SELF-STUDY GUIDE FOR IMPLEMENTING LITERACY INTERVENTIONS IN GRADES 3-8

REL SOUTHEAST
Regional Educational Laboratory
At Florida State University

ies NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE
Institute of Education Sciences

U.S. Department of Education
John B. King, Jr., *Secretary*

Institute of Education Sciences
Ruth Curran Neild, *Deputy Director for Policy and Research*
Delegated Duties of the Director

National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance
Joy Lesnick, *Acting Commissioner*
Amy Johnson, *Action Editor*
Sandra Garcia, *Project Officer*

REL 2016-224

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) conducts unbiased large-scale evaluations of education programs and practices supported by federal funds; provides research-based technical assistance to educators and policymakers; and supports the synthesis and the widespread dissemination of the results of research and evaluation throughout the United States.

September 2016

This publication and ancillary materials were prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-IES-12-C-0011 by Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast, administered by Florida State University. The content of the publication and ancillary materials does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

> Smith, K. G., Dombek, J. L., Foorman, B. R., Hook, K. S., Lee, L., Cote, A.-M., Sanabria, I., & Stafford, T. (2016). *Self-study guide for implementing literacy interventions in grades 3-8*. (REL 2016–224). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

This publication and ancillary materials are available on the Regional Educational Laboratory website at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

Photo Credits
Photographic images used by the Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast at Florida State University on the indicated pages (cover, ii, viii, and x) supplied by Thinkstock in compliance with Florida State University's annual license agreement.

SELF-STUDY GUIDE FOR IMPLEMENTING LITERACY INTERVENTIONS IN GRADES 3-8

Developed by

Kevin G. Smith
Jennifer L. Dombek
Barbara R. Foorman
Karl S. Hook
REL SOUTHEAST AT FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

And

Laurie Lee
Anna-Marie Cote
Israel Sanabria
Tammy Stafford
REL SOUTHEAST IMPROVING LITERACY RESEARCH ALLIANCE MEMBERS

September 2016

REL SOUTHEAST
Regional Educational Laboratory At Florida State University

ies NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE
Institute of Education Sciences

Introduction

While literacy interventions can be implemented in any grade, focusing on interventions in grades 3-8 is critical because it is often the best chance for students identified with earlier reading deficiencies to become ready for the literacy demands of postsecondary education and careers.

States in both the Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southeast region and across the country are implementing large-scale initiatives focused on delivering literacy interventions in grades 3-8. This self-study guide provides a template for data collection and guiding questions for discussion that may improve the implementation of literacy interventions in grades 3-8 and increase the number of students meeting college and career readiness standards.

This guide is intended to help district- and school-based practitioners conduct self-studies for planning and implementing literacy interventions in grades 3-8. Self-study is a process of using a guide with predetermined focus areas and questions to collect, share, and discuss data with stakeholders. The process can include teachers, instructional coaches, guidance counselors, school-based administrators, district administrators, and chief academic officers knowledgeable in literacy interventions in grades 3-8. It may help educators ensure strong implementation of interventions and document current practices in implementing a specific academic practice, multitiered system of support, or response to intervention policy. An ideal time for conducting a self-study of implementation of literacy interventions is the beginning or end of the school year so that prior-year implementation can be considered and planning can occur for implementation for the next school year.

States, districts, and schools that are implementing or planning to implement literacy interventions in grades 3-8 may find this guide helpful as they consider which types of evidence to collect and which components of intermediate grades and middle school literacy interventions are important for evaluating implementation.

Determining and meeting the need for literacy interventions

While many districts and schools recognize the need for literacy interventions in grades 3-8, successful implementation is often a challenge. The Self-study guide for implementing literacy interventions in grades 3-8 will be most effective if each school's current situation and needs are considered. Prior to completing this guide, a team of educators at the school might consider current literacy intervention needs and practices. This team may consist of teachers, others who deliver literacy interventions, and relevant school-based administrators and staff (for example, lead teachers, instructional coaches, response to intervention coordinators, and guidance counselors). As the team completes the guide, the following overarching questions may be beneficial in determining how interventions are being carried out and what changes may be needed:

- What is the need for literacy interventions at my school?
- How are my students performing, and how many need to be served?
- In what components of literacy are my students struggling?
- How will we determine which students are served through literacy interventions?
- Will additional adults or cross-age tutors enter the classroom to assist the teacher in differentiating instruction in small groups?
- Will students be pulled out of their classroom to receive intervention?
- How many minutes each day, days per week, and weeks per year will students receive intervention?
- What challenges will be encountered when delivering high-quality literacy interventions, and how can these challenges be overcome?

Purpose and use of the self-study guide

The purpose of the Self-study guide for implementing literacy interventions in grades 3-8 is to help districts and schools:

- Gather baseline information to use in developing an implementation plan for literacy interventions.
- Prioritize their needs as they develop their implementation plan for literacy interventions.
- Gather progress-monitoring information for continuous improvement of literacy interventions.
- Evaluate the implementation of literacy interventions.

This guide was designed to promote reflection about current strengths and challenges in planning and implementation, spark conversations among staff, and identify areas for improvement. Based on pilot testing, use of this guide for school-level self-study will take three to five hours. Time estimates are provided in the process steps outlined in box 1. It may be helpful to elicit input from participating teachers and others who deliver literacy interventions, in addition to instructional coaches and school-based administrators.

The self-study guide works best if a dedicated facilitator leads the process for members of the self-study team. The facilitator should be knowledgeable in best literacy intervention practices from research as well as in intervention policies, procedures, and implementation and should review the guide in detail before the self-study begins. This review will take approximately two hours. The facilitator should also collect relevant data and possible sources of evidence before convening a meeting. The facilitator should be a careful listener and able to lead and structure discussions around collected evidence and decisionmaking processes.

Components of the guide

The Self-study guide for implementing literacy interventions in grades 3-8 consists of the *Scoring Guide*, *Implementation Consensus Rating Form*, and *Planning Next Steps Form*.

Scoring Guide

The *Scoring Guide* includes guiding questions and potential sources of evidence to support districts and schools in reviewing district- and school-based planning and implementation of interventions. The *Scoring Guide* is tied to school actions and uses a four-point scale to assess the current status of implementation. The content of the *Scoring Guide* is based on eight areas: student selection, assessment selection and data use, content and instruction, instructional time, interventionist or teacher selection, professional development and ongoing support, communication, and intervention or classroom environment. An annotated bibliography of the research supporting each scoring guide area is provided in appendix A. Box 1 explains how to use the *Scoring Guide*.

Implementation Consensus Rating Form

After the *Scoring Guide* is completed, the facilitator guides the self-study team through a consensus rating process. The team uses the *Implementation Consensus Rating Form* to reach agreement on the current status of implementation in the school and on planning the next steps. The most important part of this process for states, districts, and schools is the discussion that goes into consensus rating. The scores on the *Implementation Consensus Rating Form* should reflect this facilitated discussion.

Planning Next Steps Form

The *Planning Next Steps Form* is used to prioritize the areas based on the strength of evidence and importance for success as described in the literature. The self-study team should review the consensus ratings showing a need to develop or improve, identify two or three top priorities from the eight areas for action planning, record the priority areas, complete a detailed plan for next steps and activities, and note any potential challenges. Box 1 explains how to use the *Planning Next Steps Form*.

Box 1. Steps to complete the *Scoring Guide*, *Implementation Consensus Rating Form*, and *Planning Next Steps Form*

- **Recruit five to seven members who will make up the self-study team, and convene a meeting to complete the self-study process. Select a dedicated and knowledgeable facilitator. Then recruit teachers, others who deliver literacy interventions, and relevant school-based administrators (lead teachers, instructional coaches, response to intervention coordinators, and guidance counselors) knowledgeable in literacy intervention policies and implementation to complete the team.**
- **Present an overview of the self-study process to all team members, including a review of relevant data and possible sources of evidence collected by the facilitator.** [Activity length: 30 minutes]
- **Have each team member individually review the content of the *Scoring Guide* for each specific area that will be rated (for example, Student Selection, Assessment Selection and Data Use, Content and Instruction) and appendix A (Support for *Scoring Guide* areas).** [Activity length: 20 minutes]
- **Discuss any questions asked during the review. Questions should be answered by the facilitator after the overview and document review.** [Activity length: 20 minutes]
- **Have each team member rate each area individually using the full *Scoring Guide*, including a review of relevant data or possible sources of evidence provided by the facilitator. Each team member should rate each area independently to allow each person's voice to be heard. A team member who does not know how to rate a specific area may abstain from rating it.** [Activity length: 60 minutes]
- **Vote as a group to reach consensus. There are several steps to consensus voting** [Activity length: 90 minutes]**:**
  - *Vote*. **Ask each team member to provide a numerical ranking (1–4) for each of the eight areas.**
  - *Identify frequency*. **Identify the most frequent number (if three team members vote 3, five vote 2, and two vote 1, the most frequent number that team members voted is 2).**
  - *Discuss the rationale of the high frequency number*. **Ask a team member who selected the high frequency number to talk about what motivated that vote.**
  - *Discuss the rationale of lower frequency numbers*. **Ask other team members to talk about why they voted in a particular way.**
  - *Vote*. **Use numeric voting a second time. Team members may change their votes based on the discussion.**
  - *Record rating*. **If there is consensus (typically determined by majority vote), record the high frequency number on the *Implementation Consensus Rating Form*. If consensus is not reached (there is no high frequency number), continue discussing and voting until consensus is reached.**
  - *Continue across all areas*. **Repeat this process for each area.**

- **Discuss and record initial team thoughts on priorities, next steps, and activities on the *Implementation Consensus Rating Form*.** [Activity length: 20 minutes]
- **Complete the *Planning Next Steps Form* by leading a discussion with the group about the priorities for action, based on the strength of research on implementation. The facilitator will next lead a discussion for the development of a detailed implementation plan for next steps and activities that are most urgent and actionable. Finally, the facilitator will lead a discussion to capture potential challenges to the plan.** [Activity length: 60 minutes]

Grades 3-8 Self-Study Implementation Team

Facilitator: _____

Team Member: _____

Team Member: _____

Team Member: _____

Team Member: _____

Team Member: _____

Team Member: _____

Team Member: _____


Division Review 11

Self-Study Guide

Scoring Guide Area 1: Student Selection

A plan is developed and implemented to identify and serve struggling students with timely literacy interventions.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

1.1 A plan is developed and implemented for timely (in close proximity to the student's first day of school) identification of students who are at risk or failing to meet grade-level literacy expectations.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- District or school pupil progression plan. (Pupil or student progression plans are typically developed by local school districts and align with state policies to identify criteria, such as course mastery, attendance, and grade point average, that students must meet to be promoted to the next grade.)
- School improvement plan.
- District or school multitiered system of support or response to intervention plan.
- Documentation of assessments and other criteria used to identify students' academic skills (including attendance and prior grade retention).
- Documentation of student grades in academic courses and prior assessment scores.
- School schedule for administering literacy progress monitoring assessments.

Guiding questions

- Are students with literacy intervention needs identified through teacher nomination, previous grades, or existing assessment data in close proximity to the students' first day of school?
- Who ensures that all students with potential risks have been identified?
- Who administers literacy progress monitoring assessments?
- Who interprets the results of the literacy assessments and translates to instruction?
- Is there a more efficient way to identify students who are at risk?
- Is prior data available to prioritize placement of low-performing students in interventions?

1.2 A schedule is created and implemented to ensure that struggling students receive literacy interventions in a timely (in close proximity to the students' first day of school) manner.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- District or school pupil progression plan.
- School improvement plan.
- Intervention implementation timeline; school master schedule.
- Intervention course schedule for individuals who will be delivering literacy interventions.
- Intervention course scheduling for students eligible to receive literacy interventions.
- Information on progress with prior interventions delivered to students.

Guiding questions

- Does the intervention schedule allow additional time as needed for students who are significantly below grade level (more than one class period or outside of the reading block, before school, after school, winter break, spring break)?
- Does the school master schedule indicate who will deliver interventions, during what times, in what location, for which students, and in what size of group (intervention class sizes should be smaller than regular academic classes—15 students or fewer at middle school, and 3-5 student groups in intermediate grades)?
- Is student performance in prior literacy interventions considered during intervention placement?
- Does each student's schedule for intervention consider grade promotion requirements and schedule requests (academic course credit requirements, student courses selected for extracurricular activities, other services received)?

Scoring Guide Area 2: Assessment Selection and Data Use

Valid and reliable standardized literacy assessments are selected and used to determine the need for intervention in the domains of word knowledge (the ability to read and write words and understand their structure and multiple meanings) and text comprehension. Text comprehension involves understanding the discourse of text as well as the ability to engage in text-dependent writing. Assessments are also selected and utilized if necessary to determine the need for intervention in foundational reading skills, including phonics and word recognition. These assessments are to be aligned with instructional content to track a student's response to intervention and inform intervention placement, focus, duration, and intensity. In addition, inventories to determine students' motivation and engagement in learning are administered to guide the teacher in providing students with meaningful learning opportunities.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

2.1 Valid and reliable standardized literacy assessments are selected and used to determine the need for literacy intervention. For students in grades 3-8, literacy assessments should include measures of embedded vocabulary and comprehension. For students below grade level, assessments should include measures of potential instructional needs in phonics and word recognition, including multisyllabic words.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of criteria used to select assessments.
- Documentation of assessments used to identify students' word knowledge and text comprehension skills.
- Documentation of assessments identified to determine the need for intervention in foundational reading skills, including phonics and word recognition.
- District or school pupil progression plan; school improvement plan.
- Documentation of eligibility requirements (cutpoints) for receiving support through multitiered system of support or response to intervention.

Guiding questions

- Do the assessments include the most predictive indicators of literacy success as documented in the technical manual for the assessments?
- What are the eligibility requirements for receiving literacy interventions?
- How does the school determine which level of support eligible students will receive through interventions?

2.2 Formative assessments that align with instructional goals are used to monitor student response to intervention.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of criteria used to select formative assessments.
- Placement and pacing guidelines from current intervention curricula.
- District or school pupil progression plan; school improvement plan.
- Multitiered system of support or response to intervention guidelines.

Guiding questions

- How are embedded assessment data used to group students for interventions and the focus, length, and intensity of interventions?
- Are the individuals delivering interventions given support in making instructional and grouping decisions for students receiving interventions? Who provides the support?
- Is there a plan to review student progress in interventions and change intervention placement as needed?

2.3 Data are used by teachers and students to set goals, adjust instructional practices, and guide the selection of literacy curriculum materials in order to enhance student-centered learning, improve student motivation, and increase student engagement.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Learning environment and interest surveys.
- Documented use of school-based facilitators (instructional coaches) for data integration.
- District or school data management plan.
- Results of formative assessments, including embedded assessments.
- Documentation of a variety of texts available for student self-selection through curriculum materials, classroom libraries, and the media center.
- District, school, classroom, or publisher's data warehouse.

Guiding questions

- How are curriculum materials and topics of study determined?
- What is the variety of data available to teachers and students?
- What informational feedback is available and provided to students?
- What is the level of integration across disciplines and collaboration among teachers?
- What supplemental text is available to students for self-selection within the curriculum, in classroom libraries, and in the media center?

Scoring Guide Area 3: Content and Instruction

The design of the curriculum and the plan for instruction and interventions reflect instructional practices that have been empirically shown to support gains in student achievement.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

3.1 Criteria for selecting and using programs and curricula that have been shown to have a positive effect on student achievement are used (see What Works Clearinghouse, http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/; Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2003).	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Review of criteria for selecting the most effective literacy programs and curricula.
- Documentation of program use.
- Professional development records.
- Log or record of literacy programs and curricula that are currently available at the school.

Guiding questions

- Have criteria been developed to select programs and materials for use with students receiving literacy interventions?
- Are all components of selected curricula or programs available in their entirety to ensure that each intervention is delivered the way it was intended to be delivered (with fidelity)?
- Has professional development been provided to individuals delivering interventions to support effective use of selected reading programs and curriculum?

3.2 A plan is developed and implemented for literacy interventions that reflects instructional practices empirically shown to increase student achievement.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Professional development plans for individuals delivering interventions, including instructional materials, an instructional schedule that maximizes instructional time, and instructional practices empirically shown to affect gains in student achievement.
- Instructional plans for interventions.
- Interviews with instructional coaches, administrators, and educators who implement interventions.
- Intervention session observations.
- Professional development attendance records and evaluations.
- Progress monitoring tools and data.

Guiding questions

- Does the professional development offered focus on instructional practices empirically shown to increase student achievement (practices validated with data)?
- Does the plan for literacy interventions for interventionists and content area teachers reflect instructional practices empirically shown to increase student achievement such as: academic language development, explicit vocabulary instruction, academic discussion, direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies, background knowledge development, focus on building depth of word knowledge (multiple meanings, morphological analysis), cooperative learning, and feedback?
- For students below grade level, does instruction include explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and the alphabetic principle, reading for meaning, and practice in fluent reading and writing as needed?
- Who facilitates the development of instructional plans that are informed by student assessment data?
- Do fidelity observations help verify the implementation and support of effective instructional practices (for example, observations of adherence to program components delivered with quality)?

Scoring Guide Area 4: Instructional Time

The school schedule has allocated sufficient and consistent instructional time to facilitate literacy interventions and meet students' instructional needs.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

	Implementation progress			
4.1 The school has established a schedule that maximizes instructional time for literacy interventions through various formats such as standalone courses, pull-out or push-in intervention groups, integration of intervention strategies in content area courses, and out-of-school time.	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- District or school pupil progression plan.
- School master schedule (includes intervention and course schedules).
- Interviews with teachers, instructional coaches, guidance counselors, administrators, and staff to determine best schedules for interventions.
- Schedule/list of opportunities for intervention available during out-of-school time.

Guiding questions

- Where in the school schedule is time provided for literacy interventions?
- How does the school schedule provide time for literacy interventions above and beyond the minimum or required time already allocated to literacy instruction?
- Does the length of time dedicated to literacy interventions offer enough intensity and duration for literacy growth?
- Are interventions delivered during out-of-school times (before school, after school, breaks)?

4.2 The school has established a schedule that delivers literacy interventions with the appropriate frequency, consistency, and duration to meet students' instructional needs.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- District or school pupil progression plans.
- School master schedule (includes intervention and course schedules).
- Review of student academic, attendance, and behavior data.

Guiding questions

- According to the master schedule, how many days per week and minutes per day will students receive literacy interventions?
- According to diagnostic assessment data, are students receiving enough intervention time to meet their needs?
- Is the intervention schedule being consistently implemented as designed?

Scoring Guide Area 5: Interventionist or Teacher Selection

A plan is developed and implemented to identify or hire, develop, and retain the best possible individuals to deliver literacy interventions for struggling students.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

	Implementation progress
5.1 A plan is developed and implemented to identify or hire school faculty and staff who will deliver literacy interventions to students daily or nearly daily in small groups. The individuals delivering interventions should be able to teach literacy skills in an engaging manner to students during classroom intervention or content area instruction.	1 2 3 4

Possible sources of evidence

- Schedules for school faculty and staff (may include content area teachers, instructional coaches, paraprofessionals or instructional assistants, other school staff).
- Documentation of hiring, training, and work hours of individuals identified to deliver interventions.
- Student data documenting the effectiveness of interventionists.

Guiding questions

- How many school faculty and staff who have demonstrated success in teaching literacy skills are available to deliver interventions daily or nearly daily in small groups?
- How many school faculty and staff can be identified who have the ability to be trained to implement effective literacy interventions?
- Do the school faculty and staff selected to deliver interventions have consistent blocks of time in their daily schedule that enable them to work with one or more intervention groups daily or nearly daily? Can schedules be adjusted to allow them to consistently (daily or nearly daily) serve intervention groups?
- How are teachers' schedules established to provide time for small-group instruction or interventions to take place in the classroom?
- How are instructional coaches hired at the school to support intervention teachers?
- How will it be assured that the students with the greatest needs are placed with the most effective intervention teachers?

5.2 A plan is developed and implemented to identify available community volunteers and cross-age tutors who can deliver literacy interventions to students daily or nearly daily in small groups.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of current community volunteers and cross-age tutors.
- Schedule of availability for each well-trained community volunteer or cross-age tutor.
- Documentation of partnerships with local colleges and universities and high school leadership organizations.
- Documentation of partnerships with local or national organizations, agencies, and nonprofit groups.

Guiding questions

- Does the district or school recruit, train, and use community volunteers or cross-age tutors to reduce group sizes for implementing literacy interventions?
- Do the current or prospective community volunteers and cross-age tutors (older high school or college students, pre-service teachers, mentors, retired teachers, parents, grandparents) have a schedule that enables them to frequently and consistently work with the same intervention groups?
- Who is providing ongoing support and monitoring of interventionists' teaching?

Scoring Guide Area 6: Professional Development and Ongoing Support

A plan is developed and implemented to provide professional development and ongoing support to school faculty, staff, and community volunteers delivering literacy interventions and strategy instruction for educators delivering initial instruction.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

6.1 A plan is developed and implemented to provide professional development for individuals delivering literacy interventions and strategy instruction for content area teachers.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Professional development schedule and training agenda.
- Professional development training materials.
- Professional learning community schedules and agendas.

Guiding questions

- Who provides training in literacy intervention strategies for educators delivering initial academic instruction?
- Who provides training to individuals delivering literacy interventions?
- When do individuals delivering literacy interventions receive initial training?
- What follow-up and other professional development opportunities are offered and when?

6.2 A plan is developed and implemented to conduct ongoing observations of and provide feedback and support to individuals delivering literacy interventions.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Literacy interventions observation plan.
- Literacy interventions fidelity checklist or rubric.
- Interviews with school faculty and staff responsible for organizing the implementation of literacy interventions.

Guiding questions

- Has a timeline agreed on by teachers and school leaders been developed for teacher implementation of instructional practices modeled during professional development?
- Does the school use rubrics or checklists to conduct ongoing fidelity observations of individuals delivering interventions? How often?
- Do observations of intervention sessions inform school leaders about the kinds of support and feedback to provide to individuals delivering intervention?

Scoring Guide Area 7: Communication

A plan is developed and implemented to facilitate effective communication and collaboration among administrators, instructional coaches, classroom teachers, intervention teachers, parents, and guidance counselors to ensure that each student's instructional needs are met.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

7.1 A plan is developed and implemented for communication and collaboration that will ensure successful startup of literacy interventions.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of faculty and staff roles and responsibilities.
- Interviews with administrators and leadership (for example, instructional coaches, response to intervention coaches, special education teachers, guidance counselors, content area teachers).
- Meeting notes from literacy intervention planning meetings.
- Memos from administrators or leadership to classroom teachers.
- Documentation of communication with parents.
- Documentation of communication with those delivering intervention during out-of-school times.

Guiding questions

- Who is responsible for organizing intervention startup (for example, identifying school personnel and community volunteers who will deliver interventions, identifying training opportunities for those delivering interventions, creating intervention schedules, ensuring timely assessment of students to determine eligibility for intervention, identifying students for intervention placement)?
- How are parents informed when a student is deemed eligible to receive literacy intervention?
- What connections have been made with educators who served students in previous school years?
- How does communication between instructors and interventionists during the school day with those delivering intervention at out-of-school times ensure alignment of instruction?

7.2 A plan is developed that enables teachers, those delivering interventions, and parents to collaborate regularly regarding students' growth in targeted skill areas.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Interviews with classroom teachers.
- Interviews with individuals delivering interventions.
- Schedule of collaborative meetings between teachers and individuals implementing interventions.
- Schedule of conferences with parents.
- Schedule of school-sponsored parent and community literacy events.

Guiding questions

- Do teachers understand the intervention goals and progress for each student?
- What types of student work and data collected during intervention sessions are shared with classroom teachers and parents?
- How are classroom teachers using information from intervention sessions?
- What types of student work and data collected during classroom instruction are shared with individuals delivering interventions?
- How is information from classroom teachers used by interventionists?
- Who is facilitating collaborative discussions between teachers and interventionists about students' instructional needs?
- Are parents provided with resources to continue to support and build literacy skills in students while at home?

Scoring Guide Area 8: Intervention or Classroom Environment

A healthy and safe learning environment is established that is conducive to student engagement, student productivity, and intensive literacy instruction.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

8.1 A plan is developed and implemented to ensure a healthy and safe learning environment.	Implementation progress			
	1	2	3	4

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of district or school criteria for instructional environments.
- Documentation of a custodial or maintenance plan for instructional environments.
- Procedures established for school faculty and staff to report concerns about the instructional environment and for concerns to be addressed quickly.
- Documentation of available instructional spaces to provide consistent literacy interventions (inside and outside the classroom).
- Documentation of instructional materials (complete curricula) and supplies (pencils, paper, calculators, erasers, pencil sharpeners) available and easily accessible for intervention use.

Guiding questions

- Have criteria been developed to select instructional environments for intervention that will provide a healthy and safe learning environment in which distractions are minimized?
- Is there a plan in place to regularly monitor instructional environments to ensure that they remain a healthy and safe learning environment throughout the school year?
- Is instructional space consistently available to provide literacy interventions?
- Is the instructional space conducive to student engagement and productivity (for example, physical space, furniture, lighting, minimized outside distractions)?
- Is the instructional environment engaging, conducive to learning, and print rich?
- Are instructional materials and supplies readily available for use during intervention sessions?

Implementation Consensus Rating Form

(to be completed by the facilitator)

State: _____

District: _____

School: _____

Complete this form by recording the results of consensus ratings and discussions from initial self-study results, initial thoughts on priorities, and initial brainstorming ideas for next steps or activities for each area rated 2 or 3 (areas where development is most needed).

Rating key:

1 = Important, but not feasible now
2 = Area to develop or improve
3 = Partially in place, under development
4 = Already in place

Scoring Guide Area	Consensus					Priorities	Ideas for next steps or activities
1. Student Selection	Part 1.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 1.2	1	2	3	4		
2. Assessment Selection and Data Use	Part 2.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 2.2	1	2	3	4		
	Part 2.3	1	2	3	4		
	Part 2.4	1	2	3	4		

Scoring Guide Area	Consensus					Priorities	Ideas for next steps or activities
3. Content and Instruction	Part 3.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 3.2	1	2	3	4		
4. Instructional Time	Part 4.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 4.2	1	2	3	4		
5. Interventionist or Teacher Selection	Part 5.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 5.2	1	2	3	4		
6. Professional Development and Ongoing Support	Part 6.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 6.2	1	2	3	4		
7. Communication	Part 7.1	1	2	3	4		
	Part 7.2	1	2	3	4		
8. Intervention or Classroom Environment	Part 8.1	1	2	3	4		

Planning Next Steps Form

(to be completed by the facilitator)

After the *Implementation Consensus Rating Form* has been completed, the facilitator will begin the completion of this form by leading a discussion with the group about the priorities for action based on the strength of research on implementation. The facilitator will next lead a discussion for the development of a detailed implementation plan for next steps and activities that are most urgent and actionable. Finally, the facilitator will lead a discussion to capture potential challenges to the plan.

Based on group discussion and consensus ratings, list the top priority areas to improve implementation of literacy interventions.

Based on group discussion, what next steps and activities are needed to address the listed priorities? Consider timelines and who will be responsible for determining the strategies or providing the resources.

Based on group discussion, what general challenges do you anticipate? How will the challenges be addressed? Consider who will be responsible for addressing these challenges.

Who will be responsible for monitoring progress as the plan is implemented? What will be the timeline for implementation?

Appendix A. Support for *Scoring Guide* areas

This appendix describes key references that provide additional support for each of the *Scoring Guide* areas.

Scoring Guide Area 1: Student Selection

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D. L. (2010). Rethinking response to intervention at middle and high school. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(1), 22–28. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886408

The authors note important differences in student selection for academic interventions at secondary school settings. "At middle and high school, academic deficits are well established. Moreover, because a greater range of performance in the academic domain can be sampled than in the elementary grades, it is easier to design middle and high school tests whereby students do not cluster near the bottom of the scale, creating meaningful distinctions among students with deficits of larger and smaller magnitudes. For these reasons, at middle and high school, it no longer makes sense to allocate scarce resources to screening for the purpose of identifying students at risk for academic failure. It makes more sense to rely on teacher nomination or existing assessment data to identify students with manifested academic difficulties" (p. 24).

"Restricting participation in secondary prevention to students for whom the likelihood of success is good creates a better opportunity to serve this population more effectively, which in turn enhances schools' opportunity to provide appropriately intensive tertiary prevention. This is the case because when secondary prevention is offered to a mix of students, some of whom seem likely to respond and others of whom have such large deficits that secondary prevention's intensity is manifestly insufficient, a higher proportion of both subsets of students may fail to respond, thereby flooding tertiary prevention and watering down the intensity required at the tertiary level. This parallels the need for high-quality primary prevention to avoid overwhelming secondary prevention with inappropriate students and thereby decreasing the intensity available at secondary prevention. For these reasons, moving students with the greatest academic deficits directly to a well-conceptualized, most intensive tertiary prevention level may produce more reliable and substantial outcomes for both subpopulations of students" (p. 25).

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506645

This practice guide for using student data in decisionmaking recommends that "after triangulating data and considering the extent to which student learning did or did not improve in response to the intervention, teachers can decide whether to keep pursuing the approach in its current form, modify or extend the approach, or try a different approach altogether" (p. 16).

Connor, C. M., Alberto, P. A., Compton, D. L., & O'Connor, R. E. (2014). Improving reading outcomes for students with or at risk for reading disabilities: A synthesis of the contributions from the Institute of Education Sciences Research Centers (NCSER 2014–3000). *National Center for Special Education Research*. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544759

"Screening all students' reading skills (i.e., universal screening) at the beginning of the school year, especially in the early grades, can be a valid and efficient way to identify students who are at risk for poor reading outcomes" (p. 4).

Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., & Smink, J. (2008). *Dropout prevention: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4025). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502502

This practice guide recommends that educators "utilize data systems that support a realistic diagnosis of the number of students who drop out and that help identify individual students at high risk of dropping out. States, districts and schools should develop comprehensive, longitudinal, student level databases with unique IDs that, at a minimum, include data on student absences, grade retention, and low academic achievement. Data should be reviewed regularly, with a particular emphasis before the transitions to middle school and high school" (p. 6).

Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Kouzekanani, K., Bryant, D., Dickson, S., & Blozis, S. (2003). Reading instruction grouping for students with reading difficulties. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24(5), 301–315. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ6770107

This study found that students who received instruction in the one-on-one condition made significantly higher gains than students in groups of 10 in passage comprehension, phoneme segmentation, and reading fluency. However, it found no statistical difference between the students who received one-on-one instruction and students who were instructed in groups of three, suggesting that intervention does not need to be one on one to be effective.

Scoring Guide Area 2: Assessment Selection and Data Use

Uccelli, P., Galloway, E. P., Barr, C. D., Meneses, A., & Dobbs, C. L. (2015). Beyond vocabulary: Exploring cross-disciplinary academic-language proficiency and Its association with reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *50*(3), 337–356. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1065926

"Prior studies have repeatedly shown that after the early elementary school grades, language skills become the primary source of variability in predicting reading comprehension for native English speakers and English learners, and across socio-economic levels (Dickinson & Tabors, 2002; Lesaux, 2006). While these language skills have remained imprecisely defined, a few studies suggest that in addition to vocabulary knowledge, morphological and syntactic skills are also predictors of reading comprehension in both native English speakers and English learners (Farnia & Geva, 2013; Kieffer & Lesaux, 2008; Mancilla-Martinez & Lesaux, 2011)" (p. 339). In addition, the authors of this study, "identified and measured

a more inclusive and school relevant set of language skills. Furthermore, we examined the contribution of the Core Academic–Language Skills (CALS) assessment to reading comprehension above and beyond the contribution of students' word reading fluency, academic vocabulary knowledge, SES, and English-proficiency designation" (p. 340).

Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (in press). Implementation of a Text-Based Content Intervention in Secondary Social Studies Classes. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 152.

"The DIME Model (Cromley & Azevedo, 2007) hypothesizes relations among critical features of reading for understanding among older students: background knowledge, strategies, inference, word reading, and vocabulary. Like two frequently used models of reading comprehension (verbal efficiency theory: Perfetti, 1985; construction – integration: Kintsch, 1998), the DIME model relies on predictors of reading comprehension for older students and derived these predictors from an extensive data-base of 98 research studies. In a path analysis, Cromley and Azevedo reported that vocabulary knowledge has both a direct influence on comprehension and an indirect effect mediated by inference. Background knowledge about the text both enhances comprehension and facilitates strategy use relative to summarizing and drawing inferences. The model also suggests that inferencing and strategy use support text comprehension, but contribute smaller amounts of unique variance when background knowledge and vocabulary are in the model. Word reading skills, which include fluency, account for comparable amounts of variance as inferencing" (p. 5).

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4027). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502398

The authors of this practice guide conclude that reading ability is a key predictor of achievement in content area classes, as well as success in the global information economy. The authors recommend explicit instruction and assessments in vocabulary, comprehension, and interpretation skills within the content areas (p. 7). Motivated students are more likely to be engaged and become autonomous, self-directed learners (p. 37).

Pearson, P., Hiebert, E., & Kamil, M. (2007). Vocabulary assessment: What we know and what we need to learn. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *42*(2), 282–296. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ760266

Vocabulary is closely tied to comprehension. The authors assert that there are different vocabulary types: listening, speaking, reading, and writing and caution that when selecting the assessment of vocabulary the type of vocabulary intended to be assessed must be considered. The authors further advise that selection of the assessment must go beyond tradition, convenience, psychometric standards, and economy of effort and move toward selecting assessments in which words are contextually embedded (p. 284).

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506645

The authors recommend a systemic process of annual, interim, and classroom assessment for collecting data to inform instruction (p. 10). The data from these assessments are to be used by educators to guide the intervention practices. The recommendations in this practice guide are applied to the data cycle used for improving math instruction to meet the student's learning needs (p. 8). Data are used to inform classroom-level instructional decisions such as how to structure instructional time and the level of intervention (p. 8). The assessments are embedded within the learning activity and linked to the current unit of instruction (p. 47). Specific feedback increases student confidence and motivation (p. 22).

Gustafson, S., Svensson I., & Fälth, L. (2014). Response to intervention and dynamic assessment: Implementing systematic, dynamic and individualized interventions in primary school. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *61*(1), 27–43. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1031409

This study recommends dynamic intervention, with frequent progress monitoring through all levels of response to intervention in order to use data to make decisions to modify or intensify instruction.

Scoring Guide Area 3: Content and Instruction

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. (2003). *Identifying and implementing educational practices supported by rigorous evidence: A user friendly guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED477483

This guide emphasizes the importance of using high-quality tools that are supported by rigorous evidence. "This Guide seeks to provide assistance to educational practitioners in evaluating whether an educational intervention is backed by rigorous evidence of effectiveness, and in implementing evidence-based interventions in their schools or classrooms. By intervention, we mean an educational practice, strategy, curriculum, or program" (p. 1).

Foorman, B., & Wanzek, J. (2015). Classroom reading instruction for all students. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *The handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of multi-tiered systems of support* (pp. 235–252). New York, NY: Springer Science, Inc.

This chapter highlights the importance of providing instruction in language skills as part of literacy instruction. Specifically, the authors indicate that focusing on academic language development can contribute to comprehension of text as it becomes increasingly complex in the later grades.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D. L. (2010). Rethinking response to intervention at middle and high school. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(1), 22–28. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886408

The authors note that "the greatest potential for accelerating the academic progress of most difficult-to-teach learners... the teacher begins with a more intensive validated tutoring program, while conducting frequent progress monitoring to tailor that program for maximal effectiveness" (p. 24).

Herrera, S., Truckenmiller, A. J., Foorman, B. R. (2016). *Summary of 20 years of research on the effectiveness of adolescent literacy programs and practices*. (REL 2016-178). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast.

Most of the 12 identified programs or practices demonstrating positive or potentially positive effects in this research summary, "included explicit instruction in reading comprehension, explicit instruction in vocabulary, instructional routines, cooperative learning, feedback, fluency-building, or writing" (p. 1).

Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(2), 196–228. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ965885

The authors found that "lessons that move beyond simple definitions to focus on building depth of word knowledge (multiple meanings, morphological analysis) over time show promise in bolstering vocabulary and comprehension skills of the middle schooler" (p. 220).

Vaughn, S., Martinez, L. R., Linan-Thompson, S., Reutebuch, C. K., Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Enhancing social studies vocabulary and comprehension for seventh-grade English language learners: Findings from two experimental studies. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *2*(4), 297–324. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ866979

The authors note that academic success depends on students' ability to acquire content and vocabulary knowledge associated with each of the content areas. Results of this study occurred through a shift to "an emphasis on the big ideas, attention to vocabulary and background knowledge development, and altering interaction patterns in the classroom between teacher and students and between students" (p. 318).

Lawrence, J. F., Crosson, A. C., Paré-Blagoev, E. J., & Snow, C. E. (2015). Word Generation Randomized Trial Discussion Mediates the Impact of Program Treatment on Academic Word Learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 0002831215579485. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1068318

"Academic discussion provides precisely the contexts that are known to support vocabulary learning" (p. 33).

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4027). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502398

This guide for improving adolescent literacy classroom and intervention practices notes that "teachers should provide students with explicit vocabulary instruction both as part of reading and language arts classes and as part of content-area classes such as science and social studies. By giving students explicit instruction in vocabulary, teachers help them learn the meaning of new words and strengthen their independent skills of constructing the meaning of text" (p. 11). Another recommendation notes that "teachers should provide adolescents with direct and explicit instruction in comprehension strategies to improve students' reading comprehension" (p. 16). In addition, the practice guide recommends that "teachers should provide opportunities for students to engage in high-quality discussions of the meaning and interpretation of texts in various content areas as one important way to improve their reading comprehension" (p. 21). A final recommendation notes that "teachers should use strategies to enhance students' motivation to read and engagement in the learning process" (p. 26).

Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Scammacca, N. K., Metz, K., Murray, C. S., Roberts, G., et al. (2013). Extensive reading interventions for students with reading difficulties after grade 3. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(2), 163–195. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1001658

The authors found that "adolescence is not too late to intervene in reading and that student achievement in comprehension, word recognition, fluency, word reading fluency, and spelling can be improved in small amounts through extensive interventions" (p. 29).

Pashler, H., Bain, P. M., Bottge, B. A., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M., et al. (2007). *Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning* (NCER No. 2007–2004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Research. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498555

This practice guide provides recommendations for organizing instruction and study to improve learning. These practices include spacing learning over time, having students alternate between worked solutions and trying to solve problems on their own, combining graphics with verbal descriptions, connecting and integrating abstract and concrete representations of concepts, using quizzing to promote learning, helping students to allocate study time efficiently, and asking deep explanatory questions (p. 2).

Foorman, B. R., Breier, J. I., & Fletcher, J. M. (2003). Interventions aimed at improving reading success: An evidence-based approach. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *24*(2–3), 613–639.

This study describes evidence-based approaches for providing students with effective instruction in reading. It concludes that effective instruction "consists…of the integration of explicit instruction in phonemic awareness and the alphabetic principle, reading for meaning, and practice in fluent reading and writing. Reading for meaning includes explicit instruction in vocabulary, spelling, and comprehension strategies" (p. 634). The study

also emphasizes the importance of having all students practice these skills and writing regularly.

Scoring Guide Area 4: Instructional Time

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4027). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502398

The authors of this practice guide note that, "the recommendations are representative of panel members' thinking about methods that have the strongest research support and those that are appropriate for use with adolescents. The first four recommendations (explicit vocabulary instruction, direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction, opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation, and increasing student motivation and engagement in literacy learning) can be implemented easily by classroom teachers within their regular instruction, regardless of the content areas they teach" (p. 8). The final recommendation of this practice guide (make available intensive individualized interventions for struggling readers that can be provided by qualified specialists) specifically notes that interventions should be provided where intensiveness matches student needs or "the greater the instructional need, the more intensive the intervention" (p. 10). The authors note that if the instructional quality is high, intensity of intervention is "related most directly to the size of instructional groups and amount of instructional time" (p. 10).

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school reading: A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York (2nd Ed.)*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved July 5, 2016, from https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/b7/5f/b75fba81-16cb-422d-ab59-373a6a07eb74/ccny_report_2004_reading.pdf.

The authors note the importance of devoting a substantial amount of daily instructional time to literacy skills. "The panel strongly argued the need for two to four hours of literacy-connected learning daily. This time is to be spent with texts and a focus on reading and writing effectively. Although some of this time should be spent with a language arts teacher, instruction in science, history, and other subject areas qualifies as fulfilling the requirements of this element if the instruction is text centered and informed by instructional principles designed to convey content and also to practice and improve literacy skills. To leverage time for increased interaction with texts across subject areas, teachers will need to reconceptualize their understanding of what it means to teach in a subject area. In other words, teachers need to realize they are not just teaching content knowledge but also ways of reading and writing specific to a subject area" (p. 20).

Goldman, S. R., Britt, M. A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., et al. (2016). Disciplinary Literacies and Learning to Read for Understanding: A Conceptual Framework for Disciplinary Literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 219–246. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1100583

"By suggesting the types of knowledge learners need to know about a discipline, it may provide valuable guidance for specifying trajectories and progressions in disciplinary literacy learning" (p. 239).

Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., et al. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide*. (NCEE No. 2009–012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505962

The authors of the practice guide recommend that out-of-school time programs align academically with instruction occurring during the school day. They also recommend efforts to maximize student participation and attendance. Finally, the authors recommend that educators adapt instruction to individual and small group needs (p. 11).

Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., & Smink, J. (2008). *Dropout prevention: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4025). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502502

This practice guide recommends that schools provide academic support and enrichment to improve academic performance. "Research shows that low academic performance, absenteeism, and grade retention are related to dropping out. Providing academic supports, such as tutoring or enrichment programs, helps address skill gaps and offset a cycle of frustration" (p. 22).

Crawford, E., & Torgesen, J. (2006). Teaching all students to read: Practices from Reading First schools with strong intervention outcomes. Florida Principal's Leadership Conference *26*(1), 2010. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498784

The authors described how schools were able to maximize instructional time in the schedule for early literacy intervention by carefully scheduling the reading block and intervention time for each grade level to maximize the personnel available for delivering intervention through the use of various formats (for example, pull-out, push-in, and teacher-led small group).

Scoring Guide Area 5: Interventionist or Teacher Selection

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D. L. (2010). Rethinking response to intervention at middle and high school. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(1), 22–28. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886408

The authors note that it is important that "teachers view their mission as reducing and eliminating already existing, sizable academic deficits" (p. 26).

Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Scammacca, N. K., Metz, K., Murray, C. S., Roberts, G., et al. (2013). Extensive reading interventions for students with reading difficulties after grade 3. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(2), 163–195. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1001658

The authors note the importance of teacher understanding of how to adequately differentiate instruction (p. 25).

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school reading: A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York (2nd Ed.)*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved July 5, 2016, from https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/b7/5f/b75fba81-16cb-422d-ab59-373a6a07eb74/ccny_report_2004_reading.pdf.

The authors note that it is important for teachers providing core instruction and intervention in secondary schools to understand "effective instructional principles embedded in content, including language arts teachers using content-area texts and content-area teachers providing instruction and practice in reading and writing skills specific to their subject area" (p. 4). Teachers "should assume leadership roles and spearhead curricular improvements" (p. 21). "The vision for an effective literacy program recognizes that creating fluent and proficient readers and writers is a very complex task and requires that teachers coordinate their instruction to reinforce important strategies and concepts" (p. 22). "Other important contextual information, such as teacher experience and education, should be tracked as well" (p. 27).

The authors also note the importance of providing additional time for students needing intensive intervention by tutors who may work during out-of-school time. "Some students require or would benefit from intense, individualized instruction. This is particularly true of the student who struggles with decoding and fluency, but is also true of students requiring short-term, focused help. Such students should be given the opportunity to participate in tutoring, which need not occur only during the school day" (p. 18).

Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Naoom, S. F., & Wallace, F. (2009). Core implementation components. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *19*(5), 531–540. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ852125

The authors focus on staff selection as an important area of implementation. "Who is qualified to carry out the evidence-based practice or program? What are the methods for recruiting and selecting practitioners with those characteristics? Beyond academic qualifications or experience factors, certain practitioner characteristics are difficult to teach in training sessions so must be part of the selection criteria (e.g., knowledge of the field, basic professional skills, common sense, sense of social justice, ethics, willingness to learn, willingness to intervene, good judgment, empathy)" (p. 533).

The authors also note that simple to implement programs using volunteer tutors may be beneficial. "Some programs are purposefully designed to be very simple in order to minimize the need for careful selection (e.g., a reading tutoring program designed to be staffed by volunteers)" (p. 533).

Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., et al. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide*. (NCEE No. 2009–012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505962

The authors discuss the importance of staff selection when hiring for out-of-school time programs. "Although little is known about the methods or characteristics that define effective teachers, researchers have discovered that some teachers are much better than others at helping students achieve significant achievement gains during the school day. For direct instruction or supervisory roles, the panel recommends hiring classroom teachers who demonstrate success during the school day, and the school can support these efforts. To identify effective teachers to employ as the out-of-school time coordinator or as an out-of-school time instructor, out-of-school-time programs can seek out award-winning teachers or work with administrators to identify effective teachers" (p. 17).

Foorman, B. R., Breier, J. I., & Fletcher, J. M. (2003). Interventions aimed at improving reading success: An evidence-based approach. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *24*(2–3), 613–639.

In this study the authors highlight the use of paraprofessionals in providing instructional support. The authors suggest that a well trained paraprofessional can deliver effective intervention as well as a well trained teacher can.

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(4), 605–619. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1037909

This meta-analysis found that well trained community volunteers and college students can successfully implement an intervention that contributed to students' success in reading. The authors emphasize that these interventionists are in addition to high-quality classroom instruction rather than a substitution for it.

Scoring Guide Area 6: Professional Development and Ongoing Support

Fletcher, J. M., & Vaughn, S. (2009). Response to intervention: Preventing and remediating academic difficulties. *Child Development Perspectives*, *3*(1), 30–37.

The authors note that in providing academic interventions for students, "classroom teachers receive professional development in effective instruction and ways to enhance differentiation and intensity through flexible grouping strategies and evaluations of progress (Tier 1, primary intervention)" (p. 31).

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Wanzek, J., Wexler, J., Fletcher, J. M., Denton, C. D., et al. (2010). Response to intervention for middle school students with reading difficulties: Effects of a primary and secondary intervention. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(1), 3. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886407

The authors note the importance of professional development for content area teachers offering literacy strategies embedded in their courses across the school day. "All students received the benefits of content area teachers who participated in researcher-provided

professional development designed to integrate vocabulary and comprehension practices throughout the school day (Tier 1)" (p. 1).

"The research team provided the interventionists with approximately 60 hr of professional development prior to teaching. This training included sessions related to the standardized intervention, the needs of the adolescent struggling reader, and principles of promoting active engagement in the classroom as well as other features of effective instruction and behavior management. They also received an additional 9 hours of professional development related to the intervention throughout the year and participated in biweekly staff development meetings with ongoing on-site feedback and coaching (once every 2–3 weeks)" (p. 7).

Averill, O. H., Baker, D., & Rinaldi, C. (2014). A blueprint for effectively using RTI intervention block time. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *50*(1), 29–38. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1037909

The authors note the importance of using data to determine professional development needs. "The RTI steering committee should then use student data to discuss areas in which interventions or assessments are still needed. By comparing areas of need with the interventions and assessments currently available, the committee will be able to identify gaps. Once these gaps are identified, the committee can think about creating a professional development (PD) plan for the upcoming year that targets areas of highest need. A PD plan for the year may include finding time for teachers to teach each other or to swap intervention programs to learn and use" (p. 31).

Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Naoom, S. F., & Wallace, F. (2009). Core implementation components. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *19*(5), 531–540. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ852125

The authors note the importance of professional development and feedback loops to implementation. "Innovations such as evidence-based practices and programs represent new ways of providing treatment and support. To be effective, practitioners (and others) at an implementation site need to learn when, where, how, and with whom to use new approaches and new skills. Even though they are ineffective implementation strategies when used alone, preservice and in-service training are efficient ways to provide knowledge of background information, theory, philosophy, and values; introduce the components and rationales of key practices; and provide opportunities to practice new skills and receive feedback in a safe training environment" (p. 534).

"Feedback loops are critical to keeping the evidence-based program "on track" in the midst of a sea of change. If the feedback loops indicate needed changes, then the integrated system needs to be adjusted to improve effectiveness or efficiency" (p. 535).

Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., et al. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2009–012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505962

The authors note the benefit of experienced teacher mentoring and feedback. "Teachers can

use their experience to advise and mentor less-experienced out-of-school time instructors or volunteers, especially when budgets are tight or sufficient numbers of experienced teachers are not available" (p. 17). "Schools should observe OST instruction and student management, recreational time, and the day-to-day operation of the program" (p. 35).

Wasik, B. A. (1998a). Using volunteers as reading tutors: Guidelines for successful practices. *The Reading Teacher, 51*(7), 562–570. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ562450

This study outlines key components for effective tutoring programs. Two of the key elements for a successful tutoring program are for tutors to be well trained so they have a basic understanding of the reading process and to be supervised by a reading specialist. The reading specialist should observe the volunteers and give them constant feedback and ongoing support in order to have the greatest positive impact on students.

Wasik, B. A. (1998b). Volunteer tutoring programs in reading: A review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *33*(3), 266–291. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ571662

This article reviewed research findings and recommends that tutors be trained on specific scaffolding and modeling techniques in order to be successful. It suggests that tutors who do not have adequate training and support could be more of a hindrance than a support to struggling students.

Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., & Smink, J. (2008). *Dropout prevention: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4025). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?&id=ED502502

This practice guide recommends that educators provide rigorous and relevant instruction to better engage students in learning and provide the skills needed to graduate and to serve them after they leave school. "Reforms to provide relevant instruction emphasize professional development for teachers so that classroom instruction meets the needs of all students" (p. 34).

Coyne, M. D., Oldham, A., Leonard, K., Burns, D., & Gage, N. (in press). Working in the weeds: Implementing multi-tiered K-3 reading supports in high priority schools. In B. Foorman (Ed.), *Challenges and solutions to implementing effective reading intervention in schools. New directions in child and adolescent development*, 152.

The authors note the importance of providing feedback and support to individuals delivering literacy interventions. "When schools use the activity timeline faithfully to schedule and chronical literacy activities, they create a living fidelity checklist that documents the implementation of their literacy plan. It helps the leadership team to evaluate their work, and provides data that informs ongoing adjustments to the school-wide literacy plan" (p. 161).

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605–619. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1037909

This meta-analysis found that well trained community volunteers and college students can successfully implement an intervention to struggling students in reading and have positive outcomes.

Scoring Guide Area 7: Communication

Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R., Willems, P. P., & Holbein, M. F. D. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, *17*(2), 99–123. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ732429

The authors found that when parents are involved, students have increased motivation, effort, concentration, attention, and positive outcomes in reading. The authors define parent involvement as parent participation in parent–teacher conferences, school functions, engaging in activities at home, engaging in student extracurricular activities, and parent influence and input regarding academic progress and decisions.

Wasik, B. A. (1998a). Using volunteers as reading tutors: Guidelines for successful practices. *The Reading Teacher*, *51*(7), 562–570. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ562450

This study outlines key components for effective tutoring programs. It suggests that tutoring needs to be coordinated with classroom instruction. However, tutoring can go a step beyond classroom instruction by presenting strategies and providing explanations that students would not receive during typical classroom instruction.

Wasik, B. A. (1998b). Volunteer tutoring programs in reading: A review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *33*(3), 266–291. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ571662

This article reviewed research and concludes that a consistent feature of successful tutoring is coordination between the volunteer program (tutoring) and classroom instruction. It highlights that it would be confusing for struggling students to learn different and inconsistent approaches to reading.

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506645

The authors of this practice guide focus on data leadership that leads to schoolwide and parent communication and collaboration. "The data team should provide guidance on using data to support the school's vision, with the ultimate aim of developing the capacity of all school staff to use data. At the outset, members of the data team should regularly interact with school staff about data and its uses, oftentimes serving as data facilitators. Team members can educate school staff, district representatives, or parents about the school's vision for data use by having individual or small group meetings focused on these topics" (p. 29).

Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., et al. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide*. (NCEE No. 2009–012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505962

The authors of this practice guide recommend alignment of out-of-school time programs academically with the school day. "In the panel's opinion, collaboration can improve

academic outcomes and in the studies reviewed for this guide, two independent evaluators recommended that collaboration between in-school time and out-of-school time be strengthened if possible" (p. 49).

Scoring Guide Area 8: Intervention or Classroom Environment

Averill, O. H., Baker, D., & Rinaldi, C. (2014). A blueprint for effectively using RTI intervention block time. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *50*(1), 29–38. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1037909

The article highlights the impact physical space can have on students' learning and behavior during intervention. The authors recommend selecting a space that can be consistently available and close to the students' classroom to minimize transition time and maximize learning time. The authors also recommend arranging the space to maximize efficient delivery of the intervention.

"Some of the things that the RTI steering committee should consider include (a) identifying appropriate assessment and intervention resources, (b) determining professional development needs to improve capacity for intervention delivery, (c) using personnel resources in the most effective way, (d) optimizing the physical space available to deliver interventions, and (e) structuring the time to deliver interventions and engage students who are not receiving intervention" (p. 31).

Tanner, C. K. (2008). Explaining relationships among student outcomes and the school's physical environment. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *19*(3), 444–471. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ810757

This work explored the relationship between schools' physical environment and student outcomes. Physical environment was "defined as four sets of design patterns: movement and circulation, large group meeting places, day lighting and views, and instructional neighborhoods" (p. 445). It was found that each of the "four design variables was positively related to student achievement, even after controlling for school SES" (p. 445).

References

Averill, O. H., Baker, D., & Rinaldi, C. (2014). A blueprint for effectively using RTI intervention block time. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, *50*(1), 29–38. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1037909

Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., et al. (2009). *Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide*. (NCEE No. 2009–012). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505962

Biancarosa, G., & Snow, C. (2006). *Reading next—A vision for action and research in middle and high school reading: A report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York (2nd Ed.)*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved July 5, 2016, from https://www.carnegie.org/media/filer_public/b7/5f/b75fba81-16cb-422d-ab59-373a6a07eb74/ccny_report_2004_reading.pdf.

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. (2003). *Identifying and implementing educational practices supported by rigorous evidence: A user friendly guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED477483

Connor, C. M., Alberto, P. A., Compton, D. L., & O'Connor, R. E. (2014). Improving reading outcomes for students with or at risk for reading disabilities: A synthesis of the contributions from the Institute of Education Sciences Research Centers (NCSER No. 2014–3000). *National Center for Special Education Research*. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED544759

Coyne, M. D., Oldham, A., Leonard, K., Burns, D., & Gage, N. (in press). Working in the weeds: Implementing multi-tiered K-3 reading supports in high priority schools. In B. Foorman (Ed.), *Challenges and solutions to implementing effective reading intervention in schools. New directions in child and adolescent development*, 152.

Crawford, E., & Torgesen, J. (2006). Teaching all students to read: Practices from Reading First schools with strong intervention outcomes. *Florida Principal's Leadership Conference*, *26*(1), 2010. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498784

Dynarski, M., Clarke, L., Cobb, B., Finn, J., Rumberger, R., & Smink, J. (2008). *Dropout prevention: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4025). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502502

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., & Moody, S. W. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *92*(4), 605–619. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1037909

Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Naoom, S. F., & Wallace, F. (2009). Core implementation components. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *19*(5), 531–540. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ852125

Fletcher, J. M., & Vaughn, S. (2009). Response to intervention: Preventing and remediating academic difficulties. *Child Development Perspectives*, *3*(1), 30–37.

Foorman, B. R., Breier, J. I., & Fletcher, J. M. (2003). Interventions aimed at improving reading success: An evidence-based approach. *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *24*(2–3), 613–639.

Foorman, B., & Wanzek, J. (2015). Classroom reading instruction for all students. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *The handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of multi-tiered systems of support* (pp. 235–252). New York, NY: Springer Science, Inc.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., & Compton, D. L. (2010). Rethinking response to intervention at middle and high school. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(1), 22–28. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886408

Goldman, S. R., Britt, M. A., Brown, W., Cribb, G., George, M., Greenleaf, C., et al. (2016). Disciplinary literacies and learning to read for understanding: A conceptual framework for disciplinary literacy. *Educational Psychologist*, 219–246. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1100583

Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R., Willems, P. P., & Holbein, M. F. D. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, *17*(2), 99–123. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ732429

Gustafson, S., Svensson I., & Fälth, L. (2014). Response to intervention and dynamic assessment: Implementing systematic, dynamic and individualized interventions in primary school. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, *61*(1), 27–43. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1031409

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED506645

Herrera, S., Truckenmiller, A. J., Foorman, B. R. (2016). *Summary of 20 years of research on the effectiveness of adolescent literacy programs and practices*. (REL 2016-178). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast.

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., & Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2008–4027). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED502398

Lawrence, J. F., Crosson, A. C., Paré-Blagoev, E. J., & Snow, C. E. (2015). Word generation randomized trial discussion mediates the impact of program treatment on academic word learning. *American Educational Research Journal*, 0002831215579485. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1068318

Lesaux, N. K., Kieffer, M. J., Faller, S. E., & Kelley, J. G. (2010). The effectiveness and ease of implementation of an academic vocabulary intervention for linguistically diverse students in urban middle schools. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *45*(2), 196–228. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ965885

Pashler, H., Bain, P. M., Bottge, B. A., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M., et al. (2007). *Organizing instruction and study to improve student learning* (NCER No. 2007–2004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Research. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED498555

Pearson, P., Hiebert, E., & Kamil, M. (2007). Vocabulary assessment: What we know and what we need to learn. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *42*(2), 282–296. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ760266

Tanner, C. K. (2008). Explaining relationships among student outcomes and the school's physical environment. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, *19*(3), 444–471. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ810757

Uccelli, P., Galloway, E. P., Barr, C. D., Meneses, A., & Dobbs, C. L. (2015). Beyond vocabulary: Exploring cross-disciplinary academic-language proficiency and Its association with reading comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *50*(3), 337–356. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1065926

Vaughn, S., Linan-Thompson, S., Kouzekanani, K., Bryant, D., Dickson, S., & Blozis, S. (2003). Reading instruction grouping for students with reading difficulties. *Remedial and Special Education*, *24*(5), 301–315. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ6770107

Vaughn, S., Martinez, L. R., Linan-Thompson, S., Reutebuch, C. K., Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2009). Enhancing social studies vocabulary and comprehension for seventh-grade English language learners: Findings from two experimental studies. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, *2*(4), 297–324. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ866979

Vaughn, S., Cirino, P. T., Wanzek, J., Wexler, J., Fletcher, J. M., Denton, C. D., et al. (2010). Response to intervention for middle school students with reading difficulties: Effects of a primary and secondary intervention. *School Psychology Review*, *39*(1), 3. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ886407

Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (in press). Implementation of a Text-Based Content Intervention in Secondary Social Studies Classes. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 152.

Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Scammacca, N. K., Metz, K., Murray, C. S., Roberts, G., et al. (2013). Extensive reading interventions for students with reading difficulties after grade 3. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(2), 163–195. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1001658

Wasik, B. A. (1998a). Using volunteers as reading tutors: Guidelines for successful practices. *The Reading Teacher*, *51*(7), 562–570. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ562450

Wasik, B. A. (1998b). Volunteer tutoring programs in reading: A review. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *33*(3), 266–291. http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ571662

This *Self-study guide for implementing literacy interventions in grades 3-8* was developed to help district- and school-based practitioners conduct self-studies for planning and implementing literacy interventions. It is intended to promote reflection about current strengths and challenges in planning for implementation of literacy interventions, spark conversations among staff, and identify areas for improvement. This guide provides a template for data collection and guiding questions for discussion that may improve the implementation of literacy interventions.

REL SOUTHEAST
Regional Educational Laboratory
At Florida State University

ies NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION EVALUATION AND REGIONAL ASSISTANCE
Institute of Education Sciences