8-2011

Read Naturall: Effect on Reading Fluency

Lola L. Stansfield
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports
Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation
Stansfield, Lola L., "Read Naturall: Effect on Reading Fluency" (2011). All Graduate Plan B and other Reports. 74.
https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/74
7-2011

Read Naturall: Effect on Reading Fluency

Lola L. Stansfield
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact beckythoms@usu.edu.
READ NATURALLY®: EFFECT ON READING FLUENCY

By

Lola L. Stansfield

A Plan B Master’s Project submitted in partial fulfillment
Of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Approved:

Major Professor
Susan A. Turner, PhD

Committee Member
Scott Ross, PhD

Committee Member
Benjamin Lignugaris/Kraft, PhD

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah
2011
ABSTRACT

The current investigation explored the effects of the Read Naturally® program on the reading fluency of students with disabilities in an elementary school setting. Participants were eight students with disabilities grades three through six who were screened and found ready to receive a fluency intervention. Reading fluency pre-post measures were collected. Weekly progress monitoring was carried out and data was compared to national norms as described by the 2005 Hasbrouck-Tindal Table of Oral Reading Fluency Norms. All three female participants showed a downward trend in their progress monitoring data. In contrast, all male participants showed an upward trend. All except two participants showed fluency gains between the pre and post benchmark fluency data, however, only one of the participants reached the 50th percentile norm fluency rate for their grade level. The majority of the students expressed reading satisfaction and the program was implemented with fidelity except for communication with parents. The teachers and aides also expressed satisfaction with the program. The Read Naturally® program was implemented for the minimum recommended time, therefore, sufficient gains were not made to close the gap between students with disabilities using the Read Naturally® program and students remaining in the classroom for core instruction without interventions. Future research should replicate these findings in a larger, normative sample and encourage maximum recommended time for the implementation of the Read Naturally® program.
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INTRODUCTION

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, signed into law by President Bush on Jan. 8, 2002, is a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Literacy development is one of the key purposes of the No Child Left Behind Act. The act creates a new competitive-grant program called Reading First, to help states and districts set up "scientific, research-based" reading programs for children in grades K-3. Reading First builds on the findings of the National Reading Panel (2000), detailed in a comprehensive report that sets the standard for research evidence of instructional practices that improve reading achievement. The National Reading Panel report identifies alphabetics, fluency, and comprehension as the essential elements of reading instruction.

Reading Fluency

Extensive research on defining reading fluency as well as on acquiring reading fluency skills has been conducted. According to Marcia R. Davidson, reading fluency is when a person can read quickly, accurately and with prosody, which is rhythm of speech with appropriate pausing. "Fluency provides a bridge between word recognition and comprehension" (National Institute for Literacy (NIFL), 2001). When decoding is automatic, readers can focus on the meaning of what they are reading which is the goal of reading (LaBerge & Samuels, 1974). Fluency is crucial to the acquisition of word recognition skills (Wolf & Katzir-Cohen, 2001). Because rate, accuracy and fluency measures reflect a reader’s proficiency level during the acquisition of reading skills, they can serve as outcome measures for proficiency as well (Torgesen, Rashotte, & Alexander, 2002).
Acquiring Reading Fluency Skills

Reading fluency takes practice and develops over time (Allington, 1983; Meyer & Felton, 1999). When a child first learns to read, their oral reading is slow. As they continue to build their skills and learn to read words automatically, they may still read word by word with little or no expression. A fluent reader not only knows to break a passage into meaningful phrases, but he also reads with prosody or with inflection. The relationship between comprehension and fluency is strong and has been demonstrated in the research consistently for over 25 years (Deon, 1985; Hasbrouck & Tindal, 1992; Shinn, 1989; Pinnell, Pikulski, Wixson, Campell, Gough, & Beatty, 1995; O’Shea, Sindelar, & O’Shea, 1985; Breznitz, & Share, 1992; Fuchs & Maxwell, 1988).

Recognizing the importance of fluency, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) addressed fluency skills in a special study (Pinnell, et al., 1995). In that study researchers identified 44% of a representative sample of fourth graders as having poor fluency skills. Students who performed poorly on fluency measures also tended to have low comprehension scores.

Research-Based Interventions for Fluency

Two research-based approaches to instruction in fluency include the following:

Repeated reading of the same text a certain number of times until the reader achieves fluency (Faulkner & Levy, 1999; Levy, Nicholls, & Kohen, 1993; Ransinski, 1990; Dowhower, 1994) and guided repeated oral reading with the use of audiotapes, peer or adult assistance, or other feedback (Pany & McCoy, 1988; Anderson, Wilkinson, & Mason, 1991).
A vital component of these interventions is the feedback the reader receives. In both examples above, a teacher, adult, or peer provides systematic error correction and scaffolded support for the reader. Systematic error correction involves the student reading a passage to the teacher, the teacher correct errors by stating the correct word; the student repeats the correct word then rereads the passage. Scaffolding support could include reading aloud new passages while students follow along, or a teacher may print new words on the chalkboard before students read a passage, which uses the words. These two approaches appear to be successful interventions that increase fluency.

**Read Naturally®: An Effective Scientifically-Based Reading Fluency Intervention**

The Read Naturally® program combines the two research based approaches mentioned above and includes a third strategy for improving fluency: teacher modeling (Eldredge & Quinn, 1988; Heckelman, 1969; McAllister, 1989; Reitsma, 1988), repeated reading (Dowhower, 1987; Knupp, 1988; Koskinen & Blum, 1984; Larking, 1988; O'Shea, Sindelar, & O'Shea, 1985; Rashotte & Torgeson, 1985; Richék & McTague, 1988), and progress monitoring (Schunk, 1982). The program is a fluency intervention and /or supplemental program based on current scientific research on reading fluency. The approach includes the recommended guided oral repeated reading and repeated reading techniques described above, accompanied by immediate quantitative feedback.

Read Naturally® is based upon the assumption that struggling readers typically have difficulty with fluency, stemming from phonological processing problems. Phonological processing difficulties pose significant problems for students who are struggling at the word level of reading and have not developed automaticity (the ability to do things by
habit without thinking). (Stanovich, 1980; Stanovich, 2000). Students who experience difficulty with fluency often score significantly below the 50th percentile as indicated by the Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Norms (2005), which measure fluency norms by selecting the median score from three unpracticed readings of grade-level materials. Readers who perform at or near these target norms should be considered as progressing adequately in automaticity. Readers who are significantly and consistently below the norm span (in the 10th or 25th percentile) for their grade level and time of year may be at-risk in their reading fluency development. Third grade students are considered to be in the some-risk category if they fall in the 50th percentile. They are considered at-risk if they are in the 10th – 25th percentile. Fourth grade students are considered to be in the some-risk category if they fall in the 25th percentile. They are considered at-risk if they are in the 10th – 25th percentile. Fifth and sixth grade students are considered to be in the some-risk category if they fall in the 25th percentile. They are considered at-risk if they are in the 10th percentile. Table 1 indicates the grade level *WCPM = Words Correct Per Minute norms for Fall, Winter and Spring. **Average weekly improvement is the average words per week growth you can expect from a student. It was calculated by dividing the difference between the fall and spring scores by 32, the typical number of weeks between the fall and spring assessments. For grade 1, since there is no fall assessment, the average weekly improvement was calculated by dividing the difference between the winter and spring scores by 16, the typical number of weeks between the winter and spring assessments.

Table 1

Hasbrouck-Tindal Table of Oral Reading Fluency Norms and Avg. Weekly Improvement
The 2005 Hasbrouck & Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Chart was used to draw conclusions and make decisions about the oral reading fluency of students. The table shows the norm oral reading fluency rates and growth of students in grades 1 through 8 as determined by Hasbrouck and Tindal's data. The chart was used as a comparison to determine if reading fluency intervention was needed and if the students were showing adequate reading fluency growth. Technical adequacy of the ORF Test-retest reliabilities for elementary students ranged from .92 to .97; alternate form reliability of different reading passages drawn from the same level ranged from .89 to .94 (Tindal, Marston & Deno, 1983). Criterion-related validity studied in eight separate studies in the 1980's reported coefficients ranging from .52 to .91 (Good & Jefferson, 1998).

The computer-based version of Read Naturally® improves reading fluency and is carried out in a series of steps. Students begin with a placement test to ensure they are reading at the appropriate level. Once the desired reading level has been determined, they choose a story from the appropriate level. Before reading the story, students write a prediction. After writing a prediction, students read the story aloud, timing themselves.
for one minute and select unknown words, which the computer underlines. This step establishes a baseline for measuring the students’ improvement. The computer graphs the cold timing (unpracticed reading) score in blue and the number of words read correctly in the one-minute timing. Next, students read along three times while listening to a recording of the story. Students continue to practice reading the story without audio support several times until they read at the predetermined goal rate. When the student determines they are ready to pass, the teacher listens to the hot timing (practiced reading). The student must meet their reading rate goal, make three or fewer errors, read with good expression, and answer all of the questions correctly. The teacher determines if the student has read with good expression. The hot-timing score is automatically marked as a red bar above the blue bar of the cold-timing score on the computer. In the last step, students write a retell (to relate again in a different form). In order to see optimal growth teachers should schedule students to work with the Read Naturally® program five days a week for 30-45 minute sessions. According to the program guidelines, minimal growth can be reached in three, thirty-minute sessions per week.

Research on Read Naturally

The Florida Center for Reading Research (FCRR) gives Read Naturally® the highest possible rating for fluency and comprehension based on two studies both in the same school in Minnesota (FCRR 2006), four in other schools in Minnesota (FCRR 2006), one study in a school in Michigan (FCRR 2006), and one in a school in Georgia (FCRR 2006). The FCRR noted no weaknesses and several strengths. “FCRR reports are prepared in response to requests from Florida school districts for review of specific reading programs. The reports are intended to be a source of information about programs
that will help teachers, principals, and district personnel in their choice of materials that can be used by skilled teachers to provide effective instruction. In sum, the strategies within the Read Naturally program have been shown by scientific research to be effective for improving students’ reading fluency” (FCRR 2006).

What Works Clearinghouse, reports that “The U.S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences found “Read Naturally® to have no discernible effects on reading fluency and potentially positive effects on writing for students with learning disabilities” (WWC 2009). This information was based on a study by Chenault et al (2006) conducted at Washington State University. The study indicated extent of evidence to be small cautioning readers when findings are drawn from studies with small samples, a small number of school settings, or a single study. This single study included one school with 20 students. The conclusion was no evidence of effects because the study showed no significant or substantively important effect, either positive or negative.

In 2006, Denton conducted a study to evaluate the effects of an intensive reading intervention on students with persistent reading difficulties. This intervention included the Read Naturally® program. Results indicated a significant improvement in reading decoding, fluency, and comprehension (Denton, 2006). The Read Naturally® program was not the only intervention used in the study, therefore, it was not conclusive that the improvement was a result of the Read Naturally® program alone. The current study focuses specifically on the effects of the Read Naturally® program.

The Purpose Statement and Evaluation Question

The purpose of this project is to determine if students with disabilities in DCSD can achieve growth in reading fluency commensurate with previous research through the
implementation of the Read Naturally® program. Since classroom instruction time is important, the district needs to be sure Read Naturally® is effective for students with disabilities if they are to devote the recommended instructional time. It is also important to discover if using Read Naturally® for the minimum recommended time will be adequate to show growth in fluency for students with disabilities. Previous training on the implementation of Read Naturally® was provided for special education teachers in DCSD by trained consultants from the publishers of Read Naturally® at the beginning of the 2010-2011 school year. District personnel also provided follow-up training.

**Research Question**

The current project posed the following research question: Does participation in the Read Naturally® program, improve the reading fluency of students with disabilities in an elementary school setting?

**Methods**

**Setting**

In the state of Utah, Criterion Reference Tests (CRT) are used to assess the knowledge and skill of students in grades 3 – 11. Within the CRT, The English Language subcategory assesses the areas of reading, writing, and listening. Based on the belief that reading is critical to all areas of student success, this series of tests incorporates reading from a variety of content areas. Following is the 2009/2010 CRT test results comparing DCSD to the state. Unfortunately, the DCSD language arts CRT results of 76% indicate a 4% discrepancy from the state’s 80% proficient for all students. The discrepancy is even larger for students with disabilities. The results for DCSD students with disabilities
in language arts are 38% as compared to the state’s 51% proficient. See Table 2 below for results of the 2009-2010 language arts CRT.

**Table 2**

*Results of the 2009-2010 Language Arts CRT, Comparing DCSD to the State*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Participation %</th>
<th>Academic Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District</td>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N&lt;40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>N&lt;40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N&lt;40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficient</td>
<td>N&lt;40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response, the district adopted the following mission statement: “The fundamental purpose of DCSD is to assure that all students achieve at high academic levels. This must be embedded into the day-to-day practice throughout the entire district.” The district also indicated a priority on providing high quality instruction and promoting optimal student achievement results in all content areas. Within this priority, students in all subgroups must achieve at least one year’s growth each year as measured by the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Map Test (measures of academic progress). In addition, overall student achievement will meet or exceed state averages in language arts on end of level assessments.
In order for DCSD to meet their goals, they must examine each sub group within the district. As one of those underachieving subgroups, the reading level of students with disabilities is a critical piece to district improvement. Therefore, this study is important to the Superintendent, District Special Education Director, principals, and special education teachers. Each of these stakeholders is responsible for student achievement within the district.

Duchesne County School District is comprised of 13 schools in Northeastern Utah. Five of those schools are elementary schools where the Read Naturally® fluency program was implemented. Altamont Elementary School (AES) was chosen for this project due to its close proximity to the researcher. It consisted of 345 students, 30% on free and reduced lunch. There were 16 teachers with an average of 22 students per classroom. A computer lab with 31 computers is located in a one-room mobile unit on the school’s premises. The lab has good lighting and regulated temperature. Students completed Read Naturally® sessions three days a week in the computer lab. A 30-minute session was held for the 3rd grade students from 9:00 to 9:30 and for the 4th, 5th and 6th grade students from 11:30 – 12:00. The computers were always turned on and ready for the students to sign in to the Read Naturally® program before they entered the lab, allowing them to start Read Naturally® immediately.

Participants

Twenty-four students with disabilities at Altamont Elementary grades 2-6 were considered for this study. Of the 24 students, eight were chosen as participants. The study’s criterion for selection was a score in the 10th or 25th percentile on the Winter DIBELS® benchmark as compared to the Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral Reading Fluency
Norms. The eight students were all Caucasian, two male students in third and fourth grade, one male and one female in fifth grade, and two female students in sixth grade. Two special education teachers and two aides administered the benchmark and screening assessments and also facilitated the Read Naturally® fluency program. They were all trained by other teachers in the school who had experience in this area. The two teachers were also trained on the Read Naturally® program at a district training meeting by trained professionals either from the company, or district personnel who had been trained by professionals from the company. The teachers, who attended the district training, trained the aides.

**Measures**

The current project employed several measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the Read Naturally program in AES. These include screening measures, progress monitoring measures, social validity measures and implementation measures.

**Screening Measures**

*Core Phonics Survey®,* is a curriculum-based measurement used to assess the phonics and phonics-related skills that have a high rate of application in beginning reading. A summary of the skills screened using the *Core Phonics Survey®* is as follows: Alphabet Skills and Letter Sounds including: letter names upper and lowercase, consonant sounds, and long and short vowel sounds; Reading and Decoding Skills including: short vowels in CVC words, consonant blends with short vowels, short vowels, digraphs, and -tch trigraph, r-controlled vowels, long vowel spellings, variant vowels, low frequency vowel and consonant spellings, and multisyllabic words. The purpose of this assessment was to determine the skills that students lacked in order to guide intervention. In addition, at
mid-year, January 4\textsuperscript{th} 2011, it was used to determine if the students knew beginning sounds indicating readiness for the Read Naturally\textsuperscript{®} fluency program. The test-retest reliability of the Core Phonics Survey\textsuperscript{®} was .92. Interrater agreement was reported as .98 (Brandt 2009; See the Core Phonics Survey in Appendix A).

*The Fry's 300 Instant Sight Words*\textsuperscript{®} is a curriculum-based measurement using the first 300 instant words. Sight words make up about 65 percent of all written material (Fry, 1993). These words are referred to as “sight words,” “high frequency words,” or “instant words.” Readers need to recognize each word as quickly and effortlessly as possible so that they can pay attention to the more mentally demanding task of understanding what they are reading. The purpose of this assessment was to determine if students knew enough sight words to be successful in the Read Naturally\textsuperscript{®} fluency program. The assessment was administered in the fall of 2010 and again at mid-year, January 4\textsuperscript{th} 2011. (See Appendix A for a list of the sight words).

**Oral reading fluency pre measure.**

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (*DIBELS*\textsuperscript{®}) oral reading fluency (ORF) measure was used to gather pre benchmark grade-level oral reading fluency data. The purpose of this assessment is to measure accuracy and fluency with connected text. Because of its beginning, middle, and end of the year design, DIBELS allows teachers to focus on specific skills that show weaknesses and then monitor the students' growth on the next testing. The students in this study were given the (*DIBELS*\textsuperscript{®}) benchmark oral reading fluency assessment in the fall of 2010 before the onset of the study, and again at mid-year on January 4\textsuperscript{th} 2011. It was used as a pre-benchmark measure for this study. See Appendix A for a sample DIBELS\textsuperscript{®} Oral
Reading Fluency Pre and Post Assessment. The fluency assessment interrater reliability was reported as .90, and the test-retest was reported as .93. Concurrent validity of the Dibels-M fluency levels for broad reading was .64 (Elliott, Lee, & Tollefson, 2001).

**Reading fluency benchmark assessor.**

The Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor (RFBA) a useful assessment tools for periodic screening, assessment, and progress monitoring (see the RFBA Appendix A) was used to monitor progress regularly throughout the study by assessing, recording, and analyzing the oral reading fluency of the students. The Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor includes three passages for each grade level, grades 1–8. Each set of grade-level passages has strong validity and reliability. The Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor from the *Read Naturally®* program was used to establish an instructional level fluency baseline for each individual student using the mean of six measures between January 13th and January 20th. See Appendix A. Read Naturally Inc. reports same-year test-retest reliability estimates ranging from .915 to .923 for all grades except grade one, which was .847. The overall validity estimate across grades and measures was .730 with a 95% confidence interval from .716 to .744. (Read Naturally, Inc. 2008).

**Progress Monitoring Measure**

**Reading fluency progress monitor.**

The Reading Fluency Progress Monitor from the *Read Naturally®* program was used to gather weekly instructional level progress monitoring data for each student from January 26th 2011 through April 4th 2011. See Appendix A... The Reading Fluency Progress Monitor includes 30 fiction and nonfiction passages with strong validity and reliability at each grade level. Teachers can monitor progress regularly throughout the
year (monthly, biweekly, weekly). Correlations with the benchmark passages and other monitoring passages were consistently at or above .90 (Read Naturally, Inc. 2008).

**Social Validity Measures**

**Student reading satisfaction.**

A student questionnaire was used by the researcher at the end of April 2011 to assess social validity by measuring the reading satisfaction of the students with disabilities who were using the *Read Naturally®* program. The following questions were asked: Do you think *Read Naturally®* helps you read better? Do you want to continue using *Read Naturally®*? Do you like the *Read Naturally®* program? An individual informal interview by the researcher with each of the eight students was conducted at the end of April in conjunction with the student questionnaire. See Appendix B for student reading satisfaction.

**Teacher satisfaction.**

A teacher/aide questionnaire was used by the researcher at the end of June 2011 to assess social validity by measuring the program satisfaction of the teachers and aides involved in administering the *Read Naturally®* program. The following questions were asked: Were you sufficiently trained? Do you think *Read Naturally®* helps reading fluency? Should the time be increased? Should *Read Naturally®* be used next year? An individual informal interview was conducted by the researcher with each of the two teachers and two aides. See Appendix B for teacher satisfaction.
Implementation Measures

Fidelity measure.

A fidelity checklist was used to measure the administration fidelity of the Read Naturally® program. The checklist was filled out at the end of February, end of March, and the end of April by the head teacher. See Appendix B.

Reading fluency post measure.

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS®) was used to gather post-benchmark grade level oral reading fluency data on May 2nd, 2011 by the researcher. See Appendix B.

Procedure

Two special education teachers and two aides were trained to administer DIBELS®, Core Phonics Survey®, Read Naturally®, Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor, and, Read Naturally® Progress Monitoring. They were all trained in the Fall 2010 to administer DIBELS® and Core Phonics Survey® by other teachers in the school who had experience in this area. The two teachers were also trained at that time on the Read Naturally® program at a district training meeting by trained professionals either from the company, or district personnel who had been trained by professionals from the company. The teachers, who attended the district training, trained the aides. Refresher training was offered at a Professional Learning Community Meeting for the teachers in January 2011, who in turn retrained the aides.

All 24 students with disabilities in the Altamont Elementary grades 2-6 were screened in September, 2010 using The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills DIBELS® to determine the need for reading interventions outside of core classroom
instruction. The students were in the following grades: one in 2\textsuperscript{nd}, seven each in 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 4\textsuperscript{th}, six in 5\textsuperscript{th}, and three in 6\textsuperscript{th}, for a total of 24 students. These students scored at least ten WCPM below the 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile on DIBELS\textsuperscript{®} as compared to the Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Norms (2005; See Table 1) therefore, they were considered for fluency intervention. Students scoring below the 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile are considered to have some risk or be at risk of difficulty with oral reading fluency depending on where their oral reading fluency score falls (Table 3 describes the DIBELS fluency indicators).

Table 3

\textit{DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency Benchmark & Risk Indicators}

According to the \textit{Read Naturally\textsuperscript{®}} program guidelines, students at any grade level will be able to work successfully in \textit{Read Naturally\textsuperscript{®}} if they know all of the beginning sounds and can recognize 50 out of 100 written sight words, which can be selected from any sight word list. Therefore, these 24 students were screened further to determine readiness for the \textit{Read Naturally\textsuperscript{®}} fluency program using the \textit{Core Phonics Survey\textsuperscript{®}}
Sixteen of the students screened knew all of the beginning sounds and could recognize 50 sight words. Therefore, they were placed in the Read Naturally® fluency program in the fall of 2010.

The remaining eight students; two male students each in third and fourth, one male and one female in fifth, and two female students in sixth grade, were found to have letter recognition, but knew fewer than 80% of beginning sounds and were not able to recognize 50 sight words. Therefore, the Read Well® program, (a reading curriculum for kindergarten and first-grade students whose goal is to increase students’ literacy skills) was the intervention chosen and used during the first half of the 2010-2011 school-year for these eight students in spite of their grade level. These students were not considered for a fluency intervention during the first half of the 2010 school year.

Prior to the current study, the eight students were screened again by a teacher or an aide using DIBELS® to obtain a mid-year oral reading fluency benchmark. Once again they scored at least ten WCPM below the 50th percentile on their oral reading fluency benchmark as compared to the Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Norms (2005), using the median score from three unpracticed readings from grade-level materials. Students #1 and #5 were in the some-risk range, and students #2, #3, #4, #6, #7, and #8 were all in the at-risk range. They were also screened again using the Core Phonics Survey® and Fry’s 300 Instant Sight Words® to determine readiness to participate in the Read Naturally® fluency program. At that time, they were able to recognize fifty sight words and knew all of the beginning sounds, showing readiness for the Read Naturally® fluency program.
The Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor from the Read Naturally® program was used to establish an instructional level fluency baseline for each individual student. At the end of this assessment, the students began the Read Naturally® program at their individual instructional level.

During student completion of the Read Naturally program, the ratio of teachers and aides to students was two to eight. In contrast, the recommended ratio is no greater than one to eight. The students were given Read Naturally® intervention three times a week, thirty minutes for each session. The recommended time is thirty to forty-five minutes three to five times weekly. Most of the schools in the Duchesne County School District have difficulty scheduling the recommended time.

The special education teachers scheduled the students selected for Read Naturally® instruction for 30 minutes, three times a week in the computer lab. Students completed Read Naturally® sessions following the program’s procedures: placement test, choose story on instructional level, write a prediction, cold timing read aloud, read along three times, pass with three or fewer errors, and write a retell.

The Reading Fluency Progress Monitor from the Read Naturally® program was used to gather weekly instructional level progress monitoring data for each student from January 26th 2011 through April 4th 2011. Post (spring) DIBELS® grade-level fluency benchmark data was collected by either a teacher or an aide, on May 2nd, 2011.

Three forms of social validity were collected in this study. First, students filled out a social validity survey at the conclusion of the study (May 2nd). Second, students were asked informal questions about the Read Naturally® program by the researcher. Finally, both of the teachers as well as the two aides were asked informal questions by the
researcher about the Read Naturally® program at the end of June 2011, to collect qualitative information concerning social validity (see Appendix A for Social Validity Survey and Informal Interview Questions).

The head teacher administering the Read Naturally® program was monitored at the end of February, March, and April to assess implementation fidelity, which involved a fidelity checklist filled out by the teacher (see Appendix A for Fidelity Checklist). At the end of the study, the researcher compiled the DIBELS® pre and post grade level benchmark data and the Read Naturally® reading fluency progress monitoring data on each student to compare to the Hasbrouck-Tindal Oral Reading Fluency and Growth Norms.

**Results**

Table 4 provides stacked line charts showing each student’s baseline, aim line, trend line, and goal line used to analyze instructional level fluency gains over time. First, a baseline was established using the mean of the six instructional level fluency data points collected from January 13\(^{th}\) to January 20\(^{th}\). Next, an aim line was created, which marked the path the student needed to take to move from his/her current baseline instructional level of performance toward the spring instructional level benchmark with a weekly rate of progress suggested by the Hasbrouck-Tindal Table of Oral Reading Fluency and Growth Norms. The trend line shows whether the student’s progress is declining or increasing. The percentage of increase or decrease can be figured by dividing the instructional level benchmark score by the instructional level goal line score then multiplying by 100, next divide the average weekly fluency score by the instructional level goal line score and multiply by 100, finally, subtract the two numbers to get the
percentage of increase or decrease. The goal line shows the typical instructional level spring benchmark.

Table 4

Students Progress Monitoring Graphs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graph</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Weekly Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>3rd Grade Student</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>3rd Grade Student</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>4th Grade Student</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4th Grade Student</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>5th Grade Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>5th Grade Student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 5 weekly growth norm .9
#5 5th grade student average weekly growth -.35

#6 5th grade student average weekly growth .76

Grade 3 weekly growth norm 1.1
#7 6th grade student average weekly growth -.35

#8 6th grade student average weekly growth -1

#1 Male 3rd Grade Student at a 3rd Grade Instructional Level

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 3rd grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 92 words correct per minute (WCPM). The January, winter base line for #1 student was 70 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 3rd grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 107 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 74.9 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 4.58% increase. Grade 3 weekly growth norm is 1.1. This student’s average weekly growth was .49.

#2 Male 3rd Grade Student at a 3rd Grade Instructional Level

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 3rd grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 92 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #2 student was 59 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 3rd grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 107 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 66.9 WCPM. The trend
line for this student was a 7.38% increase. Grade 3 weekly growth norm is 1.1. This student’s average weekly growth was .79.

**#3 Male 4th Grade Student at a 4th Grade Instructional Level**

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 4th grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 112 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #3 student was 67 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 4th grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 123 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 90.6 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 19.2% increase. Grade 4 weekly growth norm is 1.1. This student’s average weekly growth was 1.97.

**#4 Male 4th Grade Student at a 3rd Grade Instructional Level**

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 4th grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 112 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #4 student was 66 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 3rd grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 107 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 81.8 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 12.84% increase. Grade 3 weekly growth norm is 1.1. This student’s average weekly growth was .132.

**#5 Female 5th Grade Student at a 5th Grade Instructional Level**

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 5th grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 127 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #5 student was 103 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 5th grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 139 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 98.75 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 3.06% decrease. Grade 5 weekly growth norm is .9. This student’s average weekly growth was -.35.
#6 Male 5th Grade Student at a 4th Grade Instructional Level

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 5th grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 127 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #6 student was 65 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 4th grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 123 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 74.08 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 7.38% increase. Grade 4 weekly growth norm is 1.1. This student’s average weekly growth was .76.

#7 Female 6th Grade Student at a 3rd Grade Instructional Level

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 6th grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 140 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #7 student was 98 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 3rd grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 107 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 93.83 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 3.9% decrease. Grade 3 weekly growth norm is 1.1. This student’s average weekly growth was -.35.

#8 Female 6th Grade Student at a 5th Grade Instructional Level

The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 6th grade student at the January, winter benchmark is 140 WCPM. The January, winter base line for #8 student was 93 WCPM. The 50th percentile norm for ORF of a 5th grade student at the May, spring benchmark is 139 WCPM. This student’s average weekly fluency score was 100 WCPM. The trend line for this student was a 5.03% decrease. Grade 5 weekly growth norm is .9. This student’s average weekly growth was -1.

Next, clustered column charts were used to compare the Fall, Winter (Pre) and Spring (Post) DIBELS® fluency benchmark data collected to the appropriate grade level.
oral reading fluency percentile rate as shown in the Hasbrouck & Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Data Chart. See Table 5 for Fall, Winter, and Spring DIBELS® Fluency Benchmark Data.

Table 5

*Students' Fall DIBELS® Fluency Benchmark Data*

Fluency benchmark data for each student fell into the following percentile categories as compared to the Hasbrouck & Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Data Chart: 

1. **Male 3rd grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 25th percentile and Spring, 25th percentile.
2. **Male 3rd grade student;** Fall, 25th percentile, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 50th percentile.
3. **Male 4th grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 10th percentile.
4. **Male 4th grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 10th percentile.
5. **Female 5th grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 25th percentile and Spring, 25th percentile.
6. **Male 5th grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 10th percentile.
7. **Female 6th grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 10th percentile.
8. **Male 6th grade student;** Fall, 10th percentile, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 10th percentile.
Female 6th grade student; Fall, no data, Winter, 10th percentile and Spring, 10th percentile. All students who started the study in the 10th percentile remained in the 10th percentile as compared to the 2005 Hasbrouk & Tindal Oral Reading Fluency Chart.

Students who started the study in the 25th percentile remained in the 25th percentile except #2 Male 3rd grade student who went from the 10th percentile at the beginning of the study, to the 50th percentile at the end of the study.

Social Validity

The reading satisfaction of students participating in the Read Naturally® program was analyzed using data collected from a student questionnaire and input into a clustered bar graph (see Table 6). The survey asked students if they liked the Read Naturally® program, wanted to continue using the Read Naturally® program and thought that using Read Naturally® helped them read better.

Table 6

Social Validity Survey Results
The majority of the students thought that the Read Naturally® program helped them read better, wanted to continue using the program and liked the program.

Teacher and aide satisfaction of the Read Naturally® program was also analyzed using data collected from a questionnaire and input into a clustered bar graph (see Table). The survey asked if teachers and aides liked the Read Naturally® program, felt they were trained sufficiently to implement the Read Naturally® program, thought the Read Naturally® program helped increase student reading fluency, wanted to continue using the Read Naturally® program, and wanted to increase the time for the Read Naturally® program.

Table 7

Social Validity: Teacher Aide Survey Results

Both teachers and both aides felt they had been trained sufficiently to administer the screening tests and the Read Naturally® program. They all thought that the Read Naturally® program helps increase reading fluency. All except one teacher thought the
time for the Read Naturally® program should be increased next year. All of them want to use the Read Naturally® program next year.

**Implementation Fidelity**

A clustered bar graph was used to analyze the implementation fidelity of the Read Naturally® program. See Table 8 fidelity of implementation data.

Table 8

*Data for the Fidelity of Implementation of the Read Naturally® Program*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Wk. 1</th>
<th>Wk. 5</th>
<th>Wk. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Setting up</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing and Placing</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Behavior</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing the Steps</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Student Performance</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with Students and Parents</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data was split into the following categories:

**Planning and Setting Up**

- Setting promotes students’ engagement for entire session (location, room arrangement).
- Session length is 30-45 minutes.
- Ratio of adults to students is no greater than one to eight.
- Students attend three to five sessions per week.
Assessing and Placing

- Student assessment data show the need for fluency intervention.
- Students are placed in Read Naturally® curriculum at a level appropriate to promote fluency gains.
- Students’ goals are challenging enough to require three to 10 repeated reading practices to pass the story.

Student Behavior

- Students’ time on task is high. They are able to complete the steps and pass a story in one or two 30 minute time periods.
- Students spend most of the class time engaged in the act of reading.
- Students know their fluency goals.

Implementing the Steps with Accuracy

- Select a Story
- Key Words
- Prediction
- Cold Timing
- Read Along
- Practice
- Quiz
- Retell
- Pass (hot timing – teacher required).

Monitoring Student Performance

- Students’ progress is monitored frequently by reviewing the students’ reports.
• Adjustments to the student’s levels are made appropriately.
• Adjustments to the students’ goals are made appropriately.

**Communication with Students and Parents**

• Teacher interacts with students and provides feedback as needed.
• Teacher interactions with students are positive and encouraging.
• Teacher confers with students before making a change in the program.
• Teacher communicates with parents by sending home, completed packets of stories, parent letters, and calling to discuss progress as necessary.

Fidelity was analyzed using information gathered from the fidelity checklist filled out by the evaluator or head teacher three times during the study on 1/25/11, 3/18/11, and 4/19/11. The data were nearly the same for all three checkpoints. The data was figured using one point for each subcategory. The percentage was calculated by adding the points earned and then dividing by the total possible. The results were as follows: Planning and setting up, assessing and placing, student behavior, and monitoring student performance were all performed with 100% accuracy. Implementing the steps was performed with 92% accuracy, while communication with students and parents was only performed with 75% accuracy.

**Discussion**

The primary aim of this project was to investigate the utility of the Read Naturally® program as an intervention to improve the reading fluency of students with disabilities in an elementary school.
Hypothesis.

Using the *Read Naturally®* program as an intervention will result in increased fluency in students with disabilities.

To investigate this possibility, eight students with disabilities were screened using *Fry’s 300 Instant Sight Words®*, the first hundred list, and the *Core Phonics Survey®* and found to be ready to participate in the *Read Naturally®* program.

Five of the eight students made gains while in the *Read Naturally®* program. The trend-line of the 3rd grade students was fairly even with their aim line. The trend-line of the 4th grade students was well above their aim line, showing an ambitious growth. Student #6, a fifth grade student, also showed a steady incline above his aim line. Students #5 female 5th grade student, #7 female 6th grade student, and #8 female 6th grade student showed a steady decline.

The researcher investigated the results of the *Core Phonics Survey®* and *Fry’s 300 Instant Sight Words®*, (first hundred list) assessments for a possible correlation. All of the students knew all of the beginning sounds and knew at least 50 sight words, therefore a correlation could not be justified. The informal interview indicated that #5 female 5th grade student did not like the *Read Naturally®* program and #8 female 6th grade student did not want to continue using the *Read Naturally®* program. #8 student was also frequently absent.

The informal interview given to the teachers and aides indicate that they all like and want to continue using the *Read Naturally®* program. All, except one teacher, feel that the time should be increased. The teacher who did not think the time should be increased expressed that some students get bored with the stories and do not want to read out loud.
The previous results indicate a possible correlation in the use of the Read Naturally® program and increased fluency, however, the gains are not enough to close the gap.

Interestingly, the 3rd and 4th grade students showed an upward fluency trend whereas the 5th and 6th grade students, except one, showed a downward fluency trend. Future research should explore the reason for this difference.

Finally, the majority of the Read Naturally® program was implemented with fidelity according to the three checkpoints. The only checkpoint that was not implemented with fidelity was that the teacher communicates with parents by sending home, completed packets of stories, parent letters, and calling to discuss progress as necessary.

Several limitations of the current study warrant discussion. First, this study has disadvantages in terms of a small group. For example, the findings may not generalize to larger school populations. Future research should replicate these findings in a larger, normative sample.

Second, an ABA design would be a more powerful design if the fluency measure showed a strong reversal from baseline to treatment and back again, however, if fluency skills were indeed gained from the Read Naturally® program the skill could not be unlearned. The ABA approach might be considered in future research.

Lastly, these results need to be replicated and expanded upon to better understand the effect the Read Naturally® program has on the fluency of students with disabilities in the following ways in addition to the checkpoints that were completed in the fidelity checklist: Teachers should communicate with parents. The maximum instead of the minimum recommended time should be implemented to see if an even larger increase in fluency could be accomplished closing the gap at a faster rate and interventions such as
tangible rewards should be offered when the student’s progress begins to decline to attempt reversing the trend.

In sum, the Read Naturally® program implemented in the Altamont Elementary produced gains in fluency, but not enough to close the gap between students with disabilities and regular education students.

**Program Recommendations**

The goal of this project was to find a way to help students with disabilities improve their fluency, which in turn should improve their reading skills enabling them to score higher on end-of-year tests. The results showed that most students made progress, but not enough to close the gap to reach the 50th percentile grade level fluency norms. In the future, the following recommendations should be considered when implementing the Read Naturally® program:

**Continue Using the Read Well® Program Along with Read Naturally®**

Read Naturally® provides a method to improve reading fluency. Students need to have strong beginning literacy skills before reading fluency can be increased. The students selected for this study were given extra instruction in the Read Well® program along with the regular classroom instruction. Then they were screened and found to be ready for the Read Naturally® program. As a result, they were pulled out of the Read Well® program and placed in Read Naturally®. In future programs, I would recommend that students remain in the Read Well® program, or a similar program, along with the regular classroom instruction as a continuing support for beginning literacy skills until they show a mastery of beginning literacy skills and are more adept at applying the skill they have learned in their reading.
Use the Test-Retest Method When Administering Core Phonics Survey®

The Core Phonics Survey® was administered one time to determine if the students were ready for the Read Naturally® program. I would recommend that the students be tested a second time to assure mastery of beginning literacy skills using the test-retest method, which is best practice in research.

Increase Read Naturally® from the Minimum Recommended Time to the Maximum

The recommended time for implementation of the Read Naturally® program is five days a week, 30 – 45 minutes per day, to see maximum fluency growth. The students in this study were given Read Naturally® three days a week, 30 minutes per day. Most of the students showed growth, but not enough to close the gap to reach the 50th percentile grade level fluency norms. In the future, I recommend a five-day program, starting with 30 minutes per day, checking the data, and increasing the time to 45 minutes if the student’s fluency rate is not increasing at an ambitious growth rate.

Consider Using Interventions if Students’ Fluency Scores Show a Decline

The students’ progress monitoring graphs show weekly fluency rates. The students’ fluency rate declines some weeks and increases other weeks. I recommend applying an intervention if a student’s fluency score declines. The intervention could be a number of things. The student should be involved in making a list of things they would like, such as a piece of candy, their name in a drawing for a prize, or lunch with the principal etc. Progress monitoring should continue and intervention decisions made based on the data.
Consider a different method of removing students from the regular classroom

The students in this study were pulled out of their regular classroom for Read Naturally® after the regular education students were finished with Language arts and reading instruction. They generally missed out on art, music, or physical education activities. One female student in the study said that using the Read Naturally® program made her miss out on fun things in the classroom. I recommend implementing the Read Naturally® program when all the students are engaged in reading and Language Arts activities, not music and art or physical education activities.

Change the Method of Fidelity of Implementation Observation

Fidelity was analyzed using information gathered from the fidelity checklist filled out by the evaluator or head teacher. In the future, I recommend that the researcher observe the teachers and aides administering the Read Naturally® program during different phases of implementation to assure they are placing the student correctly, counting errors consistently with program guidelines, measuring prosody consistently, and conferring with students before making a change in the program. Each item on the fidelity checklist should be observed at least three different times during the study to verify fidelity of implementation.

Replicate Findings in Larger, Normative Sample

The research on the Read Naturally® program has mostly been conducted in small settings with a small group of students using more than one intervention. Best practice in research would be to single out the Read Naturally® program and conduct a larger study using a normative sample.
In conclusion, the goal of this project was to find a way to help students with disabilities improve their fluency. The fluency scores of five of the eight students did improve, therefore, my recommendation to the district is to continue using the *Read Naturally®* program using the maximum recommended days and time.
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Appendix A

Core Phonics Survey® Curriculum Based Measurement (Pg. 43-47)

---

**CORE Phonics Survey – Record Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alphabet Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter names - uppercase</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter names - lowercase</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant sounds</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long vowel sounds</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short vowel sounds</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading and Decoding Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short vowels in CVC words</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short vowels, digraphs, and -ch trigraph</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant blends with short vowels</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long vowel spellings</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variant vowels and diphthongs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r- and l-controlled vowels</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spelling Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial consonants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final consonants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC words</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long vowel spellings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skills to review:

Skills to teach:

---

*continued on next page*
CORE Phonics Survey – Record Form

1. Letter Names – Uppercase
Say to the student: Can you tell me the names of these letters? If the student cannot name three or more consecutive letters, say: Look at all of the letters and tell me which ones you do know.

D A N S X Z J L H
T Y E C O M R P W

/ / 26 K U G B F Q V I

2. Letter Names – Lowercase
Say to the student: Can you tell me the names of these letters? If the student cannot name three or more consecutive letters, say: Look at all of the letters and tell me which ones you do know.

d a n s x z j l h
T y e c o m r p w

/ / 26 k u g b f q v i

3. Consonant Sounds
Say to the student: Look at these letters. Can you tell me the sound each letter makes? If the sound given is correct, do not mark the Record Form. If it is incorrect, write the sound the student gives above each letter. If no sound is given, circle the letter. If the student cannot say the sound for three or more consecutive letters, say: Look at all of the letters and tell me which sounds you do know.

D I N S X Z J
T Y P C H M F

/ / 23 W G B F Q V
Core Phonics Survey – Record Form

4. Vowel Sounds

Ask the student: Can you tell me the sounds of each letter? If the student names the letter, count it as the long vowel sound. Then ask: Can you tell me the other sound for the letter? The student should name the short vowel sound.

\[ \text{long sound} \quad \text{short sound} \]

Record 1 on the first line for the long sound (letter name) and a for the short sound on the second line. If the student makes an error, record the error over the letter.

- Long vowel sounds (count the number of 1's above)
- Short vowel sounds (count the number of a's above)
CORE Phonics Survey – Record Form

G. Multisyllabic words
Administer this item if the student is able to read most of the single-syllable real and pseudowords in the previous items. **Say to the student: Now I want you to read down the first column of words. Each of the real words in this column has two syllables.** Point to the first column if the student can read at least 3 out of 8 of the words in this column. **Say: Now I want you to read some made-up words. Do not try to make them sound like real words.** Point to the second column. Repeat the same procedure for the third column.

**NOTE:** The following made-up words can be pronounced in two ways: sunop (sun-op or sun-up), wopam (wo-pam or wop-'am), potle (po-tle or pot-ile), zundre (zu-ride or zu-ide), and zubo (zu-bo or zub-o).

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Closed-closed</td>
<td>kidnap</td>
<td>pugnad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Closed silent e</td>
<td>compete</td>
<td>sifinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Open or closed</td>
<td>depend</td>
<td>sunop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Open or closed</td>
<td>zero</td>
<td>zubo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Silent e</td>
<td>locate</td>
<td>potle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Consonant + le</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>grickle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>R-Controlled</td>
<td>further</td>
<td>triper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>Vowel team</td>
<td>outlaw</td>
<td>coopnoo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Spelling
Give the student a pencil and a sheet of lined paper. Write the student's responses over the words.

A. **Tell the student:** Listen to each of the words I read and write the first sound you hear.

| /5 | fit | map | pen | led | hand |

B. **Tell the student:** Listen to each of the words I read and write the last sound you hear.

| /5 | rub | foc | og | soil | loss |

C. **Tell the student:** Listen to each of the words I read and write the whole word.

| /5 | fork | yam | sip | shop | tub |
| /5 | coin | float | sleep | drive | spoon |
The *Fry’s 300 Instant Sight Words®, (first hundred list)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Hundred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Benchmark 3**

**DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency**

When I say "begin", start reading aloud at the top of the page (point). Read across the page (point). Try to read each word. If you come to a word you don't know, I'll tell it to you. Be sure to do your best reading. Ready, begin. At the end of 1 minute, place a bracket[] after the last word read and say "Stop".

**Ice Cream**

It's so hot. Ice cold ice cream cools me off. I like strawberry the best, but rocky road is good, too. My brother likes bubble gum and vanilla.

The ice cream man comes down our street in the summer. He has drumsticks, ice cream bars, and bonbons. I like bonbons best.

When he gets close he toots his horn. All the kids hear the horn. They get some money and go outside to wait. They sit on the sidewalk until he comes. They want to buy something to eat. His ice cream tastes good.

But the best ice cream of all you can't buy. My mother makes it. She uses our old ice cream freezer. She puts milk, sugar and eggs inside.

I get to turn the handle. She puts lots of ice inside. My hand gets cold. It takes a long time. My arm gets very tired turning the handle. But then it is ready to eat. And my mom lets me lick the dasher. I think the very first taste is the best.

Yum! That's the best part of all.

**TOTAL:**
Panning for Gold

Have you ever dreamt about finding a big nugget of gold? Gold can be found in many of the mountains in the United States. Rivers and streams running down from mountains are good places to look for gold. Black sand is also a sign that there might be gold in the area.

Gold is not hard. Compared with other metals, gold is soft. A bumpy journey down a rocky river will make dents in pieces of gold. That's why gold nuggets found in rivers are often rounded in shape. Although gold is soft, it is also heavy. Gold's heavy weight makes it easier to find.

Panning is a common way to find gold. To pan for gold, you need a gold-panning pan. You also need moving water. If the water is warm, you can wash it in with your pan. Scoop some of the river bottom into your pan. You will see dead leaves, sticks, and normal rocks in your pan.

Move the pan in slow circles just under the surface of the water. Anything light will float away. Remember, gold is heavy. If there is gold in your pan, it will be at the bottom. Next, pick out any big rocks.

Continue to move your pan in gentle circles. Soon, you will see the bottom of your pan. You might find a few yellow flakes of gold in your pan. Put them in a safe place. Then, start all over again. Panning for gold is hard work!
### Reading Satisfaction Student Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you like the Read Naturally® program?</td>
<td>#2 Male 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td>#1 Male 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3 Male 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td>(He liked to read silently rather than orally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4 Male 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#6 Male 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#7 Female 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td>#5 Female 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#8 Female 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td>(Said that using the Read Naturally® program made her miss out on fun things in the classroom, yet she admitted that it helped her read better.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(These two students were the only two in the 25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; percentile in January)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to continue using Read Naturally®?</td>
<td>#2 Male 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td>#1 Male 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#3 Male 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td>#8 Female 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#4 Male 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#5 Female 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#6 Male 5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#7 Female 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; grade student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Validity Teacher and Aide Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were you sufficiently trained?</td>
<td>#1 teacher</td>
<td>#2 teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1 aide</td>
<td>#2 aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think Read Naturally® helps reading fluency?</td>
<td>#1 teacher</td>
<td>#2 teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#1 aide</td>
<td>#2 aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should the time for Read Naturally® be increased?</td>
<td>#1 teacher</td>
<td>#2 teacher said that increasing the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
wouldn’t help because the students become bored with the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should Read Naturally® be used next year?</th>
<th>#1 teacher</th>
<th>#2 teacher</th>
<th>#1 aide</th>
<th>#2 aide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Observation Checklist for Fidelity of Implementation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation Checklist</th>
<th>1st date</th>
<th>2nd date</th>
<th>3rd date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Setting Up</strong></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting promotes students’ engagement for entire session (location, room arrangement).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session length is 30-45 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of adults to students is no greater than one to eight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students attend three to five sessions per week.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Assessing and Placing

Student assessment data show the need for fluency intervention.

Students are placed in Read Naturally® curriculum at a level appropriate to promote fluency gains.

Students' goals are challenging enough to require three to 10 repeated reading practices to pass the story.

### Student Behavior

Students' time on task is high. They are able to complete the steps and pass a story in one or two 30 minute time periods.

Students spend most of the class time engaged in the act of reading.

Students know their fluency goals.

### Implementing the Steps

Students understand the Read Naturally® steps and are able to work through them independently.
Students implement each step with accuracy.

1. Select a Story
2. Key Words
3. Prediction
4. Cold Timing
5. Read Along
6. Practice
7. Quiz
8. Retell (phonics curriculum skips this step)
9. Pass (hot timing - teacher required)
10. Word List (Phonics only)

**Monitoring Student Performance**

Students' progress is monitored frequently by reviewing the students' reports.

Adjustments to the student's levels are made appropriately.

Adjustments to the students' goals are made appropriately.

**Communication with Students and Parents**

Teacher interacts with students and provides feedback as needed.

Teacher interactions with students are positive and
encouraging.
Teacher confers with students before making a change in the program.
Teacher communicates with parents by sending home, completed packets of stories, parent letters, and calling to discuss progress as necessary.