

Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide



Tools

Kevin G. Smith

Barbara R. Foorman

Florida Center for Reading Research
At Florida State University

This *Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide* was developed to help state-, district-, and school-based practitioners and stakeholders conduct self-studies of planning and implementation of state-required summer reading camp programs for grade 3 students who scored at the lowest level on the state reading assessment. In some states these students face potential retention in grade 3 if they cannot meet grade-level standards for reading through a good-cause exemption, applicable alternate assessment score, or portfolio of student work showing mastery of grade-level reading standards. This guide provides a template for data collection and guiding questions for discussion that may improve instruction and increase the number of students meeting the grade-level standard by the end of the summer reading camp.

Introduction

Several Regional Educational Laboratory (REL) Southeast states are implementing or planning to implement summer reading camps for grade 3 students who have scored at the lowest level on the state reading assessment. Summer reading camps are required multiweek extensions of the school year during which reading intervention is provided. Instruction provided during the summer reading camp is designed to

Improving Literacy Research Alliance members were integral to the creation of the guide: Patty Adams, Juliette Carter, Karla Casteen, Anna-Marie Cote, Heather Diamond, Linda Gaughan, Carolyn Guthrie, Lynda Hayes, Laurie Lee, Melinda Lundy, Karen Spigler, and Liz Woody. These researchers also provided helpful reviews of guide drafts: Elizabeth Bright (RMC Research Corporation) and Carol Connor (Arizona State University). Special thanks to the Just Read, Florida! Office at the Florida Department of Education for its assistance.

help students meet the grade-level standard through a portfolio of student work or satisfactory performance on an alternate assessment.

This self-study guide provides a template for data collection and guiding questions for discussion that may improve instruction and increase the number of students meeting the grade-level standard by the end of the summer reading camp. A computerized Google Forms web-based version of the guide designed to help facilitators collect individual ratings electronically is available for download from the REL Southeast website (<http://rel-se.fcrr.org/>) or by contacting REL Southeast at rel-se@fsu.edu.

Florida has required summer reading camps since 2002, and North Carolina and South Carolina enacted legislation requiring implementation of grade 3 summer reading camps by the summer of 2014. Mississippi has enacted legislation authorizing grade 3 summer reading camps to begin in the summer of 2015. This policy is also in place outside the REL Southeast Region, such as in Arizona, Connecticut, Iowa, and Missouri. In states where this policy is in place, students who have scored at the lowest level on the state reading assessment face potential retention in grade 3 if they cannot meet the grade-level standard for reading through a good-cause exemption, applicable alternate assessment score, or portfolio of student work showing mastery of grade-level reading standards.

This guide will help state-, district-, and school-based practitioners and stakeholders conduct self-studies of planning and implementing state-required summer reading camp programs for grade 3 students. Self-study is a process of using a guide with predetermined focus areas and questions to collect, share, and discuss data with stakeholders, in this case teachers, reading coaches, school-based administrators, and state and district administrators and literacy supervisors knowledgeable in summer reading camp policies and implementation. This process may help educators document current practices in implementing a specific policy and determine how to improve performance.

The guide was developed in partnership with REL Southeast's Improving Literacy Research Alliance. Feedback from alliance members helped shape the development of this guide, which was piloted with a Florida school district and refined based on the pilot report.

States, districts, and schools that are implementing or planning to implement summer reading camps may find this guide helpful as they consider which types of evidence to collect and which components may be important for later evaluation.

Purpose and use of the self-study guide

The purposes of the *Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide* are to help states, districts, and schools:

- Gather baseline information to use in developing an implementation plan for summer reading camps.
- Prioritize their needs as they prepare to develop their implementation plan for summer reading camps.
- Gather progress-monitoring information for continuous improvement of summer reading camps.
- Evaluate the rollout and progress of summer reading camps.

The most important part of this process for states, districts, and schools is the discussion that goes into the self-study. The scores on the *Consensus Rating Form* (see below) should reflect this facilitated discussion.

This guide was designed to promote reflection about current strengths and challenges in planning or implementation, spark conversations among staff, and identify areas for improvement. Based on pilot use of the

guide, this process will take about five hours, and time estimates are provided in the process steps outlined below. It is helpful to elicit input from participating teachers, literacy coaches, and school-based administrators in addition to state and district administrators and literacy supervisors.

The self-study guide works best if a dedicated facilitator leads the effort. This facilitator should be knowledgeable in best practices from research as well as in summer reading camp policies, procedures, and implementation and should review the guide in detail before the self-study. The facilitator should also collect relevant data and possible sources of evidence before convening a meeting. The facilitator should be a careful listener and able to lead and structure discussions around evidence collection and decisionmaking processes for members of the self-study guide team.

Components of the guide

The *Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide* consists of the *Scoring Guide*, *Consensus Rating Form*, and *Planning Next Steps Form*.

Scoring Guide. The *Scoring Guide* includes guiding questions and potential sources of evidence to support states and districts in reviewing state, district, and school-based planning and implementation of the camps. The *Scoring Guide* is tied to district and school actions and uses a four-point scale to assess the current status of implementation. The content of the *Scoring Guide* is based on the following eight areas, which research shows as being associated with strong implementation of summer reading camps: teacher effectiveness and qualifications; student selection and enrollment; instructional time; content and instruction; assessment selection and data use; mentoring and paraprofessional use; camp and classroom environment; and communication with administration, staff, and parents. Citations for each area are listed in the section “Support for *Scoring Guide* areas.” Box 1 lists the steps for completing the *Scoring Guide*.

Consensus Rating Form. After the *Scoring Guide* is completed, a facilitator guides the self-study team through a consensus rating process. The team uses the *Consensus Rating Form* to reach agreement on the current status of implementation in the district or school and on planning the next steps. Box 1 lists the steps for completing the *Consensus Rating Guide*.

Planning Next Steps Form. Prioritize the areas based on the strength of evidence and importance for success as described in the literature. Review the consensus scores showing a need to develop or improve. Identify two or three top priorities from the eight areas for action planning and record the priority areas. Complete a detailed plan for next steps and activities and note any potential challenges on the *Planning Next Steps Form*. [Activity length – 60 minutes]

Box 1. Steps to complete the *Scoring Guide* and *Consensus Rating Form*

- Recruit the members who will make up the self-study team and convene a meeting to complete this process. Select a dedicated and knowledgeable facilitator. Then recruit teachers, reading coaches, school-based administrators, and district personnel knowledgeable in summer reading camp policies and implementation to complete the team.
 - Present an overview of the self-study process to all members of the team, including a review of relevant data and possible sources of evidence collected by the facilitator.
[Activity length – 30 minutes]
 - Review, individually, the content of the *Scoring Guide* for each specific area that will be rated (for example, Teacher Effectiveness and Qualifications, Student Selection and Enrollment, and Instructional Time) and the section “Support for *Scoring Guide* areas.”
[Activity length – 20 minutes]
 - Discuss any questions asked during the review. Questions should be answered by the facilitator after the overview and document review.
[Activity length – 20 minutes]
 - Rate each area individually using the full *Scoring Guide*, including a review of relevant data/possible sources of evidence provided by the facilitator. Each team member should rate each area independently; this is an opportunity for each person’s voice to be heard. A team member who does not know how to rate a specific area may abstain from rating it.
[Activity length – 60 minutes]
 - Vote as a group to reach consensus. There are several steps to consensus voting
[Activity length – 90 minutes]:
 - Vote. Ask each member to provide their numerical ranking for each area (1–8).
 - Identify frequency. Identify the most frequent number (if three members vote 3, five vote 2, and two vote 1, the most frequent number that members voted is 2).
 - Discuss rationale of the high frequency number. Ask someone who selected the consensus number to talk about what motivated that vote.
 - Discuss rationale of lower frequency numbers. Ask other members talk about why they voted in a particular way.
 - Vote. Use numeric voting a second time. Members may change their votes based on the discussion.
 - Record rating. If there is consensus, record the high frequency number on the *Consensus Rating Form*. If consensus is not reached (there is no high frequency number), continue discussing and voting until consensus is reached.
 - Continue across all areas. Repeat this process for each area.
 - Discuss and record initial team thoughts on priorities, next steps, and activities on the *Consensus Rating Form*.
[Activity length – 20 minutes]
-

Self-Study Guide

Scoring Guide

Scoring Guide Area 1: Teacher Effectiveness and Qualifications	SG-1
Scoring Guide Area 2: Student Selection and Enrollment	SG-2
Scoring Guide Area 3: Instructional Time	SG-3
Scoring Guide Area 4: Content and Instruction	SG-4
Scoring Guide Area 5: Assessment Selection and Data Use	SG-5
Scoring Guide Area 6: Mentoring and Paraprofessional Use	SG-6
Scoring Guide Area 7: Camp and Classroom Environment	SG-7
Scoring Guide Area 8: Communication with Administration, Staff, and Parents	SG-8

Consensus Rating Form	SG-9
------------------------------	-------------

Planning Next Steps Form	SG-10
---------------------------------	--------------

Support for Scoring Guide areas	SG-11
--	--------------

Scoring Guide Area 2: Student Selection and Enrollment

Parents of students showing deficiencies in reading during the school year are notified in a timely manner. Eligible students are successfully enrolled, and parents are provided accurate, timely information about student selection and attendance.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

4 = Already in place
3 = Partially in place, under development
2 = Area to develop or improve
1 = Not feasible now

1. The district/school has a policy for early notification for parents of students showing deficiencies in reading during the school year. Students scoring below the state proficiency level in reading are quickly identified once reading scores are released to determine eligibility for summer reading camp (Hamilton et al., 2009).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- Strategic plan.
- Memos to schools.
- Diagnostic/progress monitoring data through the response to intervention process.
- Parent notification sample letters/templates.
- Student portfolios.
- Administrative/guidance counselor/assessment coordinator training.

Guiding questions

- Is there a process to ensure that educators are notifying parents about potential reading deficiencies during the school year?
- Is there a process to ensure efficient data collection/reporting from the reading assessment once scores are released?

2. Procedures are in place to provide summer reading camp parents with accurate, timely information about all relevant policies, procedures, and expectations for attendance (Borman & Dowling, 2006).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- Strategic plan.
- Memos to schools.
- Parent notification sample letters/templates.
- Parental support documentation.
- Notification to charter schools inviting eligible grade 3 students to attend district camps.
- Attendance policy, records, and notifications.

Guiding questions

- Does the district have timelines/guidelines for parental notification?
- Are there expectations for schools/teachers to communicate with parents during the summer reading camp?

Scoring Guide Area 3: Instructional Time

Summer reading camp schedules facilitate intensive reading intervention for the populations of students served. The district/school motivates student attendance and engagement.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

4 = Already in place
3 = Partially in place, under development
2 = Area to develop or improve
1 = Not feasible now

1. The district/school has established a schedule that will maximize student instructional time (Foorman & Al Otaiba, 2009). The district/school motivates student attendance and engagement (Borman & Dowling, 2006).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- School and district plans.
- Staff, student, and parent interviews.
- Student attendance records.
- Published schedules by the district/schools, including the number of days, weeks, and hours of instruction (Kim & Quinn, 2013).
- Reviews of student reading data, summer reading camp calendars, and instructional schedules that align instructional time and student needs.

Guiding questions

- Do instructional schedules created by the district/schools allow time for whole group (13 or fewer students) and small group (3–5 students) instruction?
- Does the length of time students participate in the camp offer the optimal amount of instructional time for positive outcomes (Schacter & Jo, 2005)?
- Does the district/school consider ways to motivate student attendance and engagement?

2. Students receive as much small group (3–5 students) instructional time as possible (Shanahan et al., 2010).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- School plans.
- Classroom schedules.
- Differentiated schedules providing more time for English language learners, special education students, and other students with severe reading difficulties.
- Staff interviews.
- District observations.

Guiding questions

- Does small group instruction occur on an ongoing basis?
- Is the amount of small group instructional time provided differentiated based on specific student needs?
- Does the district/school provide professional support to staff seeking assistance in structuring small group instructional time?

Scoring Guide Area 4: Content and Instruction

The design of the reading curriculum and the plan for reading instruction and intervention reflect instructional practices that have been empirically shown to support gains in student achievement. The focus should be on explicit and systematic instruction in foundational reading skills based on student need (for example, phonics and vocabulary/oral language comprehension).

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

4 = Already in place
3 = Partially in place, under development
2 = Area to develop or improve
1 = Not feasible now

1. The district/school has established criteria for selecting and using reading programs and curricula that have been shown to have a positive effect on student achievement (Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 2003).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of program selection criteria with an emphasis on using materials that have rigorous research support.
- Policies and procedures for adoption of materials.
- Analysis of program use and classroom observations.
- Memos to schools.
- Professional development records.

Guiding questions

- Have criteria been developed to select programs and materials for use with students in summer reading camps?
- Has professional development been provided to summer reading camp teachers to support effective use of reading programs and curriculum?

2. The district/school has implemented a plan for reading instruction and intervention that reflects instructional practices empirically shown to increase student achievement. The focus is on explicit and systematic instruction in foundational reading skills based on student need (for example, phonics and vocabulary/oral language comprehension) (Gersten et al., 2008).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- Professional development plans for summer reading camp teachers including instructional materials (Borman & Dowling, 2006), an instructional schedule that maximizes instructional time, and instructional practices empirically shown to increase student achievement.
- Instructional plans created by district staff and teachers.
- Interviews with administrators and staff.
- Classroom observations.
- Professional development records.
- Professional development evaluations.
- Progress monitoring tools and data.

Guiding questions

- Does the professional development offered for summer reading camp teachers focus on instructional practices empirically shown to increase student achievement (Beck & Beck, 2012)?
- Do district/school staff help teachers develop instructional plans for reading instruction/intervention using student assessment information?
- Do classroom observations help district/school staff verify implementation and support of effective instructional practices?
- Is there research evidence of efficacy for teachers' instructional practices with regard to student outcomes?

Scoring Guide Area 5: Assessment Selection and Data Use

Exemptions from the reading requirement are approved by the state education agency for use in making promotion decisions. Other valid and reliable standardized assessments are selected based on their alignment with instructional content and are used to establish small groups and inform instruction. (This may include assessments that provide information on student performance in fluency, word knowledge, vocabulary, and comprehension, for example.)

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

4 = Already in place
3 = Partially in place, under development
2 = Area to develop or improve
1 = Not feasible now

1. Only exemptions from the requirement approved by the state education agency are used in making promotion decisions.	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence	Guiding questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of assessments used for promotion decisions. • Documentation of a review of state policies and procedures in place for exemptions from the state requirement. • Records of students promoted through state-approved exemptions. • Student portfolios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the district/school verify policies and procedures for state-approved exemptions used for promotion? • Does the district/school maintain accurate records for students promoted through state-approved exemptions?

2. Other valid and reliable standardized assessments (including diagnostic reading assessments) were selected based on alignment with the content of instruction (such as performance in fluency, word knowledge, vocabulary, and comprehension) and were used to establish small groups and inform instruction (Hamilton et al., 2009).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence	Guiding questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of reading assessment selection criteria. • Documentation of alignment between reading assessments and instructional materials. • Professional development plans for summer reading camp teachers that include assessment policies, data-based instructional decisionmaking, and work with small student groups based on instructional needs. • Instructional plans created by district staff and teachers. • Interviews with administrators and staff. • Classroom observations. • Professional development records. • Professional development evaluations. • Data review from the end of summer reading camps. • Student portfolios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do valid and reliable assessments provide information on student performance in fluency, word knowledge, vocabulary, and comprehension? • Does the professional development offered for summer reading camp teachers focus on assessment policies, data-based instructional decisionmaking, and work with small student groups based on instructional needs? • Do classroom observations help district and school staff verify and support effective data-based instructional decisionmaking and small group instruction based on student needs? • From a review of data following the conclusion of summer reading camps, do results show that students are improving key reading skills as a result of the instruction? • Is planning for future summer reading camps based on student data from previous summer reading camps?

Scoring Guide Area 6: Mentoring and Paraprofessional Use

The district or school develops and implements a plan to provide trained mentors and paraprofessionals to reinforce students' reading skills in the smallest group sizes possible.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

4 = Already in place
3 = Partially in place, under development
2 = Area to develop or improve
1 = Not feasible now

1. The district or school develops and implements a plan to provide trained paraprofessionals, if available, to reinforce students' reading skills in the smallest group sizes possible (Elbaum, Vaughn, Tejero Hughes, & Watson Moody, 2000).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of hiring, training, and work hours of paraprofessionals.
- Documentation of summer reading camp schedules providing instructional time in small groups to reinforce student reading skills.

Guiding questions

- Does the district/school hire, train, and use paraprofessionals to reduce group sizes and reinforce student reading skills in summer reading camps?

2. The district plans to use mentors to reinforce students' reading skills in the smallest group sizes possible (Foorman & Al Otaiba, 2009).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

Possible sources of evidence

- Documentation of recruitment, training, and volunteer hours of mentors.
- Documentation of summer reading camp schedules providing instructional time in small groups to reinforce student reading skills.

Guiding questions

- Does the district/school recruit, train, and use mentors to reduce group sizes to help reinforce student reading skills in summer reading camps?

Scoring Guide Area 7: Camp and Classroom Environment

A healthy and safe learning environment is established that is conducive to student engagement and intensive reading instruction.

- Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.*
- 4 = Already in place
 - 3 = Partially in place, under development
 - 2 = Area to develop or improve
 - 1 = Not feasible now

1. A healthy and safe learning environment has been established.	Implementation progress			
	4	3	2	1

Possible sources of evidence	Guiding questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of district/school criteria for school/classroom selection for summer reading camp use. • Documentation of a custodial/maintenance plan for schools/classrooms during summer reading camp use. • Procedures are established for teachers to report concerns about the learning environment and for these concerns to be addressed quickly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have criteria been developed to select schools/classrooms for summer reading camps that will provide healthy and safe learning environments free from maintenance distractions (painting, floor waxing, and other work)? • Do classroom observations help district/school staff verify selection of schools/classrooms that provide a healthy and safe learning environment?

2. The learning environment is conducive to student engagement and intensive reading instruction (Tanner, 2008).	Implementation progress			
	4	3	2	1

Possible sources of evidence	Guiding questions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation of media center availability and support at the summer reading camp site. • Documentation of technology availability and support at the summer reading camp site. • Documentation that instructional materials and other needed resources are available and organized at the summer reading camp site. • Documentation of a selection process for schools/classrooms that includes the best physical environment for summer reading camps. • Interviews with administrators and staff. • Classroom observations for student engagement and motivation. • Class size. • Documentation of print-rich environments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the media center at the summer reading camp site open and staffed? • Is all technology needed for summer reading camp programs available, with support staff as needed? • Are instructional materials and any other needed resources for summer reading camp teachers available and organized at the summer reading camp site? • Do classroom observations help district/school staff verify that the summer reading camp environment is conducive to student engagement, motivation, and intensive reading instruction? • Do selected schools/classrooms include the best physical environment for summer reading camps (including space and furniture for large and small group instruction, lighting, and other features)?

Scoring Guide Area 8: Communication with Administration, Staff, and Parents

A communication plan is developed and implemented to provide relevant information for summer reading camp administrators and staff and for ongoing communication with students' prior-year and next-year teachers and with parents to help reinforce students' reading skills at home.

Circle the rating that best describes your program's implementation progress for each item.

4 = Already in place
3 = Partially in place, under development
2 = Area to develop or improve
1 = Not feasible now

1. A communication plan was developed and is being implemented to provide relevant information for summer reading camp administrators and staff and for ongoing communications with students' prior-year and next-year teachers (Hamilton et al., 2009).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

- Possible sources of evidence**
- Documentation of a district/school communication plan for administrators and staff providing instruction during summer reading camps.
 - Documentation of communication between summer reading camp teachers and prior grade 3 teachers and next-year teachers.
 - Memos from the district to schools.
 - Memos from school administration to teachers.
 - Interviews with administrators and staff.

- Guiding questions**
- Does the district/school provide timely, accurate, and relevant information to summer reading camp administrators and staff?
 - Do summer reading camp teachers communicate with prior-year and next-year teachers to obtain and share information that will support data-based decisionmaking?

2. A communication plan was developed and implemented to provide ongoing communication with parents to reinforce students' reading skills at home (Gonzalez-DeHass, Willems, & Holbein, 2005).	Implementation progress
	4 3 2 1

- Possible sources of evidence**
- Documentation of communication with parents.
 - Documentation of activities provided for parents to help reinforce students' reading skills (Kim & Quinn, 2013).
 - Documentation of ongoing parental support for student reading instruction (Henderson & Mapp, 2002).
 - Interviews with administrators and staff.
 - Interviews with parents.
 - Summer reading camp progress reports and student activities for parents.

- Guiding questions**
- Does the district/school have a plan to establish and maintain communication with parents?
 - Do teachers provide students and parents with activities and information that will help reinforce students' reading skills at home?

Consensus Rating Form
(to be completed by the facilitator)

State _____

District _____

School _____

Complete this form by recording the results of consensus ratings and discussions from initial self-study results, initial thoughts on priorities, and initial brainstorming ideas for next steps/activities for each area rated 2 or 3.

Scoring Guide area	Consensus ^a	Priorities	Ideas for next steps/activities
Area 1. Teacher Effectiveness and Qualifications	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 2. Student Selection and Enrollment	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 3. Instructional Time	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 4. Content and Instruction	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 5. Assessment Selection and Data Use	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 6. Mentoring and Paraprofessional Use	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 7. Camp and Classroom Environment	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		
Area 8. Communication with Administration, Staff, and Parents	Part 1: 4 3 2 1 Part 2: 4 3 2 1		

a. 4 = Already in place; 3 = Partially in place, under development; 2 = Area to develop or improve; 1 = Not feasible now.

Planning Next Steps Form
(to be completed by the facilitator)

After the *Consensus Rating Form* has been completed, the facilitator will begin the completion of this form by leading a discussion with the group about the priorities for action based on the strength of evidence and importance for success as described in the literature. The facilitator will next lead a discussion for the development of a detailed plan for next steps and activities that are most urgent and actionable. Finally, the facilitator will lead a discussion to capture potential challenges to the plan.

Based on group discussion and consensus ratings, list the top priority areas to develop or improve.

Based on group discussion, what next steps and activities are needed to address the listed priorities? Consider timelines and who will be responsible for determining the strategies or providing the resources.

Based on group discussion, what general challenges do you anticipate? How will the challenges be addressed? Consider who will be responsible for addressing these challenges.

Support for Scoring Guide areas

This appendix describes key references that provide additional support for each of the *Scoring Guide* areas.

Scoring Guide Area 1: Teacher Effectiveness and Qualifications

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Effects of multiyear summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 25–48.

In this work, Borman and Dowling note the importance of expectations and training for teachers hired for the Teach Baltimore Summer Academy program. Teachers hired for this program received three weeks of preservice training in reading curricula, lesson planning, and classroom management. Also noted was that, “Aligning the content of the program with the regular school-year materials and instruction used in the schools served by the program also helped convince parents, teachers, and principals of the saliency of the Summer Academy for students’ continued academic success during the school year” (p. 45).

Foorman, B., & Wanzek, J. (2015). Classroom reading instruction for all students. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *The handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of multi-tiered systems of support*. New York: Springer Science.

In this work, Foorman and Wanzek note: “What is abundantly clear from research (e.g., Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, Schatschneider, & Mehta, 1998; Mathes et al., 2005; Simmons et al., 2008) and from consensus documents (National Research Council, 1998; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000) is that explicit instruction in the alphabetic principle of how letters map to sounds in English is necessary to learn to decode and to prevent reading difficulties. However, mastery of the alphabetic principle must be coupled with construction of meaning—at the word, sentence, and text level—if comprehension is to occur (Foorman & Connor, 2001; Rayner, Foorman, Perfetti, Pesetsky, & Seidenberg, 2001). Thus, reading/language arts instruction in the primary grades must consist of (a) mastering the encoding and decoding of the alphabet and (b) building oral and academic language and written language comprehension (American Educational Research Association, 2009)” (p. 10).

Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children’s achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386–431.

In this meta-analysis, Kim and Quinn note that with summer “classroom interventions, the quantity and quality of teacher-directed literacy instruction is the critical mechanism that promotes reading achievement (Tseng & Seidman, 2007)” (p. 387). In addition, Kim and Quinn note the need to “illuminate the critical mechanisms inside classrooms—most notably, the quality of teachers’ instructional practice and emotional support for learning—that underlie the observed improvements in reading achievement during the summer” (p. 35). Kim and Quinn found that “there was a positive impact of classroom interventions using research-based instruction on reading comprehension total” (p. 410). Also noted is that “classroom-based interventions should implement explicit, teacher-directed instruction of high-utility words that enable children to read proficiently during the school year (Beck & McKeown, 1991; Snow, 2002)” (p. 419).

Scoring Guide Area 2: Student Selection and Enrollment

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Effects of multiyear summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 25–48.

Evidence from this study suggests that “developing a better understanding of how parents and schools from high-poverty communities can work together to improve participation in summer school could prove to be a highly productive research and policy initiative” (p. 46).

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>

Recommendation 3 from this practice guide suggests that educators should establish a clear vision for schoolwide data use. They can do so by developing “a strong culture of data use to ensure that data-based decisions are made frequently, consistently, and appropriately. This data culture should emphasize collaboration across and within grade levels and subject areas to diagnose problems and refine educational practices. Several factors (e.g., planning, leadership, implementation, and attitude) affect the success schools will have with developing and maintaining a data culture” (p. 27).

Scoring Guide Area 3: Instructional Time

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Effects of multiyear summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 25–48.

Evidence from this study suggests that summer school programs can “help improve longitudinal learning for students from high-poverty schools, but only with students’ regular attendance in the program” (p. 46).

Foorman, B., & Al Otaiba, S. (2009). Reading remediation: State of the art. In K. Pugh & P. McCardle (Eds.), *How children learn to read* (pp. 257–274). New York: Psychology Press.

Foorman and Al Otaiba conclude: “The principal’s leadership is crucial to guaranteeing a minimum of 90 minutes a day of uninterrupted reading/language arts instruction, with flexible scheduling to allow supplemental small-group instruction that addresses the needs of individual students not responding adequately to classroom instruction. Schools as well as entire districts (e.g., Fielding, Kerr, & Rosier, 2007) have implemented a successful RTI model based on these principles” (p. 270).

Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children’s achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386–431.

Kim and Quinn find that “[s]tudies that provide fewer than 43 hours or more than 210 hours did not produce statistically significant, positive effects” (p. 424). In addition this meta-analysis found, “suggestive evidence that the five resource-intensive programs with small class sizes of 13 or fewer children, 4 to 8 hours of daily program time, and 70 to 175 hours of total program time had a positive effect on reading achievement” (p. 420).

Schacter, J., & Jo, B. (2005). Learning when school is not in session: A reading summer day-camp intervention to improve the achievement of exiting first-grade students who are economically disadvantaged. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 28(2), 158–169.

This work suggests “that the duration of the majority of summer school programmes, often between three and six weeks, is too short for students to accomplish meaningful learning gains” (p. 160).

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2010–4038). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

This practice guide for improving reading comprehension for kindergarten to grade 3 students recommends that teachers “form small groups of students with similar comprehension needs or skills, allowing them to focus targeted help on a few students at a time” (p. 16). Also, teachers should “[h]ave students lead structured small-group discussions” (p. 27).

Scoring Guide Area 4: Content and Instruction

Beck, I. L., & Beck, M. E. (2012). *Making sense of phonics: The hows and whys* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Publications.

In this book, Beck and Beck point out the evidence that teacher understanding of systematic and explicit phonics instruction is key to student success in reading.

Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Effects of multiyear summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 25–48.

This study suggests that participating educators in the Teach Baltimore Summer Academy program begin with three weeks of preservice training, including training in reading curricula.

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. (2003). *Identifying and implementing educational practices supported by rigorous evidence: A user-friendly guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

According to this guide, “If practitioners have the tools to identify evidence-based interventions, they may be able to spark major improvements in their schools and, collectively, in American education” (p. iii).

Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. D. (2008). *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to intervention and multi-tier intervention for reading in the primary grades. A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2009–4045). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.

This practice guide finds strong evidence for providing “intensive, systematic instruction on up to three foundational reading skills in small groups to students who score below the benchmark score on universal screening. Typically, these groups meet between three and five times a week, for 20 to 40 minutes” (p. 6). This guide also recommends that teachers “[p]rovide intensive instruction on a daily basis that promotes the development of the various components of reading proficiency to students who show minimal progress after reasonable time in tier 2 small group instruction (tier 3)” (p. 6).

Scoring Guide Area 5: Assessment Selection and Data Use

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>

Recommendation 1 of this practice guide notes: “Teachers should adopt a systematic process for using data in order to bring evidence to bear on their instructional decisions and improve their ability to meet students’ learning needs. The process of using data to improve instruction, the panel believes, can be understood as cyclical. It includes a step for collecting and preparing data about student learning from a variety of relevant sources, including annual, interim, and classroom assessment data. After preparing data for examination, teachers should interpret the data and develop hypotheses about factors contributing to students’ performance and the specific actions they can take to meet students’ needs. Teachers then should test these hypotheses by implementing changes to their instructional practice. Finally, they should restart the cycle by collecting and interpreting new student performance data to evaluate their own instructional changes” (p. 10).

Scoring Guide Area 6: Mentoring and Paraprofessional Use

Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Tejero Hughes, M., & Watson Moody, S. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605–619.

This meta-analysis concludes that “[t]he effectiveness of one-to-one instruction has been validated by empirical research, especially for students who are considered at risk for school failure or have been identified as having reading or learning disabilities” (p. 605). The meta-analysis also revealed that “college students and trained, reliable community volunteers were able to provide significant help to struggling readers” (p. 616). The use of paraprofessionals for similar purposes was also cited in the meta-analysis.

Foorman, B., & Al Otaiba, S. (2009). Reading remediation: State of the art. In K. Pugh & P. McCardle (Eds.), *How children learn to read*. (pp. 257–274) New York: Psychology Press.

This book concludes: “Several decades of research on effective reading intervention shows us that it is possible to substantially reduce the 36% of fourth graders reading below grade level on NAEP or the 17.5% of students with reading disabilities. Better classroom instruction can reduce the numbers of low-achieving students to around 5%. Supplemental small-group or one-on-one tutoring can reduce the numbers even further to 1%–3%” (p. 270).

Scoring Guide Area 7: Camp and Classroom Environment

Tanner, C. K. (2008). Explaining relationships among student outcomes and the school’s physical environment. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 19(3), 444–471.

The summary of this descriptive study notes that the purpose was to investigate “the possible effects of selected school design patterns on third-grade students’ academic achievement” (p. 445). The school’s physical environment was defined through four sets of design patterns: “movement and circulation (e.g., adequate personal space and efficient movement patterns throughout the school), large group meeting places (e.g., social gathering places), day lighting and views (e.g., windows with natural light), and instructional

neighborhoods (e.g., large and small group areas that accommodate wet and dry activities)” (p. 445). The findings note that “each of the four full regression models, which included subsets of the design elements, explained between 2% and 7% of additional variance in achievement when compared to the reduced model, which included a measure of school SES. Therefore, each of the four design variables was positively related to student achievement, even after controlling for school SES” (p. 445).

Scoring Guide Area 8: Communication with Administration, Staff, and Parents

Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R., Willems, P. P., & Holbein, M. F. D. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), 99–123.

This review reports that teacher involvement with parents at home helped reinforce student reading. It notes that parents in a study who received communication from the school and were encouraged to help their children with reading activities and listen to them read reported that “their child’s overall interest, enjoyment in reading, and motivation to read had increased. In fact, parents as well as teachers in the home–school conditions reported seeing students display more interest in discussing books, reading books not assigned, and being motivated to read at home” (p. 117).

Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>

Recommendation 3 of this practice guide suggests: “Schools must establish a strong culture of data use to ensure that data-based decisions are made frequently, consistently, and appropriately. This data culture should emphasize collaboration across and within grade levels and subject areas to diagnose problems and refine educational practices” (p. 27).

Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement* (Annual Synthesis 2002). Austin, TX: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

A summary provided in this synthesis report notes: “When schools engage families in ways that are linked to improving learning, students make greater gains. When schools build partnerships with families that respond to their concerns and honor their contributions, they are successful in sustaining connections that are aimed at improving student achievement” (p. 8).

Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children’s achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386–431.

Kim and Quinn note: “Although most home interventions do not include a school-based event prior to the summer, it is critical to strengthen the home-school connection” (p. 421).

References

- Beck, I. L., & Beck, M. E. (2012). *Making sense of phonics: The hows and whys*, 2d ed. New York: Guilford Publications.
- Borman, G. D., & Dowling, N. M. (2006). Effects of multiyear summer school: Evidence from the Teach Baltimore randomized field trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 28(1), 25–48.
- Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy. (2003). *Identifying and implementing educational practices supported by rigorous evidence: A user-friendly guide*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance.
- Elbaum, B., Vaughn, S., Tejero Hughes, M., & Watson Moody, S. (2000). How effective are one-to-one tutoring programs in reading for elementary students at risk for reading failure? A meta-analysis of the intervention research. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(4), 605–619.
- Foorman, B., & Al Otaiba, S. (2009). Reading remediation: State of the art. In K. Pugh & P. McCardle (Eds.), *How children learn to read*. (pp. 257–274) New York: Psychology Press.
- Foorman, B., & Wanzek, J. (2015). Classroom reading instruction for all students. In S. R. Jimerson, M. K. Burns, & A. M. VanDerHeyden (Eds.), *The handbook of response to intervention: The science and practice of multi-tiered systems of support*. New York: Springer Science, Inc.
- Gersten, R., Compton, D., Connor, C. M., Dimino, J., Santoro, L., Linan-Thompson, S., & Tilly, W. D. (2008). *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to Intervention and multi-tier intervention for reading in the primary grades. A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2009–4045). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>
- Gonzalez-DeHass, A. R., Willems, P. P., & Holbein, M. F. D. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), 99–123.
- Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE No. 2009–4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>
- Henderson, A. T., & Mapp, K. L. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement* (Annual Synthesis 2002). Austin, TX: National Center for Family & Community Connections with Schools Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Kim, J. S., & Quinn, D. M. (2013). The effects of summer reading on low-income children's achievement from kindergarten to grade 8: A meta-analysis of classroom and home interventions. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 386–431.
- Schacter, J., & Jo, B. (2005). Learning when school is not in session: A reading summer day-camp intervention to improve the achievement of exiting first-grade students who are economically disadvantaged. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 28(2), 158–169.

Shanahan, T., Callison, K., Carriere, C., Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Schatschneider, C., & Torgesen, J. (2010). *Improving reading comprehension in kindergarten through 3rd grade: A practice guide* (NCEE No. 2010-4038). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Tanner, C. K. (2008). Explaining relationships among student outcomes and the school's physical environment. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 19(3), 444-471.

REL 2015–070

The National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE) conducts unbiased large-scale evaluations of education programs and practices supported by federal funds; provides research-based technical assistance to educators and policymakers; and supports the synthesis and the widespread dissemination of the results of research and evaluation throughout the United States.

February 2015

This report was prepared for the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) under Contract ED-IES-12-C-0011 by Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast administered by the Florida Center for Reading Research, Florida State University. The content of the publication does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IES or the U.S. Department of Education nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

This REL report is in the public domain. While permission to reprint this publication is not necessary, it should be cited as:

Smith, K. G., & Foorman, B. R. (2015). *Summer Reading Camp Self-Study Guide* (REL 2015–070). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southeast. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

This report is available on the Regional Educational Laboratory website at <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>.

The Regional Educational Laboratory Program produces 7 types of reports

	Making Connections Studies of correlational relationships
	Making an Impact Studies of cause and effect
	What's Happening Descriptions of policies, programs, implementation status, or data trends
	What's Known Summaries of previous research
	Stated Briefly Summaries of research findings for specific audiences
	Applied Research Methods Research methods for educational settings
	Tools Help for planning, gathering, analyzing, or reporting data or research