DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 009

CS 004 212

AUTHOR   Berger, Allen; And Others
TITLE   Guidelines for Teams Evaluating the Reading Component
            of Teacher Education Programs.
INSTITUTION Keystone State Reading Association, Pa.
PUB DATE   Jan 78
NOTE   35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Evaluation; *Evaluation Methods;
            *Guidelines; Higher Education; Knowledge Level;
            *Program Evaluation; Reading; *Reading Instruction;
            *Student Evaluation; Teacher Education; *Teacher
            Education Curriculum

ABSTRACT
            Designed for teams evaluating the reading component
of teacher education programs, the guidelines in this paper contain
statements to use in determining the degree of understanding that
students in teacher education programs have regarding 30 concepts and
techniques relating to reading development. The statements are
grouped according to the following areas: reading concepts,
diagnostic teaching and evaluation, reading materials, reading
skills, psychological and pedagogical principles, and the relation of
reading to the larger educational community. The items are arranged
so that responses to each (from program director, faculty, students,
and dean or other persons interviewed) can be displayed on the same
page. In addition to the guidelines, this publication presents a
history of the evolution of the guidelines, offers notes to aid
evaluators in ascertaining students' levels of awareness and
proficiency regarding each of the 30 statements, and provides
definitions of selected terms used in the guidelines. (GW)

GUIDELINES FOR TEAMS

EVALUATING THE READING COMPONENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Task Force Writing Committee: Allen Berger
                                Jimmie Cook
                                Sister Alice Louise Davis
                                Janice Fry

                                Louis A. Oliastro
                                Stephen A. Pavlak
                                Margaret M. Sponseller

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3

Foreword

> Each certification candidate shall demonstrate
> the ability to assess and improve reading...
> skills and/or make appropriate referrals.
>
> — General Standard VIII f

In recent months, Secretary of Education Caryl M. Kline has
expressed concern for the need to have literate children in
the State of Pennsylvania. Others expressing similar concerns
include Dr. Ronald Corrigan, Director, Bureau of Teacher
Certification. In an address before the Keystone State Reading
Association Board of Directors, Dr. Corrigan noted the minimum
level of preparation in reading required of elementary and
secondary school teachers in Pennsylvania.

To help meet these concerns, changes relating to developmental
reading have been recommended in the form of an amendment to
Regulation Chapter 5: Curriculum Requirements of the State
Board of Education. The changes include more emphasis on
developmental reading with attention to life-time reading
habits.

In order to implement the proposed changes, teachers will need
to be better prepared. Supportive services will also be needed
in order for there to be a total commitment and impact on the
school-wide curriculum.

To help teacher education institutions meet the concerns about
reading performance that have been expressed, the Pennsylvania
Professional Standards and Practices Commission requested the
Keystone State Reading Association to develop Guidelines for
Teams Evaluating the Reading Component of Teacher Education
Programs in Colleges and Universities in Pennsylvania.

The following is a brief history of the evolution of the
Guidelines.

-1- 4

Spring 1973 — President of K.S.R.A., Dr. Alice Louise Davis, created a Task Force for Secondary Reading. Mr. Louis A. Oliastro was appointed Chairperson.

Fall 1973 — President Herbert Wartenberg charged the Secondary Reading Task Force to investigate practices in Secondary Reading in the State of Pennsylvania and make recommendations. The committee established a four-stage target:

1. Fact Finding
2. Recommendations
3. Dissemination of Information
4. Implementation

January 1974 — Five centers were created to conduct a pilot study concerning problems in Secondary Reading. They were:

Northwestern Penna.	—	William McKay - Chairperson
Southwestern Penna.	—	Anthony Saludis - Chairperson
Central Penna.	—	Richard Zerby - Chairperson
Northeastern Penna.	—	Louise Stabler - Chairperson
Southeastern Penna.	—	Beatrice Levin - Chairperson

The Chairpersons in each center were to conduct surveys, meet and discuss with local school personnel and report findings in March 1974.

March 1974 — The Task Force met and presented results of the survey. Based on the findings of the survey a questionnaire was developed and disseminated to seventy-five percent of the school districts in Pennsylvania. Eighty percent of the participants responded to the survey.

August 1975 — The final report of the Secondary Reading Task Force was presented to the K.S.R.A. at Bloomsburg State College. The President presiding was Dr. Margaret Sponseller. A motion was passed to share the findings with the Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission and John Pittinger, Secretary of Education.

October 1975 — The Task Force met with the Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission. The Commission expressed interest and urged K.S.R.A. to develop specific recommendations.

Fall 1976   The Task Force presented the following
              recommendations to the Commission:

    I. Pre-Service Training

        A. Undergraduate students should be
              provided with more instruction in
              teaching secondary reading—possibly
              a requirement of at least two courses
              or equivalent.

        B. Existing secondary courses in our
              colleges and universities in Pennsylvania
              should be evaluated and refined to pro-
              vide more relevant preparation for
              students.

    II. In-Service Training

        A. Massive in-service programs need to be
              implemented for all Secondary teachers
              until the need is satisfied.

        B. The K.S.R.A. could provide a network of
              in-service workshops to meet this need.

    III. Existing Public School Reading Programs

        A. Reading Supervisors are needed in the
              Secondary Schools to provide leadership
              for existing programs.

        B. More Reading Specialists are needed at
              the Secondary level.

        C. A review of the present Junior High
              Developmental Reading Program is needed.

            1. Curriculum should include:
                a. Study Skills
                b. Critical reading
                c. Reading textbooks
                d. Speed reading
                e. Predicting test items

            2. Reasonable class size is needed.

            3. More staff is indicated.

Spring 1977   The Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices
               Commission contracted with K.S.R.A. to prepare guide-
               lines for teams evaluating the reading component
               of teacher education programs in colleges and
               universities in Pennsylvania to comply with Standard
               VIII of the General Standards. Dr. Jerry Fidler,
               President of K.S.R.A., appointed Louis Oliastro
               to chair this committee.

Summer 1977

A committee was formed to prepare these guidelines. Dr. Allen Berger and Dr. Margaret Sponseller were appointed co-chairpersons of the Writing Committee. The guidelines were completed, approved by the committee, approved by the K.S.R.A. and presented to the Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission. The guidelines were examined by a number of classroom teachers, future teachers, and reading specialists in various parts of the Commonwealth.

Fall 1977

The guidelines were approved by the Pennsylvania Professional Standards and Practices Commission.

7

Preface and Acknowledgments

The field of education is caught in a trap of history. Arguments
that should have been made when funds were plentiful were not
made and this negligence has resulted in the rich professions
growing richer, and the poorer professions fighting to preserve
what they have.

The gap widens steadily and caught in the middle are the citizens
who want something out of their tax dollar for education. This
"something" is many things to people—a good job, a good life,
a way of living... Underlying these needs and movements is the
desire of our citizens to be able to read well and intelligently.

Just as there are thousands of people who want to read but cannot,
there are thousands who can but do not read, giving rise to a
peculiar class of illiteracy.

While students have the right to read, they also have the right
not to read materials that are slanted, distorted, misleading and
libelous to the many viable ethnic groups in this great Commonwealth.

It is in the spirit of these ideas that we present a framework to
serve those who serve all of us by giving of their time and effort
to help evaluate college and university programs in the Commonwealth
of Pennsylvania.

This guide could not have been prepared without the encouragement
and suggestions from the Keystone State Reading Association, the
Pennsylvania State Education Association and the Pennsylvania Right
to Read Effort.

Special thanks for their suggestions and encouragement are extended
to Dan Austin, Director, Pennsylvania Professional Standards and
Practices Commission, and William D. Kautz, Chief, Division of
Teacher Education, Bureau of Academic Programs, Department of Education,
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Task Force Writing Allen Berger, Chair, University of Pittsburgh
  Committee: Jimmie Cook, Edinboro State College
                         Sister Alice Louise Davis, Indiana Univ. of Pa.
                         Janice Fry, Seneca Highlands Intermediate Unit 9
                         Louis A. Oliastro, California State College
                         Stephen A. Pavlak, California State College
                         Margaret M. Sponseller, Co-Chair, Bloomsburg
                                                State College

January 10, 1978

Introduction

The following guide contains thirty statements to detect the
degree of understanding that students have about concepts and skills
relating to reading development (e.g., Items 1-5, Reading Concepts;
Items 6-10, Diagnostic Teaching and Evaluation; Items 11-14,
Reading Materials; Items 15-19, Reading Skills; Items 20-24,
Psychological and Pedagogical Principles; and Items 25-30, The
Relation of Reading to the Larger Educational Community).

For evaluator ease, the thirty items are arranged so that responses
to each, from director, faculty, students and any others interviewed,
can be displayed on the same page. Through this arrangement, the
evaluators can consider not only the responses, but the perceptions
of those involved in the program.

The team member is reminded that this evaluation occurs on two levels;
i.e., the assessment of the program and the determination of students'
competencies within the program.

One of the problems arising in forming guidelines for evaluating
the reading component of teacher education programs is the degree
of competency or awareness necessary for the different roles that
educational personnel will follow. There are three basic roles:
(1) prospective teachers, nursery through secondary; (2) administrators;
and (3) resource personnel.

Evaluators must keep these roles in focus and be flexible in assessing
the degree of proficiency for each role. It is important to remember
that some of the items may not apply to some of the roles.

Evaluators should note in the space for comments the degree of
competency as it relates to the role of the prospective teacher,
administrator, or resource personnel.

Notes to Guide

In interviewing undergraduate and graduate students, the team members should ascertain the level of awareness or proficiency as determined by the professional roles. Such roles include pre- and inservice teachers (N-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12), administrators, and support services such as counselors, librarians, nurses, and psychologists. The evaluator must keep these roles in focus and be flexible in assessing the degree of proficiency for each item.

Reading Concepts

1. Students are aware of a variety of reading definitions and their relationship to the reading communication arts process.

   Do course outlines indicate that the definitions are taught? Are students able to provide the evaluator verbal descriptions of several definitions? Do they know the Comprehensive Reading Communication Arts Plan of the Pennsylvania Department of Education?

2. Students understand their roles in relationship to the overall reading program.

   Do students appear to realize the seriousness of teaching reading and demonstrate an awareness that the primary responsibility for teaching reading to children is theirs?

3. Students have an understanding of language as related to reading development.

   Students understand that language is one of the key influences on intellectual development and would emphasize the value of language experience in teaching reading.

4. Students have an understanding of psycholinguistics as related to reading development.

   Students are familiar with the concept of miscue analysis and indicate knowledge of the psycholinguistic construct or models established by such individuals as Chomsky, Goodman, Kirk, McCarthy, etc.

5. Students understand the concept of individualized learning and/or individualized instruction and are capable of various kinds of classroom organization.

   Do course outlines indicate that individualized learning and instruction are emphasized? When asked to define the meaning of the above, are students articulate?

Diagnostic Teaching and Evaluation

6. Students understand diagnostic teaching and/or teaching diagnostically.

   In conversations with students regarding their knowledge of diagnosis, do they appear to understand that diagnosis is an on-going process requiring serious observation of children while in the reading act and do they realize that diagnostic teaching is a desired skill also?

7. Students are aware of the positive and negative aspects of standardized reading tests.

   The evaluator can ask for names of specific tests and, in further questioning, determine if students understand their strengths and weaknesses.

8. Students are familiar with informal assessment techniques.

   Course outlines should indicate that students know how to make and use informal reading inventories. There should be evidence that students are able to apply readability formulas.

9. Students are knowledgable about strengths and limitations of individual and group intelligence tests.

   The evaluator should ask the students to name specific tests and what information was gathered from the tests.

10. Students are able to assess the needs of users of other dialects or languages.

How sensitive are students to the needs of those who use dialects or languages differently? Do they understand the special problems that some of these children may have in school?

Reading Materials

11. Students have an understanding of the impact of the materials on the value and beliefs of children.

Students demonstrate an understanding of proper guidance in book selection for diverse groups of readers (e.g., bibliotherapy, racial and ethnic differences, etc.).

12. Students have an understanding of pedagogical and psychological principles in reading materials for elementary and secondary students.

Students need to have an awareness of child development in this particular instance. If they have had courses in child psychology and children's literature, adolescent psychology and adolescent literature, this competency probably has been met. Otherwise, the evaluator will need to formulate specific questions about student knowledge of the above competency (e.g. Do girls usually like the same books as boys? vice versa?)

13. Students have read current and classic selections of (a) children and (b) adolescent literature.

Specific questions should be asked as to what books students have read.

14. Students have access to good (a) curricular and (b) professional libraries.

The evaluator should investigate the college library as well as collections housed in the department being evaluated.

Reading Skills

15. Students are proficient in teaching word recognition skills.

    Students should demonstrate a knowledge of such concepts as
    sight words, phonics, configuration, syllables, structural
    analysis, context clues, dictionary skills, etc. Word recognition
    skills are referred to as word analysis skills in certain parts of
    Pennsylvania.

16. Students are proficient in developing vocabulary and concepts.

    Students should understand that vocabulary is taught by pulling
    the central words together in the directed reading activity, use
    of dictionary for connotative and denotative meaning, and many
    other ways.

17. Students are proficient in improving aspects of comprehension.

    (a) literal   (b) interpretive (c) applied (d) rate and flexibility

    Students could be asked to define the above and tell how they would
    teach them. Course outlines should be investigated to indicate
    that these principles of comprehension are given their due.

18. Students are proficient in teaching thinking and study skills.

    Students demonstrate a knowledge of such concepts as SQ3R (survey,
    question, read, recite, review), scheduling time, locational
    skills, independent study habits.

19. Students are proficient in teaching skills 15 thru 18 in the content
    areas.

    If it is determined that students are proficient in 15-18, then the
    evaluator need only ask students questions as to how they would
    implement the above skills in the content areas.

-10-

13

Psychological and Pedagogical Principles

20. Students understand basic learning principles relating to children and adolescents.

    Evidence of courses in each student's background relating to growth and development of the child and adolescent seems necessary.

21. Students understand the concept of readiness at all levels of the curriculum.

    When asked to define readiness, the student should indicate that readiness is an ongoing thing; that is to say, each area (N-3, 4-6, 7-9, and 10-12) is preparation for the next stage.

22. Students can apply sustained silent reading appropriately at all levels of the curriculum.

    Students should know the underlying bases for uninterrupted sustained silent reading and how to apply it in the classroom.

23. Students are proficient in teaching strategies such as the directed reading activity, directed reading-thinking activity, and instructional framework.

    Students should be able to explain the strength of following the directed reading inventory (or directed reading activity) in their day-to-day teaching of reading.

24. Students understand terminology such as (a) developmental, (b) corrective, (c) remedial, and (d) learning disabilities.

    See definitions of terms.

25. Students are able to make referrals to other professionals.

    Students demonstrate a knowledge that teaching is a cooperative
    venture. They should know that a child encountering difficulties
    in reading might be referred to the reading specialist, speech
    therapist, school psychologist, etc., and be able to define the
    symptoms which identify a need for referral and describe the
    procedures that must be used to make referrals (e.g., principal,
    parent must be first contact).

26. Students are able to select materials, including textbooks.

    Which means are used to gather this information? How is the
    information used to benefit education?

27. Students are active (a) readers, and (b) users or writers of research.

    Students should be able to name journals that they have read from
    during their training (e.g., Reading Research Quarterly, Academic
    Therapy, Journal of Learning Disabilities, American Education
    English Journal).

28. Students are (a) capable of integrating reading with the other
    language arts and (b) have been taught in a program that does so.

    Students indicate a knowledge that reading is only one part of
    the spectrum. They must know that writing, listening and speaking
    also have great importance. Are they prepared to teach composing?
    language patterns? responses to literature?

29. Students appreciate the need for positive parent-teacher-student
    interaction.

    Without the support and cooperation of parents, much work will be
    to little avail. Ways of involving parents and their children
    in the teaching-learning process should be clearly enunciated.

-12-

15

30. Students have an understanding of the place the reading/language program has in the educational role of the rest of the college or university and to the larger educational mission of the Commonwealth.

Students offer a philosophy that indicates that a literate, educated population is the foundation of our democratic ideals and that reading critically and with ease is the bedrock of that educated, free society.

GUIDELINES FOR TEAMS
EVALUATING THE READING COMPONENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN PENNSYLVANIA

Evaluate the reading component according to the following criteria:

O – not in evidence
W – written into objectives and course outlines but not practiced
C – coverage in the programs is inconsistent
A – adequate coverage in the program
E – excellent coverage in the program
NA – not applicable

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean or Other Response
READING CONCEPTS				
1. Students are aware of a variety of reading definitions and their relationship to the reading communication arts process.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
2. Students understand their roles in relationship to the overall reading program.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

17

18

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean or Other Response
3. Students have an understanding of language as related to reading development.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
4. Students have an understanding of psycholinguistics as related to reading development.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
5. Students understand the concept of individualized learning and/or individualized instruction and are capable of various kinds of classroom organization.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

DIAGNOSTIC TEACHING AND EVALUATION

6. Students understand diagnostic teaching and/or teaching diagnostically.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

-15-

19

20

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean Or Other Response
7. Students are aware of the positive and negative aspects of standardized reading tests.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
8. Students are familiar with <u>informal assessment techniques</u>.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
9. Students are knowledgeable about strengths and limitations of individual and group intelligence tests.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
10. Students are able to assess the needs of other dialects or languages.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

22

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean Or Other Response

READING MATERIALS

11. Students have an understanding of the impact of the materials on the value and beliefs of children and youth.

	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

12. Students have an understanding of pedagogical and psychological principles in reading materials for elementary and secondary students.

	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

13. Students have read current and classical selections of (a) children and (b) adolescent literature.

	(a) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA
	(b) O W C A E NA	(b) O W C A E NA	(b) O W C A E NA	(b) O W C A E NA

-17-

23

24

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean Or Other Response
14. Students have access to good (a) curricular and (b) professional libraries.	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA

READING SKILLS

15. Students are proficient in teaching word recognition skills.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
16. Students are proficient in developing vocabulary and concepts.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
17. Students are proficient in improving aspects of comprehension. (a) literal (b) interpretive (c) applied (d) rate and flexibility	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA (c) O W C A E NA (d) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA (c) O W C A E NA (d) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA (c) O W C A E NA (d) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA (c) O W C A E NA (d) O W C A E NA

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean Or Others Response
18. Students are proficient in teaching thinking and study skills.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
19. Students are proficient in teaching skills 15 through 18 in the content areas.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES

20. Students understand basic learning principles relating growth and development to children and adolescents.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
21. Students understand the concepts of readiness at all levels of the curriculum.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

27

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean Or Other Response
22. Students can apply sustained silent reading appropriately at all levels of the curriculum.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
23. Students are proficient in teaching strategies such as the directed reading activity, directed reading-thinking activity, and instructional framework.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

RELATION OF READING TO THE LARGER EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY

25. Students are able to make referrals to other professionals.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
26. Students are able to select materials, including textbooks.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

-20-

29

30

ERIC

Points of Consideration	Director Response	Faculty Response	Students Response	Dean Or Other Response
27. Students are active (a) readers and (b) users of research.	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA
28. Students are (a) capable of integrating reading with the other language arts and (b) have been taught in a program that does so.	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA	(a) O W C A E NA (b) O W C A E NA
29. Students appreciate the need for positive parent–teacher–student interaction.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA
30. Students have an understanding of the place the reading/language arts program has in the educational role of the rest of the college or university and to the larger educational mission of the Commonwealth.	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA	O W C A E NA

-21-

31

32

DEFINITIONS OF SELECTED TERMS
USED IN THE GUIDELINES

Language: An established system of communication by means of written or spoken symbols.[1]

DRA: Teacher-guided reading activity characterized by use of specific problems, questions, and references.[2]

Corrective Reading: Remedial activities carried on by a regular classroom teacher within the framework of regular class instruction.[3]

Remedial Reading: Remedial activities taking place outside the framework of class instruction; usually conducted by a special teacher of reading.[4] A case of severe reading retardation possibly characterized by an associative learning disability, inadequacies in memory span, deficiencies in concept formation, neurological or emotional complications, etc. Requires clinical treatment with special techniques.

Developmental Reading: Reading instruction designed to develop systematically the skills and abilities considered essential at each grade level.[5]

Teaching Diagnostically: The process of prescribing for pupils learning opportunities based on individually determined needs and objectives.[6]

Slow Learner: (1) A child who exhibits slight intellectual retardation, requires adaptations of instruction, and is slightly below average in learning ability; usually remains in regular class. (2) In terms of intelligence quotient (I.Q.), a pupil who falls within the range from 75 to 89.[7]

---

[1] D. G. Schubert and T. R. Torgerson, A Dictionary of Terms and Concepts in Reading. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1964, p. 133.

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

[3] Ibid., p. 204

[4] Ibid., p. 210.

[5] Ibid., p. 205

[6] Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, p. 589.

[7] Ibid., p. 332.

Psycholinguistics: The discipline concerned with the study of the
relations between communications or messages and the cognitive
or emotional states of the persons who communicate; specifically,
the study of language as related to the general or individual
characteristics of the users of language with emphasis upon
underlying causes of language behavior and its effects on other
activities of the person, thus having implication for other
fields of psychology: an interdisciplinary field.[8]

Learning Disabilities: Children with special learning disabilities
exhibit a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological
processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written
languages. These may be manifested in disorders of listening,
thinking, talking, reading, writing, spelling or arithmetic.
They include conditions which have been referred to as perceptual
handicaps, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia,
developmental aphasia, etc. They do not include learning problems
which are due primarily to visual, hearing, or motor handicaps,
to mental retardation, emotional disturbance, or to environmental
disadvantage.[9]

Concepts: (1) An idea or representation of the common element or attribute
by which groups or classes may be distinguished; (2) any general
or abstract intellectual representation of a situation, state of
affairs, or objects; (3) a thought, an opinion, an idea, or mental
image.[10]

Study Skills: Any special ability used in study, such as reading,
outlining, summarizing or locating materials.[11]

Readability: The quality of a piece of reading matter that makes
it interesting and understandable to those for whom it is written,
at whatever level of educational experience.[12]

Individualization: (1) The organization of instructional material
in a manner that will permit each student to progress in accord
with his own abilities and interests; (2) the provision of
instructional guidance and assistance to individual pupils in
accordance with their needs.[13]

---

[8]Ibid., p. 456.

[9]P.L. 91-230, passed in 1969. Definition given by National Advisory
Committee in USOE.

[10]Carter V. Good, op. cit.

[11]Ibid., p. 537.

[12]Ibid., p. 471

[13]Ibid., p. 305

[14]Russell G. Stauffer, Directing Reading Maturity as a Cognitive Process.
New York: Harper & Row, 1969, pp. 39-40.

References

Botel, Morton. A Comprehensive Reading Communication Arts Plan:
     Working Edition. Harrisburg: Pennsylvania Department of
     Education, 1977.

Califano, Joseph A. Excellence and Equity in the Search for
     Standards. A Paper Presented by the Secretary of Health,
     Education, and Welfare before the College Entrance Examination
     Board Annual Meeting, San Francisco, October 24, 1977.

Committee on Evaluation of Teacher Education Programs in Reading
     of the International Reading Association. Evaluation of Teacher
     Education Programs in Reading: A Proposed Checklist. Newark,
     Delaware: International Reading Association, 1973.

Conference on English Education Committee of the National Council
     of Teachers of English. "Preparation of the Elementary Language
     Arts Teacher," Language Arts. Vol. 53, No. 4, April 1976,
     pp. 363-369.

Corrigan, Ronald. An Address on Teacher Certification before the
     Keystone State Reading Association Board of Directors' Meeting,
     Harrisburg, January 24, 1976.

Jones, Anne L., Louis A. Oliastro and Robin M. Williams. Survey
     Results for the Evaluation of Reading Programs in the Secondary
     Schools in Pennsylvania. A State-of-the Art Paper Presented
     to Keystone State Reading Association, Bloomsburg, August, 1975.

New England Reading Association and the New England Consortium
     for the Right to Read. Recommended Standards for Professional
     Preparation in Reading. Standards approved by the Boards of the
     New England Reading Association and the New England Consortium
     for the Right to Read, 1976.

Pennsylvania. Department of Education, Right to Read Effort. The
     Literacy Line. Vol. 1, November, 1977.

Pennsylvania State Education Association Resolutions. Resolutions
     Adopted by the House of Delegates of the Pennsylvania State
     Education Association, Philadelphia, May 13-14, 1977.

Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International
     Reading Association. Professional Preparation in Reading for
     Classroom Teachers: Minimum Standards. Newark, Delaware:
     International Reading Association, 1955.

Professional Standards and Ethics Committee of the International
     Reading Association. Professional Preparation in Reading for
     Educators in Various Roles: Proposed Minimum Standards. A
     Draft Under Consideration for Adoption by the Board of Directors
     of International Reading Association, 1978.