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ABSTRACT

Two of the largest obstacles facing today's educators are student overcrowding and illiteracy. California schools are bursting at the seams. New schools are filled to capacity before the doors are even opened. These conditions create an environment that is not conducive to all learners. With California having one of the highest pupil to teacher ratios, it is easy to see why we have problems with our literacy rate.

Year round education (YRE), relieves the congestion of our schools. However, other questions arise beyond reducing overcrowding. Can year round schools successfully implement a program previously adapted to a traditional schedule? One such program recently introduced to California schools is called Reading Recovery. This is an intervention program aimed at helping first grade students who are at risk of developing reading difficulties. Can Reading Recovery be successfully implemented into the YRE system? This project will examine that question in depth.

Continuous learning, the goal of YRE is long overdue in the United States. Countries such as Japan have far exceeded the United States in student test scores for too
long. But, we must consider that the average Japanese student, by high school graduation, has been in school two years longer than the average student from the United States. This is because Japanese students attend school for 240 days a year, while U.S. students attend for only 180 days. Even though the country may not be ready to increase the number of days students attend, the trend for YRE has it going in the right direction. By providing shorter interruptions in learning, YRE is reducing review time and increasing new learning time.

This project is designed to investigate the success of Reading Recovery in YRS. It asks the question: Will Reading Recovery be equally effective in traditional and YRS systems? Reading Recovery is an intervention program rather than a remediation program. Therefore, the purpose is to build on strengths and to teach good strategies before bad ones develop. Reading Recovery is not a cure all for illiteracy. It is a beginning. It is an effort to identify those students who may otherwise go unnoticed and become just another statistic. There will always be a need for special education. Reading Recovery does not intend to be a replacement for other special services. It is my belief that students involved
in Reading Recovery in year round schools will exit the program at about the same rate as their traditional counterparts even with differing schedules. Because Reading Recovery is based on teaching to a student's strengths, I feel that what is already learned will be retained and not forgotten over the short interruption of services. Strategies already in place are likely to remain there as long as some exposure to print is taking place.
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STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Two of the largest obstacles facing today's educators are student overcrowding and illiteracy. California schools are bursting at the seams. New schools are filled to capacity before the doors are even opened. These conditions create an environment that is not conducive to all learners. With California presently having one of the highest pupil to teacher ratios, it is easy to see why we suffer from high illiteracy rates.

Year round education (YRE), relieves the congestion of our school. However, other questions arise beyond reducing overcrowding. Can year round schools successfully implement a program previously adapted to a traditional schedule? One such program recently introduced to California schools is called Reading Recovery. This is an intervention program aimed at helping first grade students who are at risk of developing reading difficulties. Can Reading Recovery be successfully implemented into the YRE system? This project will examine that question in depth.
Year Round Education

YRE, or "continuous school" programs have been implemented in districts statewide and have met with some success. Educators and parents alike favor such programs for various reasons. First of all, it is a financially sound program which utilizes school facilities to the maximum. Without year round school programs, some districts would be forced to build more schools or place temporary classrooms at each school site. Acknowledging today's economy, both of these would require money that many districts do not have.

Another reason many favor year round programs is the belief that students do better with shorter breaks between instruction. There are a number of issues to consider in YRE.

Reading Recovery

Because class size in California has grown so dramatically, it is easy to understand why the number of students needing special services has risen as well. Reading Recovery, now under way in California, may help prevent children from slipping through the cracks. This program is an early intervention program targeted at helping first grade students who are at risk of
developing reading difficulties. This program is also of importance to me because I am a Reading Recovery teacher in training.

Therefore, I am specifically interested in finding out how special programs within the year round school system work. Are they as successful as traditional programs? Or, is there a difference in success rates due to interruption of services within the school year?

As a Reading Recovery teacher in training, I want to know how effective my program will be for students in a year round system. Will the program take longer? Will students experience progress at the same rate as traditional students?

Reading Recovery programs are in place in many states throughout the country. California is the first state to initiate the program into so many year round schools. It seems an appropriate time to examine what effects year round scheduling will have on this program. The district I work in now is primarily a year round district. The majority of the schools are on a year round schedule. This is an increasing trend in districts throughout the state. My current school has been selected to join the year round program in July of
1992. This also explains my interest in year round schools.

I must say that Reading Recovery and the knowledge I have gained during my Master's Program have certainly changed my views on how children learn to read. Prior to entering the program I was a firm believer in a skills philosophy when teaching reading. Now, I am a "whole hearted" believer in whole language. Perhaps my philosophies have changed after learning more about each of the theoretical orientations of reading. Examining each, we can see what their characteristics are.

Theoretical Views

According to some experts, there are several theoretical views of the reading process. Harste and Burke (1977), state that views on reading can be organized into three relatively distinct clusters. Each of these clusters or philosophies fall along a continuum. These three philosophies include the sound/symbol or decoding philosophy, the skills philosophy, and the whole language philosophy. The philosophies of reading discussed in this project reflect characteristics as described by Harste and Burke (1977).

Supporters of the decoding philosophy believe that
reading is defined as manipulating the relationships between the sounds of language and their graphic symbols Harste and Burke (1980). Followers of this philosophy believe that the reader obtains meaning through sound, either orally or sub-vocally. Then the reader uses these sounds to form words.

Proponents of this philosophy assume that the learner will learn language beginning with the smallest unit (letter sound) or from part to whole. It also assumes that knowing sounds and words will produce meaning. This meaning is only a byproduct of the reading process. The decoding philosophy asserts that meaning is on the page.

Decoding philosophy advocates feel that oral language is prime and print is secondary to speech. They view reading as a precise, and perfectible process. Anything that deviates from the page are considered errors.

The decoding philosophy teacher firmly believes in the teaching of phonics. The teacher’s role is to teach reading through phonics, the application of decoding skills, and finally, the teaching of comprehension.

The student’s role in this type of classroom
involves learning letter/sound relationships, the relationship between sounds of speech and graphic symbols.

Materials used to teach this model would include flash cards, workbooks, drills and controlled vocabulary.

Methods used to evaluate this practice would include standardized tests and mastery tests.

The decoding philosophy bears no resemblance to the theory behind Reading Recovery. In Reading Recovery lessons the student is encouraged to examine the "whole" text. The decoding philosophy however breaks the text down into bits and pieces.

In the skills philosophy, supporters believe that reading is defined as a system of three skills. These are decoding, vocabulary, and comprehension. Supporters of this philosophy believe that reading is a hierarchy of skills. They believe that language is learned as a set of discreet skills.

The skills philosophy is similar to the decoding philosophy in that both assume language is learned from part to whole. In this model, meaning will automatically follow the recognition of words in a sentence. Meaning in this model becomes the sum of the meaning of each of
the words in a sentence.

Like the decoding theory, the skill theory also believes that oral language is prime, print is secondary. Again, reading is perceived as a precise and perfectible process. All deviation from the print are errors. For a reader to become proficient, she must know all three skill components.

The role of the teacher in this type of classroom is to teach the hierarchy of skills. These are vocabulary, grammar and comprehension. The teacher in this classroom uses controlled vocabulary, reflecting letter sound relationships, syllabication, prefixes, suffixes, compounds and such. Sight words are taught and used frequently.

The student's role here is to master skills in each area. They should at the same time, integrate these skills while reading.

Instructional materials in this model would include basals, workbooks, and worksheets.

Methods used to evaluate the students in this model would include standardized tests and basal mastery tests. Sometimes, the Informal Reading Inventory (I.R.I.) is used as an informal evaluation in this setting.
The skills teacher encourages the isolation of discrete skills by breaking the text into parts. Unlike the theory behind Reading Recovery, the proponents of the skill philosophy feel that reading is a process that can be perfected. Reading Recovery supporters believe that reading is an ongoing process that is strengthened by the acquisition of reading strategies.

Supporters of the whole language philosophy define reading as a process utilizing three interrelated cueing systems...graphic, syntactic, and semantic which the reader uses to predict, confirm and integrate meaning; (Harste and Burke, 1980). This theoretical orientation views language as a learned process of communication.

This philosophy assumes that both speech and print are language. Print extends the language of the user. Neither of these are prime. Learning to read is viewed as a natural process.

In this model, meaning is formed by the reader's, as well as the author's background. Meaning is the base of reading and not a group of discreet skills.

This theoretical orientation understands that reading is not a perfectible process and that there will and should be variations from what the reader understands
and what the author wrote. The teacher’s role in this type of classroom is to teach function and form of language through reading, writing, speaking and listening.

The instructional materials used in this setting would include such things as predictable books, literature groups, composing, journal writing, and S.S.R.

Instruction within a whole language classroom is constructed with the reader’s knowledge in mind and with the faith that children will naturally discover the irregularities of print.

Natural and familiar language is emphasized in the whole language classroom. Context is given to support the reader.

Forms of evaluation in this model would include logs, check lists, longitudinal writing samples, anecdotal records, self evaluation and the Reading Miscue Inventory.

Examining each philosophy confirms my belief in a whole language philosophy. Research in the field of education supports the whole language movement. Goodman (1986) talks about how children learn language in his book What’s Whole in Whole Language?. He gives us a very
simple look at how kids learn language. We as teachers can make it easy or hard. Goodman says that language should be whole, meaningful, and relevant to the learners. On the other hand, he says, language can be difficult when teachers attempt to motivate kids when the stuff they are asked to read and write, hear and say, has no relation to who they are, what they think, and what they do.

Another supporter of whole language, Smith (1988), discusses the advantages of whole language in his book *Reading Without Nonsense*. He also talks about how kids learn to read. He says that we learn to read by reading. He further states that learning will continue to take place as long as it is relevant and meaningful. He says if the situation confronting us cannot be related to our theory of the world then there can be no comprehension and no learning.

Making reading meaningful to each student is a fundamental part of the whole language philosophy. Weaver (1988) echoes these thoughts in her writing. Very much like Goodman and Smith, Weaver says that for children to learn letter/sound patterns and other conventions of print without much direct instruction,
they must be exposed to a wide variety of natural, meaningful, print.

Most research today is pointing to the fact that reading is learned by reading, and students should not be asked to read print that they cannot relate to. In a recent article, Newman and Church (1990) discuss the myths of whole language and they dismiss many of the myths. They say many people believe the myths due to a lack of professional development. This article is much like a pep talk for someone who is trying to become a whole language teacher. As Newman and Church suggest, whole language is founded on the belief that learning is a collaborative venture and that we are implicated in each other's learning. Taking a whole language stance makes for a very different classroom, a classroom in which both teachers and students have a voice.

Marie Clay (1991), an educational psychologist and developer of Reading Recovery takes a position much like that of a whole language teacher. In the whole language philosophy, the readers background and past experiences help her bring meaning to print. Clay emphasizes the importance of good book introductions and the need to bring relevant knowledge into the minds of children.
This is a strategy typically taught in a whole language classroom.

Because I want to improve myself as a teacher, professional growth and development are an ongoing process for me. I am focusing my attention in this project on the effects year round scheduling may have on a special program such as Reading Recovery.

I plan to survey year round teachers who are currently training in the Reading Recovery program. I will be asking them about concerns they have with the implementation of Reading Recovery in their schools. I will then analyze the data from each survey.

It is my belief that students involved in Reading Recovery in year round schools will exit the program at about the same rate as their traditional counterparts even with differing schedules. Because Reading Recovery is based on teaching to a student’s strengths, I feel that what is already learned will be retained and not forgotten over the short interruption of services. Strategies already in place are likely to remain there as long as some exposure to print is taking place. Therefore, I contend that year round education will not impact the growth or rate of discontinuing in Reading
Recovery instruction. Some flexibility may be needed, but the outcomes will be just as effective. The results of my survey will provide suggestions for implementation of Reading Recovery in year round schools.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There has been a lot of talk among community leaders and the public in general, that too many of our students are not prepared for life after high school. A number of students graduate each year that cannot adequately read and write. Many are quick to point the finger at the schools and place the blame there. On the other hand, the schools complain that class sizes and cultural diversity make it very difficult to educate all. Many teachers feel that class size in California does not permit the type of individual attention that some students need. This helps create high illiteracy rates that have many criticizing the system.

Where does the responsibility belong? It would be too simplistic to say the teacher is to blame or the school is to blame. Likewise, parents and home life cannot take full responsibility for the success or failure that their children may experience. The problem is much bigger and goes far beyond home and school. State and local government must act together to help remedy the problems that education is facing. The community needs to be involved in helping to create change where it is needed.
Fortunately there are signs that this is beginning to happen throughout the state of California. School districts and school boards are investigating ways to reduce overcrowding in our schools. Educational research has been looking at programs that will help students who are at risk of failing. These efforts combined could improve education dramatically. But, cost for such improvements is always a concern. Today's budget and economy limit most districts because many do not have the resources available to implement expensive programs.

It is perhaps these very limitations that have led Californians to look at two very reasonable ways to improve overcrowding and illiteracy. The first is YRE, and the second is Reading Recovery. Both programs have been found to be cost effective and have gathered the support of many. Research has shown that both programs are successful. This review will take a closer look at both of these programs.

**Year Round Education**

Year Round Education (YRE) is here to stay. As California schools fill to capacity the state searches for a remedy to ease overcrowding. Districts statewide have implemented various forms of YRE to help this
situation. YRE comes in many forms and with varying schedules.

Ballinger (1988) discusses the various forms of YRE now in use in California. One form currently implemented is the 45-15 program. Under this schedule the student attends school for 45 days (9 weeks) and then has 15 days (3 weeks) off. This system has been initiated with a single or multi-track plan. On the multi-track system approximately 25% of the student body is off track (or on vacation) at all times. This allows for maximum utilization of space. The modified version of this is the single track system. This 45-15 schedule does not ease overcrowding, but does provide continual education which is a goal of YRE.

Another popular schedule is the 60-20 program. This program is essentially 12 weeks on track and 4 weeks off. This can also be adjusted to a multi-track or single track system.

One other common program is the 60-15 program. This is 12 weeks on and 3 weeks off very similar to the 60-20 system. Like the other year round systems, this too is adapted to multiple or single tracks. The determination to choose multiple or single track usually
depends on the individual needs of each school or district.

The 90-30 plan, like the others, works with one to four tracks. It provides 18 weeks on track and 6 weeks off track. Again, this program can be adapted to a single or multi-track system.

Still another program currently implemented is the Concept 6 program. On this schedule the school year is actually reduced from 180 days to 164 days. This loss of days is made up by adding additional time to each school day.

In a recent article Herman (1991), examined the Concept 6 program in depth. She compared how the Concept 6 program compare to 45-15 and traditional schedules. She was specifically interested in the question of productivity during the longer day.

The study was designed to measure productivity, instructional quality, quality of work life, and student outcomes. Initially it was believed that lack of productivity was most likely to occur in the primary grades. But, at the conclusion of the study, few differences were found between Concept 6 schools and demographically similar 45-15, and traditional schools
with regard to productivity. The study indicated that there was no loss of productivity due to a longer school day within the Concept 6 program.

Although YRE has become popular because of its ability to ease overcrowding, Glines (1987) states that YRE should be offered as a choice. He believes that space is not, and should not be the driving force in establishing a YRE calendar. He acknowledges the fact that YRE reduces congestion but feels it needs to be more of a philosophy. Advantages to this philosophy are the ability it has to provide a calendar that is more acceptable for today's changing lifestyles. YRE is a financially, fiscally and educationally sound concept. Other research supports Glines theory.


He states that one of the generalization we can now make about YRE is its ability to enable students to do as well or better than their traditional counterparts. YRE is also shown to improve attendance for both students and teachers. Some research has shown that YRE even
decreases the rate of vandalism.

Ballinger believes that long, unsupervised vacations or interruptions in education are detrimental to students. Letting students roam around unsupervised is not wise he says. He also states that elementary and secondary education need to think more progressively about YRE. It is his belief the adoption of YRE should be a trend in California.

Is YRE more educationally sound? Gatlin (1988) found support indicating this to be true. In her article she interviewed educators about YRE. One of the positive qualities listed by those she talked with included higher test scores.

Other praises of YRE, according to Gatlin include the effect it has on Bilingual kids. In a traditional setting bilingual kids may be confined, for a long period of time, to an environment that does not encourage the use of English.

Many teachers feel that long summer vacations create the need for long periods of review at the beginning of the school year. Educators agree that students are more likely to retain what they have learned over a short vacation. This cannot be said for students who endure
the long summer break.

It seems the advantages to YRE are endless. Why then, is there a resistance to the YRE movement? Parrish (1989) suggests that reluctance or disapproval of YRE is due to the publics' fear of challenging that status quo. Parrish suggests that society as a whole is not willing to face the prospect of eliminating a tradition that it has been comfortable with for so long.

As a school board member in Marion County Florida, Parrish pushed for the implementation of YRE. In July of 1987, after researching information on YRE, a pilot program was started. It met with tremendous success. Parrish noted that benefits of YRE were clearly seen. She stressed the educational benefits. As with previous research, students were doing better because of shorter interruptions in learning. Teachers did not need extra review following time off track. Other benefits included a decline in student and teacher burn out. Students who were identified as "at risk" were not falling behind at the same rate as the traditional student "at risk". Still another benefit noted by YRE programs was the decline in discipline problems. Some year round schools reported that school suspensions were down by 75%.
All the literature on YRE that I reviewed listed three common advantages to YRE. The first advantage is that YRE is financially sound. Experts noted that districts were saving money on YRE systems because they had to construct fewer new schools. YRE also reduces overcrowding in existing schools.

The second advantage is that YRE is fiscally sound. Long term maintenance costs, insurance, and utility fees are reduced. There is no longer a need for students to be off for long periods of time to help with agricultural chores.

The third advantage is that YRE is educationally sound. Continued learning promotes retention of information learned. Attendance improves, student and teacher burn out is reduced, student performance improves, discipline problems drop, vandalism decreases and bilingual and special needs' students do better with shorter interruptions in learning.

Although we would like to think of YRE as a choice, the reality of population growth in California may mandate such programs. Ideally, districts would like to offer families a choice of nine or twelve month programs. But in truth our options may be limited.
As Glines (1990) states, with 1.6 million new students projected for the nineties, housing these students must be a top priority. Glines outlines current programs that increase building capacity up to 50%.

Glines indicates that as financing becomes less available, more districts are turning to total year round calendars. School boards are now realizing that mandating a year round calendar is not different than mandating a nine month calendar. Glines says that either way there will be some people who are inconvenienced.

YRE and its use of facilities is an efficient use of classroom space. It can save Californians billions of dollars in construction. Some experts suggest that Californians no longer can afford the luxury of funding empty school buildings.

Glines mentions other advantages to YRE. They include such things as employment realities. He says that construction workers, farmers, baseball players, summer tourist operators, park rangers and other types of employees cannot take summer vacations. These people can appreciate a schedule that gives their children time off when they can take it. Also, teachers are able to substitute teach and earn extra money during their off
track time.

Community enhancement is also noted by Glines as being an advantage to YRE. YRE reduces highway congestion, puts less summer pressure on the police force and provides twelve month volunteers for health and social agencies.

YRE also addresses poverty. Glines concludes that poor children are offered a continuous home/role model for part of their day which provides most poor students with breakfast, a snack and lunch.

Clearly, these are all advantages we can live with. The advantages of YRE, proven by research clearly outweighs any disadvantages. The only disadvantage noted by research is a minimal amount of inconvenience for some parents. This is a small price to pay for such improvements in the educational system.

Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery is an early intervention program aimed at helping first grade students who are at risk of developing reading difficulties. The program was developed by educational psychologist Marie Clay in New Zealand in 1979. Later, in 1984, the program was implemented in Ohio. It has since spread across the
nation and is now being implemented in California.

Pinnell (1990) states that the program is designed to serve children identified by their classroom teacher as low achieving readers. In Reading Recovery, students receive a 30 minute lesson daily from a specially trained teacher. Reading Recovery is not designed to replace reading instruction, but to be a supplement to it.

Reading Recovery is not, as Pinnell (1990) states, a long term or permanent program. During each lesson teachers actively involve students in reading and writing. Each lesson is individualized to meet the needs of each student. Lessons are designed around each students' strengths, needs, and interests. The goal of Reading Recovery is to teach children to use strategies they have learned in Reading Recovery independently. Upon completion of the program students should be successful and independent readers. Once a child leaves the program she is replaced by another student who qualifies.

The Reading Recovery lesson is made up of five specific parts. The first part is the reading of familiar stories. The child begins each lesson by reading several familiar books. This provides the
student with the opportunity to engage in fluent reading. Through teacher selection of certain texts, she exposes the student to challenging and more difficult words. This allows the student to do some problem solving with her reading.

In the next part of the lesson the teacher becomes an observer, and takes a "running record" of text reading. The student is asked to read a book that was introduced and read once the day before. During the reading the teacher takes a running record. This is a type of shorthand for recording reading miscues. A check on the accuracy of this reading tells the teacher whether or not a particular text was the right level for the student. If the child completes the reading with a 90-95% accuracy then the test level was appropriate.

During the running record the teacher is watching for certain behaviors. Such things as substitutions, self corrections, omissions, insertions and even hesitations alert the teacher to the child's strengths and abilities. The teacher watches for cues the student may be using during her reading. She looks for the student to use one or more of the cueing systems. These include meaning, language syntax or structure, and visual
cues. After close observation the teacher may have new information she may use in the lesson.

During the next part of the lesson the child works with magnetic letters. Early on the letters may be used for work on letter identification. Later, as the child progresses, she may use magnetic letters during other parts of the lesson. They are very effective when used to construct words or in word analysis work.

Following the letter work is the writing portion of the lesson. During each lesson, the child is asked to write a message or story. The message is written word by word. The child uses words he may already know and attempts new words with the teacher’s help. The teacher may ask the child to say the word slowly and predict what letters represent the sounds they hear. Supporting the child this way encourages him to make links between sound and letters. Standard spelling is encouraged during the writing portion of the lesson because the teacher is working one on one with the student. This allows the teacher the opportunity to work on accuracy, a luxury the classroom teacher does not often have.

After the child writes her message, it is copied by the teacher onto a sentence strip. The teacher cuts the
sentence strip up for the child to reconstruct.

The last part of the lesson is the introduction or orientation of the new book. The new book has been carefully selected by the teacher. The child is invited to look at and talk about the whole book. Then the child attempts to read the book with some help from the teacher. A second reading may be done for fluency.

Reading Recovery Training

Reading Recovery training is different from many other training or inservice programs. The time commitment is one difference. Reading Recovery teachers in training attend a week long inservice during the summer. During this week they learn to administer the Diagnostic Survey test (Clay 1985). After the summer training the Reading Recovery teacher attends class once a week for two and half hours. This weekly class continues for an entire year. The program allows the teacher to earn university credit.

During the year long training the teacher is also working with her four students. By having teachers train and work with students simultaneously, the teacher learns, applies and refines her teaching strategies. As Pinnell suggests, this process is consistent with the
characteristics of effective training models.

Reading Recovery training has other special features. One such feature is called teaching behind the glass. Each teacher in training is required to do a demonstration lesson behind a one way glass in a sound equipped room. Each teacher is required to do three of these lessons. During the lesson the other teachers in the class observe and discuss what is happening between the student and teacher. Discussion usually includes ideas on the teachers instructional decisions. The discussion is led by the teacher-leader. The role of the teacher leader is to "challenge the observers with questions that require analysis" (Pinnell, 1990, p.288).

In supporting Pinnell, Boehnlein (1987) states that in an intervention program such as Reading Recovery, it is important to intervene before poor habits become ingrained and are hard to change. Strategies that good readers use and Reading Recovery encourages are the control of directional movement left to right, top to bottom; knowledge of book language, and ability to develop a good memory for text; to gain meaning from structure; to self correct errors; and to cross check with other cues.
In an effort to battle illiteracy, Boehnlein suggests that programs like Reading Recovery can be successful in achieving this goal. She also states that promoting literacy does not have to be a costly venture. Intervention programs are more cost effective than remediation programs. Programs such as Reading Recovery may save money in the long run.

Dyer (1992), in his research about the cost effectiveness of Reading Recovery, states that today's schools face the difficult job of deciding the most effective way to use scarce resources for the good of children. Dyer concludes that Reading Recovery is an educationally sound and cost effective early intervention program for helping children who are at risk of early reading failure. The benefits of Reading Recovery are many. Besides saving money for schools, it can also reduce a school district's reliance on the use of questionable practices like labeling, categorizing, and retaining children.

To combine two educationally sound and cost effective programs like YRE and Reading Recovery makes a great deal of sense, but to implement Reading Recovery into a multi track system may require some adjustments.
In an effort to determine what adjustments may be necessary, a survey was developed. This survey was given to all Reading Recovery teachers in training in California who presently serve their Reading Recovery students in a year round system.

The first question on the survey asks the teacher what type of year round program they work in. This is an important question because one system might have more success than another at accommodating Reading Recovery. Or, perhaps each are equal in their success, but create different demands on the program. The complete survey appears in Appendix A.

The second question on the survey asks the Reading Recovery teacher how many students she is serving. With YRE it would be possible for each teacher to work with five students instead of only four.

The third question on the survey asks the teacher about track representation. Does she serve students from only one or two tracks, or is each track represented in the Reading Recovery Program? This is important because this could begin a trend in tracking or labeling students which Reading Recovery tries very hard to avoid.

The fourth question asks the teacher when it is best
to have interruption of services within the Reading Recovery Program. This is an important question because this may be one of the necessary adjustments needed for the Reading Recovery Program in YRS.

The fifth question is just the opposite, but equally important. It asks the teacher when it is most difficult to interrupt services. This again could impact the program as far as when to start students and perhaps the selection of students depending on what track they are on.

The next question deals with off track time and what teachers are doing with their Reading Recovery students during this period. Is it advantageous to work with students during their time off? Or, will students retain the information learned over their brief time off? These are important issues to consider when implementing Reading Recovery into YRS.

The last three questions deal with teachers' opinions on advantages and disadvantages of year round Reading Recovery Programs. These last questions are important in that they may provide answers to help in the implementation of Reading Recovery into YRS.

Because YRE is a powerful way to reduce
overcrowding, we can be sure that it will be around in California for quite some time. But the benefits produced by YRE go far beyond reducing overcrowding. The literature reviewed in this project indicates many of the advantages to YRE. One of the most powerful in my mind is YRE's ability to provide continuous learning.

Continuous learning, the goal of YRE is long overdue in the United States. Countries such as Japan have far exceeded the United States in student test scores for too long. But, we must consider that the average Japanese student, by high school graduation, has been in school two years longer than the average student from the United States. This is because Japanese students attend school for 240 days a year, while U.S. students attend for only 180 days. Even though the country may not be ready to increase the number of days students attend, the trend for YRE has it going in the right direction. By providing shorter interruptions in learning, YRE is reducing review time and increasing new learning time.

Reading Recovery is an intervention program rather than a remediation program. Therefore, the purpose is to build on strengths and to teach good strategies before bad ones develop. Reading Recovery is not a cure all for
illiteracy. It is a beginning. It is an effort to identify those students who may otherwise go unnoticed and become just another statistic. There will always be a need for special education. Reading Recovery does not intend to be a replacement for other special services. It does try to catch children young, before they experience failure. The question is not whether Reading Recovery is a good program. That has already been determined. The question rather, is whether or not it can be implemented into the ever growing number of YRS? The literature reviewed in this project does not suggest that there would be any real difficulties with Reading Recovery in YRS.
GOALS AND LIMITATIONS

The purpose of this project is to examine the potential a special program such as Reading Recovery has when implemented into year round schools (YRS).

Although individually YRE and Reading Recovery have been proven to be beneficial, it is the goal of this project to look at the two programs combined. Will Reading Recovery work in a year round system? What will need to be considered to implement Reading Recovery into year round schedules?

Another goal of this project is to survey teachers who are currently training in Reading Recovery and who service their Reading Recovery students within a year round program. The results of this survey would provide suggestions for implementing Reading Recovery in YRS. The surveys may also indicate where and what adaptations will be needed to make Reading Recovery successful in YRS.

One of the limitations of this project is the short amount of time. Reading Recovery was just introduced to California schools this 1991-1992 school year. This brief encounter of the program may make it difficult to draw long term conclusions about it's success.
Another limitation is the sample or size of the surveyed group. Reading Recovery now has three training sites in California. One is in San Diego, another in Orange County, and the third is in San Bernardino. There are approximately 60 Reading Recovery teachers in training from all three sites. Of these 60 teachers, not all are on year round schedules. Therefore, the results of the surveys are coming from a small sample group.

There are currently two other states implementing Reading Recovery in year round schools. Salt Lake City Utah has a small number of YRS as well as Chicago Illinois. Neither state are implementing the program on a wide spread basis, as is California. For information on the success of Utah’s Reading Recovery program please see Appendix B. Kirby (1990) looks at the success rate of traditional Reading Recovery students and compares them to Reading Recovery students in YRS.

This project does not attempt to deal with other special programs within the year round system. Nor, does it attempt to look at the Reading Recovery program within the traditional school setting.
SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the implementation of Reading Recovery within year round schools in California. A survey was developed to question Reading Recovery teacher leaders and teachers in training about their first encounter with the program and how it works in year round schools. The survey consisted of 10 questions, each with room for comments.

The survey was given to all Reading Recovery teacher leaders and teachers in training within the California school system that serviced their Reading Recovery students in a YRS setting. There are approximately 73 teachers in training and four teacher leaders. Of that population, approximately 15 are in YRS. This includes one teacher leader and 14 teachers in training. All but one of the 15 Reading Recovery teachers responded to the survey. The results discussed in this chapter reflect the opinions and beliefs of those 14 teachers.

The first question on the survey was to determine the type of year round schedule that each teacher was on. Of the 14 responding, eight teachers were on the 60-20 system, four were on 45-15, and 2 were on single track year round schedules.
Question two asked how many Reading Recovery students each teacher was servicing. The answers ranged from two to five students for each teacher with a total of 53 students in all. One teacher in the study serviced students from each track giving her five students total. One teacher leader had two students because her schedule did not allow time to service the standard number of four students.

The third question on the survey dealt with the servicing of tracks within the year round setting. The majority surveyed were serving students from more than one track. Six of the 14 teachers were serving one track only. One teacher responded that although she was servicing one track only, this would be temporary, and for training purposes only. Next year she would be serving all tracks.

The next two questions dealt with the real implementation issues. Each teacher was asked to respond to which times were easiest and which times were hardest to interrupt services within their Reading Recovery program. This question considered what was best for the student. Responses to these questions were quite varied. Most teachers believed that it was easier to interrupt
services during the early period of one to four weeks. Some felt in was easier during the middle portion of the program, and only three felt that it was easiest to interrupt services at the end of the program.

Responding to the hardest time to interrupt services, the majority surveyed felt that from five to ten weeks was the hardest time to interrupt the program. Reasons for these responses and teacher comments will be discussed later in the chapter.

Question six asked each teacher what if anything was done to service students during their off track time. There were five common responses to this question. Five teachers responded that nothing was done to further student progress during off track time. Five also responded that some type of work packets were sent home with the child. These packets varied in their contents. Some were made up of familiar reading, other good literature, and some of the students cut up stories. Others included flash cards of known words and self made books. At least three teachers provided students the opportunity to come back in during their vacation time. Two teachers reported that they did work daily with their students during the students' off track time. One
teacher even provided home visits. This teacher stated that it was enjoyable to observe her student in a different setting.

The seventh question asked teachers about the advantages to teaching Reading Recovery within a YRS. Some of the advantages noted were that YRE resembled the New Zealand model of school schedules and that it reduced teacher and student "burn out". Other teachers mentioned the ability to provide continuous service was important and definitely an advantage of YRE. Some teachers stated that there were advantages to year round schedules if Reading Recovery students returned during their time off. One teacher said she preferred the short off track time instead of a long summer vacation. Four teachers expressed that to them there were no advantages to teaching Reading Recovery in a YRS.

Question eight asked teachers to list any disadvantages they had experienced teaching Reading Recovery within a YRS. Two teachers said there were no disadvantages with the year round schedule. Three teachers felt that there were too many interruptions in the year round schedule. The most common response to this question was the problem that one teacher has
meeting the needs of four or five different tracks. Suggestions were made about compensation for teachers who work during their off track time. Other suggestions included putting Reading Recovery teachers on different schedules. Some teachers felt that even four or five weeks was too long for their Reading Recovery students to be without instruction. Another common response was that if was difficult to ask parents to transport their child to school during their vacation time.

The ninth question asked teachers to discuss the problems they had scheduling Reading Recovery students in YRS. Two of the 14 teachers surveyed discussed the difficulty working around the off track time. Two others stated it was extremely difficult to cover all tracks effectively. Another teacher noted that on a year round schedule, it is impossible to work in 14-16 weeks of instruction without interruption. Others discussed the problems of moving from room to room each time tracks changed. This is inconvenient for the Reading Recovery teacher who really needs to have a permanent room.

The last question on the survey simply asked for teachers to respond and share any comments they had about the implementation of Reading Recovery into a year round
system. Most teachers responded to this question by giving suggestions or ideas that would be useful in successfully implementing Reading Recovery in YRS. Some ideas are based on the assumption that California has unlimited financial resources, and others are more realistic. One comment was made that there should be a Reading Recovery teacher on each track. This would be nice, but very expensive. It would also take years to train enough teachers to do this. Other ideas included the necessity for Reading Recovery teachers to be on a individualized schedule. Since time is a prime concern one teacher suggested the idea of having back ups or students on waiting lists ready to enter the program without any wasted time. Other comments about time included the need to begin Reading Recovery immediately. Perhaps kindergarten teachers could alternately rank their students at the end of the year, so that when they entered first grade they would already be on a waiting list. The coordination of schedules for Reading Recovery students and teachers would also be helpful. This however may create problems for students that have siblings on other tracks. One person said that working with shorter periods of time forced her to focus her
lessons and instruction more carefully. I thought one of the most practical ideas came from the teacher who suggested training more kindergarten teachers and reducing their Reading Recovery load from four to three students. This is certainly a financially sound and educationally sound idea. Not only would a district save money by training kindergarten teachers, they may in the long run reduce the number of returning students needing Reading Recovery in first grade. Highly trained kindergarten teachers may be able to teach early reading strategies to their students effectively so that when they enter first grade, these strategies are well in place.

After reviewing the survey it was interesting to note some of the similarities to the Utah study provided by Kirby (1990). Both studies suggested that by students having shorter breaks they retain more. In Kirby's study she commented that Reading Recovery teachers in training who were in YRS needed less help administering the Diagnostic Survey. This was because their summer training came right before they returned to school. Their traditional counterparts had to wait until nearly the end of September before testing. Some teachers had
difficulty remembering how to administer parts of the survey correctly.

Another similarity is the lack of "burn out" for both student and teacher. This fact was brought up in both studies. Teachers and students were more enthusiastic about the program after returning from a short break.

Kirby believes that Reading Recovery students on a year round schedule do better initially because they have had less time off between instruction.

In the Utah study, students in Reading Recovery received some form of reading enrichment during their off track time. This enrichment was varied and did not include regular Reading Recovery lessons.

In her study, Kirby noted that although Reading Recovery students started the program at a slightly higher text level than their traditional counterparts, by the end of the year they seemed to level out. This helps to support the idea that Reading Recovery is just as effective in a year round setting as in a traditional setting.
Conclusion

In conclusion it would be reasonable to say that some adaptations need to be made when implementing Reading Recovery into YRS. Information gathered from this survey would suggest that Reading Recovery will work and be just as effective in YRS as in traditional ones. It seems that the most significant issue with Reading Recovery and YRS includes proper and effective scheduling. Comments on the survey provided suggestions for this. According to those surveyed, Reading Recovery students and teachers need to have compatible schedules. This can be arranged in a variety of ways.

Off track service for Reading Recovery students is another important issue when implementing the program into YRS. As Kirby pointed out in her study, students provided with enrichment material during off track time continued to make good reading progress. Formal Reading Recovery lessons were not necessary for students to eventually discontinue the Reading Recovery program within the average amount of time.

If California is to continue implementing Reading Recovery in YRS, consideration should be given to the scheduling issues that have been encountered during this
first year. These are not issues that question the success of the program, rather adaptations necessary to promote the same quality and success the program has shown in traditional settings. California has always been a progressive state when it comes to education. Therefore, I am hopeful that Reading Recovery and YRE will work together to meet the needs of our students for years to come.
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APPENDIX A

A survey for Reading Recovery teachers in training
Reading Recovery and Year Round Schools

A survey for Reading Recovery Teachers in training

1. Please indicate the year round program that best describes your school site.
   a. 45-15__________
   b. 60-20__________
   c. Year round single track__________
   d. Concept 6__________
   e. Other (please describe) ______________________________________________________________________

2. Number of Reading Recovery students you are servicing__________________

3. Which best describes your schedule of services?
   a. Serving reading recovery students from one track only __________
   b. Serving reading recovery students from more than one track__________
   c. Serving one student from each track__________
   d. Other (please describe) ______________________________________________________________________

4. Considering the average duration of a reading recovery program, in your opinion when is it easiest to interrupt services? (off track)
   a. Early in program (1-4 weeks)________
   b. Middle of program (5-10 weeks)_______
   c. End of program (11-16 weeks)________

   Please comment ________________________________________________________________________________

5. Considering the average duration of a Reading Recovery program, in your opinion when is it hardest to interrupt services? (off track)
   *Please see next page for options.
a. Early in program (1-4 weeks)_____

b. Middle of program (5-10 weeks)_____

c. End of program (11-16 weeks)_____

Please comment__________________________________________

6. Briefly describe what (if anything) you do with your Reading Recovery students during their off track time.

7. What do you feel are the advantages to year round Reading Recovery programs?

8. What do you feel are the disadvantages to year round Reading Recovery programs?

9. Do you have problems with scheduling Reading Recovery students in your year round program? If so, please describe them briefly.

10. Please share any comments you have about the implementation of Reading Recovery in year round school programs.
Graph 19

Reading Recovery Discontinued Students

Regular Track vs Year Round Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Track Schools</th>
<th>Year Round Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dictation</td>
<td>Word Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table provided by B. Kirby, Teacher Leader, Salt Lake City, Utah.
GRAPH 20
READING RECOVERY DISCONTINUED STUDENTS
Regular Track vs Year Round Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Track Schools</th>
<th>Progress in Text Reading Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Round Schools</th>
<th>Progress in Text Reading Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table provided by B. Kirby, Teacher Leader, Salt Lake City, Utah.
GRAPH 21
READING RECOVERY DISCONTINUED STUDENTS
Regular Track vs Year Round Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Track Schools</th>
<th>Progress in Word Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Round Schools</th>
<th>Progress in Word Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table provided by B. Kirby, Teacher Leader, Salt Lake City, Utah.
**GRAPH 22**

**READING RECOVERY DISCONTINUED STUDENTS**

Regular Track vs Year Round Progress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Track Schools</th>
<th>Year Round Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress in Dictation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Progress in Dictation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Fall Score</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Spring Score</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table provided by B. Kirby, Teacher Leader, Salt Lake City, Utah.