability to teach rest of class
g) other ________________________________

35. How should discipline be handled during the SFA reading block?
a) ________________________________
b) ________________________________
c) ________________________________
d) ________________________________

36. How should the point system be managed in the classroom? Circle all that apply.
a) I do not use the point system
b) I use a card on each table with a clothespin attached to keep track of the points
c) I give a variety of points for each activity
d) I give the same number of points for each activity
e) After points are earned, rewards are given by me
f) After points are earned, rewards are given by someone else
g) other ________________________________
37. How efficiently are the students in each classroom able to walk into the classroom, pick up materials, pass out materials, and record grades on team score sheets?
   a) students are able to accomplish all of the tasks with no problem
   b) students are able to accomplish approximately 75% of the tasks with no problems
   c) students are able to accomplish approximately 50% of the tasks with no problems
   d) students are not able to accomplish 25% of the tasks

38. How should you require students to come into your classroom and prepare to begin the reading lesson?
   a) sit in a group for LC
   b) go to desks and be called in groups to LC
   c) go to desks and be called as a class to LC
   d) stay at desks for LC
   e) other __________________________

39. Do you require the book clubs to be completed at home or at school?
   a) no, there are not enough materials at home
   b) no, there is not enough help at home
   c) no, there is not enough time at school to complete these activities
   d) yes, students are able to borrow any needed supplies from school
   e) yes, students are able to obtain help at school to complete the activity
   f) other __________________________

40. What materials do your teachers utilize other than those required by SFA?
   a) none
   b) computers
   c) music
   d) other __________________________

41. What plans do you leave in the event a substitute is needed?
   a) complete, extensive plans so the sub will be able to follow the plan exactly
   b) somewhat complete so that the sub will be able to complete the major potions of the program for that day
   c) lesson plans for all subjects so the sub can understand and follow them
   d) other __________________________

42. Who benefits the most from the Success for All program?
   a) below average students
   b) average students
   c) above average students
   d) independent readers
   e) struggling readers
   f) other __________________________
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