

2007

The effect of Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program on reading gains program evaluation, II

Kelli A. Potoczny

Follow this and additional works at: <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Elementary Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [School Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Potoczny, Kelli A., "The effect of Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program on reading gains program evaluation, II" (2007). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones*. Paper 792.

**The Effect of Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program
On Reading Gains
Program Evaluation, II**

Thesis Submitted to
The Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of the
Requirements for the degree of
Educational Specialist in
School Psychology

Kelli A. Potoczny
Marshall University Graduate College

Sandra Stroebel, Ph.D. Committee Chairperson
Fred Jay Krieg, Ph.D.
Edna Meisel, Ed.D.

April 2007

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of the Marshall University Summer Enrichment Program on students' reading success in grades Kindergarten through eighth. From June 26, 2006 through July 27, 2006, a 5 week chronological period, 105 students attended the summer program and were evaluated for reading achievement. The study measured students' reading performance during the 5 consecutive weeks. Students were divided into three groups, primary, intermediate and middle school to evaluate the different age groups for changes in reading ability. This study compared student's pre and post running records to determine any gains in reading skills. The data was analyzed using a 2 tailed-paired t-test to determine the significance of the initial and final reading record probes' means. There was a significant gain in reading skills for the primary and intermediate students. While the middle school students made gains, the improvement was not significant. The data is consistent with the Cottle-Willard study completed in 2005. The subjects enrolled in the Marshall University's Summer Enrichment Program made gains in reading as measured by the running records.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Table of Contents	3
List of Tables	4
Chapter I.	
Introduction	5
History of the Summer Program	6
Chapter II	
Literature Review	8
<i>Importance in Reading</i>	8
<i>No Child Left Behind</i>	9
<i>90 Minute Reading Block</i>	11
<i>Reading Interventions</i>	12
<i>Running Records provided by Guided Reading</i>	13
Chapter III	
Methods	16
<i>Statement of Problem</i>	16
<i>Program Description</i>	16
<i>Subjects Characteristics</i>	18
<i>Instruments</i>	18
<i>Procedures</i>	19
Chapter IV	
Results	20
Chapter V	
Discussion	23
References	26
Appendix A	30
Appendix B	31
Curriculum Vitae	31

List of Tables

Table 1 Intercorrelation of grade level teams and Means of reading improvement.....	21
Table 2 Analysis of Variance among Primary, Intermediate and Middle grades reading improvement.....	22

CHAPTER I

Nature and Scope of Study

Introduction

Reading is a complex and dynamic process. Effective reading instruction is one of the most important factors in the success or failure of a child's reading achievement in our schools (Chard, Vaughn & Tyler, 2002). As education professionals knowing what instructional methods are effective in transforming challenges to strengths for struggling readers is essential. The ability to read has a significant impact on the lives of our children and some children fail to accomplish this important life task. Illiteracy can lead to further difficulties including legal involvement, school drop out, substance abuse, and unemployment (Debolt, 1998).

Since the implementation of the "No Child Left behind" schools are mandated to provide quality research-based reading instruction. One method to measure the effectiveness of a reading instruction is to pre-test the students to determine skill level, provide the instruction, and then post-test. Marshall University Graduate College (MUGC) Summer Enrichment Program in West Virginia has implemented a summer school program which focuses on literacy instruction. This study is designed to assess the effectiveness of the MUGC Summer Enrichment reading program.

History

Marshall University Graduate College Summer Enrichment Program was developed to present a best practices model for training graduate students. The program provides a training experience for graduate students that are seeking certification or a licensure in school counseling, special education, reading or school psychology. At the site, supervisors provide support to the graduates with both observational and training direction for the 6 weeks.

The children are separated according to their grade. The instruction provided to the students is activity based with emphasis placed on becoming actively involved in the learning process through numerous hands-on activities (Krieg et. al. 2005). These activities are permitted to take place due to the fact that each classroom is staffed with graduate students that are in various specialties. The Summer Enrichment Program not only permits an enrichment opportunity for the children but it also allows the graduate students to have the experiences needed to collaborate with peers in various educational fields.

The children that attend the program are recruited in several ways. These are through parent contact, public or private clinics, or from their school (Krieg, et.al. 2005). The multiple recruitment strategies allow for diversity in the children's needs. Some students attend due to grade level failure, reading difficulties, behavioral problems or concern for lack of educational development. Others attend to extend their skills or simply because they enjoy being in a school setting (Krieg, et. al. 2005).

Students come with different goals in mind, hoping this program will provide the services that they need. Young children that face developmental delays attend to decrease the drop in skills that increase over the summer. Older student often participate in the program to avoid retention in their home schools. Students are recruited to develop a racially diverse population as

well as a variety of socio-economic levels. A one hundred dollar fee applies to all students, however those that qualify for free or reduced lunches are offered scholarships as an incentive to attend (Krieg, et. al. 2005). Lunch is provided to all children as well as breakfast through the USDA subsidized meal program (Krieg, et. al. 2005).

According to the article, *Field Based Experience: In Light of Changing Demographs* published in 2005 by Krieg, Meikamp, O'Keefe and Stroebel, the program emphasizes reading instruction. The article specifically states that:

Literacy is at the center of the curriculum, evidenced by an uninterrupted 90 minute reading block each day. All team members, instructional and support are involved in teaching using short cycle assessment, running reading records, leveled reading materials, and weekly regrouping of children based on skill level and instructional needs. Instruction and planning are based on the learning needs of the children. Team members use assessment information to differentiate instructional activities which provide project oriented, hands-on, discovery learning opportunities. Thus, graduate students participate in determining the scope and depth of the material the children are expected to learn.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Introduction to Literature Review

Reading instruction is more important now than ever. With current legislation mandating achievement for all students, teachers feel pressured to ensure that all children learn to read. While children being served by schools have diverse abilities and experiences, all are expected to succeed. Utilizing instruction based on best practices to improve reading skills is a major commitment of the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program.

Importance in Reading

Reading is more important today than it ever has been; it is crucial for becoming an informed citizen, for succeeding in one's chosen career, and for realizing personal fulfillment. People initially thought technology would decrease the need to read. However, there is more to read and refer to than ever before, more magazines, more books and more articles to read on the Internet. Children who read well do better in all other subjects and in all aspects of the schooling and beyond (National Reading Panel, 2000). As continual technological advances surface, reading is increasingly important for children trying to find their place in society.

Since 1996, state and federal reading initiatives have focused on the problem of reading failure at kindergarten and the primary grades. The focus on early intervention is based on strong evidence that research-based instruction beginning in kindergarten significantly reduces the number of children who experience reading difficulty (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000). Once children fall behind, they seldom catch up so if a child is not on grade reading level in 1st grade this is a good predictor of reading achievement on into high

school (Catts et al., 1999; Cunningham and Stanovich, 1997). Reading failure begins early, takes root quickly, and affects students for life. Improvements in reading education in the lower elementary grades have been targeted. But coming too slowly are the needed intensive instructions that would affect the huge numbers of students beyond third grade, who have been the victims of misguided reading instruction and limited resources. According to the 2000 National Reading Panel about 42 percent of 4th graders score below basic in overall reading skill on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Their findings also reported that in Washington, D.C., the amount of students beyond 3rd grade who cannot read well enough to participate in grade-level work is between 60 and 70 percent depending on the grade and year of assessment. About half fail to complete high school and too few can compete in higher education. In this community, the rate of adult illiteracy -- reading below 4th grade level -- is 37%, the highest in the nation. Nationally, 25% of all adults are functionally illiterate (National Reading Panel. 2000).

No Child Left Behind

Only three days after taking office in 2001, President George W. Bush announced the revision of Elementary and Secondary Education Act called, No Child Left Behind. This was the new law that proposed to increased accountability for states, school districts and schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). The revision wanted to give greater choices to the students and parents as well as more flexibility for states and local educational agencies to have access to the federal education funding. The law has placed a stronger emphasis on reading for students, particularly on those attending low-performing schools, which has had a large impact on our

educational system. These changes are being made in hopes of closing the achievement gap and providing all children the same opportunity for obtaining a successful education.

The new NCLB law, under “Accountability”, introduces a new buzz word called AYP, known as Annual Yearly Progress. This standard requires each state to submit a performance report showing their progress toward English proficiency and state educational standards (Mayers, 2006, pg 451). Schools failing to meet the AYP are required to craft and submit an improvement plan. If the school should miss the AYP benchmark consistently for four years, then the state must ensure that modifications are made to the curriculum as well as the manner in which it is being delivered (Geppert, 2001).

Another change under the new law states that “Putting Reading First” needs to establish new assessment techniques. These techniques need to target students falling behind the content standards for their grade level. They then need to follow up by using scientifically based reading research to help young children to attain grade level reading skills. The West Virginia State Board of Education program drafted their Policy 2510 to support the New Child Left Behind federal law. This policy specifically states, “In accordance with revisions in Policy 2510 and effective July 1, 2005, schools are required to schedule in K-2 classrooms, at a minimum, a daily uninterrupted 90-minute reading block. For intermediate elementary 3-4 classrooms, 90 minutes for Reading and English Language Arts instruction is required which includes 60 minutes of uninterrupted daily reading instruction (Boyer, L. & Butcher, K., 2005). With the mandated 90 minute reading block for elementary schools and the new assessment techniques, it will hopefully lead to early detection. This will allow teachers to provide effective intervention and divested teaching methods for those students that are falling behind the content standards for their grade level.

90 Minute Reading Block

In accordance with the NCLB guidelines MUGC's Summer Enrichment Program reading program provides ninety minutes of uninterrupted reading at the beginning of each instructional day. Instruction is provided in small groups.

During the ninety minute reading block, the students are involved in whole and small group activities and workstations. It consists of a variety of reading and writing experiences that are designed to help children develop their own effective strategies for literacy. It focuses on scientific-based reading research (SBRR) by providing instruction in the five essential components of reading (NCLB, 2001, Part B, Sec. 1201). The five essential components are phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension (Armbruster, Osborn, 2003). At 9:30 a.m. a writing specialist provided instruction to each individual classroom in expressive writing.

The 90 minute reading block has been found to be effective in schools. A study was conducted by Torgesen and his research team from Florida State University in 2006, where he visited 10% of the Reading First schools in Florida to interview principals and others about their Reading First programs. When asked about the most important element of their Reading First programs, 85% of the principals interviewed reported that the 90 minute reading block was clearly a key element to the success of their program (Torgeson, 2006).

Providing 90 minutes of reading instruction is a starting point. The appropriate amount of time allocated to reading instruction in grades K-3 will vary with the needs of the majority of students. Schools that serve a high proportion of students at risk for reading difficulties (students from poverty, students with restricted language experience, etc.) will likely require a longer

block of time devoted to reading instruction than schools that have small numbers of students at risk (Foorman and Torgesen, 2001). If a large numbers of students in the early elementary grades are not able to meet grade level expectations in basic reading skills and reading comprehension by the end of third grade, both the amount and quality of instruction may need to be increased.

Reading Intervention

Intervention, according to the Oxford English Dictionary, has come to mean “the action of intervening, stepping in, or interfering in any affair, so as to affect its course or issue.” In the area of reading research and practice *intervention* is a term that has recently attained prominence. A search of the ERIC database using the descriptors “intervention”, “reading”, and “early childhood/elementary education” yielded a set of 243 studies. Six percent of these were published during the 1970s, 10 percent during the 1980s, and 84 percent during the 1990’s and the year 2000, with the majority appearing in the last 6 years. Starting in the 1990’s the bulk of the studies describe individual and small group instruction as the major design of an effective intervention that will place a child on the right track with their reading development. More recently there has been a call for “evidence-based research” (Forman & Torgesen, 2001).

The No Child Left Behind 2001 federal legislation law which mandates the adoption of scientifically based research, and is undoubtedly the driving force behind the new focus on the importance of reading for children. So what does scientifically based reading research material mean? According to the The No Child Left Behind Act it is defined as a research that involves the application of rigorous, systemic and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education actives and programs. There are several programs available that are scientifically research based and there are many examples of successful individual and

small group interventions. While these interventions vary in how instruction is provided and in the amount of emphasis placed on certain contents, each one generally reduces the number of struggling readers to 4.5% or less of the school population (Torgesen et al., 2003). With this noted MUGC Summer Enrichment Program selected the Sunshine series and chose guided reading as the research based strategy to help increase the odds for their students in attendance. The running record was utilized to determine reading gains.

Running Records provided by Guided Reading

Guided Reading was originated in New Zealand in the 1960s. It was developed by two literacy educators - Myrtle Simpson, an inspector of schools, and Ruth Trevor, the National Adviser on Reading (Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G.S., 1996). From their work they developed a handbook called, *Suggestions for Teaching Reading in Primary and Secondary Schools*. It was then developed in the United States by Tom Wright of the Wright Group. The rights to Guided Reading are owned by *The Sunshine series* of leveled books from New Zealand (Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G.S., 1996).

One can do guided reading assessments by taking a running record using a book that is believed to be as close to the child's developmental level (Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G.S., 2001). The running record will show a record of a child's reading behavior as he or she reads from the book. During shared readings within the classroom the instructor guides the entire class or reading group through stories with a high level of support. Guided reading has many of the same components as shared reading (Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G.S., 2001). However, it was conducted with a smaller number of students and focused more on the individual reading needs of each child. During guided reading, the educator works with the student at their instructional level to

guide them in using the context, visual, and structure cues within stories to generate meaning. By using instructional level texts that gradually increase in difficulty, students apply strategies in context and feel successful (Smith-Burke, M et. al. 2002). The end goal, as with any literacy component, is for students to become confident, proficient readers who enjoy reading.

At the Marshall site, a half day setting, each child was exposed to their guided reading group every day during the reading block. These Guided Reading lessons generally lasted ten to fifteen minutes. Each child had a copy of the book and the educator would introduce the text to the group, selecting one or two teaching points to present. Each child would read the whole text aloud in a whisper voice. The teacher would prompt or offer support when needed.

A Running Record was coined by Marie Clay, the originator of Reading Recovery. The Running Record is similar to Yetta Goodman's system of Miscue Analysis (Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G.S., 1996, p.89). As a child reads a portion of a book the teacher notes errors, self-corrections, repetitions, re-readings, hesitations and appeals for help. The focus, first, is on what the child can do when reading and, secondly, what the child needs to learn to do to become a better reader. Analysis of the results reveals the child's accuracy and self-correction rates; further analysis of the errors and self-corrections reveals the cueing systems (meaning, structure and visual) that the student uses and/or ignores. The Running Record allows the teacher to note and record the reading progress of a child over time. It also allows the teacher to determine if a given book, either a student's own choice, or a book considered for instruction or for independent reading, is at an appropriate level for him/her. In order to be able to read and comprehend a book independently a student should be able to read a book with at least 94% accuracy (Fountas, I.C. & Pinnell, G.S., 1996, p. 90). With the support of an adult or within the circle of a guided

reading group, a student will make the most progress reading at instructional level, accuracy rate of 90% - 94% (Fountas, I.C. & Pinnell, G.S., 1996, p. 90).

An article written by Anita Iaquinta addressed the importance that guided readings, a research-based approach, is an effective reading instruction. She also reported that in a truly balanced literacy program, such as guided reading, that how it is taught is as important as what is being taught. This showed that guided reading provides the necessary opportunity for teacher to explicitly teach reading strategies at the students' individual level. It provides reinforcement for problem solving, comprehension, and decoding skills (Iquinta, 2006).

CHAPTER III

Methods

Statement of the Problem

Reading is an important life skill for children. Providing effective instruction so children can become proficient readers is more important than ever because of changes in society and recent laws. This study will examine whether students attending the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program experience gains in reading. As noted in the previous program evaluation completed by Cottle-Willard (2006), there have been limited studies completed to explore the reading gains of those students who participated in MUGC Summer Enrichment Program. There have been numerous studies completed evaluating the program that have focused on parental satisfaction with the conduct and professionalism of the School Psychology staff as well as their overall rating of the services that were offered at the program site. This research will measure each student's initial reading ability and then a post test will be conducted to obtain the same information. The researcher will conduct a comparison study to determine the percentage of reading growth with the participants. The pre-test and post-test running record assessments will be compared to evaluate any relationship between the individual scores.

Program Description

MUGC offers their Summer Enrichment program for five weeks during each summer. The 2006 Summer program ran from dates June 26, 2006 through July 27, 2006. This gave the students a total of 18 instructional days. As in the past, the 2006 Summer Enrichment program provided instructional guidance for students in grades Kindergarten through Eighth.

A total of seven classrooms were assigned this particular summer. Team one consisted of Kindergarten students. Team two was made up of first and second grade children. The third team was solely made up of second grade students. Team four had students from both the third and fourth graders. The fifth team had both 4th and 5th grade students as participants. Team six was only for sixth grade students and the seventh and final group had students from seventh and eighth grade students within the classroom. The Graduate College faculty appointed graduate students within each classroom. The average classroom consisted of two reading specialists, six or seven educators, two counselors and one or two school psychologists.

Services were provided in a full inclusion model with the first ninety minutes being uninterrupted reading instruction. All team members, instructional and support are involved in teaching using short cycle assessment, running records, leveled reading materials, and weekly regrouping of children based on skill level and instructional needs. Instruction and planning are based on the learning needs of the children. The remaining one hundred and fifty minutes involved science, math, social studies, developmental guidance and character building skills.

The study was an Action Research design. It utilized students and staff at Marshall University Graduate Summer Enrichment Program to examine the reading progress of the students within the program and determine if the current reading program is effective. The students were assessed before the implementation of the reading programs and a comparison was done with the students' results after 5 weeks of reading instruction assessments. The study was longitudinal following the participants over a 5 week summer program. Parent permission was obtained prior to any formal or informal evaluations being completed. Other instruments used during the evaluation program were, Color/Word list, Number/Word list, Phonemic Awareness,

Concepts of Print, Letter Identification, Ohio Word List, Frye Instant Word list, QRI Word Lists, Developmental Spelling and Running Records.

Subjects Characteristics

A total of 144 students registered for the Summer Enrichment Program. By the end of the Enrichment Program there were only 122 students that attended on a continual basis. To be considered as a student that attended on a continual basis the student needed to attend 16 out of the 18 instructional days. As noted previously all students were to be administered the running record probes, except for the Kindergarten classroom. This was a total of 17 students out of the total 122 participants that were given a different reading instrument. The diversity of these children came from a wide range of social-economic status as well as different educational backgrounds.

Instruments

Pre and Post running records were used for this study to reveal individual reading achievement. The initial assessments were administered to each child during the first week of the program, June 26, through June 31, 2006, by each classroom team. Each student orally read a pre-leveled, designated reading probes. As the child read aloud the administrator listened for errors, self corrections made by the child and the accurate number of words read. These results allowed the team to place each child in the necessary reading level group for proper instruction.

Procedures

All of the children (n= 105) who participated in the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program from grades 1st through 9th were administered the running probes on a weekly basis to evaluate both the reading achievements and instructional levels. The Reading Record documentation was to show the initial reading book level the student was reading fluently. Then at the end the final reading book level was to be recorded and the accuracy rate at that level. Upon conclusion of the 5 week program the research was gathered and stored by the Reading Department at Marshall University Graduate College.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The original data was ordinal in character and was converted to interval data to provide a quantitative comparison for analysis purposes. After the collection of data a 2 tailed-paired t test was conducted to determine the significance of the initial and final reading record probes' means. The results of this study showed a statistically significant difference between the mean of the pre-reading records and the mean of the post-reading records. $t(64) = 1.24 \times 10^{-9}$, $p < 0.5$. Also for analysis purposes, the seven groups were categorized into three classifications: Primary, Intermediate and Middle. The Primary group consisted of pre-kindergarten through second grade, the Intermediate group was third through fifth grade and the Middle School team was made up of sixth through ninth grade. These results showed that both the Primary and Intermediate group, as well as the overall results showed a significant improvement difference in those students reading levels. Further analysis reflected that all three teams showed an increase of their overall reading level. The primary group went up 1.7 reading levels, the intermediate went up 1.5 levels in their reading ability and the Middle team went up one reading level. Supporting data demonstrated that MUGC's Summer Enrichment Program made an average of one and one half reading level increase for each group in attendance.

Table 1

Reading Improvement Means and Standard Deviations

Among Grade Level Teams (N= 65)				
	Number	Mean	SD	Reading Level of Improvement
Primary	29	2.97	2.41	+ 1.7 Levels
Intermediate	19	2.21	1.61	+ 1.5 Levels
Middle	17	0.12	1.40	+ 1 Level
Overall	65	2.00	2.27	+ 1.6 Levels

Table 2

Reading Improvement Means and Significant Differences using the T-test

Among Grade Level Teams (N= 65)					
	Number	Mean Pre-Test	Mean Post-Test	Sign. Difference (2-tailed)	Indicator of Significant Differences
Primary	29	5.65	8.62	3.51×10^{-7}	Y
Intermediate	19	12.10	14.31	1.24×10^{-5}	Y
Middle	17	18.00	18.11	.735	N
Overall	65	10.72	12.76	1.24×10^{-9}	Y

CHAPTER V

Discussion

The results of the study indicated that children in the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program made gains in reading. Significant reading progress was obtained at the lower grade levels, labeled as primary and intermediate grades. This finding corroborates the previous study of Cottle-Willard (2006). The finding reinforces the value of summer reading programs for children who are below grade level in reading achievement.

Addressing reading skills at the MUGC Summer Enrichment Program could remediate reading deficits by determining, in a short amount of time, effective techniques that work with a diverse population of students. A review of the research completed by Elizabeth Cottle-Willard in 2006 indicated that 74% of the students involved in the 2006 Summer Program showed an increase in their reading skills. The current study found that 71% of the students showed an improvement in their reading within the 5 week instructional period. Out of the total number of students where the data was measurable, 71% showed an increase in their reading, 23% reflected no change, leaving 6% having a decline in their reading abilities.

This study is similar to the results of previous studies from the literature review showing that implementing SBRR interventions are effective in improving children's reading skills. While few studies have addressed the reading problems of older students, interventions being used for younger children may not be as effective with the higher grades. These students need more intensive instruction to support gains toward reading success. The reading record has proven to be an effective instrument in measuring reading achievement with the younger children (Foorman and Torgesen, 2001); however a different instrument may want to be considered for older students. When using the Running Record the measurement of progression

reaches a plateau once high school reading levels are obtained. This may be the cause for data results showing a lack of progress in the older students. Proposals in correcting the lack of reading gains in older students may need to be more intense instruction and the utilization of a different instrument. Other areas of reading may need to be assessed, such as comprehension and fluency. This can be accomplished by the Qualitative Reading Inventory QRI, which is already being implemented at the MUGC Summer Enrichment program. If the data collection had been more uniform and functional, the comprehension gains of the older students may have shown that progress was made.

Teams need to be more aware of the importance of recording the students' progress based on the weekly assessment results. Baseline data was used to place children in groups. Once groups were established, children needed to be moved between levels when mastery was achieved. Often this was not done. Instead children were moved as groups. If students made an overall gain in their reading level of 1.6 within the 5 weeks without being moved as individuals between reading groups, imagine what could be achieved for a struggling reader when placed within the correct reading level. Careful implementation of the guided reading strategy is needed to ensure maximum progress for each child.

In conclusion, the limitations to this study were; limited sample size due to the inconsistency of the data collection, lack of monitoring of data collection, and limited instrument selection. Graduate students were not aware of the importance of moving students as they progress with reading.

If this study should be replicated one should consider measuring the reading gains of older students based on fluency or comprehension. Additionally, it would be advantageous for

both the student and the graduates to use the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBLES) when evaluating reading abilities. Currently this instrument is being used in West Virginia to screener for reading deficits, as well as measuring the effectiveness of reading instruction. This would allow a better assessment of reading gains. The final recommendation is for there to be specific instruction on how to administer and record the results of the reading record and/or the Qualitative Reading Inventory. Then closer monitoring of the interventions to make sure the guidelines were being followed. These recommendations if implemented will improve the effectiveness of Marshall University Graduate College's Summer Enrichment Program.

References

- Bear, D. R., Invernizzi, M., Templeton, S., & Johnston, F., (2004). *Words their Way: Word study for phonics, vocabulary, and spelling instruction 3rd ed.* Columbus, OH; Pearson, Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Boyer, L. & Butcher, K., (2005) West Virginia Department of Education
[Electronic version]. *Clarification of Uninterrupted Reading Block.* Retrieved on October 30, 2006 at <http://wvde.state.wv.us>
- Chard, D.J., Vaughn, S., & Tyler, B.J. (2002). A synthesis of research on effective interventions for building reading fluency and elementary students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 386-406.
- Cottle-Willard, E., (2006) Reading Achievement for Students in Marshall University Graduate College's 2005 Summer Enrichment Program: Program Evaluation. [Electronic version]. *Marshall University Graduate College.* Retrieved on June 1, 2006 at <http://www.marshall.edu/etd/schoolPSYCH.html>
- Debolt, K. (1998) Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Parenting Education Programs. [Electronic version]. *Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, North Carolina State University.* Retrieved on April 19, 2007 at <http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/depts/fcs/>

- Foorman, B.R., & Torgesen, J. (2001). Critical elements for classroom and small-group instruction promote reading success in all children. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 16(4), 203-212
- Fountas, I. C. & Pinnell, G.S., (1996). *Guided Reading: Good First Teaching for All Children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fountas, I.C. & Pinnell, G.S. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers, grades 3-6: Teaching comprehension, genre, and content literacy*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graner, P.S., LaCava, P.G., Simpson, R.L, (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act: Challenges and Implications for Educator [Electronic version]. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, Vol. 40 No.2, 2004, 67-75.
- Geppert, J., Kane, T. J., Staiger, D.O. (2001) Assessing the Definition of Adequate Yearly Progress [Electronic version]. *House and Senate Education Bills*, (2001) Vol. 1. Retrieved on October 15 from <http://www.brook.edu/dybdocroot/gs/brown/housesentate6.pdf>.
- Iquinta, A., (2006), Guided Reading a Research Based Response to the Challenges of Early Reading Instruction. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 6, June 2006
- Kosanovich, M., Ladinsky, K, Nelson, L., & Torgesen, J. (2006). *Differentiated reading instruction: Small group alternative lesson structures for all students*. Tallahassee: Florida Center for Reading Research

Krieg, F.J., Meikamp, J, O'Keefe, S.L., Stroebel, S. - Marshall Graduate College

(2006) *Field-Based Experience in Light of Changing Demographics*, Trainers Forum,
Vo. 25, No. 4, 5-17

Lyons, C. (2003). *Teaching struggling readers: How to use brain-based research to maximize learning*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Mayers, C.M., (2006) Public Law 107-110 No Child Left Behind Act of 2001:

Support or Threat to Education as a Fundamental Right? [Electronic version].
Education Vo. 126, No. 3, 449-461.

National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction [Electronic version]. *Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development*. Retrieved October 2, 2006 at <http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/Publications/publications.htm>

Smith-Burke, M., Pinnell, G.S., Jackson, M., Wey, S., Askew, B.J., & Hambright-Brown, E. (2002). *A principal's guide to Reading Recovery*. Columbus, OH: Reading Recovery Council of North America.

Torgesen, J.K, Rashotte, C., Alexander, A., Alexander, J., & Macphee, K. (2003). Progress toward understanding the instructional conditions necessary for remediating reading difficulties in older children. In B.R. Forman (Ed.), *Preventing and remediating reading difficulties: Bringing science to scale* (pp. 275-298) Baltimore: York Press.

Torgesen, J.K. (2006, July). *The assessment/instruction connection: What every principal and coach should know*. A paper presented at the Florida Principal's Leadership Conference, Tallahassee, FL.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006) *Questions and Answers on No Child Left Behind- Reading*, Retrieved October 5, 2006 from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/methods/reading/reading.html>

RUNNING RECORD SHEET

Name _____ Date _____
 School _____
 Examiner _____
 Text Title _____

Errors Running Words Error Ratio Accuracy Rate Self-Corrections Ratio

Independent: 95-100% Instructional: 90-94% Frustration: 50-89%

Page	Title	E	SC

Kelli A. Potoczny

HC 62 Box 21-C
Alma, WV 26320
(304) 758-0043
kellipotoczny@yahoo.com

CAREER INTEREST

To secure a full-time employment position with the opportunity to grow in experience and advance in responsibility.

QUALIFICATIONS

Hard working, reliable and dependable
Able to maintain a sense of humor in tense situations
Skilled in consultation strategies
Ability to work well with families with specialized needs
Experience working with students of all ages

EDUCATION

Fairmont State College

B.S. Psychology/Criminal Justice (Dec. 1991)
Emphasis in Corrections
Minor in Psychology

Marshall University

Ed.S. School Psychology (May 2007)

WORK EXPERIENCE

School Psychology Internship, Harrison County Board of Education, Harrison County (8/2006 – 6/2007)

- Administration, scoring and report design on Intelligence and Achievement tests. Anxiety, Attention-Deficit Hyperactive- symptoms, Depression, Adaptive-Behavior, -- Behavioral and Asperger/Autism Rating Scales.
- Case Consultation, Collaboration with teachers and parents
- Individual and Group counseling
- Crisis Intervention
- Program Evaluation

WV Dept. of Health and Human Services, Tyler/Wetzel Co. (07/1998 – 02/2006)

- Assessment of family needs
- Linkage and referral to needed services
- Determination of eligible services
- Emergency assistance services for families in need
- Processing of applications for State funded programs

Northern Panhandle Head Start, Wetzel County

(08/1997 – 06/1998)

- Family Service Coordinator
- Working with families and children
- Developing plans for families- financial and educational
- Organized parent training and adult education classes. –
- Monthly home visits
- Linked families to needed services.
- Literacy advocate

Sistersville Nursing and Rehab Center, Sistersville WV

(04/1996 – 07/1997)

- Admissions Coordinator
- Assessments and care planning
- Linkage and referral to other agencies,
- Contact and intervention with family members
- Advocacy for the residents
- Investigation of all complaints, either neglect or abuse

Northwood Health Systems, New Martinsville WV

(05/1995 – 04/1997)

- MR/DD Service Coordinator for
- Designing of Treatment plans
- Linking clients to needed services
- Complete monthly home visits to monitor services
- Provided consultation for the families
- Advocate for the client.

**ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION**

Hold a temporary Social Work License.

Personal References and transcript available upon request.