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ABSTRACT

"READ WELL-JELL WELL" PROJECT: INTERVENTION TOOL FOR TEACHING THE “READ WELL” CURRICULUM

by

Lisa VaLaire Hart

May 2010

The purpose of the Prepared Jell Well Project is to create user friendly, one page templates that maintain fidelity to the “Read Well’ reading program and follow the research based guidelines of the National Reading Panel, No child Left Behind, and Reading First. This intervention tool will enable teachers to teach target goals to mastery and therefore serve as a preventative model. The Prepared Jell Well tool will enhance teaching the “Read Well” curriculum using Direct Instruction methods. The Prepared Jell Well provides materials for pre-teaching and re-teaching the focus skills of the First grade reading program. The materials are designed to provide at-risk students with extra practice in phonemic awareness, vowel discrimination, sight words and rhyming practice.
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CHAPTER I

AMERICA'S EDUCATIONAL CRISIS

There is an educational and economic crisis in America, and everyone pays the price. ABC News (2008) reports that the National Illiteracy Action Project claims, “Five billion a year in taxes goes to support people receiving public assistance that are unemployable due to illiteracy.” The ABC News website proclaims, “Seven million Americans are illiterate. Twenty-seven million cannot even complete a job application. Thirty million cannot read a sentence” (Thomas, Date, Sandell & Cook, 2008, p. 1).

The question that needs to be asked is should students be educated now or incarcerated later. Literacy specialist Marjorie Gillis (2006) of The New York Times reports, “Some states even estimate future prison populations based on third-grade reading scores. Thus not only do reading problems affect students, but they also have a host of negative effects on the economy” (para.6). According to Bruce Western, Vincent Schiraldi, and Jason Ziedenberg (2003) of the Justice Policy Institute, prison inmates are not well educated and rarely have a high school education: “In educational and correctional populations, the Bureau of Justice Statistics reported that, in the late 1990s, 68% of state prison inmates had not received a high school diploma” (p. 6). The editor of the world’s largest professional literacy journal, Robert Cooter, and by his wife, Kathleen Cooter, (2004) illustrate the importance of literacy by noting the following:
State planners in Ohio, recognizing the correlation between slow learners and reading failure in U.S. schools, project how many prison beds will be needed in the future on the basis of how many children are reading below level in third grade. (p. 681)

This is very frightening. These sobering facts cry for a change in reading instruction for low scoring students. It can no longer be business as usual. “An excellent education for all of America’s children has benefits not only for the children themselves but also for the taxpayer and society,” (Levin, Belfield, Muennig, & Rouse, 2007, p. 2).

Washington State Out-Performs the National Average

Students in Washington State score higher than the national average of students who met reading assessment benchmarks. Nationally, “sixty-seven percent of fourth-graders performed at or above the basic level in 2009” (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2009). According to the “Washington State Report Card” for the 2008-2009 school year, 71% of third-grade students and 73% of fourth-grade students met state grade-level benchmarks (Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction [WA OSPI], n.d.). Washington’s student success in reading is partly due to the adoption of a systematic reading model.

Washington State K-12 Reading Model

Washington State has a systematic three-tier instructional plan for improving instruction, which includes five reading components. The Washington State K-12 Reading Model is emphasizes the five essential reading components: phonemic
awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, “as analyzed by the National Reading Panel in their landmark K-12 meta-analysis of reading research” (WA OSPI, 2005, p. 52).

The Washington model follows the National Reading Panel’s guidelines, and the Reading First criterion, as well as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) recommendations. Although progress is being made in Washington State, 60% of students are still failing to pass the state Washington State Student Learning (WASL) goals in reading (WA OSPI, n.d.).

Hart Elementary School Demographics

Only 36% of fourth-grade students at Hart Elementary met the WASL reading benchmark in the 2008-2009 school year, according to WA OSPI (n.d.). In the Hart School District, 75% of students are Hispanic, 77% of students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch, 13% of students are enrolled in special education, 30% of students are in transitional bilingual programs, 6% of students are homeless, and 19% of students are classified migrant (WA OSPI, n.d.).

Challenges of Teaching at Hart Elementary

These demographics present many more educational challenges than a typical classroom and require teachers to be well trained in best practices:

In a typical U.S. classroom of twenty-five students, one would expect to find three to four slow learners. In areas of poverty and many low-income urban areas, the
children per classroom who could be characterized as slow learners might be twice that number (Cooter & Cooter, 2004, p. 681).

Hart School District is committed to using the best practices to teach reading and follows all the aforementioned guidelines and criteria to teach its diverse population.

Background of the Project

The Prepared Jell Well is an intervention tool created to enhance instruction through Direct Instruction based on the “Read Well” curriculum created by Marilyn Sprick, Lisa Howard, Ann Fidanque, and Shelley Jones (2007). The name Prepared Jell Well is part of the “Read Well” curriculum. The Prepared Jell Well project is adapted from the one page blank “Jell Well” template found in the Read Well Assessment Manual (Sprick, Howard, Fidanque, & Jones, 2007, p. 117-118). This project has adapted and improved the original blank form template and now introduces an intervention tool called Prepared Jell Wells. They provide intervention materials for pre-teaching and re-teaching the focus skills of the first grade “Read Well” reading program. The materials are designed to provide at risk students with extra practice. Teachers needed the blank template to be completed for each of the thirty eight units and ready for instruction when reinforcement of skills as necessary.

The Prepared Jell Well tool follows the national and state recommended guidelines for implementing best practices and maintaining fidelity to the core curriculum. The tool requires the use of intense Direct Instruction to teach phonemic awareness, vowel discrimination, along with sight words to at risk students. The
Prepared Jell Wells provide repetition in phonemic awareness and sight word practice.

Teaching

Prepared Jell Wells in small groups encompass the critical elements of effective instruction for teaching phonemic awareness:

In general, small-group instruction is more effective in helping your students acquire phonemic awareness and learn to read. Small-group instruction may be more effective than individual or whole-group instruction because children often benefit from listening to their classmates respond and receive feedback from the teacher. (United States Department of Education, 1998, p. 9)

In concordance with best intervention practices this tool is designed to teach using Direct Instruction in small groups of at risk students. It is a model that fails to wait for children to fail and follows the following recommendations:

The most critical elements of an effective program for the prevention of reading disability at the elementary school level are (a) the right kind and quality of instruction delivered with the (b) right level of intensity and duration to (c) the right children at the (d) right time. (Torgeson, 1998, p. 35)

Statement of the Problem

There is still an educational crisis in America as 33% of the nation’s children failed to meet standardized reading tests in 2009 (United States Department of Education, 2009, p. 3). Student’s need to be identified early, and intense interventions need to be implemented to keep children from failing further:
One of the most compelling findings from recent reading research is that children who get off to a poor start in reading rarely catch up. As several studies have now documented, the poor first-grade reader almost invariably continues to be a poor reader. (Torgeson, 1998, p. 32)

Interventions Need to be Implemented in First Grade

Solutions to the problem include early interventions; for the students identified as at risk, the best methods of instruction, scientifically based research proven materials. Immediate interventions need to be implemented in first grade in an attempt to decrease or close the achievement gap and lessen the Matthew effect (the rich get richer in reading and the poor get poorer) (Torgeson, 1998, p. 32). The problem of illiteracy can effectively be addressed beginning in first grade. First grade is a pivotal time for students to experience success. Many students are not achieving grade level benchmark expectations at that time. Marjorie Gillis, The New York Times' literacy expert, supports early intervention: “Statistics repeatedly confirm that if a child doesn’t learn to read by the end of first grade, he or she has only a one in eight chance of catching up” (Gillis, 2006, para. 5).

As Gillis points out, “there is no time to waste” (para. 6). Students need to be identified and immediate interventions implemented to prevent the achievement gap from opening up so wide students are unable to ever catch up with their peers:
As Stanovich (1986) pointed out in his well-known paper on the “Matthew effects” associated with failure to acquire early word reading skills, these consequences range from negative attitudes toward reading to reduced opportunities for vocabulary growth, to missed opportunities for development of reading comprehension strategies. (Torgeson, 1998, p.32)

Illiteracy and low literacy must be wiped out. Schools may not be able to effectively close the achievement gap but they can decrease it.

Hart Elementary School demographics indicate the need for teachers to provide explicit instruction in vocabulary, language and pronunciation. Hart Elementary School has specific language and vocabulary challenges because of the demographics. Thirty percent of students are in transitional bilingual programs, according to WA OSPI (n.d.). Nineteen percent of students are classified migrant according to the Office of Public Instruction; Washington State Report Card. Six percent are classified homeless (WA OSPI, n.d.).

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of the project is to create user friendly, one page templates that maintain fidelity to the “Read Well” reading program and follow the research based guidelines of the National Reading Panel, No child Left Behind, and Reading First. This intervention tool will be readily available and enable teachers to teach target goals to mastery and, therefore, serve as a preventative model.
The “Read Well” curriculum fails to provide enough Direct Instruction support materials for at-risk students. Additional materials are needed for interventions and extra practice. “Read Well” guidelines instruct teachers to create materials to re-teach students when students do not pass units. Teachers are kept on strict pacing schedules to ensure they finish the required curriculum before the end of the year. Teachers do not take the time to follow the core program’s recommendation and create labor intensive intervention materials for failing students. Thus, re-teaching missing skills and following the adopted program recommendations for remediation rarely takes place. First grade students are not learning the curriculum to mastery level.

The Prepared Jell Well will provide teachers the missing tool to compliment the “Read Well” program and enable immediate correction and instruction of missing skills. The Washington State Reading Model states the following:

Students who are not meeting the reading standards need intervention that emphasizes the components of instruction appropriate to their needs. An adequate amount of engaged, instructional time must be allocated in order to optimize student growth in reading. . . . Struggling readers need more time and more intensive instruction in order to close the achievement gap. (WA OSPI, 2005, p. 3)

The Prepared Jell Well ensures compliance with the Washington State K-12 Reading Model by providing supplemental material that compliments the adopted reading model.
Significance of the Project

The project is significant because the Prepared Jell Well is a one page user friendly review of each of the thirty-eight unit teacher guides. The one page review is consistent with the learning objectives and critical skills taught in each unit. Interested parents can use this tool at home. Teachers and paraprofessionals can be trained to introduce and pre-teach units or re-teach and review units.

Having the Prepared Jell Well already created and ready for use is critical for immediate feedback and error correction. Many students are not given feedback and learn erroneous information:

Feedback boosts retention and corrects errors. One potential method for increasing the benefits of testing and reducing the negative effects of exposing students to misinformation is to provide feedback after testing. Feedback allows students to correct errors and maintain correct responses resulting in superior performance on a subsequent test with no feedback. (Butler & Roediger, 2008, p. 605)

Using template cards with built-in feedback will ensure teachers will use consistent language and first grade classrooms will be teaching uniformly. A common template card for directions and correction procedures is provided with the Prepared Jell Well, which will enable teachers to teach deficit skills to mastery level.
Limitations of the Project

The first limitation of the project is that this tool is designed specifically for Hart Elementary School and its diverse population. Second, specific vocabulary terms taught must be predicted based on experience with second language learners. Third, teachers must be willing to devote time to implement the Prepared Jell Well. Review into the ninety minute reading block or intervention time. Fourth, the project is not research based.

Definition of Terms

The American Federation of Teachers classifies reading as a science: “Teaching reading is rocket science!” (Moats, 1999, p. 1). Along with scientifically based instruction, reading has its own language of terms specific to the science of teaching reading. The following terms were used in creating the project, and a brief definition is provided.

**Blending:** The task of combining sounds rapidly to accurately represent the word. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

**Comprehension:** Understanding what one is reading, the ultimate goal of all reading activity. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

**Core Reading Program:** The primary instructional tool to teach children to learn to read; typically referred to as a basal because it serves as the base of reading instruction. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)
Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS): Universal screening and progress monitoring for early identification and effective prevention. (Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills, 2002)

Direct Instruction: The teacher defines and teaches a concept, guides students through its application, and arranges for extended guided practice until mastery is achieved. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

Fluency: Ability to read text quickly, accurately, and with proper expression. Fluency provides a bridge between word recognition and comprehension. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

Jell Well: A condensed review of earlier units. (Sprick, et al., 2007, pp. 117-118)

Mastery: Full understanding of a skill at a predetermined level. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

Matthew effect: A term coined by Keith Stanovich, a psychologist who has done extensive research on reading and language disabilities. The “Matthew Effect” refers to the idea that in reading (as in other areas of life), the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. (Wright, 2008, para. 1)

Nonsense Words: Words that follow the patterns of Standard English, but are not real words. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

Phonemic Awareness: The ability to notice, think about, or manipulate individual phonemes (sounds) in words. It is the ability to understand that sounds
in spoken language work together to make words. This term is used to refer to the highest level of phonological awareness: an awareness of individual phonemes in words. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

**Phonics:** The study of the relationships between letters and the sounds they represent; also used to describe reading instruction that teaches sound-symbol correspondences. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

**Read Well:** A primary grade, phonics-based, core-reading curriculum. (Sprick et al., 2007, pp. 117-118)

**Rhyming:** Words that have the same ending sound. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

**Vocabulary:** Refers to all of the words of our language. One must know words to communicate effectively. Vocabulary is important to reading comprehension because readers cannot understand what they are reading without knowing what most of the words mean. Vocabulary development refers to stored information about the meanings and pronunciation of words necessary for communication. Four types of vocabulary include listening, speaking, reading and writing. (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

**WASL:** The Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL) was given as the state's primary assessment from spring 1997 to summer 2009 (WA OSPI, n.d.).
Project Overview

The first chapter describes the need to close the achievement gap and a tool that will enable first grade students to perform at their highest potential through a systematic review of the key components of a “Read Well” unit. The problem and solution are quite simple. The problem is teachers do not have the time to create review materials that match the curriculum. The solution is to provide a prepared tool. This tool will be referred to as a Prepared Jell Well. Chapter two of the project validates the need for the Prepared Jell Well through research and literature describing research based best practices that produce stronger readers. Chapter three summarizes the development and implementation of the project. It also describes how the project has been implemented to implicitly teach key concepts of “Read Well”. Chapter four is a description of the project. Chapter five offers a brief summary and a conclusion of the project along with implications for the use of the project.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review explored past practices for teaching reading and examined extensive studies that have been done to determine the best practices and methods to teach reading. The studies identified the critical components of reading instruction and defined the most effective methods of instruction including phonics and whole language and direct instruction methods were analyzed in the literature review. The literature review identifies who has reading difficulties, when to begin interventions, and the effects of feedback.

Historic Background of Reading Instruction

Historically, there have been differences of opinion and different levels of government interest in teaching reading. “Analyses of government and media reports demonstrate that there seems to have always been debate about the most appropriate literacy pedagogy for our schools” (Turibill, 2002, para. 1).

Teaching Reading in Colonial America and the United States

Traditionally, students were taught the alphabetic principals of reading. “Following in the footsteps of our English forebears, the alphabet method reign[ed] supreme” from 1640-1826 (Monaghan & Barry, 1999, p. 3).
Farnham's Sentence Method

Comprehension and meaning was the next reading movement. This era of reading instruction was known as "the great period of experimentation in introductory reading instruction, 1826-1883" (p. 3). A popular reading method was the Farnham's Sentence Method, a type of whole word method that focused on memorizing whole sentences (p. 31). "Reading as meaning making" (p. 14). Another innovation was developed by Frank Smith. "A strong message was that readers bring meaning to print in order to take meaning from print. Frank Smith talked about 'reading behind the eye' as he and others demonstrated that reading is more than decoding print on the page." (Turbill, 2002, "The Age of Reading as Meaning Making," para. 4)

McGuffy Readers

McGuffy Readers merged comprehension, syllabication and morality (Monaghan & Barry, 1999, p. 15). In 1837, McGuffey published the eclectic second reader. Piety, morality and education were now coupled with comprehension questions. McGuffey introduced a speller in 1849. It included syllabication and comprehension (p.15).

Scott Foresman

Most baby-boomers grew up reading Scott Foresman's reading series. In 1930, Scott Foresman's controlled text "Dick and Jane" entered the reading scene along with Thorndike's word list (pp. 36-39). Scott Foresman was focused on the most common sight words and highest frequency words as a method to teach fluency in reading instruction.
**Phonics Focused Instruction**

Phonics focused instruction was the direction the pendulum swung next. “[The Age of Reading as Decoding] is the period from about the 1950s into the early ’70s” (Turbill, 2002, “The Age of Reading as Decoding,” para. 1). Phonetic decoding raged in as the reading instruction sensation of these two decades filled with change and continues still today as an effective instructional method for primary instruction. “Phonics instruction tends to be most helpful to students reading at or below the second-grade level” (Shanker & Ekwall, 2003, p. 59).

**Whole Language Approach to Reading Instruction**

The next revolution in reading was the whole language approach to teaching reading. It was introduced as a theory and educators needed to embrace change. It was very controversial and success was limited:

Whole language or whole word teaching was implemented as an untested theory. . . However, once children got into the 3rd or 4th grade, the 1,000 to 2,000 words they had memorized were insufficient for reading at an advanced level, and they had no way of sounding out new words. (Brown, 2008, para. 3)

Sight word recognition sought to downplay the role of phonics in reading instruction and was a vital part of the whole language reading movement:

Phonics is only one of the tools that readers use in decoding. Millions of people have learned to read English without receiving instruction in phonics. These include most of the population of American public schools in the middle decades.
of the twentieth century, who learned to read using the Look-Say approach of the famous Dick and Jane series, published by Scott Foresman and Company. These youngsters learned to decode by relying on a substantial sight vocabulary combined with skill in using context clues. (Shanker & Ekwall, 2003, p. 59)

Studies to Determine the Best Practices for Teaching Reading

Reading instruction experts have had many varied opinions of best practice. Fortunately, there have been many scientifically based studies done to determine what constitutes best practices in reading instruction. The major studies which have investigated best practices in reading instruction are Project Follow Through, The National Reading Panel, and No Child Left Behind, along with Reading First, and Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children. All have done significant research in to best practices and made contributions to education and recommendations to Congress for a nation in literacy crisis.

Project Follow Through

In 1967, President Lyndon B. Johnson declared war on poverty, according to Bonnie Grossen (1995, para. 1). The correlation between poverty and low readers was apparent, and over a billion dollars was spent researching ways to break the poverty cycle through improved education models. "The objective of Project Follow Through was to determine which general educational approaches or models worked best in fostering and maintaining the educational progress of disadvantaged children across the primary school
years" (Snow, 1998, p. 176). The research continued from 1967 to 1995 (Grossen, 1995, para. 1). This project lasted from President Johnson until President Clinton.

Poor academics and poverty go together “failure to learn to read adequately is present among children of low social risk who attend well-funded schools and is much more likely among poor children” (Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998, p. 87). Project Follow Through sought answers for closing the achievement gap. It studied methods and theories for reading instruction.

There were four main focus areas of study: basic skills focused on teaching basic reading components, cognitive skills focused on a child's discovery and construction of meaning, and affective skills study which focused on boosting the child's self-esteem as a means to induce achievement. Project Follow Through also compared whole language acquisition with Direct Instruction.

The results of Project Follow Through and over a billion dollars in research substantiated, Direct Instruction as the best model to teach reading to failing students. “The only model that brought children close to the fiftieth percentile in all subject areas was the Direct Instruction Model” (Grossen, 2002, p. 246). Direct Instruction employs a systematic phonics-based approach to teaching reading. The lessons are repetitive, scripted, and immediate corrections are implemented. Although the results implied Direct Instruction is the best method for teaching reading to failing students, it has not been welcomed as might be expected (Grossen, 1995).
Project Follow Through was vast, cost over a billion dollars, and not without critics:

The national Follow Through evaluation study has been criticized for many problems of the type often associated with field research in education and social services, including nonrandom assignment of subjects, unclear definition of treatment, problems of assessing implementation, less than ideal instrumentation, misleading classification of models and outcome measures, inadequate research design, questionable statistical analyses, and the use of methodological and statistical strategies that favored some types of models over others. Perhaps because of some of these factors, intersite variation among models was larger than between-model differences. (United States Department of Education, 1998, p. 176)

National Reading Panel

Congress approved the creation of a National Reading Panel (NRP) just thirty years after Project Follow Through. In 1977, the NRP was formed to assess the current research-based knowledge of teaching children to read, according to National Reading Panel (2000, Chapter 1, p. 1). “The NRP was composed of 14 individuals, including (as specified by Congress) leading scientists in reading research, representatives of colleges of education, reading teachers, educational administrators, and parents” (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 1, p. 1).
The NRP was commissioned to make recommendations to congress of effective reading instructional practices:

The panel was charged with providing a report that should present the panel’s conclusions, an indication of the readiness for application in the classroom of the results of this research, and, if appropriate, a strategy for rapidly disseminating this information to facilitate effective reading instruction in the schools. (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 1, p. 1)

The following topics were investigated in depth: alphabetics including phonics and phonemic awareness, fluency and the effects of reading with prosody, the effects of comprehension in relation to repetition teaching vocabulary, text comprehension, teacher preparation, comprehension, teacher education, reading instructional strategies, computer technology (Chapter 1, p. 2).

The NRP was commissioned by congress in 1997 to initiate a report on the best practices for teaching reading and guide the development of public literacy policy. In April 2000, the NRP published its findings and recommendations in the form of the Report of the National Reading Panel Teaching Children to Read. It is from the NRP report that Reading First legislation within Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was formulated (National Reading Panel, 2000). To explain in simple terms, No Child Left Behind and Reading First are bi-products of The National Reading Panel Report.
Results of the National Reading Panel

Findings of the Panel found “that teaching children to manipulate phonemes in words was highly effective across all the literacy domains and outcomes” (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 2, p. 3). Phonics instruction findings concluded “systematic phonics instruction makes a more significant contribution to children’s growth in reading than do alternative programs providing unsystematic or no phonics instruction. (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 2, p. 123). The research on fluency surprised many:

Despite widespread acceptance of the idea that schools can successfully encourage students to read more and that these increases in reading practice will be translated into better fluency and higher reading achievement, there is not adequate evidence to sustain this claim. (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 3, p. 28).

Criticism of the National Reading Panel

Not all members of the panel were educators as one might expect. The panel’s composition was as follows:

The panel originally consisted of 15 people, independent of each other and without support staff. They included 12 university professors (eight with reading background, two were administrators, one was a physician), along with a parent, principal, and middle school language arts teacher. Missing was anyone who might have actually taught a beginning reader. (Trelease, 2008, para. 2)
The only education member on the National Reading Panel was Joanne Yatvin. She did not feel the report accurately solved the “Reading Wars” dilemma. She was the only member of the panel with practical experience in elementary schools. She withdrew her support of the NRP report, claiming student’s backgrounds played an important role in literacy development and the report did not account for differences in backgrounds of students. She stated the following in the NRP section called the Minority View:

I attended a presentation by Patricia Edwards, a member of the International Reading Association (IRA) Board, who has done research on the effects of home culture on children’s literacy development. She did not have to persuade me; this area of early language development and literary and world experience is the one I believe is most critical to children’s school learning, and the one I could not persuade the Panel to investigate. Without such an investigation, the NRP Report’s coverage of beginning reading is narrow and biased. (National Reading Panel, 2000, Minority View section, p.1)

*The National Reading Panel Did Not Address Second Language Learners*

This country has a serious need to educate many children who speak a language other than English. Second language learners were not addressed in the report, and considering the sheer number of studies identified by Panel staff relevant to reading (more than 100,000 published since 1966 and more than 15,000 prior to 1966), second language learners were negligently overlooked (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 1, p. 1).
Reading First

The National Reading Panel’s recommendations were the framework for No Child Left Behind’s (NCLB) Reading First Initiative (RF). “Reading First is the academic cornerstone of the bipartisan No Child Left Behind Act” (United States Department of Education, 2008, para. 2). RF provides grants to low performing needy schools from kindergarten through the third grade to improve reading achievement. Diagnostic screens are given three times per year. Weekly or monthly progress monitoring of reading skills are required. RF forces schools to improve reading scores. Schools must continue to improve improvement in reading as a criterion for continued funding thus, RF mandates that schools must be held accountable for ensuring that all students read on grade level by third grade. Put quite simply, no improvement in scores means no federal money. “Reading First builds on a solid foundation of scientifically based research and provides struggling students in the nation’s highest need schools with the necessary resources to make significant progress in reading achievement” (United States Department of Education, 2008, para. 1).

*Five Essential Components to Build Literacy Competency*

Five of the essential reading components identified and studied intensively by the National Reading Panel were: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension (National Reading Panel, 2000). All schools receiving RF funding are required to implement these components into reading programs.

*Reading Component 1—Phonemic Awareness*
The Florida Center for Reading Research definition of phonemic awareness reiterates phonemic awareness is a verbal skill:

Phonemic awareness is the ability to notice, think about, or manipulate individual phonemes (sounds) in words. It is the ability to understand that sounds in spoken language work together to make words. This term is used to refer to the highest level of phonological awareness: an awareness of individual phonemes in words.

(Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002)

The National Reading Panel identified phonemic awareness as a key to predictor of reading success:

Correlation studies have identified phonemic awareness and letter knowledge as the two best school-entry predictors of how well children will learn to read during their first 2 years in school. This evidence suggests the potential instructional importance of teaching PA [phonemic awareness] to children. Many experimental studies have evaluated the effectiveness of PA instruction in facilitating reading acquisition. Results are claimed to be positive and to provide a scientific basis documenting the efficacy of PA instruction. (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 2, p. 1)

The Washington kindergarten through grade twelve reading model adopted the National Reading Panel's recommendations:

Phonemic awareness is one component identified as a building block to reading success. Phonemic Awareness is necessary in learning to decode an alphabetic
language, as print decoding depends on mapping phonemes into graphemes. . . .

Phonics instruction is not effective unless children have some phonemic awareness. (WA OSPI, 2005, p. 52)

On the other hand, the NRP “Minority View” by Joanne Yatvin disputed the role of phonemic awareness in reading instruction:

In review on phonemic awareness, for example, the critical question of whether all children need special training in phonemic awareness was not addressed, even though several studies suggest that many children grasp the concept and are able to apply it through ordinary reading instruction. (National Reading Panel, 2000, p. 3)

Reading Component 2: Phonics

Phonics is the study of the relationships between letters and the sounds they represent; it is also used to describe reading instruction that teaches sound-symbol correspondences (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002). Phonics instruction is an effective method for teaching students to read. Research has proven systematic instruction leads to rapid word recognition. “Children who were directly instructed in the alphabetic principle improved in word-reading skill at a significantly faster rate than children indirectly instructed in the alphabetic principle through exposure to literature” (Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, & Schatschneider, 1998, p. 51).

“The conclusion drawn from these findings is that systematic phonics instruction is significantly more effective than non-phonics instruction in helping to prevent reading
difficulties among at risk students and in helping to remediate reading difficulties in disabled readers” (National Reading Panel, 2000, p. 294).

Harvard psychologist Jeanne Chall in 1967 did extensive work deciphering reading practices:

Among efforts to identify factors associated with more and less effective beginning reading practices, Jeanne S. Chall's (1967) work Learning to Read: The Great Debate remains a classic. While producing this work, Chall visited classrooms, interviewed experts, and analyzed programs. Yet it was her review and analysis of the then-available research on instructional practices that yielded the most stunning conclusions. Chall found substantial and consistent advantages for programs that included systematic phonics, as measured by outcomes on word recognition, spelling, vocabulary, and reading comprehension at least through the third grade. Moreover, the advantage of systematic phonics was just as great and perhaps greater for children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. (United States Department of Energy, 1998, p. 173)

Criticism of Phonics Based Instruction

The age old question is still looming: Is whole language or phonics the best method for instruction?

Some evidence suggests that an environmental literacy or whole-language orientation in kindergarten is more effective than phonics-oriented instruction, particularly for children with low initial scores on knowledge of literacy
conventions, including letter knowledge presumably because these children are not yet developmentally prepared to benefit from explicit instruction in letter-sound relationships. (United States Department of Education, 1998, p. 177)

Reading Component 3: Fluency

Fluency is the ability to read text quickly, accurately, and with proper expression. Fluency provides a bridge between word recognition and comprehension (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2002). “Fluency represents a level of expertise beyond word recognition accuracy, and reading comprehension may be aided by fluency. Skilled readers read words accurately, rapidly, and efficiently” (WA OSPI, 2005, p. 52).

Reading Component 4: Vocabulary

Vocabulary refers to all of the words of our language. One must know words to communicate effectively. Vocabulary is important to reading comprehension because readers cannot understand what they are reading without knowing what most of the words mean. Vocabulary development refers to stored information about the meanings and pronunciation of words necessary for communication. Four types of vocabulary include listening, speaking, reading and writing. Vocabulary knowledge is essential to students comprehending text:

What is missing for many children who master phonics but don’t comprehend well is vocabulary, the words they need to know in order to understand what they’re reading. Thus vocabulary is the missing link in reading/language instruction in our school system. (WA OSPI, 2005, p. 52)
**Extensive Vocabulary Research**

Teaching students that live in poverty requires more time developing vocabulary. Many textbooks are not designed for teaching a poverty population. Remarkable vocabulary research was done in 1995 by Betty Hart and Todd Risley (2003) that compared the vocabularies in differing socioeconomic classes in words heard per 100 hour week (p. 5). The average child in a professional family has 215,000 words of language experience per 100 hour week. The average child in a working-class family is provided with 125,000 words, and the average child in a welfare family is exposed 62,000 words of language experience. In a 5,200-hour year the amount would be 11.2 million words for a child in a professional family. 6.5 million words for a child in a working-class family, and 3.2 million words for a child in a welfare family. In four years of such experience, an average child in a professional family would have accumulated experience with almost 45 million words; an average child in a working-class family would have accumulated experience with 26 million words, and an average child in a welfare family would have accumulated experience with 13 million words. By age 4, the average child in a welfare family might have 13 million fewer words of cumulative experience than the average child in a working-class family (Hart & Risley, 2003, p. 5).

Robust vocabulary instruction often takes a great deal of instructional time. In order for reading to be comprehended teachers need to be skilled in pre-reading skills such as vocabulary development:
Students from families of lower socioeconomic status often enter school significantly delayed in a broad range of pre-reading skills. Such at-risk students typically have great difficulty with the meanings of language (semantics) because of a lack of exposure to the language skills necessary for reading and writing success (vocabulary, speaking, listening). Many are born into homes where their parents either do not speak the language or are language-deprived themselves. A child growing up in a limited language family environment may hear one-half to one-third as many spoken words as children in more affluent households. The limited language environment child might know 3,000 words by age 6, while the high language environment child might have a vocabulary of 20,000 words. This gap tends to widen the longer children are in school. By the time they reach high school, the impact on academic achievement is insurmountable; ninth-grade students will never comprehend ninth-grade material with a fourth-grade vocabulary. Children who enter the upper elementary grades with significant vocabulary deficits also show increasing problems with reading comprehension, even if they have good word identification skills. (Lockavitch, 2007, p. 689)

*Reading Component 5: Comprehension*

Comprehension is the ability to understand what one is reading, the ultimate goal of all reading activity. Comprehension is essential or reading has no purpose. Comprehension strategies improve understanding according to the Washington State Reading Model. “The instruction of cognitive strategies improves reading
comprehension in readers with a range of abilities … This improvement occurs when teachers demonstrate, explain, model, and implement interaction with students in teaching them how to comprehend text” (WA OSPI, 2005, p. 52).

Who Has Reading Difficulties?

Children from poor families are more likely to have reading difficulties as explained:

Among the reasons public attention has turned to the need for systematic prevention of reading difficulties are the patterns of reading difficulty cited in the first chapter: failure to learn to read adequately is present among children of low social risk who attend well-funded schools and is much more likely among poor children, among nonwhite children, and among nonnative speakers of English. To begin our consideration of who is likely to have reading difficulties and how many children we are talking about, we outline a number of conceptual issues in identifying and measuring reading difficulties in young children. (Snow et al., 1998, p. 87)

Interventions

As soon as students show signs of reading failure, immediate interventions need to be implemented as early as first grade:

The majority of reading problems faced by today's adolescents and adults could have been avoided or resolved in the early years of childhood. . . . Only one in six
children not at grade level by the end of first grade ever catch up with their peers.
(Snow et al., 1998, p. 87)

It is imperative that at risk students are identified. After students are identified, instruction must be targeted, and the components of reading need to be purposefully taught:

Students with learning difficulties benefit from explicit instruction in decoding skills and strategies, fluency (modeling fluent reading, directly teaching how to interpret punctuation marks when reading orally, etc.), vocabulary word meanings and word-learning strategies, and comprehension strategies. When a teacher provides explicit instruction she or he clearly models or demonstrates skills and strategies and provides clear descriptions of new concepts (providing both clear examples and non-examples). Students don't have to infer what they are supposed to learn. For example, a teacher who is explicitly teaching 1st grade students to sound out words demonstrates this process step by step, then provides opportunities for students to practice the skill with the teacher's feedback and support. If the student is not successful, the teacher models again. (Denton, 2010, p. 2)

Benefits of Providing Immediate Feedback

Reading interventions and materials need to be in place and implemented immediately. Providing feedback boosts retention and provides the opportunity to correct errors:
One potential method for increasing the benefits of testing and reducing the negative effects of exposing students to misinformation is to provide feedback after testing. Feedback allows students to correct errors and maintain correct responses resulting in superior performance on a subsequent test in comparison with no feedback. (Butler & Roediger, 2008, p. 605)

Direct Instruction

Direct Instruction of phonemic awareness activities will produce stronger readers. The results of Project Follow Through substantiated Direct Instruction as the best model to teach reading to failing students. “The only model that brought children close to the fiftieth percentile in all subject areas was the Direct Instruction Model” (Grossen, 2002, p.246).

Repetition

Research validates the need for more repetition and phonemic awareness activities for students that are at risk for failure in reading:

In a study of first grade students with severe reading disabilities Hargis (1992) found the lower a student’s reading level, the more repetitions were required to achieve automaticity. Students reading at grade needed a minimum of 76.1 repetitions for those reading at grade 3-regardless of age and IQ. The correlation coefficient for the relationship between reading level and repetitions was an amazing -0.9317! (Lockavitch, 2007, p. 692)
The core program “Read Well” fails to provide enough repetition of reading skills which would enable students to be successful which is exactly what necessitates this project.

Summary

A vast amount of research has been done to investigate the best practices for reading instruction. The basic components of reading instruction have been identified. The ultimate method of instruction is yet to be determined research in the literature review supports Direct Instruction as appositive approach.

Project Follow Through, the National Reading Panel, and No Child Left Behind, along with Reading First and Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children have all provided insights to best practices.

Does the Panel's work put an end to controversy about the best way to teach reading? The Panel's research suggests that reading instruction is complex. Children come into the classroom with different levels of preparation, as do their teachers. In addition, learning to read requires a combination of skills, including phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency, and text reading comprehension skills. Not all children learn in the same way and one strategy does not work for all children. As a result, the Panel's findings demonstrate that learning phonics skills is critical for positive reading development. However, the best results will be achieved when direct instruction is combined with the development of other skills, and when teachers are able to use a combination of direct instructional strategies to achieve those skills. (National Reading Panel, 2001, para. 27)
Despite all the known research and findings one fact remains, the United States is still a nation with a major literacy crisis and we all pay the price. Solutions are complicated and immediate answers are needed.
CHAPTER III

THE NEED FOR THE PREPARED JELL WELL PROJECT

Nationally, reading scores show a serious educational deficit. Sixty-seven percent of fourth-graders performed at or above the basic level in 2009 (United States Department of Education, 2009). According to the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (n.d.), seventy-one percent of third grade students and seventy-three percent of fourth grade students meet state reading benchmarks during 2008-2009. Hart School District fourth-grade state reading test showed only thirty-seven percent of students met grade level expectations (WA OSPI, n.d.). This alarming statistic was the catalyst for the project.

The “Read Well” program is the adopted core curriculum for kindergarten and first grade at Hart School District. Although it is an excellent research based program that focuses on the five key components of reading, it does not provide enough prepared curriculum materials for failing students. The curriculum materials meet the National Reading Panel, No Child Left Behind, and The Washington K-12 Reading Model and Reading First recommendations. Although Hart Elementary School is teaching the “Read Well” program with fidelity, students continue to need reading interventions and oftentimes the material needs to be presented in a different style such as the Prepared Jell Well format.

At a check and adjust stage, students are given formative tests to see if they have learned desired knowledge and/or skills. Then, if a student has not learned some information or skill, you adjust by *Reteaching* that student, using different
methods, tasks, or styles of learning if necessary. The goal in this critical step is to have the student achieve mastery. (Fitzgerald, 2005, p. 59)

This project was initiated to provide an intervention tool for teachers. This project fills a need of first grade teachers of the “Read Well” curriculum. The Prepared Jell Well provides the necessary intervention to enable teachers to work smarter not harder! Each Prepared Jell Well is a one page intervention lesson plan.

The inception of the project was the creation of needed immediate resources that were not available. A blank black line master “Jell Well Planner” provided with the “Read Well” Assessment Manual was the inspiration (Sprick et al., 2007, p. 117-118). The seven blank boxes were listed labeled: sound practice, tricky word practice, stretch and shrink phoneme practice, sound counting, smooth and bumpy blending, word dictation, sounding out smoothly and fluency practice story reading.

First grade teachers requested a mock up of a completed Prepared Jell Well unit be made and brought to a grade-level team meeting. The teachers were excited with the results. Assessments showed remarkable progress after implementing the material. Teachers requested other units be prepared for immediate classroom use.

Reading instruction at Hart Elementary has a daily uninterrupted ninety minute reading block with approximately twenty-four students per classroom. There are three small groups of about eight. The students rotate every thirty minutes. Daily each student receives thirty minutes of reading instruction with the teacher. Another thirty minutes are spent practicing the “Read Well” sound and word cards, and one page of phonics
decoding skills. The remaining thirty minutes are spent working independently on skill and comprehension activity workbooks. Most teachers introduce a unit on Monday and teach it throughout the week. The unit assessment is administered on Friday.

There have been recent budget cuts. Class sizes are now larger than in previous years. In prior years three adults were assigned in each room but teachers no longer have this luxury. In each classroom there is now one teacher and one paraprofessional. It is even more important than ever before that interventions need to be consistent, efficient, and streamlined.

The Project Procedure

The project began by gathering thirty-eight teacher’s manuals and dissecting each sixty-eight page guide for key components. A Prepared Jell Well template was typed using Microsoft Excel. The template was adapted from the blank template provide by the “Read Well” curriculum “Jell Well Review” (Sprick et al., 2007, p. 117-118). Vocabulary instruction is critical for students at Hart Elementary therefore a vocabulary component was added to the template. Also the daily chant was incorporated to provide extra fluency practice in pronunciation of phonics sounds and vocabulary. The next step was compiling and condensing the teacher manuals and typing the critical components of the program on to spreadsheets while maintaining fidelity and exact sequencing of the research based “Read Well” framework for teaching reading.

The basic core components identified as critical to include in the Prepared Jell Well include the following: vocabulary, the alphabet chant, phonemic awareness,
phonics, sounds, rhyming, word discrimination, sight words, blending, dictation, and multisyllabic words. The "Read Well" program lacked a complete typed page of the chants. To create the chant list for the Prepared Jell Well, all thirty-eight teacher's manuals had to be gathered and the chant found in each teacher's manual and typed. Now teachers have this resource at their fingertips and can reinforce alphabetic sounds using the chants.

Vocabulary terms were reviewed, and words anticipated to be unfamiliar to second language students were identified. Royalty free graphics of difficult words were found on the internet and copied into the spreadsheets. The graphics used are from Yahoo! Images and Fotosearch (Yahoo! Image Search, 2010; Fotosearch, 2010).

Phonemic awareness activities, phonics, and letter sounds were located and reviewed in each unit teacher's guide, and then they were typed using a template. Sight words, multisyllabic, and tricky words were also located, reviewed, and typed using into the Prepared Jell Well template.

The project products are one page of user-friendly, simple-to-use Direct Instruction, pre-teaching or re-teaching intervention pages, aka Prepared Jell Wells. Specifically, it enhances each of the components by providing extra practice of the key components of each unit.

Implementation of the Project

The Prepared Jell Well tool provides opportunities to use the best methods of instruction with intensity. The Prepared Jell Well provides immediate corrective
feedback. Teaching at-risk first grade students to read to mastery level demands having the best scientifically research based curriculum and the best methods of instruction. “Mastery goals, by definition, articulate the content that is to be learned. For example the following are mastery goals: Students will be able to use word segmentation and syllables to decode an unrecognizable word” (Marzano, 2009, p. 7).

Identification of Failing Students

Any student that fails the weekly unit assessment or any student which is identified as below the fortieth percentile should be in a Prepared Jell Well intervention. The DIBELS reports clearly identify students as at some risk or at risk. All students identified as at risk or some risk are to be taught using the Prepared Jell Well in a small group of about six students. This can be done during the classroom ninety minute reading block in lieu of the independent center, or when parent or high school volunteers are available. It is also taught during the thirty minute reading intervention. Volunteers can be trained to do a Prepared Jell Well in less than thirty minutes. The Prepared Jell Well is also a resource for parents that want to help at home.
CHAPTER IV

WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Each one page Prepared Jell Well was derived through first, methodical analysis of thirty-eight cumbersome teacher’s manuals which are each sixty-eight pages long. Second, the key components of each unit were carefully dissected and painstakingly identified. Fourth, the material was then hand written into the one page blank template provided by “Read Well.” Fifth, vocabulary terms deemed difficult for second language learners were identified. Sixth, each of the thirty-seven unit chants were located and typed to be added. Thus, the finished product provides teachers with a resource ready to use to reinforce the lesson. Students now can receive intervention in phonemic awareness, phonics, comprehension, vocabulary and fluency based on the unit they are on in the “Read Well” program.

The National Center for Reading First Technical Assistance created cards that summarized methodology for teaching individual components of reading. Ten template cards with instructional target goals are used in the Project. The cards provide research-based, generic, Direct Instruction lesson procedures that are meant to be used while teaching. They include signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures. They follow a general “I do it, we do it, you do it” pattern. Template cards have five steps: explain the task, model the task, provide whole group practice using whole group responses, correction procedures, and individual turns.
The Chant

The first component taught on the Prepared Jell Well is the chant. The chant enables students to isolate sounds, practice oral language and learn new vocabulary. The chant provides introduces new letters and sounds. The teacher models the chant. The teacher then Reads a line and has the students echo back the line. Students sing the chant using alliteration of the new sound. The chant is fun and students enjoy participating, and “research confirms that engagement activates more of the pleasure structures in the brain than do tasks of simple memorization” (Jensen, 2005, p.35). Students are given individual turns to recite the chant.

Vocabulary

The second item taught on the Prepared Jell Well is vocabulary. The Prepared Jell Well provides pictures of difficult vocabulary terms. The teacher shows the graphics. Each student pronounces the new words chorally and then is given the opportunity to use the word in a sentence.

Letter Sound Correspondence

The third item taught are letters and sound correspondence. “A program of systematic phonics instruction clearly identifies a carefully selected and useful set of letter-sound relationships and then organizes the introduction of these relationships into a logical instructional sequence” (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn, 2001, p. 16). The teacher writes the new letters and sounds on a white board. And models the letters and sounds, students chorally respond and individual turns are given. Template card two (see
appendix) is used for teaching sounds, the directions, and error correction procedures. The Prepared Jell Well Project provides letter sound practice and smooth blending practice for letter combinations following the recommendations of the NRP and Jeanne Chall's research.

**Fluency**

The fourth item taught on the Prepared Jell Well is word fluency. "It is clear that many theorists believe that fluency is a facilitator of comprehension and precedes its development" (Applegate, Applegate, & Modla, 2009, p. 8). Students are taught to instantly recognize sight words, which in the Read Well program are also called "tricky words" (Sprick et al., 2006, p.102). A high degree of sight word fluency is necessary for success. Fry's instant word list is taught. Sight and tricky words are pronounced and modeled. Students chorally read the words on flash cards when given a signal. Flash cards are provided with the "Read Well" program or may be written on index cards. Directions for signaling and error correction procedures are on template card three. For multisyllabic words, the teacher models the word and provides multiple opportunities for students to say and use words with more than one syllable.

**Phonemic Awareness**

The fifth item taught using the Prepared Jell Well is phonemic awareness. Phonemic Awareness is taught in units one through twenty. The National Reading Panel (2000) identified that teaching phonemic awareness skills to children is an important
foundational reading component. Template card number five provides signaling
directions and error correction procedures for teaching phonemic awareness.

Blending

The sixth item taught with the Prepare Jell Well is blending. Students progress
from words with one sound to two sounds by unit two and three sounds by unit four.
Consonant blends are introduced in unit seven. Template card number four provides step
by step signaling directions and error correction procedures for teaching phonemic
awareness.

Dictation

The seventh item taught on the Prepared Jell Well is dictation of newly introduced
sounds and words. The teacher carefully pronounces the sounds and words, and the
students write them on individual white boards. Word patterns, word families, and sound
substitutions are taught using individual white boards and dry mark erasers. Template
cards four and six provide signaling directions and error correction procedures for
teaching phonemic awareness. Template card six is used to teach students to count the
sounds and sound out the word.

Rhyming

The eighth item on the Prepared Jell Well is rhyming. The teacher says a word and
models rhyming words. Students take turns and respond individually by orally saying a
rhyming word.
Additional Teaching Options

The ninth and final item on the Prepared Jell Wells is optional re-reading. If students have not demonstrated a mastery of the concepts taught in each unit, then there is the option of having students reread Read Well stories two and four. If scores on the end of the unit assessment indicate students need extra practice to increase mastery, the re-reading options should be implemented. Assessments can be done by having each student read the curriculum assessment for one minute with fewer than two errors. Comprehension is also gained as students reread the text using new skills. Story two of each unit is a duet story. The teacher reads several lines of the script written in small letters and the students read the larger font print. Story four is independent reading and may be done with a partner.

Multicultural Aspects of Teaching Reading

The multicultural aspects of teaching reading to the students attending Hart Elementary include a need to focus on language, vocabulary and phonics. “Read Well is recognized as an excellent choice for second language learners as Debra Kamps (2005) writes:

Students in secondary level interventions improved in early literacy skills. This was true for the majority of students in our sample, as evidenced in significant gains on the DIBELS assessments for decoding NWF and oral reading ORF skills. The second finding was that the secondary-level interventions used (i.e., direct instruction interventions) were highly effective with ELL groups, including Spanish-speaking students and students speaking other languages (Somalian,
Sudanese, Vietnamese). First grade interventions that appeared especially effective included Reading Mastery, Early Interventions in Reading, and Read Well. (p. 500)

Teaching reading in a predominantly Hispanic school can be extremely challenging. Research on specific strategies and implementation of best practices was done, and the results were implemented into the construction of the Prepared Jell Well. Research reiterates the necessity of using specific language and vocabulary strategies, teaching to mastery and identification of students needing enrichment. The premise that reading requires "mastery" of language is part of the rationale for concentrating on the following strategies. Knowledge of a language involves both its literal and non-literal forms, and hence idiomatic expressions and figures of speech which enable students to infer, associate, and recognize implications. Since vocabulary acquisition is a linchpin of literacy and since reading comprehension and vocabulary are intimately related, any student who falls below the 50th percentile on a standardized pre-test in reading/vocabulary should be targeted for rich instruction. According to the findings of the National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic students need more personal attention and daily contact, including more instructional materials, if they are to improve their reading comprehension (Zarate, 1986).

The results of Project Follow Through substantiated Direct Instruction as the best model to teach reading to failing students. "The only model that brought children close to the fiftieth percentile in all subject areas was the Direct Instruction Model" (Grossen,
2002, p. 246). Research based decisions were analyzed before compiling the best instructional methods for this project.

Vocabulary Building

For many students, extra practice in vocabulary is needed. The Prepared Jell Well provides chant practice as well as opportunities to practice and learn new words. The National Reading Panel (2000) recommends, "Vocabulary should be taught both directly and implicitly. Repetition and multiple exposures to vocabulary items are important. . . Vocabulary learning should entail active engagement in learning skills" (Chapter 4, p. 27). The Prepared Jell Well provides vocabulary practice and fluency.

Comprehension

The Prepared Jell Well focuses on accuracy and learning to master individual sounds and words automatically. Students that can decode a word are more apt to apply meaning to the new word:

Because the ability to obtain meaning from print depends so strongly on the development of word recognition accuracy and reading fluency, both should be regularly assessed in the classroom, permitting timely and effective instructional response when difficulty or delay is apparent. (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 3, p. 6)

Syllabication strategies that empower students to decode multisyllabic words will enable students to be successful. "Many big words occur infrequently, but when they do occur they carry much of the meaning and content of what is being read. . . . Students
who learn to look for patterns in multisyllabic words will be better spellers and decoders” (Cunningham, 1998, p.189).

Supplies

The following supplies are needed to implement the Prepared Jell Well.

Supply List

1. The one page Prepared Jell Well
2. Flash Cards of Sounds taught in each unit
3. Flash Cards of Words taught in each unit
4. Student individual white boards and markers
5. Templates Cards of instructions and correction procedures for teachers
6. Optional items to use if students need further instruction
   a. “Read Well” story books
   b. Teacher’s manual for comprehension questions during duet story.

Assessment

Assessments drive the instruction of the Prepared Jell Well. Four different methods of assessment track the growth of students receiving the intervention. The first assessment is the “Read Well” program unit assessment at the end of every unit. Any student failing the unit assessment should be placed in the intervention group. After completing a Prepared Jell Well review, the student can be reassessed using the “Read Well” assessment.
The second method of assessment is the weekly or bimonthly progress monitoring. Progress monitoring is done on all students not at grade level using DIBELS progress monitoring grade level materials. Students are tested in phonemic awareness, nonsense words, fluency and retell. Nonsense words measure students' ability to decode small words and recognize short vowel sounds. Phonemic awareness and fluency passages are recorded and compared to see which areas students need to continue improving. The third method of assessment is informal assessment. Students are monitored during the Prepared Jell Well intervention to check if they respond appropriately and if they can individually give the correct responses.

The fourth method of assessment is the DIBELS benchmark assessments that are given at the beginning, middle and end of the year. These help guide the formation and adjustment of intervention groups. The beginning of the year assessment establishes a baseline for students and determines if the child will be immediately placed in an intervention group. The middle of the year groups are adjusted based on data and the final assessment determines if the student is at grade level.

Implementation of the Project

The first component of the Prepared Jell Well is the chant. The purpose of the chant is to enable students to isolate sounds, practice oral language and learn new vocabulary. The procedure for teaching the chant is the teacher models the phrase and asks the students to echo back the phrase. The teacher says, “My turn,” and again models. Next, the teacher says, “Your turn,” and students chorally respond.
Example:

Teacher: My turn. M as in monkey. Your turn.

Students: M as in monkey.

Developing Vocabulary

The second focus of the Prepared Jell Well is developing vocabulary through repetition. Students are introduced to new vocabulary and recite the daily chant which introduces and expands vocabulary. Students and teachers discuss the vocabulary images.

The Prepared Jell Well provides pictures of key vocabulary terms in each of the thirty-eight units, thus providing extra opportunities to master vocabulary terms. Students develop vocabulary during the daily chant. Students see the word in print, say the word, and have key vocabulary pictures.

Sound Blending

The third focus of the Prepared Jell Well is blending. There are two procedures for teaching blending. One is “bumpy blending” and the other is “smooth blending” (Sprick et al., 2006). The Prepared Jell Well follows the same pattern taught in “Read Well.” It is taught by having students put their fingers under the letter and say the sound of the letter. Students then move to the next letter and say the sound. Smooth blending is taught by having the students’ fingers fly under each letter like their fingers are paper airplanes. Students say the sounds and then repeat them the fast way.
Template cards four and five are provided for instructions. There is a standard correction procedure when errors are made so students are given immediate feedback and many opportunities to respond.

Word Recognition

The fourth item taught on the Prepared Jell Well is word recognition. Sight word repetition is also called tricky word practice. The procedure for teaching words is the students follow a signal then chorally recite the word on the flashcard or whiteboard to reinforce learning. Template card three provides instructions and a standard correction procedure. Students are given immediate feedback and many opportunities to respond.

Phonemic Awareness Instruction

The procedure for teaching phonemic awareness is initiating student involvement orally, auditory and kinesthetically by having students practice oral segmenting /counting sounds in words. Template card number five is provided for instructions. In Prepared Jell Well instruction, students count each phoneme sound they hear in words. Next, students say the word as they move their hands apart pretending they are stretching the sounds in the word. The National Reading Panel (2000) found that teaching phonemic awareness “in small groups produced larger effect sizes on acquisition than teaching children individually or in classroom-size groups” (National Reading Panel, 2000, Chapter 2, p. 28). Prepared Jell Wells are used to teach students in small groups how to blend phonemes, decode, and segment words. Phonemes are pronounced and students spell unfamiliar words.
Consonant Blending

Students progress from words with one sound to two sounds by unit two, and three sounds by unit four. Consonant blends are introduced in unit seven. Blending is taught by writing the word or sound on a white board. The teacher has the students say the underlined part as a finger is slid under the word.

Dictation

Dictation practice is provided for newly introduced sounds and words. Individual white boards are provided. The teacher dictates the words carefully with clear enunciation of each sound. As soon as one student gets it correct, the teacher provides positive feedback. Other students quickly produce the correct letters and words and appropriate immediate feedback is given. Individual turns are also given so the teacher can check students for understanding. Template cards nine and ten are provided for exact dictation procedures.

Word Patterns (Onset-Rime)

Word families are taught and sound substitutions. This is done using individual white boards and dry mark erasers. Word families are introduced and manipulated, such as the word family op. Students are then asked to add an h to form hop. Next, the students are instructed to replace the letter h with the letter b in front of op to make the new word bop. Next a p replaces the b to form pop.
Rhyming

The eighth item on the Prepared Jell Well is rhyming. It is taught orally. The teacher pronounces a word, and students each take turns saying a word that rhymes. The words can be make-believe or real words as long as the word rhymes.

Re-teaching Options

The ninth item on the Prepared Jell Well are the “Read Well” stories. Stories two and four are options for re-reading. If the teacher re-reads story two and students read without difficulty then there is no need to re-read story four. Students re-read the story to increase fluency of the newly introduced skills in the unit.

Summary

Prepared Jell Wells provide a quick and easy Direct Instruction re-teaching tool based on research. The Prepared Jell Well implements the five critical components of reading—phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and vocabulary—to bring about the ultimate goal of reading with comprehension.

The “Read Well” program follows the adopted core curriculum for first grade at Hart School District, although it is an excellent research based program that focuses on the five key components of reading: phonics, vocabulary, phonemic awareness, comprehension, and fluency. Washington State reading scores on fourth grade standardized reading tests were at seventy-four percent of students at benchmark in 2009 (WA OSPI, 2009). Twenty-six percent of students are failing (WA OSPI, 2009). Washington School districts using “Read Well” continue to need intervention materials
that meet the following criteria: National Reading Panel, No Child Left Behind, and The Washington K-12 Reading Model. The Prepared Jell Well provides the needed intervention materials, the best methods of instruction for the demographics of Hart Elementary.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The Prepared Jell Well project is a tool created to enhance teaching the first grade “Read Well” curriculum. Intervention materials are needed to supplement first grade curriculum. The project follows the National Reading Panel and the Washington State K-12 Reading Model, and Reading First recommended guidelines for implementing best practices and maintaining fidelity to the core curriculum. The tool employs Direct Instruction to teach phonemic awareness, vowel discrimination, and phonics, along with sight words to at risk students.

Much research determining the best methods for teaching reading was done by Project Follow Through. Project Follow Through determined the best instructional method to for teaching struggling students to read was Direct Instruction. Direct Instruction methods as recommended by Project Follow Through are implemented in teaching the Prepared Jell Well.

The National Reading Panel identified five essential reading components that need to be taught to struggling students: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. The Prepared Jell Well provides intervention materials for pre-teaching and re-teaching the focus skills of the “Read Well” first grade reading program. The materials are designed to provide at risk students with extra practice in vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, vowel discrimination, fluency, sight words,
and rhyming practice. Thus, students can decode words to make meaning and gain comprehension of words.

The Prepared Jell Wells provide repetition in phonemic awareness and sight word practice. Teaching Prepared Jell Wells in small groups encompasses the critical components of an effective reading program:

The most critical elements of an effective program for the prevention of reading disability at the elementary school level are (a) the right kind and quality of instruction delivered with the (b) right level of intensity and duration to (c) the right children at the (d) right time. (Torgesen, 1998, p. 34)

There is a significant educational crisis in America, Washington State, and in Hart School District. According to the ABC web site, seven million Americans are illiterate (Thomas, Date, Sandell, & Cook, 2008). Twenty-seven million cannot even complete a job application. Thirty million cannot read a sentence (Thomas et al., 2008). The price of illiteracy affects all Americans. According to ABC News (2008), the National Illiteracy Action Project claims, “Five billion a year in taxes goes to support people receiving public assistance that are unemployable due to illiteracy.” Effective reading interventions that follow research and best practices are essential for this nation.

Washington State out performs the national average of students that meet state reading benchmarks. In 2008, Washington had seventy-three percent of students at reading benchmark (WA OSPI, n.d.). Washington State has a reading model in place. It is a systematic, three-tier instructional plan for improving instruction. The model follows
the National Reading Panel’s guidelines and the Reading First criterion as well as NCLB recommendations.

Although progress is being made in Washington State, twenty-seven percent of students are still failing to meet reading goals (WA OSPI, n.d.). The Washington K-12 Reading Model implements the five essential components for building a literacy foundation as identified by the National Reading Panel Report. This model focuses on phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension.

Hart School district is committed to using the best practices to teach reading and follows all the aforementioned criterions to teach its diverse population. Seventy-five percent of students are Hispanic (WA OSPI, n.d.). Seventy-seven percent of students qualify for free and reduced lunches. Thirteen percent of students are enrolled in special education. Thirty percent of students are in the transitional bilingual program. Nineteen percent of students are classified migrant. Six percent are classified homeless. Reading scores on fourth-grade standardized reading tests are at thirty-seven percent of students at grade level benchmark. In 2008 at Hart School District, sixty-three percent of students are failing (WA OSPI, n.d.). These demographics present many educational challenges and require teachers to be well trained in the best practices.

Most instructional models wait for children to fail. This model fails to wait. The goal of the project is to provide the best tool with the best method of instruction to students identified as at risk. The Prepared Jell Well tool will simplify interventions and increase at-risk students’ achievements, prior to failure. The report "Preventing Reading
Difficulties in Young Children" calls for widespread information to be shared. "Most reading difficulties can be prevented. There is much work to be done, however, that requires the aggressive deployment of the information currently available" (Snow et al., 1998, p.8). This project supplies the identified skills and methods of instruction, so all students can learn to read at mastery level.

Implications

The implementation of Prepared Jell Wells has provided teachers with a prepared tool: language component practice, phonics practice, mirrors the core reading curriculum. Students are provided immediate feedback, so learning is reinforced immediately. The intervention tool can be used to pre-teach, re-teach or for extra practice. Preliminary data shows students are making gains in phonemic awareness and in nonsense word testing. This intervention model does not wait for students to fail prior to receiving assistance. Students currently receiving instruction using the project are successfully passing unit assessments.

Recommendations

All students in the first grade “Read Well” program who are not passing the units or students who are identified by the DIBELS assessment as not at grade level benchmarks should receive daily intervention for thirty minutes using the Prepared Jell Well.

The Prepared Jell Wells should have further study to determine the effects of incorporating kinesthetic activities into the instruction. The chant could be done as a
cheer with movements and gestures, for example, “N as in nest.” The students would cup hands to simulate a nest.

Kindergarten “Read Well” is a mirror image of the skills in taught in first grade units one through twenty. The Prepared Jell Well could be expanded to include kindergarten materials for use as a kindergarten intervention. Prior to implementation training should be to introduce the materials and error correction procedures. Instruction should be modeled and immediate positive feedback practiced.
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Step by Step Jell Well Instructions

The Jell Well is a 30 minute Direct Instruction review of Read Well skills. It reinforces reading instruction taught in the 90 minute reading block. The Jell Well is a second dose of the daily skills and is intended as a resource for failing students. It can be used to pre-teach, re-teach or as a reading intervention tool. Jell Wells are to be taught with enthusiasm and a perky pace. Each component should be covered in 3-5 minutes. All students are to be actively engaged.

- Template cards are provided as a method of instruction. Templates provide consistency in Direct Instruction directions and error correction procedures.

- Chant: Read Well chants are the first component of the lesson. See page 66, Appendix A for a complete list of the chants. Teacher models the chant. Next students and teachers do the chant together, the teacher reads a line and students echo it back. Last the students recite the chant independently. Repeat 3 times.

- Vocabulary: Teacher shows vocabulary pictures and pronounces the vocabulary words. The teacher briefly uses the word in a sentence. Students look at the pictures and chorally pronounce the words. Students discuss the pictures and briefly share their knowledge.

- Sound practice: Teacher models sounds or blends with care given to enunciation. Students pronounce each sound or blend. Letters of the alphabet are written on a white board, named and pronounced. Example: s as in snake, your turn. Using
flash cards or white boards ask students to name the letter and sound. Template card 1.

- Stretch and shrink: words are pronounced slowly. Students put fists together and move them apart three inches or so every time they hear a new sound in a word. Example: man-m-a-n. How many sounds did you hear? 3 sounds. Group participation, “let’s say the word “man” together, and move our hands apart for every sound we hear. M-a-n.

- Smooth Blending: teacher models sounds and writes them on a white board while saying the sound: Example c and r go together and say cr, a says ah, s and h go together and say sh, lets put the sounds together, cr a sh. Blend. What word?

- Sound Dictation: students use individual white boards to write the sounds the teacher is pronouncing.

- Word Dictation: students write the words on individual white boards as the teacher pronounces them.

- Discrimination: students write the words on individual white boards as the teacher dictates, or the teacher can write the words on a white board and students sound them out. The teacher changes letters to make new words. Example: dad, sad, hat, cat, sat, mat.

- Rhyming: this is an oral activity. Teacher pronounces words and students take turns rhyming with the word.
- Example: teacher says, cat, students take turn saying words or make believe words, zat.

- Multisyllabic Words: have students count how many times their chins move down when saying a word. Example: ra-coon 2 syllables, say it the fast way, ra+coon=raccoon.

- Fluency: instruct students to sound words out and write them the fast way. Students write words quickly on white boards or paper.

- Optional re-teaching: re-read story 2 and 4 in the Read Well books if students are not firm in the skills.

- Assessment: after re-teaching the Jell Well retest students on the end of the unit assessment. Space is provided at the top left of each Jell Well to record informal assessment of student needs.

- Template cards provide Direct Instruction methods and directions to help teach reading. Templates maintain consistency and uniformity in: wording, signaling, explaining the task, modeling, practice, error corrections, and individual turns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="center">S as in Snake</th>
<th align="center">T as in turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="center">Capital letter S, small letter s, S says sss. Snazzy snoozing snake s, s, sss.</td>
<td align="center">Capital letter T, small letter t, T says t. Ten terrific turkeys, T, t, t.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="center">E as in Emu</th>
<th align="center">W as in Wind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="center">M as in Mouse, M as in Monkey</th>
<th align="center">I as in insect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="center">A as in Ant</th>
<th align="center">H as in Hippo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th align="center">D as in Dinosaur</th>
<th align="center">C as in Cat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td align="center">Capital letter D, small letter d, D says d. Dangerous dancing dinosaur, D, d, d.</td>
<td align="center">Capital letter C, small letter c, C says c. Curious cat, C, c, c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">th as in the</td>
<td align="center">R as in Rabbit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">-------------</td>
<td align="center">----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">See the cat.</td>
<td align="center">Capital letter R,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">See the dog.</td>
<td align="center">small letter r,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">See the word &quot;the&quot;</td>
<td align="center">R says rrr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">See the letters go together,</td>
<td align="center">Racing rabbit,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td align="center">th, th, th.</td>
<td align="center">R, r, rrr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N as in Nest</th>
<th>Y as in Yarn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter N,</td>
<td>Capital letter Y,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter n,</td>
<td>small letter y,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N says nnn.'</td>
<td>Y says y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nightingale in a nest,</td>
<td>Yards and yards of yellow yarn,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N, n, nnn.</td>
<td>Y, y, y.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L as in letter</th>
<th>P as in Pig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter L,</td>
<td>Capital letter P,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter l,</td>
<td>small letter p,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L says lll.</td>
<td>P says p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter in the laundry,</td>
<td>Pennies in a piggy bank,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O as in Otter</th>
<th>V as in Volcano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter O,</td>
<td>Capital letter V,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter o,</td>
<td>small letter v,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O says ooo.</td>
<td>V says v v v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otter on a log,</td>
<td>Violent volcano,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B as in baseball</th>
<th>Qu as in Quake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter B,</td>
<td>The letter q goes with u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter b,</td>
<td>Qu says qu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B says b.</td>
<td>Quiver and quake,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue bat playing ball.</td>
<td>Qu, qu, qu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, b, b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G as in Gorilla</strong></td>
<td><strong>J as in Jaguar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter G</td>
<td>Capital letter J,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter g,</td>
<td>small letter j,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G says g.</td>
<td>J says j.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great, great gorilla,</td>
<td>Jazzy jaguar in a jeep,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G, g, g.</td>
<td>J, j, j.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F as in Frog</strong></td>
<td><strong>X as in Fox</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter F,</td>
<td>Capital letter X,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter f,</td>
<td>small letter x,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F says fff.</td>
<td>X says xxx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funny flying frog,</td>
<td>Fox in a box,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F, f, fff.</td>
<td>X, x, xxx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U as in umbrella</strong></td>
<td><strong>Z as in Zebra</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital letter U,</td>
<td>Capital letter Z,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small letter u,</td>
<td>small letter z,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U says uuu.</td>
<td>Z says zzz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up, up umbrella,</td>
<td>Zany zebra zipping zippers,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U, u, uuu.</td>
<td>Z, z, z z z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>er as in Sister</strong></td>
<td><strong>SH as in Sheep</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter e goes with r,</td>
<td>s and h go together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er, er, er.</td>
<td>They say sh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister, brother, mother, father,</td>
<td>Sh, sh, shivering sheep,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er, er, er.</td>
<td>Sh, sh, sh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E as in Engine</strong></td>
<td><strong>ar as in Shark</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter e has two sounds,</td>
<td>Two letters a and r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e as in emu,</td>
<td>always say ar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And e as in engine.</td>
<td>Ar as in shark and star,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Ed in the engine.</td>
<td>Ar, ar, ar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, e, eee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y as in Fly</td>
<td>Wh as in Whale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The letter y has</td>
<td>The letter w goes with h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several sounds.</td>
<td>What begins with wh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear the y at the end of fly.</td>
<td>Whoosh went the whale!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My, oh my, a fly in the sky,</td>
<td>Wh, wh, wh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y, yy, yyyy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Number</td>
<td>Instructional Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Letter Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Letter Sounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Regular &amp; Irregular Word Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Phonemic Awareness-Onset Rime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Phonemic Awareness-Blending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Phonemic Awareness-Segmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sound/Spelling (oi, aw, sh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Blending-Sound by Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Blending-Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Spelling Focus (Sound-spelling to word)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Write the letters from the Lesson Map on the board in random order. Put new or difficult letters on the board more than once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Point just to the left of the letter. Name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Tap under letter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Say: You’re going to practice saying the names for some letters. You’re going to say the name of the letter when I tap under it.

(Model only the first couple of times you do this lesson.) Say: I’ll model for you how to say the name of the first two letters. My turn.

Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.

Say: Each time I tap under a letter, you say the name of the letter. Your turn.

Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.

To correct students:

Use signaling procedure above with only teacher responding to correct students.

Say: My turn.

After you model, use signaling procedure above with only students responding to have them repeat correct responses.

Say: Your turn. Back up two letters and continue.

When it appears that the group is consistently answering all items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students for one letter each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.
Template Card 2

Letter sound review
Write letters from the Lesson Map on the board in random order. Put new or difficult letters on the board more than once.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Point just to left of letter.</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>2 seconds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Tap/touch under letter*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tap for stop sounds, touch for two seconds for continuous sounds.

Say: You’re going to practice saying the sounds for some letters. You’ll say the sound as long as I touch under it.
(Model only the first couple of times)
Say: I’ll model for you how to say the sound of the first two letters when I touch under them. My turn.
Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.
Say: Each time I touch under a letter, you say the sound it makes. Your turn.
Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.
To correct students:
Use signaling procedure above with only teacher responding to correct students.
Say: My turn.
After you model, use signaling procedure above with only students responding have them repeat correct responses.
Say: Your turn.

Back up two letters and continue.
When it appears that the group is answering items correctly, provide individual turns. Call on several students for one sound each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.
### Card #3 Template for Practicing Word Reading (regular and irregular words)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Explanation/Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular and irregular word reading</td>
<td>Write words from the Lesson Map on the board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNALING PROCEDURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPLAIN TASK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly name and explain the task to students prior to starting the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL RESPONSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model desired response to the task with several examples using signaling procedure above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVIDE PRACTICE USING WHOLE-GROUP RESPONSES UNTIL KNOWLEDGE APPEARS TO BE SOLID</strong></td>
<td>Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CORRECTION PROCEDURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Focus
- **Do**: Point just to the left of word.
- **Say**: Word?

#### Wait time
- **Do**: 2 seconds

#### Signal for student response
- **Do**: Sweep hand under word swiftly
- **Say**: You’re going to practice reading words. When I point to a word, figure out the word in your head. When I sweep under the word, say the word.

(Model only the first couple of times you do this lesson.)

#### Say:
- When I sweep under a word, you say the word. Your turn.
- Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.

To correct students for regular words:
- **Do**: My turn. The word is ______.
- **Say**: Your turn. Word?
- **Have students blend the word using the appropriate blending routine for your group and then say the whole word.**
- **Back up two words and continue.**
INDIVIDUAL TURNS

To correct students for irregular words:
Say: My turn. The word is ______.
Your turn. Word? ______.
Say: Spell ______. Tap under each letter as students spell the word aloud. Word? ______.
Back up two words and continue.

When it appears that the group is consistently answering items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Say: When I point to the left of a word, everybody figure out the word in your head. When I call your name, say the word. Point to the left of the first word, pause several seconds, say a student’s name, then sweep under the word. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Card #4</th>
<th>Template for Onset-Rime Blending Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steps</strong></td>
<td><strong>Explanation/Script</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>Onset-Rime Blending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>Have white board marker with green cap and words from lesson map available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALING</td>
<td>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCEDURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do</strong></td>
<td><strong>Say</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>1 Tap green cap of whiteboard marker.  2 Tap white part of marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Slide finger above marker from left to right from student perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAIN TASK</td>
<td>Say: We're going to put together the first sound and the end part of a word to make a whole word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL RESPONSE</strong></td>
<td>(Model only the first couple of times you do this lesson.) Say: I'll model two words for you. I'll say the first sound and the end part, then I'll say the whole word. My turn. Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVIDE PRACTICE USING WHOLE-GROUP RESPONSES UNTIL UNDERSTANDING APPEARS TO BE SOLID</td>
<td>Say: For each word, I'll say the first sound and the end part. When I signal, everybody will say the whole word. Your turn. Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRECTION PROCEDURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To correct students:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use signaling procedure above with only teacher responding to correct students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say: My turn. /f/ /o/f/ for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After you model, use signaling procedure above with only students responding to have them repeat correct responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say: Your turn. /f/ /o/f/.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back up two items and continue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL TURNS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When it appears that the group is consistently answering all items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students for one word each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Card #5 Template for Phoneme Blending Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Explanation/Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK PREPARATION</td>
<td>Phoneme blending Prepare chains of 2, 3, 4, and 5 unifix cubes prior to lesson. Have words from lesson map available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALING PROCEDURE</td>
<td><strong>Do</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALING PROCEDURE</td>
<td>Wait time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPLAIN TASK</td>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly name and explain the task to students prior to starting the activity.</td>
<td><strong>Say:</strong> You’re going to practice blending individual sounds to make words. I’ll tap a cube as I say each sound in the word and then you’ll say the word. (Model the first couple of times) Say: I’ll model for you how to blend the sounds I say into a word. I’ll model two words. My turn. Model for students, using cubes and the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding. Say: I’ll say the sounds in a word. When I signal, you say the word. Your turn. Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding. To correct students: Use signaling procedure above with only teacher responding to correct students. Say: My turn. /f/ /i/ /g/ fig. After you model, use signaling procedure above with only students responding, have them repeat correct responses. Say: Your turn. /f/ /i/ /g/ Back up two items and continue. When it appears that the group is consistently answering all items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RESPONSE</td>
<td>PROVIDE PRACTICE USING WHOLE-GROUP RESPONSES UNTIL UNDERSTANDING APPEARS TO BE SOLID Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTANDING APPEARS TO BE SOLID</td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL TURNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps</td>
<td>Explanation/Script</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDENTIFY TASK</td>
<td>Phoneme Segmenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>Have words from Lesson Map available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNALING PROCEDURE</td>
<td>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Hold up a closed fist, fingers facing you.</th>
<th>Pan. Say the sounds in <em>pan</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Every second hold up one finger in a left to right progression from student perspective for every sound in the word.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Say: You’re going to practice saying the sounds in words. I’ll say a word. Each time I hold up a finger, you’ll say a sound in the word.

(Model only the first couple of times you present this template.)

Say: I’ll model for you how to say the sounds in two words. I’ll say a sound each time I hold up a finger. My turn.

EXAMPLE

Listen. *net*. Here are the sounds in *net*: /n/ /e/ /t/.
Listen. *pan*. Here are the sounds in *pan*: /p/ /a/ /n/. Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.

Say: I’ll say the word. Each time I hold up a finger, you say a sound. Your turn.

Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.
Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.

**CORRECTION PROCEDURE**

To correct students:
Use signaling procedure above with only teacher responding to correct students.
Say: My turn. Tag /u/ /a/ /g/
After you model, use signaling procedure above with only students responding have them repeat correct responses.
Say: Your turn. Tag.
Back up two items and continue.

**INDIVIDUAL TURNS**

When it appears that the group is consistently answering all items correctly, provide individual turns as a check.
Call on several students for one word each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.
**Card #7** Template for Sound/Spelling Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Explanation/Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK</strong></td>
<td>Sound/spelling review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td>Write spellings from the Lesson Map on the board in random order. Put new or difficult spellings on the board more than once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNALING PROCEDURE</strong></td>
<td>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPLAIN TASK</strong></td>
<td>Briefly name and explain the task to students prior to starting the activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL RESPONSE</strong></td>
<td>Model desired response to the task with several examples using signaling procedure above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVIDE PRACTICE USING WHOLE-GROUP RESPONSES UNTIL KNOWLEDGE APPEARS TO BE SOLID</strong></td>
<td>Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Point just to left of spelling.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wait time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Signal for student response</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Say: You’re going to practice saying the **sounds** for some spellings.

(Model only the first couple of times you do this lesson.)

Say: I’ll model for you how to say the sounds of the first two spellings when I touch under them. My turn. Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.

Say: Each time I tap under a spelling, you say the sound it makes. Your turn. Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.

To correct students:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORRECTION PROCEDURE</th>
<th>Use signaling procedure above with only teacher responding to correct students. Say: My turn. After you model, use signaling procedure above with only students responding have them repeat correct responses. Say: Your turn. Back up two letters and continue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL TURNS</td>
<td>When it appears that the group is answering items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students for one sound each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Template for Sound-by Sound Blending Explanation/Script

**Task**

**Preparation**

**Signalizing**

Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.

**Explain Task**

Briefly name and explain the task to students prior to starting the activity.

**Model Task**

Model desired response to the task with several examples using signaling procedure above.

**Provide Practice Using Whole-Group Responses Until Knowledge Appears to Be Solid**

Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.

**Correction Procedure**

**Individual Turns**

### Sound-by-Sound Blending. Have words available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound/Spellings</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Write letter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Tap under letter</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blending*</td>
<td>Do</td>
<td>Say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Point to left of first letter</td>
<td>Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Sweep under letters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Blend after two spellings have been written. Blend after each additional spelling is presented.

**Example**

Write *m* on board. Say: *Sound?* Tap under *m.*

Write *a* on board: *ma.* Say: *Sound?* Tap under *a.*

Say: *Blend.* Sweep under *m* and *a.*

Write *s* on board: *mas.* Say: *Sound?* Tap under *s.*

Say: *Blend.* Sweep under *m,* *a,* and *s.*

Write *k* on board: *mask.* Say: *Sound?* Tap under *k.*

Say: *Blend.* Slide hand quickly under the *word:* *mask.*

Say: *Word?* *Mask.*

Say: Today you'll be practicing blending individual sounds to make words.

Model, using the signaling procedure above. Say: *Your turn.*

Provide practice with only students responding.

Sound Error: Model sound, have students repeat sound. Say: *My turn. Sound?/\*.*

Your turn. Sound?

Then return to beginning of word. Say: *Let's start over.*

Blending Error:

To correct students:

Use signaling procedure model blending correctly. Say: *My turn.*

Test students on blending step. Say: *Your turn. Blend.*

Return to beginning of word. Say: *Let's start over.*

Back up two words, re-present missed word. When it appears that the group is understanding provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students for one word each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.
## Template for Continuous Blending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Explanation/Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK</strong></td>
<td>Continuous Blending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td>Write words from Lesson Map on board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNALING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROCEDURE</strong></td>
<td>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blending</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Point just to the left of word*</td>
<td>Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>1 second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Loop under each letter, moving forward every 1-2 seconds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Word Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Immediately, point just to the left of word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Sweep hand swiftly under word</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For words beginning with a stop sound start by pointing under the first letter.

### EXAMPLE

Write *slam* on board.
Point to left of the *s* and say: **Blend**.
Loop under each letter every 1-2 seconds to prompt students to say each sound.
Immediately point again to left of word.
Then say: **Word?** and sweep hand under whole word swiftly.
Say: Today you'll practice blending individual sounds to make words. When I touch under a letter you'll say the sound for that letter. When you blend, don't stop between the sounds.

(Model only the first couple of times you present this template.)
Say: I'll model for you how to blend two words. My turn. Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.)
above.

PROVIDE PRACTICE USING WHOLE-GROUP RESPONSES UNTIL KNOWLEDGE APPEARS TO BE SOLID Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.

CORRECTION PROCEDURE

Say: Your turn. Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.

To correct students:

Sound Error:

Blending Error:
Use signaling procedure to model blending correctly. Say: *My turn.*
Lead students in blending. Teacher responds with students. Say: *Do it with me.*
Test students on blending step. Say: *Your turn. Blend.*
Repeat word from beginning using signaling procedure. Back up two words, re-present missed word, and then continue on.

When it appears that the group is consistently answering all items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students for one word each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Explanation/Script</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TASK</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spelling focused word reading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREPARATION</strong></td>
<td><em>Write words from Lesson Map on board.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIGNALING PROCEDURE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Use appropriate signals to elicit unison student responses.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPLAIN TASK</strong></td>
<td><em>Briefly name and explain the task to students prior to starting the activity.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MODEL TASK</strong></td>
<td><em>Model desired response to the task with several examples using signaling procedure above.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROVIDE PRACTICE USING WHOLE-GROUP RESPONSES UNTIL KNOWLEDGE APPEARS TO BE SOLID</strong></td>
<td><em>Use effective signaling, monitoring, and pacing procedures.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blending</th>
<th>Do</th>
<th>Say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Point under focus spelling*</td>
<td>Sound?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>1 second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Tap under spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word reading</td>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Point just to the left of word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>2 seconds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal for student response</td>
<td>Sweep hand swiftly under word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* If spelling has two letters, point with two fingers together.

**EXAMPLE**

Write point on board.
Point under oi and say: **Sound?**
Tap under oi spelling to prompt students to say /øy/.
Point just to the left of word and say: **Word?** Pause two seconds.
Sweep hand under whole word swiftly to prompt students to say point.

Say: Today you’ll be practicing reading words. First you’ll say the sound for a spelling in the word. Then you’ll read the whole word.

(Model only the first couple of times you present this template.)
Say: I’ll model for you how to read two words. My turn.
Model for students, using the signaling procedure above, with only teacher responding.

Say: Your turn.
Provide practice using the above signaling procedure with only students responding.
| CORRECTION PROCEDURE | Continued on next page  
| To correct students:  
| Sound Error:  
| Model sound, then have students repeat sound. Say: My turn. Sound? /ə/. Your turn. Sound?  
| Word Error: If students say word incorrectly, model sound and sound for students, then have students say the sound and the word.  
| Your turn. Sound? ___ Word? ___  
| Then back up two words, re-present missed word, and continue on.  
|  
| INDIVIDUAL TURNS | If student misreads word on second attempt, use continuous blending or erase word and use sound-by-sound blending. Then back up two words, re-present missed word, and continue on.  
| When it appears that the group is consistently answering all items correctly, provide individual turns as a check. Call on several students for one word each. Call on students in an unpredictable order. Call more frequently on students who made errors.  