Intensity of Focus, Richness of Content:

Crafting Tier 2 Response to Intervention in an Era of the Common Core

Abstract

This article describes a Tier 2 intervention program for fourth graders that is well-suited to supporting implementation of the Common Core State Standards. Screening assessments and miscue analysis were used to clarify student strengths and challenges. Students then attended only classes that were suited to their particular literacy needs, spending the remainder of their time participating in classroom lessons that integrated language arts throughout content area curriculum. This program supported struggling readers in effective and efficient ways. A Tier 2 class in prosody is explained in depth. Findings demonstrate clear growth on progress monitoring assessments and overall reading gains as measured on an Informal Reading Inventory. The study has implications for adjusting RtI protocols to better suit contemporary literacy practices.

Teaser Text: How can educators provide rich and engaging support for struggling readers? Here is one way.

Pause and Ponder Questions:

1. How might you revise and re-organize the way in which your school provides support for struggling readers as they tackle more challenging standards?

2. What type of screening assessments and progress monitoring tools might be used to measure academic improvement for students in the Tier 2 setting?

3. What difficulties do you envision in adjusting student services in this way and how will you assure that all students receive the instruction they need?
Commissioned by the National Governor’s Association for Best Practices and the Council of State School Officers (NGACBP & CSSO, 2010) and adopted by 43 states and the District of Columbia, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) are a set of content standards that drive curriculum and assessment. By most accounts, they are far more challenging than the state standards that preceded them (Alberti, 2012/2013). Recent results from English language arts tests developed by the Partnership for Assessment for Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC, 2015) and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC, 2015) show pass rates ranging from 21-24% in New Mexico (depending on the grade level) to 60% in Massachusetts. Of greater concern are results from New York, a state that implemented its own CCSS-based tests from 2013 through 2015; 31.1% of students in grades three through eight were deemed proficient in 2013, rising only .2% by 2015 (New York State Education Department, 2015). Nevertheless, absent from the CCSS literature is a systematic framework for teaching struggling readers as they attempt to navigate these new standards.

Response to Intervention (RtI)—also known as Multi-Tiered System of Supports—is such a framework. RtI was developed as an alternative to the “wait to fail” special education service model in which students qualified for extra help only if they demonstrated a substantial discrepancy between ability and achievement on standardized measures (Fuchs, Compton, Fuchs, Bryant, & Davis, 2008). For over 25 years, researchers and educators had expressed concerns about use of a discrepancy formula as the eligibility criterion for a learning disabilities designation (Heller, Holtzman, & Messick, 1982). Eventually, specifications for an RtI alternative—eligibility as a response to continuing academic failure even with intense levels of
support—were explicated in the most recent iteration of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004).

In addition to its role as a determinant of learning disability status, RtI serves as a “multi-tiered method of service delivery in which all students are provided an appropriate level of evidence-based instruction based on their academic needs” (Barnes & Harlacher, 2008, p. 417). Strong, differentiated Tier 1 core curriculum is key to progress for all students (Jones, Yssel, & Grant, 2012). It appears, however, that 15-20% of students will require additional support if they are to be successful (Brown & Doolittle, 2008). This support typically begins with small group instruction, termed Tier 2 intervention.

Tier 2 interventions are provided using one of two designs or, in some cases, a combination of the two (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006). In the standard treatment protocol model, prescribed and standardized interventions are provided for a specified duration, whereas in the problem-solving model interventions are modified in a more substantive way to meet student needs. In both cases, group size is generally set at between three and six students (Fuchs & Vaughn, 2012; Reschley, 2005) and intensity of intervention (duration, precision of progress monitoring, explicitness of instruction, etc.) is in the moderate range (Legere & Conca, 2010)

Nothing in this model of Tier 2 intervention precludes a focus on higher-level standards such as the CCSS. But rooted as most RtI research is in the constrained orientation typifying pedagogical approaches for special populations (van Kraayenoord, 2010), there is little evidence within the reading research literature that this type of content is regularly included in RtI and RtI-like interventions. In fact, in a review of 78 reports describing such interventions and/or assessments used to measure progress in the interventions, only six assessed inferential thinking, application, or student self-reflection; of these, only one referenced the CCSS explicitly (Jaeger
& Pearson, under review). If struggling readers are to receive the support they require to be successful in meeting more complex standards, educators need to find ways to integrate CCSS and RtI.

**The Potential for CCSS/RtI Integration**

Although other researchers (Buhain, 2015; Galloway & Lesaux, 2014) have recently referenced the CCSS/RtI connection, to date only two pairs of authors (McGill-Franzen & Smith, 2013; Wixson & Lipson, 2012) have sought to imagine in some detail what a connection between the CCSS and RtI might entail. Wixson and Lipson (2012) note that the CCSS are likely to result in greater performance variability among students, thereby demanding substantive approaches to providing the help they need. McGill-Franzen and Smith (2013) speak specifically to ways in which the two policies might transact: “The Common Core provides curriculum focus and coherence. RtI provides a framework for supporting individual learners” (p. 117). They also suggest that the CCSS and RtI mandates share much in common; both initiatives: (a) require curriculum alignment; (b) are supported by rich diagnostic assessments; and (c) depend on knowledgeable teachers. Because results from CCSS measures to date demonstrate that students are struggling with the standards covered on these assessments, a systematic intervention model is needed; this model should include content aligned with the CCSS within a structure of reflective of what we have learned about student support from the RtI literature. More detailed research is needed to specify how these standards and this service model might be connected in ways that support all readers.

**Current Issues with Tier 2 Instruction**

There are concerns about Tier 2 interventions as commonly implemented. Students receiving Tier 2 services often work with a pull-out teacher on a daily basis, missing as much as
130 hours of regular class time over the course of a year (Vaughn, et al., 2010); this practice occurs even though it remains unclear whether extending intervention time produces stronger results (Wanzek & Vaughn, 2008). This approach is also problematic because the CCSS emphasize integration of the English language arts with content area curriculum; as a result, it is crucial for struggling readers to miss as little classroom instruction as possible. In addition, many Tier 2 interventions offer the same instruction for all students who qualify, either by providing a smorgasbord of approaches including decoding, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension (Wanzek & Vaughn, 2008) or by teaching only one specific aspect of reading (Faggella-Luby & Wardwell, 2011).

Research suggests, however, that not all readers who struggle do so for the same reasons. Buly and Valencia (2002) studied fourth grade students who failed the state standardized test, assessing each student using measures of word identification, fluency, and comprehension. They found that only 9% of students demonstrated difficulties in all three areas. The remaining students exhibited strengths in at least one aspect of reading. For example, one group excelled in word identification and fluency with low comprehension, whereas another group had strong comprehension, but struggled in the other two areas. As a result, these authors recommend that additional support for these students reflect their important differences.

Stephens, et al. (2012) studied the instruction provided by Tier 2 intervention teachers, noting ways in which these teachers varied the support they provided to better meet students’ individual needs. These interventions were based on a set of key principles. If a student did not yet understand that reading was about meaning-making, this area of difficulty served as the focus for initial support, with facilitating belief in self as reader, cultivating enjoyment, and strategy instruction following as needed. Ultimate goals involved growing independence while reading.
This article describes a Tier 2, CCSS-based intervention program developed to serve children who failed to progress with strong classroom teaching alone. The work of Buly and Valencia (2002) and Stephens, et al. (2012) served as the theoretical foundation for the program. The current study builds on their work and expands it. The text that follows:

- Explains the way “instructional features associated with positive academic outcomes” (Barnes & Harlacher, 2008, p. 425) were combined to produce a coherent experience for the students; and
- Delineates the unique structure of the program which allowed students to receive the support they needed while missing a minimal amount of class time

The Tier 1 curriculum experienced by the students in this study was also based on the CCSS; it included a range of rich instructional practices such as read alouds, Reading Workshop, shared reading, guided reading, and Literature Circles. For those students who struggled, we offered short-term classes focusing on various aspects of reading, attended only by those students who needed extra work in that particular area. This practice insured that the children were served both effectively and efficiently and remained in their classrooms for the great preponderance of the school day. The intent of this study was to investigate the question: How do struggling readers respond to a Tier 2 intervention program designed to meet their individual needs?

**CCSS/RtI Integration in Practice**

From 2013-2014, I conducted a formative experiment at Campbell Elementary School (all names are pseudonyms). The school had a population of 534 students in grades K-8 with the
following demographics: 3% African-American, 1% Native American, 2% Asian-Pacific Islander, 44% Latino, and 50% White, with 41% of the population qualifying for free- or reduced-price lunch. After years of strong standardized test results, scores at the school had begun to decline, and the superintendent worried that staff and students were less than fully prepared for the CCSS assessments looming ahead.

The fourth grade language arts teacher, Katrina, had taught for 28 years when the study began, 27 of them at this school. She was interested in expanding her practice: cultivating a sense of greater independence among her students and meeting the needs of those who had struggled in earlier grades. We co-taught the Tier 1 curriculum that I had developed.

Charlotte, the Title I teacher, had been teaching for eight years and was in her second year at this site. For kindergarten through third grades, she provided the traditional Title I intervention, seeing the same children each week all year long. However, she taught the fourth grade Tier 2 classes on a short-term basis, using the curriculum I developed. Of the 50 fourth grade students, 14 were selected to attend one or more of the Tier 2 classes.

Despite the ubiquity of standard protocol approaches, especially in the RtI research literature (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2009), Barnes and Harlacher (2008) assert that RtI implementation demands flexibility. Our intervention design was out of the ordinary for the area in which Campbell School was located, but officers at the state department were aware of our work and supported it. They attended to the fact that the elements of each unit we taught had research support, rather than demanding that we implement a standard protocol model, the entirety of which could be found in the research literature. This flexibility allowed us to best meet the needs of students at the site.
Data collection began with a survey of reading beliefs, attitudes, and experiences administered to all fourth graders in fall of 2013 (see key questions in Table 3). This was followed by a reading screening measure, the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) (Beaver, 2002); it was administered following prescribed procedures by the fourth grade teachers. I then assessed students scoring below grade level on the DRA using a modified version of the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment (Fountas & Pinnell, 2011). I used the benchmark information texts included in the assessment system. To the standard administration procedure were added follow-up questions that were asked if the student’s retelling was inadequate in order to distinguish students with retelling difficulties from those who struggled with comprehension more broadly. I also employed a modified miscue analysis procedure, noting challenges students exhibited with decoding words of various lengths and evidence of difficulty with content vocabulary, as well as the traditional notations about use of syntactic and semantic cues.

Those students scoring at the 3.5 grade level or below on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment were enrolled in the study. Other data collected over the course of the year included:

- Post-survey data on reading beliefs, attitudes, and experiences (spring 2014)
- Post-test scores on the modified Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment (spring 2014)
- State standards-based assessment data (fourth graders’ scores from spring 2013 when they were in third grade and as fourth graders in spring of 2014)
- Progress-monitoring data for students who attended Tier 2 classes; average pre- and post-scores were calculated for each of the progress-monitoring assessments
Miscues, prosody ratings, and comprehension data (retelling and responses to questions) from the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment were employed to group students for Tier 2 instruction. For example, if a child demonstrated difficulty retelling, but read fluently and with expression, s/he attended the retelling class but not the prosody class. If a class was inappropriate for a child, s/he remained in the regular classroom at that time, thereby assuring that students missed as little instruction in science and social studies as possible. Class sizes ranged from three to six; Table 1 provides specific enrollment information for the Tier 2 classes offered.

(Insert Table 1 about here)

**Tier 2 Curriculum**

The Tier 2 units shared common features. They focused on standards at the third grade because enrolled students still struggled with these standards. Each began with a progress monitoring pre-assessment related to unit content. For example, in the multi-syllable decoding unit, we used the Names Test (Cunningham, 1990) and for the use of context unit we counted the number of total miscues made by the child and calculated the percent of these miscues that made sense in context or were self-corrected. We shared the results of the pre-assessments with the students enrolled in the class and they set goals for improvement.

Curriculum for each unit was based, so far as was possible, on the following key principles:

- Assessment-based grouping for instruction (Lipson, Chomsky-Higgins, & Kanfer, 2011)
- Focus on meaning-making and enjoyment (Stephens, et al., 2012)
- Incorporation of student strengths as well as challenges (Watts-Taffe, Laster, Broach, Marinak, Connor, & Walker-Dalhouse, 2012)
• Reading of authentic texts (McEneaney, Lose, & Schwartz, 2006), many of which were
  self-selected (Ivey & Johnston, 2013)
• Whole-to-part instruction (Dombey & Moustafa, 1998)
• Gradual release of responsibility instructional models (Pearson & Gallagher, 1983)
• Integration of reading and writing (Frankel, Jaeger, & Pearson, 2013)
• Student-to-student as well as student-to-teacher interaction (Beecher, 2010/2011)
• Student self-evaluation and tangible evidence of success (Schunk, 2003)
• Integrating CCSS in Literature and/or Information Text, even in units focused on
  Foundations Skills

Groups met for from three to five weeks, in two 45 minute sessions per week. Only those
students who exhibited an assessed need in a particular area attended; in addition to allowing
students to participate more fully in core instruction, this practice kept class size low and
supported focused instruction in the Tier 2 groups.

**Tier 2 Exemplar Unit: Prosody**

Over the course of the study, Charlotte offered a series of Tier 2 classes for fourth
graders. For purposes of this article, the prosody unit (RF3.3B. Read grade-level prose and
poetry with accuracy, appropriate rate, and expression) is described here in depth.

We considered for enrollment in the prosody class children who struggled to read
smoothly and with expression on the Fountas and Pinnell assessment. Prior to enrollment, each
child read aloud from a text at her/his independent level. The child and I then discussed the oral
reading: Was it accurate enough to maintain meaning? Were words chunked together to make
phrases? Was it smooth? Did the level of expression engage the listener? Were rate and volume
appropriate? By attending to these criteria, we came up with a collaborative rating on a prosody scale (see Figure 1). If the child’s rating was at Level 3 or below, s/he was enrolled in the class.

(Insert Figure 1 about here)

As the child read aloud, I surreptitiously timed the child’s reading because we were interested in determining whether instruction in which rate was never mentioned would affect the commonly-employed words-correct-per-minute measure.

On the first day of class, students set goals for improvement (Schunk, 2003). For example, one child who scored at Level 3 on the scale felt he could reach Level 6 by the end of the class, while another chose Level 4 as a target. Then, the students settled into a daily routine.

Each class began with a read aloud of a section from *Rotten Island* (Steig, 1984) because teacher read alouds provide a strong model for prosody (Rasinski & Young, 2014). We selected this text because Steig employs vivid verbs and adjectives within a gripping story. The students then discussed what they noticed about the teacher’s oral reading, focusing on ways she made listening enjoyable, such as reading at a moderate rate, speaking clearly, and using different voices when reading dialogue. In addition, they commented about the plot and characters of the story, thereby including CCSS in Literature, as well as the Reading Foundations standard that was the focus of the unit. This aspect of the lesson was important because it kept the focus on meaning-making and emphasized student strengths; all students in the group struggled with prosody, but they understood and appreciated books well above their reading level.

Next came echo reading from short stories (Morra & Tracey, 2006). Charlotte read the first sentence; then students read that same sentence, copying her expression. They continued in this way through the story with students sometimes responding chorally and sometimes independently. In this activity, Charlotte gradually released responsibility to the children
(Pearson & Gallagher, 1983): she modeled reading with expression and then students had the opportunity to hear their own expressive version of the text.

Following echo reading was the mini-lesson for the day (Swift, 1993). As time went by, Charlotte introduced more and more sophisticated levels of prosody—beginning with a focus on attending to punctuation and a reasonable level of accuracy, chunking words into phrases, reading smoothly, and adding expression. Each day Charlotte would model reading that incorporated what the children had learned in the last session, but exhibited a new problem. She asked students to comment on what she did well and then to note what problems remained. For example, the day after they focused on punctuation, Charlotte attended carefully to this aspect of reading but made a number of miscues which did not affect the meaning of the text; she mentioned that students probably failed to notice the miscues because they sounded sensible. Then she read the text again, this time making meaning-disruptive errors. Students noted that her reading was confusing, leading to a discussion of high- and low-level miscues.

After the day’s mini-lesson, students practiced repeated readings with a partner from a selection of their choice, focusing on the point of the mini-lesson (Therrien, 2004). One child read aloud a section of her/his text as the other listened; after reading, the partners negotiated a rating on the prosody scale. This process was repeated two more times and then the children switched roles. Next, the group came back together to assess progress (Barnes & Harlacher, 2008) via teacher feedback and celebrate gains made from the first to third readings.

The unit ended with an oral reading post-test. Once again, rating on the prosody scale was negotiated and compared both with the original score and with the goal the child set at the beginning of the class.

Findings
Due to the exploratory nature of this study, findings are illustrative rather than representative or generalizable; still, they offer insights that may add to the knowledge base regarding Tier 2 interventions.

**General Reading Achievement Measures**

Achievement results for all below-level fourth graders are shown in Table 2. Students gained, on average more than two grade levels in reading over the course of the year (range = 1 to 3.5 years’ growth) on the Fountas and Pinnell assessment which, of the two measures, most closely resembles the act of day-to-day reading. In addition, they demonstrated significant progress on the state standards-based test with an average gain of 40 scaled score points (range = -14 to 92).

(Insert Table 2 about here)

**Reading Surveys**

Most survey question responses from these students also changed in a positive direction. For questions 1-4, students selected a number from the following: 1 (terrible), 2 (not so good), 3 (OK), 4 (good), 5 (great). Answers to questions 7 and 8 refer to the number of days/books named respectively (see Table 3).

(Insert Table 3 here)

It is concerning that few students reported reading at home on a regular basis. Of note, however, is the fact that data for the classes as a whole showed a decrease from fall to spring in the number of days students reported home reading, whereas struggling readers’ home reading habits remained steady. In addition, the percent of struggling readers who did not read at all during the week dropped from 65% in fall to 50% in spring.

**Tier 2 Progress-Monitoring Results**
Progress-monitoring scores are shown in Table 4. Although the number of student participants was too small to calculate significance, mean score gains on progress-monitoring measures ranged from 19% for the multi-syllable decoding assessment to 66% for the prosody measure. Students made strong gains in words-correct-per-minute despite the fact that speed was never mentioned, much less measured, during the prosody class.

(Insert Table 4 about here)

“Exiting” Tier 2

Since Tier 2 instruction was provided in a non-traditional way in this model, exiting Tier 2 and returning to Tier 1 only instruction was managed somewhat differently. All Tier 2-eligible students were formally assessed on the Fountas and Pinnell assessment three times during the year. In addition, we collected scores from Tier 1 units. If, at mid-year, a student had made at least one-half year’s growth and was doing well in the Tier 1 setting (i.e., scoring at the 70% or above level on most unit assessments), s/he continued to attend appropriate Tier 2 classes in the second semester; this was the case for 13 students. If the student was reading on grade level at that point and was doing well in the Tier 1 setting (true for one student), s/he no longer attended Tier 2 classes. Had any student not made acceptable growth by mid-year, s/he would have begun one-to-one tutoring. It should be noted that ten of the 14 students were reading at the fifth grade level or higher as measured on the Fountas and Pinnell assessment by the end of fourth grade and the rest were at the mid-fourth grade level.

Conclusions

Students in this study demonstrated solid gains in reading and these gains are particularly noteworthy when compared to interventions in which upper grade students received as many as 130 hours of pull-out instruction (e.g., Vaughn, et al., 2010). Even the two students who
attended three of the four Tier 2 units offered, missed less than 20 hours of class time over the course of the year.

Clearly, there are important limitations to the study. Only 14 students qualified for the classes, so all findings must be considered illustrative. The interventions were implemented at only one grade level; findings might differ if implementation was broadened to all elementary grades.

This project has continued to grow. Although the formal research study concluded in May 2014, Campbell School has continued to expand their RtI program, incorporating work with the most sophisticated of the CCSS. For example, after a Tier 1 (classroom-based) unit on character analysis (RL4.3: Describe in depth a character (setting or event) in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text (e.g., a character’s thoughts, words, or actions), fourth graders who struggled on the end-of-unit assessment attended a related Tier 2 class. This class did not simply replicate the Tier 1 curriculum. Rather than focusing immediately on book characters, students drew pictures of, reflected on, discussed, and wrote about their own traits and those of friends and family members. Only then did discussion shift to characters from a picture book read aloud; class members constructed a chart with traits and evidence for the text *Thank You, Mr. Falker* (Polacco, 1998) (see Figure 2), followed by shared writing from that chart. Students took on more and more of the responsibility until, by the end of the unit, all but one could manage independently all aspects of the assignment: trait selection, evidence collection, and paragraph composition.

(Insert Figure 2 about here)

Rather than being two separate policy mandates, the CCSS and RtI are, and ought to be, fundamentally linked. It is unlikely that all students will progress in learning these sophisticated
standards unless schools employ a comprehensive and systematic approach to ensuring that struggling readers have the support they need. On the flip side, unless schools expand interventions to incorporate literature and information text standards as well as foundational skills, these readers will never attain their full potential.

The small-scale Tier 2 protocol described here has affected teachers as well as the children served. After years of operating from a more traditional Title I frame in which children were selected for support and attended weekly classes all year long, this new model was quite a change at Campbell School. Katrina, the fourth grade teacher, appreciated the efficiency of the program, with students spending more time in her classroom, yet also receiving the help they needed. Charlotte, the Title I teacher, described it in this way:

> Going out into unknown territory for me was a little strange, but . . . the redesign and the structure—I think it’s more beneficial to the kids. They’re being pulled for what they need help with and then they’re back in their room. The kids are excited [about their progress], the teachers are excited, and I’m excited because it works.

**Take Action**

1. Meet with other teachers and administrators to talk about the ways your current system of support for struggling readers is effective and how it might be improved.

2. If you do not already have a screening assessment—one that reflects a meaning-making view of reading—select one. Decide how to administer the assessment and collect and analyze results.

3. For students who struggle with the screening measure, select a diagnostic assessment that will alert you to each child’s individual literacy strengths and challenges. It will be important to read with each child individually as part of this assessment.
4. Which aspects of reading seem to cause the most difficulty for your students? Craft Tier 2 curriculum units to address those problems first, adding other units as time allows.

5. As you begin offering these classes, attend carefully to student growth on progress monitoring assessments and overall reading measures.
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More to Explore

   www.corestandards.org/what-parents-should-know  The CCSS website offers this primer for parents, including links to other resources and a list of Frequently Asked Questions.


Table 1: CCSS, related Tier 2 classes, progress monitoring measure, cut score for enrollment, number of students enrolled, and total time of unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCSS</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Cut Score</th>
<th>Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RF 3.3C</td>
<td>Multi-syllable decoding</td>
<td>Names Test (Cunningham, 1990)</td>
<td>Less than 85% of syllables pronounced correctly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF 3.4B</td>
<td>Prosody</td>
<td>6-point Prosody Scale (see Figure 1)</td>
<td>Level 3 or below</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF 3.4C</td>
<td>Use of context clues</td>
<td>Percent of miscues that make sense in context or are self-corrected</td>
<td>Less than 60%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL 3.2</td>
<td>Oral retelling</td>
<td>Percent of possible points on retelling protocol</td>
<td>Less than 70%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Reading assessments for fourth graders who were reading below level on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment in fall 2013 (n = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Fall 2013 Mean Pre-Score</th>
<th>Spring 2014 Mean Post-Score</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fountas and Pinnell</td>
<td>3.36 grade level</td>
<td>5.75 grade level</td>
<td>+2.39 years</td>
<td>p = .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State standards-based test</td>
<td>440 scaled score points</td>
<td>480 scaled score points</td>
<td>40 points</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Survey data for fourth graders who were reading below level on the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment in fall 2013 (n = 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How good of a reader do you think you are?</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you feel about reading on a school night?</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do you feel about reading on the weekend?</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How do you feel about reading on vacations?</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you have a favorite book? What is it?</td>
<td>50% named a book</td>
<td>50% named a book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you have a favorite author? Who is s/he?</td>
<td>24% named an author</td>
<td>44% named an author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How many days this week did you read at home?  
   2.06 days  2.13 days

8. What are the last three books you’ve read?  
   1.47 books named  1.75 books named

Table 4: Progress monitoring data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2 Class</th>
<th>Mean Pre-score</th>
<th>Mean Post-score</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-syllable decoding</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>+19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody (six point scale)</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>+66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosody (rate)</td>
<td>70 wcpm</td>
<td>105 wcpm</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of context clues</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retelling</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>