Perspectives: Public High School Principles of Illinois 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence on the Design and Supervision of Reading Programs in Their Repective Schools

Jerry Lee Anderson
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons

Recommended Citation
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3758

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License. Copyright © 1998 Jerry Lee Anderson
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PERSPECTIVES: PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS OF ILLINOIS 1996
BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS OF EXCELLENCE ON THE DESIGN AND
SUPERVISION OF READING PROGRAMS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE SCHOOLS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

BY
JERRY LEE ANDERSON

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
MAY 1998
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you Dr. Janis Fine for your assistance and support as my dissertation advisor and to Dr. Phil Carlin and Dr. Art Safer my many thanks for serving as my committee members. Thank you Dr. Steven Miller for getting me off to a good start. To Dr. Barbara Swaby, my gratitude for letting me know it was possible.

My sincere appreciation to my grandmother and my mother for everything they have done to encourage and inspire me to achieve. To my husband and my children, thank you very much for your patience, understanding, and support.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student Enrollment, District Operating Expense per Pupil, and State Average for the Same Type School District, by School</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Average Class Size, by School</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teacher Experience and Education, by School</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers in Schools, by Racial/Ethnic Background</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pupil-Teacher Ratio and Pupil-Administrator Ratio, by School</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Racial/Ethnic Background of Students, by School</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Low Income Students, by School</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Limited English Proficiency Rate of Students, by School</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Attendance, Chronic Truancy, and Dropouts, by School</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Graduation Rate of Students, by School</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Student IGAP Scores in Reading, by School</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Comparison of IGAP Scores with State Goals, by School</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Student Scores in Reading, by School</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Present and Most Recent Past Position of the Instructional Leaders in Their Current District and Total Number of Years for Both Positions, by School</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Self-Identified Strengths of the Instructional Leaders, by Skill and by School</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Overall Reading Staff Development and New Teacher Staff Development for Reading Instruction, by School....................... 93
17. Tests Identified by Instruction Leaders to Assess Student Reading Achievement........... 96
18. Instructional Leader’s Perception of Their Respective School’s Philosophy of Reading Instruction and Personal Belief Statements, By School.................................... 99
19. Identified Factors Causing Interference with Reading Instruction, by School....................... 106
20. Identified factors which could Improve Reading Instruction, by School.......................... 107
21. Reading Courses Available at School A........... 110
22. Reading Course Offered at School C.............. 113
23. Reading Course Offerings at School E............ 115
24. Comparison of the Design Factors of the Reading Programs of the 1996 Illinois Public High Schools Recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence................................... 123
25. Comparison of the Performance and Demographics of the 1996 Illinois Public High Schools Recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence................................. 124
26. Course Objectives According to the Course Descriptions of the Award Winning Schools.... 133
ABSTRACT

This study identified commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence. It also compared and contrasted the perspective of the principal to their respective school's written documentation about reading instruction. It identified how the supervision of reading instruction occurs in high school and because of the limited amount of information available, added to the body of information on reading instruction at the high school level.

The following research questions were addressed:
1. How are reading programs designed and supervised in Illinois public high schools recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence?
2. What role does the principal have in the supervision of reading instruction?
3. What are the underlying philosophical beliefs of the reading programs?
4. What pedagogy is advocated for reading instruction?
5. Who is responsible for reading instruction and assessment?
6. What are the identified course objectives?
7. Where does reading instruction take place?
8. Who is the targeted population for reading instruction?

The participating instructional leaders of the award
winning schools were interviewed and the data was analyzed using qualitative research methods. For each school, there was also a descriptive analysis of the school report card and of written documentation on the reading program.

The principal’s participation in the supervision of reading instruction varied among the schools. Some principals assumed a more active role while others gave responsibility to the person who directly observed and evaluated reading instruction, in most cases the English department head. The principals assumed a managerial role in their respective school’s reading program organizing for instruction and setting goals for student achievement.

The reading programs of each school included remedial reading instruction, especially at the freshman level. A smaller percentage had developmental reading classes for freshmen and upperclassmen. Although the idea of content area reading instruction was supported by the instructional leaders, there was little evidence of its existence in written documentation.
CHAPTER 1

WHY READ FURTHER?: RATIONALE AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Reading is a basic life skill. It is a cornerstone for a child's success in school, and indeed, throughout life. Without the ability to read well, opportunities for personal fulfillment and job success inevitably will be lost.¹

Why read further? Because reading is such an integral part of the learning that takes place in schools on a daily basis. The need for reading instruction is not typically a subject of debate in the field of education, but what does complicate reading instruction in schools is the significant debate concerning how to teach reading, where to teach reading, and when to teach reading. When a comprehensive definition of reading is examined, the complexity of reading instruction becomes more evident:

Reading is a complex process in which the recognition and comprehension of written symbols are influenced by readers' perceptual skills, decoding skills, experiential backgrounds, mind set, and reasoning abilities as they anticipate meaning on the basis of what they have read. The total process is a gestalt, or whole; a serious flaw in any major function or part may prevent adequate performance.²

With reading being such an involved process, reading


instruction has become an intricate web of approaches and strategies. Skills based instruction and whole language instruction, each implemented in a variety of ways, stand at the center of a methodological debate in which a myriad of other methodologies exists, each having their own merit. While some reading programs focus primarily on one method of reading instruction, other reading programs teach to reading styles operating on the premise "that no single method is 'best' for every child. Children possess a wide range of strengths and abilities; teachers need to master a similarly wide range of strategies so that they can match their instructional approach to the most appropriate way of engaging the child."  

Reading instruction, using whichever method(s) of instruction, occurs in various contexts such as classrooms designed specifically for reading instruction and/or in content area classes such as math, science, and social studies. Technology has begun to play an increasing role in instruction, and in computer labs and classrooms with computers "technologically oriented reading specialists are using computers as naturally as they are using books and magazines."  

There are also reading programs designed to be used at home with parents assisting their children in improving their reading skills. The focus of reading instruction is sometimes remedial

---

1 National Reading Styles Institute, The Power of Reading Styles (New York: National Reading Styles Institute, 1995), 2.
in nature and is for “students who are reading at levels that are below their capacity, or potential reading level” in attempt to bring students to the level of achievement experienced by their peers. It can also be developmental in nature which “helps students to further develop comprehension skills and strategies, vocabulary knowledge, rate of reading, and study skills.” Enrichment programs are often designed for gifted students.

The needs of gifted readers extend beyond the instruction offered in a typical heterogeneous reading program. Through curriculum compacting, modifications of the content, and the processes used to interact with that content, an appropriate program can be created for gifted readers.

Content area literacy “defined as the level of reading and writing skill necessary to read, comprehend, and react to appropriate instructional material in a given subject area,” is used to deliver reading instruction in classes such as math, science, and social studies. In addition, “Journals, monographs, and other professional sources have focused on independent reading as a way of fostering an interest in reading, improving fluency with different text structures, and establishing a life long reading habit.” The aforementioned methodologies and reading programs do not

---


Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 11.


exhaust the possibilities. The possible permutations and combinations of reading methodologies and reading program designs are practically inexhaustible. Which is the most effective can vary depending on factors such as the context for instruction, the pedagogy, student populace, and the instructor's ability to deliver quality reading instruction. Examining reading programs of schools which have excellent academic achievement can give some insight into what combination of design and methodologies that have resulted in excellent student achievement. "Rather than attempting to determine which types of reading programs are most viable, current researchers attempt to identify characteristics common to all successful programs." ¹⁰

The Role of the Principal

One of the most significant characteristics of successful reading programs, identified by several researchers, is the role of the principal. "The principal's role is indispensable to providing a high quality reading program in the school."¹¹ The principal of a school is considered to be the instructional leader. Wilma F. Smith and Richard L. Andrews, in their book Instructional Leadership: How Principals Make a Difference, explain that:

¹⁰ David W. Moore and Ann G. Murphy, "Reading Programs" in Research Within Reach Secondary School Reading: A Research Guided Response to Concerns of Reading Educators, ed. Donna E. Alverman, David W. Moore, and Mark W. Conley (Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1987), 10.

¹¹Gary L Manning and Maryann Manning, "What is the Role of the Principal in an Excellent Reading Program? Principal Give Their Views," Reading World 21 No. 2, (December 1981): 130.
Principal as instructional leaders means that the principal is perceived by close associates as (1) providing the necessary resources so that the school's academic goals can be achieved; (2) possessing knowledge and skill in curriculum and instructional matters so that teachers perceive that their interaction with the principal leads to improved instructional practice; (3) being a skilled communicator in one-on-one, small group, and large-group settings; and (4) being a visionary who is out and around creating a visible presence for staff, students, and parents at both the physical and philosophical levels concerning what the school is about.  

Accordingly, within the Illinois School Code, the principal is designated as the instructional leader of the school:

Each principal shall assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership, in accordance with reasonable rules and regulations of the board, for planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance center for which he is assigned...his or her primary responsibility is in the improvement of instruction. A majority of the time spent by a principal shall be spent on curriculum and staff development through formal and informal activities, establishing clear lines of communication regarding school goals, accomplishments, practices and policies with parents and teachers.

The principal directly affects the quality of a reading program in numerous ways among which include establishing (most often in conjunction with others) and communicating the mission or vision of the reading program; the supervision of instruction; coordinating staff development; and establishing an environment conducive to the achievement of students. John A. Mangieri, a professor of education at the University of South Carolina, Columbia explains as a result of his study he discovered:


The secondary school principal does such things as: promote reading activities during faculty in service day; arrange school visitations, workshops, demonstration lesson, etc., which will provide faculty members with knowledge concerning the teaching of reading; inform faculty of reading conferences, courses, lectures, and meetings occurring within the school's geographical area; encourage teachers to implement practices which will enhance student achievement in reading; and, actively participates in the evaluation and redesign of the school's reading program.  

To assume a leadership role for the reading program the principal, as the instructional leader, should have some understanding of reading instruction for the skill of reading is fundamental to all content area course work.

Admittedly, principals cannot develop proficiency in all content areas, nor should they be expected to do so. After all, theirs is a higher charge: To create an environment that is conducive to good learning and that results in student achievement. However to do so they must monitor instruction—and they could do that much more satisfactorily if they had a basic understanding of reading in the content area and were aware of the indications that effective reading instruction was taking place.

The principal might not be as knowledgeable of specific reading strategies as a reading specialist, however, "Principals, as the curriculum leaders, must be armed with the knowledge and the philosophy of what makes a successful reading program and what methods are available to teach reading."  

As expressed by R. Kay Moss in a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, "Knowledge of reading is prerequisite to building

---


professional development goals and for evaluating a faculty member in reading." As an instructional leader, the principal is usually tasked with observing and evaluating instruction. When the principal is observing the reading instructor he or she should have some idea of what constitutes good reading instruction. If the principal does not have this understanding, he or she would be more likely to have difficulty in providing adequate feedback to the teacher providing reading instruction on how to better deliver instruction.

Because of the testing done in schools such as the Illinois Goals Assessment Program (IGAP), Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), and The American College Testing Program (ACT), the principal should have an understanding of how his or her students' reading scores compare to other students in comparable grades, subjects, and schools. Not only should the principal should have an idea about the students' current reading achievement, but also an idea about the goal of future instruction in order to foster ongoing or improved reading achievement. The principal is instrumental in helping to determine what students should be able to do as a result of reading instruction received in school. With an understanding of reading and its importance to student achievement, the principal can better keep the vision or mission, based on the school's philosophy, as a focus for the staff. John Mangieri presents the idea that:

---

Quality reading programs do not merely happen. Rather, they exist as a result of careful planning and strong administrative support. The principal's acceptance of leadership in this effort can make the difference between a mediocre and a successful reading program...

The role of the principal is identified throughout the literature as being an important factor in a school's reading program. Because of this, the perspective of the principal is considered to be an integral part of understanding the design and supervision of a school's reading program. The principal should have some knowledge of the design of his or her school's reading program, the philosophy of the program, and what teachers are doing within the context of the school's reading program. The principal should also be aware of his or her role, what should be done specifically, in order to provide the necessary leadership and guidance which will assist teachers in helping students to become better readers.

**Reading Instruction in High School**

Within the context of a high school there are many complex decisions to be made about reading instruction. At one time elementary schools were given the sole responsibility of making decisions about how, where, and when reading instruction should occur and ensuring students knew how to read. There was an assumption made that this task could be accomplished at the elementary school level and students would not be in need of additional reading instruction once they reached high school. Consequently, the overwhelming majority of information about reading

---

10 Mangieri, 93
As expressed by Elizabeth A. Wilson, it is necessary to consider that:

Reading is not simply an isolated subject that is mastered in elementary school and then need never be taught again. On the contrary, reading—and literacy in general—is a critical tool that must continue to be developed in adolescence and beyond. Our reading abilities are fundamentally tied to other important life skills, such as communicating thoughts through writing, discussing and analyzing information with others, gaining knowledge, improving vocabulary, and following written directions. 19

High schools are therefore being given an increased amount of responsibility for reading instruction. There are instances in which students need assistance to develop their skills to a degree which will allow them to read materials appropriate for their peers, but beyond their individual reading ability. In other instances, students are needing to become even more proficient readers to compete and excel academically in preparation for continued education. Furthermore, students benefit from learning to read technical journals and other challenging materials necessary to efficiently utilize today's technology and to subsequently prepare them for a work force requiring such technical know how.

Reading instruction at the high school level involves many decisions about how, where, and when to teach reading. It is something which can not be ignored considering emphasis placed on academic achievement by teachers, school officials, parents, and community members. Reading is not the only measure of achievement for students. Reading scores

are often targeted when examining, comparing, and contrasting the rigor of a school's curriculum, the ability of teachers to deliver instruction, and reflects whether or not an instructional leader is capable of recognizing instructional needs and providing the necessary direction and guidance to address those needs. To gain a more in depth understanding of what happens at the high school level, the focus of this study is on high school reading programs.

The Context

The instructional leaders interviewed in this study are principals of public high schools which were recognized as 1994-1996 Blue Ribbon Schools. Examining these schools can provide some insight into the design and supervision of reading programs in high schools which are considered to have excellent academic programs and achievement. The Blue Ribbon Schools Program is coordinated by the U.S. Department of Education and recognizes public and private schools that are exemplary in meeting local, state, and national goals. Since 1982, the Blue Ribbon Schools Program has been identifying and recognizing outstanding public and private schools across the nation. "The purpose of the Blue Ribbon Schools Program is to identify and honor America’s outstanding public and private schools while encouraging other schools and communities to look to them for ideas and inspiration."20

Elementary schools and secondary schools are recognized in alternating years. The schools are recognized for having:

---

Student focus and support; challenging standards and curriculum; teaching and active learning; learning centered school contexts; professional growth and collaboration; leadership and organizational vitality; and school, family, and community partnership. The panel also considers objective 'Indicators of Success.' This category includes: student performance on measures of achievement; daily student and teacher attendance rates; student' post graduation pursuits; and school, staff and student awards.²¹

There are certain procedures that must take place in order for a school to be recognized as a Blue Ribbon School. Schools complete an extensive application and submit it to their state nominating agency for consideration. For a public school, the nomination must come from the Chief State School Officer. Then:

A national review panel evaluates the nomination. The panel consist of 100 outstanding public and private school educators, college and university staff, state and local government officials, school board members, parents, the education press, business representatives, and the general public...Based on the quality of the application, the most promising schools are recommended for site visits. The purpose of a visit is to verify the accuracy of the information the school has provided in its nomination form and to gather any additional information the panel has requested. Experienced educators, including principals of previously recognized schools, visit and observe the school for 2 days and submit written site visit reports. The panel considers the report and makes recommendations to the U.S. Secretary of Education, who then announces the names of schools selected for recognition.²²

In 1996, two hundred sixty six public and private schools were recognized from across the United States including Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Department of Defense Dependents Schools.

²²Ibid, 2.
Amongst the award winning schools were six public high schools in Illinois: Champaign Central High School, Elk Grove High School, Homewood-Flossmoor Community High School, James B. Conant High School, Rolling Meadows High School, and St. Charles High School. After being evaluated using the "outcomes measures and conditions of effective schooling, such as leadership, teaching environment, curriculum and instruction, student environment, parent and community support, and organizational vitality," these schools were considered to have outstanding educational programs. What happens in these Blue Ribbon schools, with reading instruction, could be valuable to other high school programs which are in the process of addressing the needs of their students and staff in the area of reading instruction.

The Purpose

From information gained through interviewing the principals of high schools recognized as a 1996 Blue Ribbon School of Excellence, and by conducting a descriptive analysis of each school's written documentation about reading instruction, this study will identify commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence. It will also compare and contrast the perspective of the principal to their respective schools written documentation about reading instruction; identify how the supervision of reading instruction occurs in high school; and because of the limited amount of information available, add to the body of information on reading instruction at the high school level.

Overview of the Study

The high school principals of the six Illinois public high schools, recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence, were contacted in order to solicit their participation in the study. Simultaneously documents were requested such as: 1. Mission statement(s) related to reading instruction; 2. Reading course description(s) or program design information; 3. A scope and sequence of skills for reading instruction; 4. School improvement plan information related to reading instruction; 5. Titles of any specific text for reading or class novels used for reading instruction; and 6. 1996 School Report Card. A descriptive analysis of these documents was conducted in order to compare and contrast the schools reading programs. The following questions were addressed:

1. How are reading programs designed and supervised in Illinois public high schools recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence?
2. What role does the principal have in the supervision of reading instruction?
3. What are the underlying philosophical beliefs of the reading programs?
4. What pedagogy is advocated for reading instruction?
5. Who is responsible for reading instruction and assessment?
6. What are the identified course objectives?
7. Where does reading instruction take place?
8. Who is the targeted population for reading instruction?
The descriptive analysis was also used to get an overview of the student population, staff, test scores, and expenditures per student. Statements were identified in school documents on the philosophy or reading instruction. The title of reading courses, course descriptions, course objectives, and the targeted population for the courses were also examined and noted. There was a search for documentation of the existence of other programs such as independent reading programs, reading labs, computer assisted programs, summer reading programs, and programs designed to be used at home.

Each of the principals of the participating award winning schools was interviewed in order to gain insight into the design and supervision of the reading program in their respective schools. A semi-structured interview schedule was used to guide the interview process. The questions were divided into five categories consisting of personal data, reading program philosophy and design, perception of students, supervision of reading instruction, and views on reading instruction at the high school level. The information given by the principals was tape recorded.

The information was then coded inductively beginning with a start up list of codes as described by Miles and Huberman in their book *Qualitative Data Analysis*. The information was analyzed and conclusions and implications were given on the design and supervision of reading programs in the Illinois public high schools given the recognition of 1996 Blue Ribbon School of Excellence. Triangulation of data sources (principals and school documents), methods (interview and a descriptive study), and theories (of reading
and a descriptive study), and theories (of reading instruction and supervision of reading programs) occurred to lend validity to the study. The reading programs were compared with the elements of successful reading programs described throughout the literature and there was a search for discrepant evidence. The study is organized into five chapters which include the rationale and purpose for study, the review of the literature, the methodology, the findings, and the conclusion.
CHAPTER 2

THE READING CIRCLE: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Reading circles are often made up of people who come together to read, explore, or closely examine a selection by an author. In the context of this dissertation, the "reading circle" encompasses a vast array of authors who have written about supervision and design of reading programs. The review of the literature is an attempt to bring together the ideas and knowledge about reading instruction to support the course of this study. The purpose of this study is to identify commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence from the perspective of the instructional leader, the principal. This second chapter is a review of the literature on:

1. The role of the principal in high school reading programs.
2. The supervision of reading instruction at the high school level.
3. The design of high school reading programs.

Because of the expanse of reading methodologies, only methodologies revealed in the literature as being common to a specific reading program design will be examined.
The Role of the Principal in the Reading Program

What is necessary in order for a principal to assume an active role as instructional leader in a school's reading program and what does that role in encompass? Both of these questions are addressed in the literature. Throughout the literature there is an emphasis on the importance of the principal to school reading programs. Clearly the role of the principal can vary in different educational environments. There are, however, some factors that have been found to be common to the role of principals in schools with successful reading programs. The literature reveals:

1. The principal should have knowledge of reading and the learning needs of students in order to make well informed decisions about reading instruction.

2. The principal should have a vision of the reading program with a supporting philosophy and goals.

3. The principal should communicate the importance of reading instruction to teachers, parents, and community members thereby gaining support from these groups.

4. The principal needs to have influence or control over resource allocation determining program funding, staffing, and materials.

5. The principal should provide the necessary supervision of instruction including observation and teacher evaluation along with subsequent staff development.
Knowledge of Reading Instruction

Knowledge of reading is a basis for making well informed decisions about reading instruction. "The principal does not need to become a reading specialist, but that principal must know something about the teaching of reading."\(^1\) Roe, Stoodt, and Burns suggest in their book, *Secondary Reading Programs: The Content Areas*:

The Administrator should arrive at some basic principals or understandings about reading, such as (a) reading is a complex act with many factors that must be considered; (b) reading depends on the interpretation of the meaning of printed symbols - it is not just "decoding"; (c) there is no one correct way to teach reading - the teacher is the focal point; (d) learning to read is a continuing process; (e) reading and other languages are closely interrelated; and (f) reading is an integral part of all content area instruction.\(^2\)

This importance of the principal having knowledge of reading instruction is further emphasized by Glatthorn in his book, *Curriculum Leadership*. Not only does his writing describe specific procedures and characteristics of curriculum leadership, but it also acknowledges the importance of a curriculum leader having specific knowledge about reading. He states that curriculum leaders should be aware of the recent developments in reading among which include "the awareness that the ability to read probably progresses through clearly demarcated stages in which specific skills and different methods are needed."\(^3\)

The importance of the principal having knowledge about

reading instruction is further supported in the literature through guidance given to principals in how to become more knowledgeable about reading: "Ways an administrator can increase knowledge are to take formal courses in reading and attend reading workshops and conferences, visit often with outstanding reading teachers, study the reading material used in school, and maintain a professional reading library." Hillerich, in *The Principal's Guide to Improving Reading Instruction*, emphasizes the importance of principals becoming or staying informed about reading instruction:

> In addition to your own reading of such journals as *Principal*, *Educational Leadership*, and *Phi Delta Kappan*, you should have in your school, for yourself and teachers, the two main journals of language arts teachers: *The Reading Teacher*, and *Language Arts*. If your are responsible for middle school or secondary, you would want *The Journal of Reading* and *English Journal*. Furthermore it is wise to keep abreast of articles that might appear in some of the popular "supermarket" variety of magazines.  

Hillerich seems not only to emphasize the importance of the principal becoming more knowledgeable about reading instruction, but to share reading materials with the staff to increase their knowledge. Binkley also supports Hillerich as she says, "The best principals also subscribe to and read professional newspapers and journals. When they find timely articles, they make sure all interested faculty members get copies and they take the time to follow up by asking the faculty what they thought about the articles."

> It is recognized that "few junior high or high school

---

4 Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 515.
5 Hillerich, 5.
principals have formal training in reading." Therefore, in addition to professional reading, when principals have a "lack of reading program expertise, many principals rely upon classroom teachers, reading specialist, reading consultant/ coordinators and other central office staff to provide the major ideas or decision making." Hillerich further emphasizes the importance of acquiring knowledge about reading instruction when he suggests that, "the principal must get help on the details from print or through specialists who have expert knowledge of the field. Such help may be from teachers on the staff who have advanced knowledge or specialization in reading, local reading consultants, or outside professionals."

The principal should not only have knowledge of reading instruction, but also an understanding of the learning needs of students within his or her building. Being aware of the strengths and weakness of students in the area of reading, should enable the principal to more effectively guide decisions about reading instruction. Three types of assessment are used in determining student reading achievement. There are standardized norm-referenced tests, criterion referenced tests, and informal assessments.

Standardized, norm referenced tests "compare an individual students performance with that of his or her

---

7 Ronald M. Nufrio, An Administrator's Overview for Teaching Reading (Anna, Ohio: Anna Local Schools, 1987), 1, ERIC, ED 286 287.
9 Hillerich, 3.
Most often, conventional standardized measurements are used to provide information about the reading performance of students to important constituents: parents, board members, and school administrators. Test scores from these standardized instruments are also used to make initial grouping decisions, provide information that serves as a basis for referral for additional assessment, and provide information about the general strengths and weaknesses in the reading program.\footnote{10}

A second type of test which is administered in schools are criterion referenced tests. "Criterion reference tests, which check the test taker's performance against a performance criterion as predetermined standard, can also be helpful in assessment. Results of criterion-referenced tests can be used as instructional prescriptions, making them useful in decisions about instruction."\footnote{11} "They focus on individual rather than comparative skill development, and provide more comprehensive coverage of individual skills than do norm referenced tests."\footnote{12}

Informal assessment is another way of determining how students are doing in a reading program. "Informal tests are often teacher-made, though some are published. Thus, they can be designed to obtain information specifically related to

\footnote{10}{Marguerite Radencich, Administration and Supervision of the Reading/Writing Program (Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), 194.}
\footnote{11}{Rita M. Bean, "Effective Reading Program Development" in The Administration and Supervision of Reading Programs, ed. Shelly B. Wepner, Joan T. Feeley, and Dorothy S. Strickland (New York: Teacher's College Press, 1995), 31.}
\footnote{12}{Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 243.}
\footnote{13}{Barbara E. R. Swaby, Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Difficulties (Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1989), 71.}
an individual school's reading program.""14 They are informal in that administration and interpretation of results are more flexible than with commercially prepared norm- and criterion-referenced materials. Both teacher and student reports of evaluation of student reading and writing are incorporated."15

Because of the importance of assessment in planning for instruction, "the principal must also be able to interpret local test results in terms of the meanings of scores, at individual grade levels and over all the grades. This requires understanding of the nature of local and national norms, as well as how the test relates to the local curriculum plan."16 The principal can also help to ensure that teachers understand and have information about student performance in reading. "Many teachers would like information about students' strengths and weaknesses in order to meet individual needs. A plan for dissemination of data on student reading to those teachers is essential."

As previously identified, there are a number of ways in which principals may acquire knowledge about reading instruction. It may be through professional reading, in service participation, attending conferences, relying upon the expertise of reading specialists or other experts in the field among other things. Principals may not necessarily agree on the definition of reading, nor may they have the same understanding of the reading process. They do, however, need to have an understanding of both which will be

15 Radencich, 196.
16 Hillerich, 18.
consistent with achievement in reading for students in their school. The principal must then be prepared to use this knowledge of reading and student achievement in reading, to establish, communicate, and implement a philosophy for the reading program.

Communicating Philosophy and Goals

"A philosophy guides decisions about goals and objectives, materials, and the organizing of instructional tasks." The philosophy of a reading program can contribute to the success of the program as it provides a foundation and framework for instruction. The principal should participate in the development and implementation of the reading philosophy. He or she is also instrumental in communicating the philosophy to the staff. Roe, Stoodt, and Burns explain, the principal "must encourage the staff and ensure that the reading philosophy is implemented in logical and innovative ways. He or she needs to provide the impetus for defining the reading program's philosophy and must facilitate that philosophy by extending it to the entire school." Radencich reinforces the necessity of communicating the philosophy when she writes, "A philosophy or mission statement has little value if it is simply written and then forgotten. But there is often a great success when businesses or school staffs pull together and then march in the same direction."

While the philosophy of the reading program gives direction to the program, the goals supporting the

\[\text{Radencich, 17.} \]
\[\text{Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 514-515.} \]
\[\text{Radencich, 17.} \]
established philosophy are also significant:

Clearly stated goals are crucial to educational effectiveness. Goals allow educators to ensure curricular continuity across grade levels; they serve to identify priority areas and help assure allocation of educational resources to those priority areas; and they assist instructional planning by clarifying purposes of learning; they facilitate identification and strengthening of weak curricular areas; they assist communication with students and parents by serving as a framework for reports of student progress; and they make possible assessment of how well school districts accomplish their priorities...Goals provide direction about which students to serve, what materials to purchase, and what teaching techniques and staffing patterns to use.20

Smith and Andrews in their book, *Instructional Leadership: How Principals Can Make a Difference*, express that a principal who is a strong instructional leader "is dedicated to the goals of the school [and] demonstrates commitment to academic goals, shown by the ability to articulate a clear vision of long term goals for the school."21

Communicating an established philosophy and supporting goals for a reading program and using them to guide the direction of the program can enable the principal, teachers, and students to work together in pursuit of achievement in reading. As Barnard and Hetzel emphasize, "if the goal is not foremost in the minds of those who must implement the program, the goal tends to be displaced, resulting in a lack

---


of goal attainment." Because reading plays an important role in subjects such as math, social studies, science, and language arts, communicating the philosophy and goals for a reading program can encourage achievement in all subject areas.

Communicating the Importance of Reading Instruction

Communication about the importance of reading instruction extends beyond promoting the philosophy and goals of the program. The principal also communicates the importance of reading instruction through the actions that he or she takes with regard to reading instruction. In Becoming a Nation of Readers: What Principals Can Do, Binkley strongly recommends to principals to "serve as a model for faculty and students in demonstrating the importance of reading through their own reading habits." Principals can be a role model when stressing the importance of reading by maintaining their own professional libraries, being involved in the evaluation, design, and redesign of the reading program, and expressing their concern about what is happening in a school's reading program.

The principal also has responsibility for the supervision of the reading program including observing reading instruction and providing access to the necessary staff development to improve reading instruction. "In the same ways that they administer their schools - understanding

---

23 Binkley, 16
processes, observing, offering feedback - principals can act as models for teachers, motivating them to make reading a top priority in their classes."  

Because of the enormity of the area of supervision of reading instruction, the next section will be used to delineate the various components of the supervision of reading instruction, and will address the role of the principal.

The principal must communicate the importance of reading instruction not only to students and teachers, but also to parents and community members.

The principal should continuously inform the members of the community concerning important aspects of the reading program. He should also try to involve the community actively in the program. These goals can be attained in a variety of ways, including PTA meetings, coffee klatches, adult education programs, and pamphlets... Parents can become actively involved in the reading program by serving the school as tutors or paraprofessionals.

Additionally, principals can also communicate to parents the importance of independent reading. Garnering support of parents, school libraries, and public libraries, can positively impact students' access to reading materials and time made available for reading. As summarized by Barbara Scofield in her study of reading programs, "Although the principal relies on teachers to teach a program and draws on consultants for special needs, it is the principal who must make programs work. Pulling people, ideas, processes and kids together must be accomplished if reading instruction is

---

to be successful program-wide."²⁶

Resource Allocation

How a principal chooses to allocate available resources for an instructional program can be instrumental in determining the success of the program. "There is little question that the principal's commitment is best reflected by how he allocates resources (time, space, personnel, and material) at the school level. It is not enough to state that reading improvement is an important goal; it must be demonstrated by placing reading as a priority in the budget."²⁷ This is supported in the findings of Robert Wilhite in his study, "An Investigation of the Reading Programs of the Secondary (9-12) Public Schools in Dupage County, Illinois." He concluded that among other things "in a leadership role, the ideal principal establishes sound financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding; allocates the best facilities and materials available; and establishes guidelines for selecting specialized reading personnel."²⁸ Good instructional leaders can "effectively and efficiently mobilize resources such as materials, time, and support to enable the school and its personnel to most effectively meet academic goals."²⁹

²⁶ Sandra Scofield, "Principals Make a Difference: The Role They Play in Quality Reading Programs," OSSC Bulletin, 22, no. 10 (June 1979): 1.
²⁷ Barnard and Hetzel, 387.
Supervision of Reading Instruction

"Supervision in education is a process with one major goal: improvement of instruction. It is a multifaceted interpersonal process dealing with teaching behavior, curriculum, learning environments, grouping of students, teacher utilization, and professional development." Consistent with this definition is Allen Ornstein's explanation of what is entailed in the supervision of instruction. Allen Ornstein reviewed texts on supervision and on a consistent basis he found that:

The supervisor is seen as a policy maker and implementer of curriculum, involved in planning and designing the curriculum, from clarifying goals and objectives of a school (or district) to evaluating personnel as well as the ongoing curriculum. This is reflected in the traditional view that sees the supervisor (along with the administrator) as the curriculum and instructional leader [with responsibility for] staff development, commitment to curriculum change, selecting and organizing curriculum resources, improving curriculum communication, and working with teachers in and outside classrooms to organize and improve instruction.

A succinct definition of supervision is given by Daniel L. Duke, "Supervision entails the direct monitoring of instruction and the collection of data that may be useful in setting targets for instruction".

Although the principal has responsibility for supervision of all instruction, pertinent to the topic of this dissertation is the supervision of reading instruction.

---


According to the International Reading Association a reading supervisor is considered to be one who is:

Responsible for student progress toward reading maturity through: (a) improvement of curriculum, methodology, and management of district-wide reading/language arts programs and policies; (b) application of current research/theory in refinement of reading and language arts instruction; (c) coordination and implementation of collaborative reading research; (d) attainment of resources through budget processes and grant applications; (e) development of community support for the reading language arts program; (f) supervision and evaluation of classroom teachers, diagnostic remedial specialists, and reading consultants; and (g) support professional development through provision for attendance at workshops, conferences, and conventions.  

As site-based management has become more prevalent in schools, principals have assumed the responsibility of many of the tasks once designated to district supervisors of curriculum and instruction. Principals, though they may not have each of the responsibilities delineated above, have assumed responsibility for many aspects of the supervision of reading programs within their schools. When taking into consideration the definition of supervision of reading instruction, some of the supervisory responsibilities of the principal have been reviewed in the previous section on the role of the principal in high school reading programs. This section of the review of the literature will be on the supervision of reading instruction and will explore the role of the principal in instructional observation, teacher evaluation, and staff development.

Radencich, 10.
Instructional Observation

With knowledge about reading instruction and an understanding of the reading process, the principal is better prepared to observe the delivery of reading instruction in the various contexts within a school. "The principal should observe classrooms in order to recommend ways of improving instruction which will increase students' understanding of subject matter and encourage building of lifelong reading habits." In order to efficiently observe reading instruction the principal needs to know what to look for during the observation process.

Marcia Nash in her article, "A Secondary School Administrators Guide to Evaluating Reading Instruction," suggests that the principal observe reading instruction before making program decisions:

1. Observe the amount of reading going on school wide.
2. Observe the appropriateness of the reading which is going on in your school.
3. Determine the kind of instruction which would be appropriate for your schools' needs.
4. Determine the setting which would be appropriate for reading instruction in your school.

The principal, is therefore given responsibility for observing and evaluating the overall reading program and making decisions about how to teach reading and where to teach reading.

In his article, "Administrators' Guidelines for More Effective Reading Programs," Sidney Rauch also suggests to administrators that it is important to know what to look for.
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when observing reading instruction. He explains the aspects of a good reading lesson:

The teacher has a definite goal or purpose for the lessons and that purpose is evident to students. Lesson is planned, systematic, yet flexible to the dynamics of classroom situation. Classroom atmosphere is pleasant attractive and optimistic. Attention is paid to individual differences. Rapport is good between teachers and students is evident. Teacher is diagnosing as she is teaching. There is readiness for the lesson. Pupils are motivated. Materials are varied...

Full use is made of audio visual aids. Questions are varied to check different levels of comprehension. Material is at appropriate level for students. Teacher is aware of such levels as "instruction," "independent," and "frustration." Meaningful oral reading activities are used to check comprehension. Pupils have been trained in self-direction...

All children are productively involved in some aspect of reading. Use is made of classroom and school libraries. There is application of basic reading skills to content areas. Efficient record keeping is done by teacher and students. Teachers has a sense of perspective and humor. There is evidence of review and relationship to previously learned material. There are follow-up or enrichment activities.36

Davida Egherman, in addressing what to look for in reading instruction, asserts that "Although every content area has its special language and text requirements, all teachers need to structure classes to include a prereading phase, a reading phase, and a post-reading phase." She contends that the principal should know what a 'good lesson' consists of:

The Prereading Phase  Thus, not only must the teachers select essential vocabulary and concepts for students to understand, they must also determine what the students should be able to do as a result of reading... The teacher should preview the assignment with the students, helping them to define the purpose of their reading and the way they should approach it... The teacher can also assist

36 Sidney J. Rauch, "How to Evaluate a Reading Program," The Reading Teacher 24 no.3 (December 1970): 244-250.
37 Egherman, 77.
students by pointing out and explaining the organizational features of a chapter or section to be read... To motivate students to read by arousing their curiosity or interest some teachers read the first paragraph of the text aloud or present visual material such as slides, photographs, or films which set the stage for reading. Teachers may also preview assignments by connecting what students already know about a subject with what they will need to know, linking the reading with individual group needs.

The Reading Phase. During this phase, the student is seeking meaning from print, and depending on the assignment, doing something with the knowledge gained. The teacher can help the student in this process. The teacher can help the students apply [various questioning strategies]... Second the teacher can prepare written study guides for the student to use while reading... Another strategy is for the teacher to walk around and be available to answer students' questions, clarify directions, or check that study guides are completed accurately.

The Post-reading Phase. The purpose of this phase is to reinforce and extend students' comprehension... In this post reading phase the student needs to use and practice communication skills, and extend and apply the information gained from reading.38

Egherian continues to encourage the principal to communicate to teachers the importance of reading through each phase of reading and to help them understand how, as teachers, they can positively impact student achievement.

In giving their explanations about what to look for in reading instruction, each of the authors above have somewhat of a different, but not incompatible focus. The first examines observing reading instruction in assessing the overall reading program. The second and third authors, though they both describe the attributes of a "good reading lesson", approach the issue by using different methods of analysis. When determining what a principal should look for
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38 Egherian, 77-78.
when observing reading instruction, it must be taken into consideration, that in addition to what the literature says constitutes “good reading instruction,” part of what a principal is looking for is also going to be related to the philosophy and goals of their reading program. The instructional needs of students and the perceived ability of teachers to meet those needs also has a strong influence on what the principal might target in the observation of reading instruction. “The quality of the observations and the way administrators collect and share data with teachers, are still the major factors in the success and effectiveness of teacher evaluation.”

“The quality of supervision and evaluation is unlikely to be any better than the quality of data collected on teaching performance.” The data collected, however, does not in itself lead to the improvement of reading instruction. “Teachers, like students, should be given appropriate feedback so they may consciously and deliberately use [the principals of learning] in future teaching. If something did not go well during the observed teaching, the observer must be able to provide the teacher with a potentially more effective behavior.” Likewise teachers should receive positive feedback about what went well in their lesson.


40 Duke, 110.

Positive feedback helps to reinforce the behaviors which supervisors see as good instructional strategies. Classroom observations "ought to be springboards for improving the instructional program. As such, they must be done by a principal who knows something about the reading program -- who knows what to look for -- and who then sits down with the teacher to discuss their mutual goals and assessment."

Teacher Evaluation

The data collected during the observation of instruction is a primary source of information used when evaluating teachers. Both formative and summative evaluation are used in teacher evaluation. When describing the roles of formative and summative evaluation, Michael Scriven, a philosopher of science made this distinction:

Formative and summative evaluation are different in the function they serve and (hence) the destination to which they go. Formative evaluation is evaluation designed, done, and intended to support the process of improvement, and normally commissioned or done by, and delivered to, someone who can make improvements. Summative evaluation is the rest of evaluation: in terms of intentions, it is evaluation done for, or by any observers or decision makers (by contrast with developers) who need evaluative conclusions for any other reason besides development.\(^\text{42}\)

Although it is possible to use either summative or formative evaluation, they are not necessarily used independently of one another. The relationship between formative and summative evaluation is described as follows: "Formative evaluation is ongoing, descriptive, nonjudgmental, and

performed to help teachers teach better. Summative evaluation, at the end of a formative cycle, is comparative and judgmental and, if the teacher is a sub par performer, may become adjudicative.\textsuperscript{43} Formative evaluation with its emphasis on instruction will be the type of evaluation focused upon in this dissertation.

When evaluating a teacher, "to get as complete of a picture as possible, a number of sources and a variety of instruments must be used...checklist, anecdotal reports, questionnaires, logs, and specific observational data about teaching behavior can be useful."\textsuperscript{44} However the data is collected, when formative evaluation is being used, feedback given to the teacher by supervisor is instrumental in improving instruction. Feedback can be initiated when supervisors encourage teachers to think critically about their own teaching. "The research on cognition supports the assertion that the evaluation of teaching should include the assessment of the thought processes of teaching...Focus on enhancing teacher's thinking capacities will, in turn, increase student learning."\textsuperscript{45} The relationship between observation, feedback, and evaluation is described well by Smith and Andrews when they say, "Teacher evaluation is: (a) characterized by frequent classroom visitation, clear


\textsuperscript{44} Pfeiffer and Dunlap, 158.

evaluation criteria, and feedback, and (b) is used to help students and teachers improve performance."\(^{46}\)

**Staff Development**

The principal can use information gained through teacher observation, formative evaluation, and knowledge of student achievement to determine if the staff is in need of additional training in reading instruction. This training can be provided through staff development. "Staff development refers to efforts to assist groups of teachers to better meet the organizational needs of their schools and school systems."\(^{47}\) Staff development opportunities can be made available through various venues:

1. Workshops in the school, conducted by the school's reading consultant or reading teacher
2. Workshops in the school conducted by an outside expert on the topic under consideration
3. Reading conferences and conventions
4. Demonstration lessons
5. Faculty planning sessions (teachers working together) to plan implementation of the program in their special areas using the resources available in the school.
6. Teachers observing the teaching of innovative peers
7. Consultants teaming with individual teachers or small groups of teachers to solve teacher-identified problems
8. University courses\(^{48}\)

Staff development opportunities can be offered on a short term or long term basis to individuals, small groups of teachers, building staff, or district wide. Attending the staff development session(s) is only the beginning of the process. As indicated by Lutz in research on staff development, "Effective staff development occurs in stages,

\(^{46}\) Smith and Andrews, 8.
\(^{47}\) Duke, 126.
\(^{48}\) Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 521
staff development is often necessary when achievement in reading is focused upon as an instructional goal. In reference to reading instruction in high school:

Many secondary teachers (in some schools most teachers) have little background knowledge concerning the nature of reading, the reading strategy needs of students, available formal test of reading progress, informal measures of reading achievement, reading interest and tastes of adolescents, and other topics related to helping secondary students' progress in reading. As secondary schools are faced with the need to improve student achievement in reading, staff development can be an effective tool to increase knowledge about reading.

Administrators and teachers need opportunities to learn more about equipment and materials to be used in the reading program. Teachers also need guidance to interpret the results of educational research and to implement sound innovations in the classroom. New staff members usually need assistance to become acquainted with the class room, while experienced teachers occasionally need motivation to try new ideas.

Staff development can also focus teacher efforts toward instructional goals and to provide them with means to positively influence the achievement of their students.

When examining exemplary reading programs, S.J. Samuels found these characteristics of inservice training:

50 Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 520.
51 Sanacore, " Enhancing the Reading Program," 115.
The role of the principal in staff development begins in the planning stages by allowing the needed time, resources, and eliciting the participation of staff. The principal can also keep teachers apprised of staff development opportunities outside of his or her building. Once staff development process begins the role of the principal continues. "The administrator/supervisor should be committed to the program and be eager to collect data, do observations, experiment with new strategies, and reflect with the rest of the staff on what is happening in the classroom." \(^{53}\) The principal can also, through formative evaluation, be of assistance in helping to implement staff development research into classroom practices.

The Principal and the Reading Program

In creating and maintaining a successful high school reading program, the principal has a very significant role. The principal communicates the importance of reading when he or she make a concerted effort toward learning about the teaching of reading and sharing that knowledge with the staff. This knowledge can be used to help establish and communicate the philosophy and supporting goals keeping

---


\(^{53}\) Ibid, 147.
importance of reading must be communicated to students, staff, parents and community members so that all stakeholders are motivated to work together to increase student reading achievement. How the principal chooses to allocate available resources to the reading program, can be an indication of the importance that the principal places on reading instruction and can directly affect the quality of reading instruction within a school. Also, very significant to the success of a reading program are the teachers who are to deliver instruction. The supervision of instruction is the responsibility of the instructional leader. Through observing instruction, giving feedback, providing staff development opportunities, and working with teachers to improve instruction the principal contributes to orchestrating the success of a school's reading program.
High School Reading Programs

Reading programs in high schools can be designed in a number of different ways. Many high school reading programs consist of a combination of individual classes designed specifically for reading instruction and school wide efforts to support reading achievement. Throughout the literature, when examining the descriptions of high school reading programs, it is revealed that some characteristics are considered necessary to maintaining a quality reading program. For example, David Shepherd describes what he considers the five essential components of a reading program:

1. Reading instruction is provided in each of the subject fields as it applies to each.
2. The central library of the school provides opportunity to the students for both research and pleasure from reading.
3. Supplementary classroom libraries must be available to provide opportunities for enrichment.
4. Elective courses are offered in the mechanics of reading for those students who wish to sharpen their reading-study skills.
5. Remedial courses are available for those students who need help in addition to the content reading instruction in each classroom.\(^{54}\)

Roe, Stoodt, and Burns seem to support the above description. Their description of an overall design of a high school reading program is as follows:

A total-school reading program is one in which all school personnel cooperate and all students are offered reading instruction according to their needs. Reading instruction is offered in special reading class and clinical settings and is a priority in content area classes as well. The skills are taught as their use is required; therefore, instruction is meaningful to the student because they see a direct application for it. Developmental instruction is offered to students who are

progressing satisfactorily in building reading skills, and corrective and remedial instruction is offered to students who are experiencing difficulties. In such a program, all aspects of a reading program are included: 1. Developmental reading is taught; 2. Content area reading is taught; 3. Recreational reading is encouraged; and 4. Remedial reading is offered.\(^{55}\)

Vacca and Williams also support the idea of the whole school being involved in reading instruction. "In affective secondary reading programs, all students are recognized as having reading instruction needs, and instruction is integrated with the reasoning strategies that ground each discipline."\(^{56}\)

Throughout this and other literature, comprehensive reading programs in high schools are said to consist of a number of common instructional components: 1) content area reading instruction; 2) developmental reading instruction; 3) remedial reading instruction; and 4) recreational and independent reading. Some reading programs supplement these components with the use of computers and reading instruction for gifted students, among other things. Underlining the design of the reading program are the learning needs of the student population; assessment of students helps to determine the scope of instruction. This section of the review of the literature will examine these various common components of high school reading programs in order to get a better understanding of how high school reading programs are designed.
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\(^{55}\) Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 519.

Content Area Reading Instruction

Content area reading instruction "involves helping all students comprehend and apply the materials they are required to read in their school subjects" such as math, science, and social studies.\(^57\) Content area reading instruction is seen as necessary in high schools because the learning needs of students and the structure of high school classes. Elizabeth Wilson in "Reading in the Middle and High School Levels," describes other issues that make content area reading essential to high school reading programs. She explains:

1) Reading in classes such as science, mathematics, and social studies demands skills beyond those used in the early grades; 2) Maturing students often lose interest in reading; 3) Large numbers of secondary students are at risk of reading failure, and they require reading instruction that is targeted to their deficits; [and] 4) Secondary teachers have limited time for implementing reading strategies, unless such strategies can be incorporated into approaches for teaching the curriculum.\(^58\)

Content area teachers use "special strategies that teach students how to handle the terse, densely written style so representative of text book writing."\(^59\) Teachers in content area classes use a variety of strategies before, during, and after reading to ensure that students interact appropriately with text to gain understanding of the content. In reviewing various content area texts, the strategies suggested for use
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\(^57\) Mark W. Conley, "Middle and Junior High Reading Programs," in The Administration and Supervision of Reading Programs, ed. Shelly B. Wepner, Joan T. Feeley, and Dorothy S. Strickland, (New York: Teacher's College Press, 1995): 86.


by content area teachers consisted of text preview activities, activating prior knowledge, introduction of significant vocabulary, and guided reading instruction. Comprehension strategies were recommended such as questioning strategies used before, during, and after reading, and post reading activities were suggested which check for comprehension along with extending learning into writing and other activities. Content area reading instruction enables students to better understand reading materials in classes such as math, social studies, and science.

Developmental Reading Instruction

In 1964 Shelly Umans wrote, "A developmental reading program is one in which students who are able readers continue to be taught reading skills in a sequential program of instruction, designed to reinforce skills and appreciations acquired in previous years, and to develop new skills as they are needed." This definition has changed little over the years. Harris and Sipay, in their text published in 1985 explain "developmental reading activities are concerned primarily with the further refinement and improvement of skills already well started." In making distinctions between developmental reading instruction content area reading, Carter and Klotz, in 1991, describe the following:

Content area reading is not developmental reading. In the developmental reading classroom, students learn to expand their overall reading abilities under the guidance of a special reading teacher. There they develop comprehension skills, vocabulary knowledge, reading flexibility, and study skills through use of an assortment of reading materials, none of which requires them to learn a given subject. In the developmental classroom, what the students read is less important than the skills they develop.

Newer to the developmental reading program is the process described by Roe, Stoodt, and Burns in their description of a complementary relationship between developmental reading and content area reading. "The development reading classes also may go beyond basic skills instruction and offer help with special reading problems in the content areas, in cooperation with the content area teachers, who will also stress such assistance." Developmental reading classes therefore reinforce previously learned skills, allow for the development of new skills, and assists students by providing reading strategies to enable them to more effectively read content area reading materials.

Remedial Reading Instruction

Some students have reading skills which require even more intensive skill instruction than is offered in the developmental reading program.

Remedial reading instruction is usually designed for those students who read two or more years below the level at which they could be expected to read with understanding. Such instruction is given by a reading specialist in a special reading class or reading laboratory. In most cases the student-teacher ratio for a remedial program is lower than that for a developmental program. 
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"Remedial teaching allows for diagnosis of individual needs and instruction tailored to fit those needs to a degree that few classroom teachers can match. Skilled remedial teachers are more expert at both diagnosis and at individualized instruction than are most classroom teachers."

Key to remedial instruction is the diagnosis. Barbara Swaby, in her book, Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Difficulties discusses the four components of diagnosis:

[1.] Analysis refers to the continuous and careful observation of a range of student behaviors to identify areas of strength and need in relation to reading performance...

[2.] Measurement refers to the administration of a test - formal or informal - in order to obtain a score or set of scores related to student performance. Measurement relates to analysis in that a test is often given because certain characteristics or behaviors have been noted...

[3.] Evaluation refers to the careful examination of the measurement scores to identify specific skill strengths, skill weaknesses, and patterns or trends in errors...Evaluation helps to identify the way instruction must be modified in order to establish growth...

[4.] Change refers to the modification of instructional strategies to bring about positive changes in students' reading. If a child is not successful in reading, instruction might need to change in order for performance to improve. If you change the way you teach the child and if you change the tasks the child must practice, then the child's performance will probably also change."

Judith A. Langer in her study, "Approaches Toward Meaning in Low and High Rated Readers," suggests that "instructional strategies for low-performing readers might do well to focus on helping students to think about the primary purpose for their reading experience before they begin to read as well as
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"Barbara E. R. Swaby, Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Difficulties, (Needham Heights, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1989): 8-10."
during reading. Such activities might help them consider the kinds of understanding they might come away with as well as some meaning developed approaches they might use along the way.”

With remedial instruction, the strengths and weaknesses of individual students are assessed in order to create an instructional plan. The instructional plan necessitates the use and learning of reading strategies which lead to increased reading achievement. In a remedial reading program instruction is catered to individual student needs and “individualized as much as staffing will allow.”

Reading Instruction for Gifted Students

Gifted readers can be described as those “who have exceptional ability in reading and working with text information.” They have instructional needs which differ immensely from those of students in developmental and remedial instructional programs. When describing the needs of gifted readers, Dooley claims, “appropriate, differentiated reading programs are essential for the academic growth of highly capable readers and for the preservation of their desire to learn.”

Collins and Alex describe reading instruction for gifted readers, among other things they say:
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(1) gifted readers need instruction in reading that is different from a regular classroom program; (2) instruction for very able readers should focus on developing higher cognitive level comprehension skills; (3) teaching reading to gifted readers requires more than a skill-oriented approach; (4) books for gifted readers should be selected on the basis of quality language—books that use varied and complex language structures are a primary source of cognitive growth; (5) reading programs for gifted readers should foster a desire to read; and (6) a reading program for gifted readers should include a variety of reading materials and strategies which are based on the present needs and demands of the reader, not on the chronological grade level.  

Mason and Au also give four suggestions for providing reading instruction to gifted students:

1. Provide gifted readers with systematic and challenging instruction in comprehension.
2. Have gifted readers spend more time in recreational reading, or in reading for information, and less time with worksheet and workbook assignments.
3. Be sure to give gifted readers a balance between opportunities for independent discovery and participation in reading activities involving other students.
4. Be sure to give gifted readers the opportunity to work actively and creatively with the ideas gained through reading. 

However one chooses to address the needs of gifted readers it should be recognized that gifted readers can also benefit from reading instruction. Although they have mastered basic reading skills, they can be guided toward discovering and enjoying literature which requires them to further develop their cognitive abilities.


72 Mason and Au, 341.
Independent Reading and Recreational Reading

"Practice makes perfect," is a saying that has been used over the years to encourage the practice that it takes to become proficient in any arena in which one is seeking to excel. No matter what reading level a student is considered to have, practicing reading skills outside of instructional time periods can help students to become better readers. As stated by Marie Carbo and Robert Cole, "Practice helps to improve reading comprehension and vocabulary; practice also helps to raise test scores."73

There are a number of ways that students can be encouraged to practice their reading skills. One way is through independent reading. In, "Encouraging the Lifetime Habit of Reading," Sanacore supports the idea of independent reading. He suggests that reading can be encouraged through providing an assortment of reading materials in the classroom, providing time for independent reading, and activities such as book talks and pairing books with similar themes or authors with similar styles.74 Essentially independent reading entails students reading on their own without direct instruction. "It can help students to refine their skills and strategies by applying them to meaningful text (expository, descriptive, narrative). It can also help readers build their prior knowledge of different topics and improve their reading achievement through the natural process.

of reading."  

In high schools, independent reading often takes the form of silent sustained reading time periods in which a block of time is set aside for reading. Wilson suggests:

In the teenage years, opportunities for new activities abound, such as clubs, dating, sports, music, and social events; at the same time, however the homework load is likely to increase. Regrettably, all of these activities take away from pleasure reading. Perhaps the only way to encourage adolescents to read for fun is to set aside time for free reading during the day. Moreover, making time for students' independent reading serves as a demonstration that reading is a high-priority concern to teachers and schools. In an in-school free reading program, the teacher, or even the school sets aside a certain period of time during the day or week in which students can read books of their choice.

Independent reading can also take the form of extending students the opportunity to read materials related to a topic being covered in class. Some teachers also assign book reports to encourage students to read independently while requiring some measure of accountability.

"Many advocates of free reading caution against holding students accountable for what is read, because that will discourage a reluctant reader." There are those who support recreational reading. They seem to believe that it is also independent reading, however, "recreational reading is reading done purely for pleasure." Whether or not students are held accountable for reading they do independently, reading skills are still practiced and strengthened. Recreational and independent reading give students the chance not only to practice their reading skills, but also to
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78 Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 528.
develop their own reading interests and motivates students to explore the world of literature.

Computers and Reading Instruction

Each of the above sections have focused on instructional needs of students and how reading programs should be designed in order to address those needs. The use of computers in reading instruction, a specific methodology, warrants discussion as computers are increasingly being used to address student learning needs. "Today's technologies included marrying the stand-alone computer with videodisc players, CD-ROM drives, scanners, video and audio digitizers, modems, and televisions...The new software provides an interactive environment." 79

Marjorie R. Simic provided guidelines to be used when using computers in reading instruction:

1. Computer instruction in reading should focus on meaning and stress reading comprehension...
2. Computer instruction in reading should foster active involvement and simulate thinking...
3. Computer instruction in reading should support and extend students' knowledge of text structures...
4. Computer instruction in reading should make use of content from a wide range of subject areas...
5. Computer instruction should link reading and writing... 80

"Computers, particularly when used for purposes beyond drill and practice, can provide sensory involvement, continuous, and timely feedback, and interaction. Computers can provide opportunities for simulation, program solving, and word

79 Radencich, 50.
The role of computers in reading instruction, is also described by Readence, Bean and Baldwin.

Computer instruction, when combined with video and text sources, promises to be an exciting technological and educational innovation. New methods of presenting traditional information, new methods of problem solving, new ways of organizing and structuring large data bases, and new ways of providing personalized instruction are just a few of the opportunities available. Schools must provide students at all levels with access to the new technology and make sure they have equal access to resources whatever their socioeconomic background, race, or gender. At the same time we must make sure that new technologies do not limit or impede our capacity to be human and critical interpreters of the world in which we live and work.

Computers can be used throughout a school’s reading program. Recognizing that they are, “a mighty poor observer of reading behavior and cannot be a substitute for teacher-pupil exchange,” computers can be used as one of the many tools in the delivery of reading instruction.

Summary of Reading Programs

Reading is a complex process which students have mastered to varying degrees by the time they come to high school. As a result, quality high school reading programs are designed in ways which address a spectrum of learning needs. The literature on reading describes content area reading instruction as being beneficial to all students, as it helps students to understand the content material which they are expected to read. Independent and recreational reading are considered to be a means to provide students with the opportunity to practice reading skills and therefore

---

81 Radencich, 52.
82 Readence, 247.
improve their reading skills. Computers, when used in an interactive and thought provoking manner, can also enhance reading instruction.

While developmental reading instruction helps students to refine their reading skills, remedial reading instruction tries to alleviate skill deficit areas. Gifted students can also benefit from reading instruction tailored to fit their individual learning needs. The context for reading instruction might be in a specialized reading class or within a content area class. There must, however, be an awareness of how to deliver instruction to students in need of gifted, developmental, or remedial instruction, and awareness of how to assist all students in understanding content area reading to ensure achievement in reading for all students.

Summary of Chapter Two

In reviewing the literature on supervision of reading programs, the principal was described as having many responsibilities which directly effect the quality of instruction in his or her school. As with any instructional program, sufficient resources must be available for staff, materials, and space to enable the program to be effective. The principal was said to be responsible for the allocation of resources within the school, demonstrating the importance that he or she places on reading instruction. Working together, the principal and the staff can establish and implement a philosophy for the reading program along with supporting instructional goals. The principal can also communicate the importance of reading instruction and solicit
the support of all stakeholders in the school community: students, teachers, parents, school board members, and other community members.

Since the principal has the responsibility for the supervision of instruction, he or she has the opportunity to improve and monitor instruction. With an understanding of the reading process, knowledge about reading instruction, and an awareness of student achievement, the principal is prepared to address the specific concerns about reading instruction in his or her school.

Commonly used to assess the learning needs of students are standardized norm referenced tests, criterion test, and informal assessment. It is vital that the principal have an understanding of how to interpret test results and understand the impact those results should have on curriculum and instruction. Even though tests do not assess every aspect of reading, they are used as a primary source of information about student achievement. As the instructional leader, the principal is in a role to disseminate information about test scores to the staff and to receive input from reading specialist and other teachers as to the direction the reading program should take. This input is essential because through interacting with students in an instructional environment, it is possible for teachers to observe and further assess student learning needs.

Teacher observation, formative evaluation, and subsequent staff development, can be tools by which to direct the course of reading instruction to meet the learning needs of students. The principal is instrumental in fostering an
environment conducive to achievement in reading. The reading circle, encompassing literature on the supervision and design of reading programs, supports the importance of the principal in establishing and maintaining a quality reading program.
CHAPTER 3

JOURNEY INTO DISCOVERY: THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine the commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence. It will compare and contrast the perspective of the principal to their respective school's written documentation about reading instruction; identify how the supervision of reading instruction occurs in high school; and because of the limited amount of information available, add to the body of information on reading instruction at the high school level. This dissertation will not debate the merits of one reading methodology over another, but describe the focus reading instruction found in academically excellent high schools.

The research questions will lead to a thorough analysis of reading programs in the six Illinois public high schools recognized in 1996 as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence:

1. How are reading programs designed and supervised in Illinois high school Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence?

2. What role does the principal have in the supervision of reading instruction?

3. What are the underlying philosophical beliefs of the reading programs?
4. What pedagogy is advocated for reading instruction?
5. Who is responsible for reading instruction and assessment?
6. What are the identified course objectives?
7. Where does reading instruction take place?
8. Who is the targeted population for reading instruction?

To answer these questions, and adhere to the purpose of this study, a qualitative research design, as described in the section of this chapter describing the procedure, will be used to organize, collect, and analyze data. A qualitative research approach relies “on the written or spoken work or the observable behavior of the person being studied as the principal source of data for analysis. The purpose of the research is a greater understanding of the world seen from the unique viewpoint of the people being studied.”

The Sample

The sample population consists of the principals of the Illinois public high schools who were recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence in 1996. These high schools, Champaign Central High School, Elk Grove High School, Homewood-Flossmoor Community High School, James B. Conant High School, Rolling Meadows High School, and St. Charles High School were among two hundred sixty six public and private schools recognized from across the United States including Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the

1 Paul A. Bloland, “Qualitative Research in Student Affairs,” (Ann Arbor, Michigan: ERIC Clearing House on Counseling and Personnel Services, 1992), 1, ERIC Digest, ED 347487.
Bureau of Indian Affairs and Department of Defense Dependents Schools (See Appendix).

The Blue Ribbon Schools Program is conducted by the United States Department of Education and as identified by the U.S. Secretary of Education, Richard W. Riley:

These successful schools feature:
- challenging academic standards and a rigorous curriculum for all;
- a disciplined, supportive, safe and drug-free environment;
- participatory leadership and a strong partnership among the family, school, and community;
- excellent teaching and an environment that strengthens teacher skills and improvement.
- low drop out rates and documented student achievement.

There is a rigorous selection process which entails several steps. The selection process is explained again in this section of Chapter Three to reiterate the selection process explained in the introduction. "A school conducts a self evaluation - a useful process that allow teachers, students, parent and community representatives to assess their strengths and weaknesses and develops strategic plans for the future." After completing the extensive application, the schools submit it to their state nominating agency for consideration. For a public school, the nomination must come from the Chief State School Officer. Then:

A national review panel evaluates the nomination. The panel consist of 100 outstanding public and private school educators, college and university staff, state and local government official, school board members, parents, the education press, business representatives, and the general public...Based on the quality of the application,

---


the most promising schools are recommended for site visits. The purpose of a visit is to verify the accuracy of the information the school has provided in its nomination form and to gather any additional information the panel has requested. Experienced educators, including principals of previously recognized schools, visit and observe the school for 2 days and submit written site visit reports. The panel considers the report and makes recommendations to the U.S. Secretary of Education, who then announces the names of schools selected for recognition.

The principals of each of the six Illinois public high schools, recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence in 1996, are the source of information about the supervision and the design of the reading programs in their respective schools. If the principal feels he or she cannot provide a sufficient amount of information, the person who the principal designates as key to the supervision of the reading program will be contacted for an interview. Since the principal has the overall responsibility for the supervision of instruction in his or her building, the designee is under the auspices of the principal.

**Procedures**

The high school principals of the six Illinois high schools, recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence, were sent a letter in order to solicit their participation in the study. Simultaneously documents were requested such as: 1. Mission statement(s) related to reading instruction; 2. Reading course description(s) or program design information; 3. A scope and sequence of skills.

---

for reading instruction; 4. School improvement plan information related to reading instruction; 5. Titles of any specific text for reading or class novels used for reading instruction; and 6. 1996 School Report Card (See Appendix). Each of the principals were then contacted by telephone to arrange a time that they could be interviewed and to arrange for collection the documents pertaining to their reading programs.

A semi-structured interview schedule was developed in order to ascertain the role of the principals in the supervision of the reading program, their knowledge of the reading program, and information on the design of the high school reading programs (See Appendix). To develop this instrument, questions were developed based on the information found in literature on the supervision and design of high school reading programs. Once developed the interview schedule was reviewed with a professor of qualitative research at Loyola University of Chicago and with students in Loyola University of Chicago's southern doctoral cohort who were administrators (3 principals and 2 assistant principals) of Illinois high schools.

Feedback was given on the clarity of the questions, the perceived purpose of the questions, and the feasibility of the intended audience to answers the questions. The purpose of receiving feedback was to increase the theoretical validity of the semi-structured interview schedule as described by Joseph A. Maxwell. According to Maxwell, "What counts as theoretical validity depends on whether there is consensus within the community concerned with the research
about the terms used to characterized the phenomena.”

According to the feedback given, the questions were clearly understood and the principals found them feasible to answer in their instructional roles. There were suggestions made to increase the number questions to address:

1. The development of student appreciation and recreation of reading
2. The evaluation of student competency to meet and incorporate standards of employability
3. Creating an ongoing reading initiative within each department within a school
4. The utilization of community resources to encourage and promote reading programs within high schools
5. Title One Programs

It was also suggested that the questions be sent to the principals ahead of time. Finally, there was a question as to whether or not the design of the study would allow for interviewing a person who a principal felt was more qualified to answer questions about reading instruction. The interview schedule was reviewed considering the feedback given on the questions. The interview schedule was then used to guide the interviews with the principals of the high schools. To increase the accuracy of reporting their statements, the interviews were recorded.

School documents were requested to give impetus to formulating a description of high school reading programs. A template for analyzing these documents was developed based

---

upon the types of reading program descriptions found in the literature (See Appendix). The school report card was needed to ascertain characteristics of the student population, staff, test scores, and expenditures per student for each school. The other documents (the mission statement(s) related to reading instruction, the reading course description(s) or program design information, the scope and sequence of skills for reading instruction, the school improvement plan information related to reading instruction, and titles of any specific text for reading or class novels used for reading instruction) were used to analyze the structure of the reading program and to conduct a descriptive analysis of the schools' reading programs. There was a search for documentation of the existence of other programs such as independent reading programs, reading labs, computer assisted programs, and summer reading programs. The descriptive analysis also provided a source of comparison when analyzing the interview data from the principals.

A start up list of codes was developed in order to efficiently analyze the information given by the principals in the interview process. The information was to be coded inductively beginning with a start up list of codes as described by Miles and Huberman in their book Qualitative Data Analysis (See Appendix). As described by Miles and Huberman, "Codes are tags are labels for assigning units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information completed in a study. Codes usually are attached to 'chunks' of varying size, words, phrases, sentences, or whole
paragraphs, connected or unconnected to a specific setting.”

The start list of codes, “comes from the conceptional framework, list of research questions, hypothesis, problem areas, and/or key variables the researcher brings to the study.” In the case of this study, the start list of codes was developed from the descriptions of the role of supervisors found in literature along with the program descriptors. In addition the conceptual framework created to organized this study was a source of information (See Appendix). Additional codes were developed as the data was analyzed.

**Validity**

To establish validity triangulation of data sources will be used. Sandra Mattheson explains that “the value of triangulation lies in providing evidence - whether convergent, inconsistent, or contradictory - such that the researcher can construct good explanations of the social phenomena from which they arise.”

Triangulation of data sources (principals and school documents), methods (interview and a descriptive analysis), and theories (of reading instruction and supervision of reading programs) will occur in the analysis of data to lend validity to the study. The reading programs will be compared with the elements of successful reading programs described thought the literature and a search for discrepant evidence will occur. Using these

---


Ibid, 58.

methods of comparison will help to increase the validity of the research findings.

**Summary**

The methodology used to explore the design and supervision of reading programs, in the Illinois public high schools who were recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence in 1996, makes it possible to embark upon a journey of discovery. The information discovered through the qualitative analysis of an interview with the participating instructional leaders and a descriptive analysis of written information about each school's reading program and school report card leads to the conclusion. The collected data is analyzed and reported in the next chapter on the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4

LOST AND FOUND TREASURE: THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The primary purpose of this study is to identify commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence. This assists in identifying how the supervision of reading instruction occurs in high school and because of the limited amount of information available, adds to the body of information on reading instruction at the high school level. Chapter four of this dissertation consists of a report of the research findings.

The research findings of this study have been divided into three sections. First, there is a profile of each of the Illinois public high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence. It provides an overview and a comparison of the population, per pupil expenditure, and reading test scores of the schools. The information is derived from a descriptive analysis of the school report card which denotes the demographics and performance of each school. This will be followed by a qualitative analysis of the interviews conducted with the participating instructional leaders on the design and supervision of their respective school's reading program. The information given by the instructional leaders will then be compared to the written documentation they made available about the philosophy,
goals, and the instructional components of their respective reading program.

To help insure confidentiality, the award winning schools were randomly assigned the letters A, B, C, D, E, and F to be used in lieu of specific names. Each of the Illinois public high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence provided a school report card and some information on how reading instruction is addressed in the curriculum. Five of the six instructional leaders agreed to be interviewed.

The sixth instructional leader, due to his or her own time constraints, only participated in the study to the extent of providing the school report card and written information about and the philosophy, goals, and structure of the school's reading program. The written information was considered to be significant to the purpose of the study as it described the design of the school's reading program. Because of the significance of the information provided, this school was included in the study, but only in the analysis of the written information. There was no data provided on the supervision of instruction, nor did the written descriptions have the benefit of explanation or interpretation by the instructional leader of the school.
School Profiles

This section of the dissertation will be an analysis of information found in the school report card of each of the participating public high schools. According to the Better Schools Accountability Law (Section 10-17a of the 1996 Illinois School Code) all public school districts in Illinois are required to report the performance of their school. The school report card therefore has information which is useful in providing a descriptive analysis of the school population, expenditures, test scores, teaching staff, and administration. The information consisting of specific numbers will be reported within a range of numbers in order to provide a description of the schools while maintaining the anonymity of each school.

The Schools

Using the classification scale on the school report card form, two of the schools are a part of a unit district (pre-kindergarten through 12th grade) and four of the schools are high school districts (grades 9 through 12). Within these categories all of the schools are considered to be medium in size with the exception of one, which is considered to be large. According to the 1996 school report cards, medium in size for a high school district is 604 to 2,747 students; medium in size for a unit district is considered to be 555 to 1927 students. Large in size is over 2,747 students for a high school district and over 1,927 for a unit district. The student enrollment of the schools in this study ranges from approximately 1000 to 3000 students (see table 1).
One of the financial indicators for a school district found in the school report card is the operating expense per pupil.

The operating expense per pupil represents the total operating cost of a local district except for non-regular K-12 program expenses. Non-regular expenses include those for adult education, summer school, and capital expenditures...Per pupil cost is obtained by dividing the allowable expenditures by the average daily attendance for the regular school year.1

The high schools in the study have an operating expense per student which ranges from approximately $5000 per student to approximately $11,500 per student. Table 1 is a comparison of schools participating in the study in enrollment, operating expense (by district), and operating expense for the same type of district (see table 1).

Table 1. Student Enrollment, District Operating Expense per Pupil, and State Average for the Same Type School District, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Operating Expense Per Pupil</th>
<th>State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1500 - 2000</td>
<td>$10,500 to $11,500 $</td>
<td>$8,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1500 - 2000</td>
<td>$10,500 to $11,500</td>
<td>$8,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2000 - 3000</td>
<td>$5,000 to $6,000</td>
<td>$5,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1000 - 1500</td>
<td>$5,000 to $6,000</td>
<td>$5,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2000 - 3000</td>
<td>$9,000 to $10,500</td>
<td>$8,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2000 - 3000</td>
<td>$9,000 to $10,500</td>
<td>$8,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>1,906,599</td>
<td>$5,933 (average for state)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 school report card of each of the participating schools.

1 Illinois State Board of Education: State, Local and Federal Financing or Illinois Public Schools 1996-97, 79.
The school size seems to be less of an indicator of operating expense per student than the school type. High school districts according to the way schools are funded in Illinois have a larger operating expense per student than found in unit districts. Nevertheless, having an operating expense per student ranging from approximately $5000 per pupil to $11,500 per pupil does seem to be significant. It would appear that some Blue Ribbon Schools are able to spend over twice as much per pupil as other Blue Ribbon schools. Four of the school districts have an operating expense above the state average for their particular type of district, while two do not. It should be noted, however, the operating expense per student does not necessarily reflect all of the components which could contribute to students receiving a quality education.

According to the school report card, "The average class size is the total enrollment for a grade divided by the number of classes for that grade reported the first day of school in May. For high schools, the average class size is computed for the whole school, based on average class sizes for the second and fifth periods."² The average class size, for these Blue Ribbon Schools, ranges from 19.0 to 22.7. One school has a class size slightly below the state average and all other schools have an average class size slightly above the state average of 19.5 (see table 2).

Table 2. Average Class Size, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.

The Teachers

The description of a school could not be complete without having information provided about the teachers and students. The teachers in the districts of the Blue Ribbon Schools have a significant amount of experience ranging from an average of 10 to 20 years and the percentage of teachers with Masters and above is significantly higher than the state average (see Table 3).

Table 3. Teacher Experience and Education, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Teachers with Masters &amp; Above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15 to 20 years</td>
<td>75 to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15 to 20 years</td>
<td>75 to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>55 to 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>55 to 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>15 to 20 years</td>
<td>75 to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15 to 20 years</td>
<td>75 to 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>14.4 years</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 School Report Cards of the participating schools
The racial and ethnic background (by district) of the teachers of the Blue Ribbon Schools is reported on the school report cards. As described in the Table 4, the majority of teachers in the schools are white with a low percentage of minority teachers (see table 4). This is not unusual in the state of Illinois, however, the percentage of minority teachers is less than the state average.

Table 4. Teachers in Schools, by Racial/Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Background</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
<th>Illinois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>&gt;99%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.
*Source: The 1996 School Report Cards of the participating schools

Finally, when examining the teacher-pupil ratio found in these Blue Ribbon Schools, the range is from 17.8:1 to 18.7:1. In most instances the pupil teacher ratio is slightly above the state average of 17.9:1. As indicated in table 5 the administrator-pupil ratio has a greater degree of variability ranging from approximately 150 students to one administrator to 260 students to one administrator. The state average is 253.2 students to one administrator (see table 5).
Table 5. Pupil-Teacher Ratio and Pupil-Administrator Ratio, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</th>
<th>Pupil Administrator Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
<td>145-165:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
<td>145-165:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
<td>250-270:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18-19:1</td>
<td>210-230:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
<td>250-270:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>18-19:1</td>
<td>210-230:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>17.9:1</td>
<td>253.2:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.

The Students

The racial/ethnic background of students in these Blue Ribbon Schools reflects a greater amount of differentiation than is found in the teaching staff. The minority student population in the schools ranges from approximately 5% to 35% demonstrating some variation amongst the schools (see Table 6).

Table 6. Racial/ Ethnic Background of Students, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/ Pacific Is</th>
<th>Native American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>70-75%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>65-70%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>70-75%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%.

*Source: 1996 school report cards of the schools.
The low income rate is determined by students who "are from families receiving public aid, living in institutions for neglected or delinquent children, being supported in foster homes with public funds, or eligible to receive free or reduced-priced lunches." For these schools the low income rate is significantly lower than the state average. In Table 7, the state average is 34.9% and the range of low income rates for these Blue Ribbon Schools is between 1% and 15%.

Table 7. Low Income Students, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of Low Income Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The 1996 School Report cards of the participating schools

The limited-English-proficiency rate is determined by the number of students who have been found to be eligible for bilingual education. It does not include the total number of students who speak English as a second language. The limited English proficiency rate, amongst the Blue Ribbon Schools in this study, has a great amount of variability with the range being from less than 1% to 12%. The state average is 5.9%. (see Table 8).

Ibid, 2.
Table 8. Limited English Proficiency Rate of Students, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Eligible for Bilingual Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4-8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>8-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 school report card of each of the participating schools

The School Report Card states that "A perfect attendance rate (100%) would mean that all students attend school every day."¹ The Blue Ribbon Schools in this study have an attendance rate that ranges from approximately 93% to 95% with an average consistent with the state average (see Table 9). Chronic truants, according to the school report cards, are "students who were absent from school without a valid cause for 10% or more of the last 180 school days."² All of the schools have a chronic truancy rate less than the state average of 2.3% (see Table 9). The dropout rate is determined by the "number of students in grades 9-12 who dropped out of school during the 1995-96 school year."³ As shown in table 9, all of the schools also have a dropout rate less than the state average, although one school has a dropout rate greater than the other schools and close to the

---

¹ Ibid, 2.
² Ibid, 2.
³ Ibid, 2.
state average (see table 9).

Table 9. Student Attendance, Chronic Truancy, and Dropouts, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Chronic Truancy</th>
<th>Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-95%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>93-94%</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>93-94%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>92-93%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>4-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>92-93%</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>94-95%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%
*Source: The 1996 school report card of each of the participating schools.

Student Achievement

"The 1995-96 graduation rate compares the number of students who enrolled in ninth grade in the fall of 1992 with number from that group who actually graduated in 1996. Adjustments to the rate have been made for students who transferred in and out of the school. The formula to compute the graduation rate was changed in 1995. The graduation rate may now include students who took more than four years to graduate." Table 10 shows the graduation rate for each of the Blue Ribbon Schools in this study is above the state average of 80.5%. All except one of the schools has a graduation rate above 85%.

Ibid, 5.
Table 10. Graduation Rate of Students, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>85-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>80-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1996 School Report Cards of the participating schools*

The IGAP (Illinois Goals Assessment Program) is administered to students in the 10th and 11th grade at all of the high schools in this study. Achievement is assessed in reading, mathematics, and writing for students in 10th grade and in science, and social studies for students in 11th grade. The average IGAP scores "are reported on a 0-500 scale." When examining student performance in reading on the IGAP, the average scores of the Blue Ribbon Schools exceed the state average of 223 (see Table 11).

Table 11. Student IGAP Scores in Reading, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>240-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>240-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.*

"Ibid, 5."
The average scores in Table 11, fall within a band of scores from 237-267.

The IGAP scores on the school report card are also reported in terms of meeting, exceeding, and not meeting state goals:

Between 1991 and 1993, the [Illinois] State Board of Education established performance standards for reading, mathematics, writing, science and social science. Based on their IGAP scores, students are placed in one of three levels: Level 1 (do not meet state goals for learning; level 2 (meet state goals); and Level 3 (exceed state goals). The cut-off scores for these levels were established with the help of Illinois elementary and secondary educators.

As found in table 12, when analyzing the reading scores, students in the Blue Ribbon Schools are found in all three categories. However when comparing these schools with the state averages, more students meet and exceed state goals (see table 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Do Not Meet Goals</th>
<th>Meet Goals</th>
<th>Exceed Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>40-45%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>50-55%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Students in these Blue Ribbon Schools also take the ACT (American College Testing Program) "ACT scores range from 1
(lowest) to 36 (highest). A 'core' program is a high school program which includes at least 4 years of English and at least 3 years each of mathematics, social studies and natural sciences. Generally, students who complete core programs earn higher average scores than those who had less than core programs." Because of the nature of the core program, these students are most likely upper classman. When comparing the reading scores on the ACT, one school did not achieve the state average in the category of students who completed the core curriculum, nor in the category of all students tested. A second school fell slightly below the state average in the category of all students tested. All other schools exceeded state goals in both categories (see table 13).

Table 13. Student Scores in Reading, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Core Curriculum</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Illinois</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The 1996 report cards of all of the participating schools.

On the IGAP, student scores in all instances exceed state averages. However on the ACT, the students have scores which exceed state averages in some instances but not in others.

10 Ibid, 7.
Summary of the School Profile

There are many factors which contribute to a school having an environment conducive to learning and students who achieve. When examining these particular Blue Ribbon schools there are ways in which they are very similar and ways in which they differ. The schools are located in both unit and high school districts. The enrollment ranges from 1000-3000 students. However, the schools are considered to be medium in size for their type of district, with the exception of one which is large. Although schools in high school districts and unit districts are funded differently in Illinois, having an operating expense per student that ranges from $5000 per student to $11,500 per student is significant. It appears that some schools are able to spend twice as much to educate their student populace.

Class sizes range from 19 to 22.7 and this does not seem to be a large variation. The teachers in these Blue Ribbon Schools are well educated, with over 55% holding masters degrees or above. They also have a significant amount of teaching experience. There is some variability (1% to 11%) of minority teachers, which is not reflective of the minority student population which ranges from less than 1% to approximately 30% of the overall student population. The teacher-pupil ratio is very similar ranging from 17 to 19 students per teacher. The pupil-administrator ratio varies significantly with some schools having about 150 students to one administrator and other schools having approximately 270 students to one administrator.

There is a low percentage of low income students in the
schools even though a range from 1% to 15% does reflect some degree of variability. This is especially true when considering the state average is 34.9%. Twelve percent or less of the students are eligible for bilingual education, which is reflective of the state average of 5.9%. Student attendance is high with a low truancy rate and a low dropout rate.

When examining student performance in reading on measures of achievement, the IGAP and the ACT, students generally scored above state averages. As previously explained, all exceeded state averages on the IGAP. However there were instances when students scored below the state average on the ACT. With further examination of each school’s philosophy of reading, reading program, and supervision of reading instruction more information will be provided on individual school efforts to improve or maintain reading achievement.

The profiles of Illinois public high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence will provide a foundation for exploring the reading programs in each school. The information provided in the school profile is not included to indicate causation for achievement or lack there of, but to provide a description of the schools included in the study. For individual school profiles see Appendix C. The next section of Chapter 4 will consist of an analysis of the information gathered as a result of the interviews conducted with the instructional leaders of the award winning schools.
The Instructional Leaders

Each of the instructional leaders interviewed as part of this study either held the position of principal in their respective school during the 1995-96 award winning school year and/or are currently principals with the exception of one. The one person, who has not held the position of principal, was designated by the building principal as having responsibility for the supervision of reading instruction in that particular school. All of the instructional leaders have been in administrative positions in their schools for at least the last three years. Two of the instructional leaders have changed administrative positions within the last two years to assume positions with increased responsibility. One moved from assistant principal to principal and another moved from principal to superintendent (see table 14).

Table 14. Present and Most Recent Past Position of the Instructional Leaders in Their Current District and Total Number of Years for Both Positions, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Position at Time of Interview</th>
<th>Most Recent Past Position</th>
<th>Total Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Associate Principal</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>English Division Head</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>10-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principal of School E was joined by the associate principal of the school during the part of the interview on the supervision of reading instruction. The principal of
School F immediately forwarded written information about how the school addresses the reading instructional needs of students. However, this principal did not agree to be interviewed. Therefore, the information on School F will only consist of a written description of the reading program.

The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview schedule developed in order to address the following research questions: 1. How are reading programs designed and supervised in Illinois high school Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence?; 2. What role does the principal have in the supervision of reading instruction?; 3. What are the underlying philosophical beliefs of the reading programs?; 4. What pedagogy is advocated for reading instruction?; 5. Who is responsible for reading instruction and assessment?; 6. What are the identified course objectives?; 7. Where does reading instruction take place?; 8. Who is the targeted population for reading instruction?

Strengths of Instructional Leaders

The instructional leaders were asked to identify their strengths. Collectively, the instructional leaders identified a number of strengths. Individually, they seemed to identify what they felt was important to leadership at their particular school (see table 15). When examining their identified instructional strengths, there are some patterns that seem to emerge. The strengths can be more easily explained according to the "three managerial skills that are relevant to managerial effectiveness" as described by Gary
Yukl in his book, *Leadership in Organizations*. Although these skills are very relevant to the business world, they are also applicable to the skills of instructional leaders in schools.

Interpersonal skills is one category that appears to be inclusive of many of the strengths the instructional leaders identified.

Interpersonal skills include knowledge about human behavior and group processes; ability to understand the feeling attitudes, and motives of others; and the ability to communicate clearly and persuasively...Interpersonal skills such as empathy, social insight, charm, tact and diplomacy, persuasiveness, and oral ability are essential to develop and maintain cooperative relationships with subordinates, superiors, peers, and outsiders. Interpersonal skills therefore seem to consist of those skills which involve listening and communicating effectively with others, facilitating and influencing groups of people to work together, and the ability to mediate problems which arise during group interactions. Interpersonal skills were identified as instructional leadership strengths 12 out of the 21 identified strengths (see table 15). There are two strengths in table 15 which are identified as personal skills. They can be placed in the category of interpersonal skills. They do not involve interacting with others, but having having knowledge of self which perhaps contributes to the effectiveness of interpersonal skills (see table 15). By including personal skills with interpersonal skills this category was identified as an instructional strength fourteen out of twenty-one times.

---


12 Yukl, 273.
The second prevalent instructional strength identified could be categorized as technical skills. "Technical skills include knowledge about methods, processes, procedures, and techniques for conducting the specialized activities of the manager's organizational unit. These skills are learned during formal education in specialized subjects...and through on the job training and experience." Technical skills were identified as instructional strengths five out of twenty-one identified strengths (see table 15). It should be noted that the technical skills identified are associated with leadership and not expertise in reading instruction.

The least identified instructional strength was that of conceptual skills. "Conceptual skills include several cognitive abilities such as analytical ability, logical thinking, concept formation, inductive reasoning. In general terms, conceptual skills includes good judgment, foresight, intuition, creativity, and the ability to find meaning and order in ambiguous, uncertain, events." Conceptual skills were identified only once out of twenty-one self-identified skills (see table 15).

13 Yukl, 272.
14 Yukl, 274.
Table 15. Self-Identified Strengths of the Instructional Leaders, by Skill and by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Instructional Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>I 1.</td>
<td>Creating a school climate where students have responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 2.</td>
<td>Creating a school climate which fosters risk taking and creativity by the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 3.</td>
<td>The ability to facilitate groups and work with staff to get things accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>T 4.</td>
<td>Recognizing and developing the talent of individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 5.</td>
<td>Finding quality people to become a part of the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 6.</td>
<td>Leading by example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>I 7.</td>
<td>Being able to help people focus on what is important in school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 8.</td>
<td>Creating a mission to unify others and rally around a common focus and a common direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 9.</td>
<td>Helping the staff to take ownership in school decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 10.</td>
<td>Communicating the successes of the school and encouraging people to continue on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 11.</td>
<td>Supporting the ideas of teachers in the best way possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15 Continued. Self-Identified Strengths of the Instructional Leaders, by Skill and by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Instructional Strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>P 12.</td>
<td>Recognizing you won't have all of the ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>P 13.</td>
<td>Recognizing you can't do it alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>I 14.</td>
<td>Good interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 15.</td>
<td>Having clear expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 16.</td>
<td>Successful mediation of problems that occur among staff members, students, and parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 17.</td>
<td>Good Organizational Skills that carry over into all parts of administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>I 18.</td>
<td>Managing the &quot;Web of Tension&quot;, in other words managing well when people have conflicting interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Good at seeing the big picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C 20.</td>
<td>Having a knack for looking at things in new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I 21.</td>
<td>Being a good listener</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I = Interpersonal Skill  *P = Personal Skills
*T = Technical Skill     *C = Conceptual Skills
Instructional Leaders and the Supervision of Reading Instruction

The instructional leaders have a varying amount of involvement with reading instruction in their respective schools. The principal of School A meets with administrators and reading teachers in the school, and throughout the district, and also with those of feeder schools in order to try to establish a Kindergarten through 12th grade reading program. This principal also meets with division heads in the school and with them sets goals directed toward improving reading scores of all students on standardized tests of achievement. The principal discussed giving building level administrators the responsibility of building into the goals of all teachers, the reading goal of having all students read more. He did state that he feels reading instruction is the responsibility of the administrators and the teachers. The English division head of School A does observe and evaluate the reading teachers, however the principal has active role in organizing others to meet building reading goals.

On the other end of the spectrum, the principal of School B gave total responsibility for the supervision of reading instruction to the English division head and seemed to have little direct involvement. The English division head in school B is responsible for observing and evaluating the reading teachers, working with the department to meet district goals in reading, and assumes some instructional responsibilities. The English division head has at least 10
years of experience working with "reluctant readers" and participates in workshops with teachers to discuss and address the instructional needs of students in the area of reading. This instructional leader explained that many people feel reading instruction is the responsibility of the English department, but contends reading instruction is the responsibility of all teachers.

In School C, the instructional leader, who was principal of an award winning high school and now holds the position of superintendent, focuses on empowering teachers to address the instructional needs of students in their classrooms. Teachers were said to need time to discuss reading achievement and not only English teachers, but all teachers. The role assumed by this instructional leader was one of supporting teacher efforts and ideas to meet the instructional needs of students. This support was described in terms of encouraging teachers to develop ideas and in turn presenting proposals to the school board to secure needed funds for implementation. His role was also said to be one of communicating the successes of the high school and continuing to encourage people onward. Reading instruction was viewed as the responsibility of all teachers.

The principal of School D expressed the responsibility for the direct supervision of reading instruction as belonging to the English department chair. He described his particular experience with reading instruction as being limited, but he had very definitive ideas on the need to promote and support the efforts of teachers in addressing the reading instructional needs of students. School D had
experienced a reduction in reading courses due to budgetary cuts. As a result, the responsibility for reading instruction has been assumed by English teachers and the teachers of a program developed to meet the instructional needs of low achievers. The principal considered reading instruction to be important, however the reading program at the school was not very extensive and he did not have a very active supervisory role.

In School E, the associate principal has direct responsibility for observing and evaluating the teachers responsible for reading instruction. The associate principal also meets with the English department on a regular basis to discuss and address the instructional needs of students. As far as the day to day operations of the English department, the department coordinator oversees department meetings and communicates information to the administration concerning department activities. The principal does meet with the department chairpersons of the school and serves as a part of the school improvement team where they have addressed the instructional needs of students in the area of reading. Reading instruction was said to be the responsibility of the English department, but eventually it was the hope of this instructional leader that reading instruction would become the responsibility of all teachers.

The direct supervision in observation and evaluation of the reading instructor is the responsibility of the English department chair or English division head in all except one school where the assistant principal assumes this responsibility. The instructional leaders of Schools A
and C claimed reading instruction was the responsibility of all teachers. The instructional leaders of Schools B and E claimed that reading instruction was the responsibility of the English department, but should be the responsibility of all teachers. The instructional leader of School D reported that reading instruction was the responsibility of the English department and the teachers of the class designed to address the learning needs of students with low skill levels.

The instructional leaders nevertheless had an idea of what they look for when evaluating the reading instruction in their respective schools. When asked, "What do you look for when evaluating reading instruction?", the instructional leaders had three categories of responses, School A and School D referred to assessment; School B and School E referred to what they observe in the classroom; and School C referred to the role of the teachers.

The principal of School A specifically examines the test scores on the Illinois Goals Assessment Program (IGAP) and the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test. In addition, the instructional leader of School A examines what was referred to as the "audit" consisting of school test scores from the IGAP, Gates MacGinitie Reading Test, Explorer, PLAN, the American College Testing Program (ACT), and the consumer education vocational assessments, along with analysis of the information from the senior exit surveys, and the career planning survey. Similarly, the principal of School D examines the test results on the IGAP, the ACT, and the Stanford Test of Achievement to determine if students are having their instructional needs met.
Because of their direct role in the supervision of reading instruction, the English division head of School B and the associate principal of School E gave more specific information on what they look for when evaluating reading instruction. They referred directly to observing reading instruction in the classroom. The instructional leader of school B looks for: pre-reading activities; teachers giving kids tools to help them with decoding; class discussion involving all students; classroom materials; questioning strategies, specifically higher level questions and low level questions; and time given to specific students.

The associate principal of School E tries to see 1) If the things the teachers say are being done are actually being done in the classroom; 2) How instruction is tailored to meet the individual needs of students; 3) Are teachers reading with the kids?; 4) What techniques do they use to assist students when they are reading aloud?; 5) What are the students doing?; and 6) How are they using the information they have learned? Are they discussing what they have read with other students or are they writing about what they have read? The associate principal stressed more than once the importance of being aware of what both the teacher and the students are doing when reading instruction is being evaluated.

The instructional leader of School C did not refer to a specific role in evaluating reading instruction. The instructional leader did, however, emphasize that it is important to recognize that "good" teachers see the value of reading instruction, recognize when students are having
difficulty, and they help students learn.

Staff Development

Staff develop, which could be considered part of the supervision of reading instruction, took place to varying degrees throughout the school and school districts. School A is part of a district which builds staff development programs in cooperation with a local university. As a part of their program, they are able to earn college credit. Staff development opportunities are offered in reading. When asked how he or she would assist a new teacher with addressing the reading instructional needs of students, the instructional leader described the desire to create a situation, once their reading across the curriculum program was further developed, in which teachers could teach teachers.

The instructional leader of School B described a past reading workshop where teachers in the building had met on a number of Thursday mornings in large group and small group sessions devoted to reading instruction. They examined the reading outcomes, the state goals, and the outcomes for their reading courses. When asked how he or she would help a new teacher incorporate reading instruction into his or her classroom, the instructional leader of School B replied that the teacher would be assigned to a veteran reading teacher. The instructional leader, however, felt that universities are better preparing new teachers to address the reading instructional needs of students.

In the district of School C, staff development for reading instruction is beginning to take place as teachers of
kindergarten through twelfth grade work together to determine standards addressing, "What should students accomplish and be able to do in reading?" The instructional leader felt in developing standards it is necessary to determine what it means, define the standard, decide how it will be addressed, and decide how staff development can respond to needs. When asked, how to he or she would help a new teacher incorporate reading instruction into his or her classroom, the instructional leader referred to the orientation program for new teachers. The school district has a program in which veteran or experienced teachers and matched with new teachers and they meet throughout the school year to address various topics.

The teachers in School D were described by the instructional leader as continuing to stay current with what is happening in their particular field. Teachers have the opportunity to attend both state level and national level conferences. The school district assumes some financial responsibility for sending teachers to the conferences. Some teachers who have found themselves in need of additional training in reading instruction have chosen to take university classes or workshops. At times, there are also district level workshops teachers can attend.

The principal of School E referred to past efforts to offer staff development workshops in reading instruction and explained because it was voluntary, there was not a lot of participation. Reading staff development was described as something which might need to be revisited and required. When asked how he or she would help a new teacher incorporate
reading instruction into his or her classroom, the
instructional leader explained the teacher would have the
opportunity to work with the reading instructors. The new
teacher could take some time to see what the reading
instructors do and get advice on how to use those techniques
in his or her classroom.

In each of the schools A, B, C, D, and E there was a
venue in place to assist staff in learning about reading
instruction. Staff development in these schools, however,
took place in various ways (see table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Overall Reading Staff Development</th>
<th>New Teacher Staff Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>-university accredited workshops</td>
<td>a desire for teachers teaching teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-building level workshops</td>
<td>veteran teachers teaching new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>-district meetings to develop standards</td>
<td>veteran teachers teaching new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>-district financed attendance at conferences both state and national university courses -district level workshops</td>
<td>veteran teachers teaching new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-building level workshops</td>
<td>reading teachers working with new teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the staff development venues listed
in table 16 include only those specifically identified by the
instructional leaders. It is not improbable that teachers, in schools outside of school D, might also attend conferences and take university courses.

The instructional leaders had very little training in teaching reading and/or the supervision of reading instruction. The instructional leader of School A had the opportunity to work as a volunteer in the high school in which he was employed as a tutor of "low readers". The instructional leader of School B made reference to attending a workshop on reading instruction, but primarily this person's understanding of reading instruction was said to have come from the reading teachers in the building and in their preparation for administering IGAP tests to students. Only one instructional leader (School E) had taken a course in reading instruction. The other instructional leaders said that they had no training in teaching or supervising reading instruction. The instructional leaders involvement with reading instruction was not based on expertise with reading instruction but their expertise as instructional leaders in organizing for instruction. Organizing for instruction involved their role as instructional leaders and the supervision of the overall reading program by:
1. Having an understanding of student skills through assessment and communication with teachers
2. Setting building goals and objectives to address student instructional needs
3. Securing the necessary resources to assist teachers in meeting student instructional needs
4. Making time available to discuss students achievement
and addressing areas of weakness

5. Encouraging teacher to develop ideas
6. Using self-identified instructional strengths to work with others to address the instructional needs of students
7. Being aware of staff development opportunities related to reading instruction

Instructional Leaders and Reading Assessment

Although there was a varying amount of participation in the supervision of the reading program by the instructional leaders, all of the instructional leaders were very aware of student achievement in reading. Each instructional leader was able to discuss the assessment of student reading skills and had an idea of how his or her students compared to other students across the state on tests measuring achievement. Each of the instructional leaders was able to identify tests used by the school to assess student achievement in reading and each school was said to use multiple assessments to identify the strengths and weaknesses of students in the area of reading (see table 17). Each of the instructional leaders also emphasized the necessity of ongoing assessment in order to meet student instructional needs in the area of reading.
Table 17. Tests Identified by Instruction Leaders to Assess Student Reading Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>Illinois Goals Assessment Program (IGAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>American College Testing Program (ACT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A, B, C, E</td>
<td>Gates MacGinitie Reading Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>Explorer, PLAN, District Assessment Program (DAP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>Nelson Denahue Reading Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td>Stanford Achievement Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some additional issues surrounding reading assessment were discussed by the instructional leaders of each of the schools. The principal of School A discussed the need to compare the test results of different assessments in order to more effectively evaluate student strengths and weaknesses in reading. This was done through what was called an audit which included a summary of student test scores on all tests of achievement administered in the school. In addition, the principal of School A relayed that there was a need for better preparation for timed tests in reading and addressed it by incorporating timed reading tests into the curriculum. The principal also questioned, as others have, how does one address students not trying on test of achievement. Very important to the principal of School A was the need to recognize growth in student achievement, not only the test result at hand, but how much growth students experienced.

The instructional leader of School B felt there needed to be assessment "during the first two weeks of every course, especially in the fall, so that teachers get a very clear
handle on how well students read." In addition there was a desire to find a tool which would assist in the diagnosis of student's reading skills which could be administered to a large group of students.

The instructional leader of School C emphasized the importance of teachers in assessing student skills because teachers have students all of the time. "Teachers can look at their own assessments," and ask questions about student achievement. The instructional leader of School C also indicated that they were considering the notion of portfolios and they could be used in examining reading skills.

The instructional leaders of schools D and E both mentioned assessment of reading and other curricular areas. The principal of school D expressed that if the school was not doing a good job with reading instruction it would be apparent in all the curricular areas. The principal of School E approached the issue from a different point of view in saying, "There should be an ongoing evaluation of all things being done in the curriculum; assessment is necessary to determine the effectiveness of the curriculum."

Because of being familiar with assessment tools and results, the instructional leaders had idea of how the skills of their students compared to those of students in other schools. They also had an awareness of the relative strengths and weaknesses of their students in the area of reading. So, although the instructional leaders of these Blue Ribbons Schools of Excellence do not maintain sole

15 School B, Interview with the Instructional Leader.
16 School C, Interview with the Instructional Leader.
17 School E, Interview with the Instructional Leader.
responsibility for the supervision of the reading program. They are aware of student achievement in reading and seem to take an active role in setting goals to increase it.

Perspective of the Instructional Leaders on the Philosophy of Reading Instruction

During the interview with the instructional leaders of the award winning schools, each was asked to state the philosophy of their respective school’s reading program. Besides answering this specific question, throughout the interview, the instructional leaders made statements about what their reading programs are trying to accomplish. Through answering the specific question about the school’s philosophy and with the personal belief statements made about their reading programs, the instructional leaders presented their perspective of the philosophy and some the goals of reading instruction in their respective schools (see table 18).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>The Instructional Leader's Perception of Their Respective School's Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>I would say what we are trying to do is to take kids, where they're at, at whatever reading level, and trying to increase that as much as possible before they leave our school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Instructional Leader's Personal Belief Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My thing is we have to do it across the curriculum, we can't just have the English department doing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We would like to get to a point where everyone is responsible for reading instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe we have to give students skills and tools to read other things besides literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think we give them those tools and then the other teachers can reinforce them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe we have a responsibility as a school to build timed readings into all of our curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I believe reading instruction has to be looked upon as a school wide issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The reading philosophy here that we've really worked to implement within the last six or seven years is trying to mainstream [from remedial reading classes to &quot;regular&quot; English classes] students more in terms of the English program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 Continued. Instructional Leader's Perception of Their Respective School's Philosophy of Reading Instruction and Personal Belief Statements, By School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>The Instructional Leaders’s Personal Belief Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>It is definitely a tool for future learning, not only for reading and for learning how to be a good citizen, but it's a self esteem issue too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It needs to target a student's deficits, focus on those deficits and remediate them, but also work on the student's self esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think we need to isolate what's wrong with kids. We also should hopefully emphasize with kids that reading can be a wonderful friend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The Instructional Leader's Perception of Their Respective School's Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it's more that reading is important throughout the curriculum and students need to be able to read everywhere. And so the reading program is encouraging reading throughout the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Instructional Leaders’s Personal Belief Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So, I think it's recognition that reading is important throughout the curriculum as opposed to teaching reading here and there and don't worry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading is something that is critical to students being successful wherever they go, in whatever direction their talents take them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think at the high school that's a skill, an ability, that's a foundation along with writing that if they are going to be successful they need to know how to do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>The Instructional Leader’s Perception of Their Respective School’s Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I think the philosophy is if we give our kids a solid foundation at the preschool, pre-k, and first, second, and third grade level they are going to be a successful reader on through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Instructional Leaders’s Personal Belief Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think if they are going to be successful, they have to exit from high school with a 12th grade reading level and comprehension level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think they have to be able to understand what they are reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well I think students have to be our primary focus and you get away from it if you don’t focus on it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>They debated about whether or not to use a whole language approach or phonetic approach. They actually provided activities and methods to incorporate both approaches into their instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Instructional Leaders’s Personal Belief Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the big picture, we try to encourage people across the board to teach reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In reading, we’re looking at how to teach reading across the curriculum in English. Then hopefully we can expand beyond the English department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The more individual instruction the more we profit. The more I think kids sustain syntax. I don’t know that we need more reading classes. And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>I think in the bigger sense, we need everybody to buy into the idea that we're all teachers of reading. You know you identify the kids that who need help with reading and provide a program for them. And for everyone else, for all the other teachers, you give them some skills of how to teach reading as part of their normal course of instruction in the classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the instructional leader of School A stated a philosophy centered around increasing student achievement as much as possible using content reading instruction to develop reading skills, applicable to other areas besides literature. The instructional leader of School B emphasized the need to identify weak skill areas, remediate student reading skills and mainstream students back into the regular English program. This instructional leader also mentioned the need to instill in students a joy of reading. The instructional leader of School C described the importance of content area reading instruction and helping students being able to read everywhere. At School D, the instructional leader discussed reading being taught at the pre-elementary and elementary school levels giving students a strong foundation for learning. At School E, the instructional leader discussed: 1) the use of whole language and phonetics in the teaching of reading; 2) using content area reading instruction; and 3) identifying and helping students with low skills become better readers. This instructional leader also
discussed the need to individualize instruction to meet students' learning needs.

Additionally, the instructional leaders were asked how reading instruction should be organized in order to be effective at the high school level. The instructional leader of School A again emphasized the need for reading to be looked upon as a school-wide issue, while the instructional leaders of Schools B and D emphasized the need for remedial instruction. The instructional leader of school C stated that the organization of any reading program would depend on the context of the school. Finally, the instructional leader of school E expressed a need for both remedial and content area reading instruction.

Comparative Written Information on the Philosophy and Goals of the Reading Programs

The principals were asked to provide a copy of each of the available items: 1. Mission statement(s) related to reading instruction; 2. Reading course description(s) or program design information; 3. A scope and sequence of skills for reading instruction; 4. School improvement plan information related to reading instruction; 5. Titles of any specific text for reading or class novels used for reading instruction; and 6. 1996 School Report Card. Most of the requested information was made available. However the list of reading materials was only made available by one school and the scope and sequence of skills seemed to be replaced in most instances by course objectives. It was surmised that the philosophy related to reading instruction and goals for
reading instruction would be stated somewhere within the requested documents. What resulted was three of the five schools (A, B, and E) had written goals for reading instruction. None of the schools had a written philosophy directly related to reading, and only three of the schools (A, B, and C) had a mission statement related to the overall learning of students in the school. The available written goals for reading instruction were compared and contrasted amongst the schools and with the statements made by the instructional leader regarding the philosophy and goals of reading instruction.

The written reading instructional goals for School A were very consistent with the philosophy and goals identified by the instructional leader. The primary goal was identified as improving student reading comprehension. Supportive goals included: 1) having reading teachers throughout the district network with one another to share information; 2) having reading teachers available to work with students and staff across the curriculum; and 3) making courses available to address the instructional needs of students with low reading skills.

The philosophy of reading instruction stated by the instructional leader of School B was centered around remedial instruction and the goals are relevant to remedial instruction and also to reading instruction offered in other reading classes. Consistent with the direct supervisory role of the instructional leader of School B, the reading goals provided were very specific instructional goals. Most of the goals are applicable to all of the classes. The overall
instructional goal was stated in terms of the State Goal and there were supporting instructional goals:

As a result of their participation in the language arts program, students read, comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and use written material:

1) Recognize, recall, and summarize material read
2) Use the self-directed process of questioning and predicting, giving rationales for each, prior to, during, and after reading.
3) Read for various purposes
4) Adjust strategies for reading according to demands of the text
5) Use appropriate inferences to achieve a full understand of text
6) Integrate information from more than one text
7) Justify answers to questions about material read
8) Value reading as a source of developing self concept
9) Value reading as a source of understanding others
10) Value the sharing of reactions to written work
11) Value reading as a source of developing self-concept

The Instructional leader of School E also provided goals directed toward the improvement of reading skills. The State Goal of having students "read, comprehend, interpret, evaluate and use written material," was identified with the supporting of goals of: 1) "The student will be able to apply literal, inferential, and critical comprehension skills in reading a variety of materials"; and 2) Implementing a reading across the curriculum in-service.

Even though School C did have classes specifically focused on reading instruction, there were no school goals focused on the improvement of reading instruction. In School D, the reading program, as it was, no longer existed and the responsibility for reading instruction was incorporated into the English classes. The only written goals for reading

---

which were apparent were those listed in the course descriptions for English.

Factors Identified by the Instructional Leaders as Interfering with Reading Instruction

Each of the instructional leaders were asked to identify what they feel might possibly interfere with reading instruction in their respective school (see table 19).

Table 19. Identified Factors Causing Interference with Reading Instruction, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Some teachers feel it is not their job Teachers do not want to give up their content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Not having adequate time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>We just don’t have enough time to do everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Not focusing on reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>The race to complete the content Tracking students into classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time was the most commonly identified factor viewed as interfering with reading instruction. When identifying time as a factor, the instructional leaders seemed to convey that time to teach reading and time to complete the content of a course are considered by some teachers to be at odds with one another. The instructional leaders of Schools A, B, and D all emphasized that reading instruction is, however, considered to be important by teachers. The instructional
leader of School E expressed the thought that tracking in classes could be used as an excuse not to address the reading instructional needs of students. Students in certain class levels were expected to have certain skill levels and if they did not their placement was often considered incorrect.

Improvement of Reading Instruction

Each of the instructional leaders were asked how reading instruction could be improved in their respective schools and each had an idea of some things that could be done (see table 20).

Table 20. Identified factors which could Improve Reading Instruction, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>We need to develop a program which teachers will buy into. We have to somehow have a place where teachers can go and say, &quot;Okay what are some of things that you can give me to help my kids read better?&quot; We have to give them things and we have to make sure that it's intertwined with what they are doing and not take extra time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>If I could change something it would probably be the first two weeks of every course, especially in the fall. that teachers get a very clear handle on how well each kid reads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>I think one of the areas identified as a place we don't do as much as we should [is in] technical reading...Reading manuals and reading things that tell us how to do things, that kind of reading we're looking at and more and more and saying we need to expose students to more of that and help them understand how to comprehend that kind of reading as oppose to literature or the text book.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 Continued. Identified factors which could Improve Reading Instruction, by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I would like to put reading classes back in, the remedial reading classes back into the curriculum. I think it would be a real boost for our kids to get fifty minutes of instruction every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Reduce class size. The smaller the classes the more individual the instruction. The more individual the instruction, the more we profit. And I think in the bigger sense, we need everybody to buy into the idea that we’re all teachers of reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School A would therefore further the develop the reading program while School B would have teachers assess student skills as they enter courses, especially at the beginning of the year. School C would focus on improving students skills in reading technical materials. School D would reinstate remedial reading classes. School E would reduce class size and increase content area reading instruction.
Information was provided by the instructional leaders of each of the Illinois public high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence on the design of their respective school's reading program. Some of the information is from course description books, but the instructional leaders also provided some information through their interviews which is not necessarily apparent in the written documentation. Both sources of information complement each other to provide an overview of the way reading instruction is delivered in the award winning schools.

School A

The principal of School A described some of the various components of the school's reading program. A summer reading program had been put into place the previous year which required freshman to read certain books before the school year began. The program was extended to include sophomores and it was hoped that program could eventually be extended to include junior and seniors. A reading skills class was made available for entering freshman students who scored within a certain stanine on standardized tests of achievement. These students are also given the opportunity to not take social studies or science their freshman year to allow time for this class concentrating on reading instruction. One other component described as being a part of the school's reading program was a class called American Studies where English and
Studies where English and a Social Studies teacher team up, teaching their subjects together. Throughout the interview the instructional leader emphasized the need for all teachers to participate in helping students become better readers.

The course offerings of School A consist of a wide array of reading classes designed to meet the needs of students with various learning needs. Evident is the emphasis on remediation. The classes are described according to the level of instruction offered, in lieu of the course title, along with the targeted student population (see table 21).

Table 21. Reading Courses Available at School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Instruction</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Targeted Audience</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Semester</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course is chosen for or by students who need remedial work in reading. Freshman may be assigned to this course rather than [an introductory literature course].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Semester</td>
<td>9th/10th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course is chosen for or by students who need remedial work in reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Semester</td>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course is recommend for or chosen by students who need remedial work in reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Semester</td>
<td>11th/12th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course is recommended or chosen by students who need remedial work in reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Semester</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td></td>
<td>A course designed to reinforce literacy skills of students currently reading two or more years below grade level. This is a course taken in addition to the core curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Instruction</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Targeted Audience</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Placement is determined based on standardized test scores and/or junior high teacher recommendation. Practical reading strategies and study skills will be taught using assignments given in the students' core courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Sem. 10th thru 12th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course examines narrative and expository American, British, and World Literature and broadens and refines the reading and writing skills to meet the demands of college level work. Reading comprehension and flexibility are expanded through an emphasis on the techniques of speed, overview, and critical reading. This course also develops vocabulary and efficient study skills. The use of individualized diagnostic testing, evaluation and student-teacher conferences motivate students to increase reading and writing standards, abilities, and speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent/Developmental</td>
<td>Sem. 10th thru 12th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is designed to provide students the opportunity to expand their reading experiences. Being an individualized course it can accommodate students of varying abilities. It helps students develop independence in selecting reading material and fosters a more positive attitude toward reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Course descriptions are from the course description book for school A and B.
It should be noted that along with each remedial reading course there is a corresponding writing course to help develop student skills in writing.

School B

The instructional leader of School B described the reading program as being one focused on the remediation of student skills. Students entering the school as Freshman who are at least one grade level below in reading are placed in a reading skills class with the goal of placing students in "regular" English classes as soon as possible. There is a definite goal of having students in "regular" classes senior year. The English division head in School B also discussed the importance of students having experience with certain literary works, despite their reading level. This gives them common experience with their peers and better prepares them to enter the "regular" English classroom.

Interestingly, the reading courses offered at School B are the same courses offered at school A, with the exception of the remedial reading class for eleventh and twelfth grade students. Both schools are part of a large high school district. The schools have done some articulation on reading instruction, however School A seems to place a greater emphasis on reading across the curriculum than school B

School C

At School C, the instructional leader stressed the importance of all teachers having some responsibility for reading instruction. The reading program which, has been in
place for a number of years, was designed for the students in the freshman population who enter high school behind their classmates in reading skills. This was described as being a relatively low number of students, perhaps 50 out of 700 students. These students are given the opportunity to take a reading course for a semester during their freshman year focused on improving their reading skills. At one time the course was restricted to students who were two grade levels below in reading skills. This is now more flexible. Teachers continue to give extra support to students who need extra help beyond the course. Accordingly there is one reading course described in the course description book (see table 22).

Table 22. Reading Course Offered at School C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Instruction</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a semester course mandated for incoming freshmen who do not read up to grade level. The credit offered is supplementary to graduation. This curriculum will include those reading, study, and library skills which will enhance the students' chance for success in high school. Each student will successfully complete his individual educational plan and take a comprehensive final exam.

Source: Course descriptions are from the course description book for School C.
School D

School D does not have courses designed specifically to address the reading instructional needs of students. At one time there were remedial reading classes. Reading instruction is the responsibility of the English teachers and there is also a program designed to address the needs of students who have low skill levels. The English classes were described as being tracked with a lower level, a regular level and an accelerated level. The lower level was said to have twelve to fifteen students so that instruction could be individualized. The other program which addresses the instructional needs of students with low skills is a grant program which is a remedial instructional program designed to work with all subject areas. The students have the class for one period a day. The teacher of the class stays in touch with the students' other teachers so he or she is made aware of assignments and projects. There is also a life-skills component to the program. The time in the class is divided between remedial instruction for subject areas and life skills. This program is listed in the course description book as one of alternative education programs offered at the high school in which students are enrolled with administrative approval.
The reading program at School E was described as being primarily delivered through the reading courses in the English department. There was a desire for all English teachers, not only the reading teachers, to take an active role in teaching reading. There was also a desire for content area teachers to take a more active role with reading instruction. One of the reading classes offered at the school was described as being one which is designed to remediate the reading skills of entering Freshman. There has also been a summer reading list sent home to the parents of entering freshmen recommending books for summer reading. Two developmental reading courses and two remedial course are described in the course description book (see table 23).

Table 23. Reading Course Offerings at School E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Instruction</th>
<th>Targeted Length</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial</td>
<td>Year 9th Grade</td>
<td>A year long reading program designed for students who want to improve all aspects of their reading performance. This course emphasizes reading in the content area. It integrates materials and skills from all high school subjects. The students will receive individualized materials and audio visual material. This course is open to all freshmen. [Students who are enrolled in the lower level English course are required to take this class]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Instruction</td>
<td>Targeted Length</td>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Semester 10th Grade</td>
<td>10th Grade</td>
<td>A one semester course designed for sophomores who desire to improve their reading skills. Using high interest material at their instructional level students will progress through levels at their own rate. Large group, small group, and individualized instruction will be used to accompany an integrated studies approach. Students will use all available resources for instruction. Computer technology, audiovisual materials, newspapers, individualized material, etc. [Students who are enrolled in the lower level English course are required to take this class]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Semester 9th and 10th Grade</td>
<td>9th and 10th Grade</td>
<td>Students who have no specific reading weaknesses may elect this course. Students will work on comprehension rate based on their needs at the appropriate level. Comprehension skills which will be stressed include finding main ideas and details of paragraphs, inference skills, vocabulary development, and paragraph organization. Study skills will also be incorporated. Rate of comprehension techniques may include mechanical devices and rate techniques using printed material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 Continued. Reading Course Offerings at School E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Instruction</th>
<th>Targeted Length</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Semester 11th</td>
<td>and 12th Grade</td>
<td>Students who wish to improve their comprehension and rate would profit from this course. Comprehension skills will include finding main ideas and details of paragraphs, developing vocabulary, drawing conclusions, and more efficient reading skills and various study skills will also emphasized. Also by following a prescribed procedure, students will develop skills for improving reading speed without losing flexibility. The course will focus on techniques to improve previewing, to understand phrase reading, to develop skimming and scanning skills, and to incorporate techniques for remembering what has been read. Students must score at grade level or above to take this course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Course descriptions are from the course description book for school E.

School F

The principal of School F did not agree to be interviewed and therefore, the perspective of this instructional leader could not be presented. This instructional leader did however provide written information about the design of the school's reading program. Two aspects of School F's reading program differed from Schools A through E. First, tutoring in reading is available to any upperclassman in need of it throughout the school day.
Secondly, "to promote recreational reading, librarians encourage students to suggest books for purchase. Between three to 15 student requested titles are added to the school's holding each week." There is one Freshman level reading class offered for students who do not score at least a 7.0 grade level on the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test. In this class, students are tested to diagnose their reading weaknesses so that individualized instruction can be made available. The emphasis of this class is the development of comprehension and vocabulary. In addition, the lower level English classes are staffed by both an English teacher and a reading teacher.

Summary

Chapter four of this dissertation has consisted of a report of the findings of this study. An overview was given of the population and test scores of the award winning school. The instructional leaders were described and information was provided on their views of their respective school's reading program. The instructional design of the reading program for each award winning school was also described. The next chapter of the dissertation will consist of the conclusions based upon the research findings.

---

Chapter 5

MAKING IT COUNT: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to: 1) Identify commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence; 2) Compare and contrast the perspective of the principal to the respective school's written documentation about reading instruction; 3) Identify how the supervision of reading instruction occurs in high school; and 4) Because of the limited amount of information available, it was to add to the body of information on reading instruction at the high school level.

Written documentation was provided by each of the instructional leaders, of the Illinois public high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence, in order gain an overview of the school's population and a more thorough understanding of the design of the school's reading program. An interview was held with five instructional leaders of the award winning schools. The interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview schedule. Both sources of information were analyzed in order to address the research questions. In this chapter of the dissertation, each research question will be restated and followed by pertinent findings discovered through the study. Then the conclusions and implications for the study will be given.
Summary of the Findings

1. How are Reading Programs Designed and Supervised in Illinois Public High Schools Recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence?

There are ways the reading programs appear to be very similar and ways they differ. In examining the similarities of the award winning schools which offer specific reading classes (5 out of 6 schools or 83%), there is a concerted effort to offer remedial reading instruction to students during their freshman year. The one school which does not offer a specific remedial reading class, addresses the reading instructional needs of freshmen through lower level English classes with approximately fifteen students. Four out of the six schools, or approximately 67%, continue to offer specific opportunities for students to have remedial reading instruction beyond their freshman year. Remedial reading instruction as described in this study is for "students who are reading at levels that are below their capacity, or potential reading level" in attempt to bring students to the level of achievement experienced by their peers. Assessment seems to play an important role in determining whether or not students are in need of remedial instruction. The course descriptions of particularly the freshman level remedial classes support this premise.

Three or 50% of the schools offer developmental reading classes to students in their schools. The purpose of developmental reading instruction is to help "students to

---

further develop comprehension skills and strategies, vocabulary knowledge, rate of reading, and study skills."\(^2\)

Students in developmental reading classes are most likely at a higher skill level than those students who are in need of remedial reading instruction.

There was no specific reference to a reading class for students who might be in need of enrichment opportunities. However, in examining the course description books, there is a wide array of English classes designed in order to prepare students for college. It would seem reasonable to expect that these classes would give students the opportunity to read more advanced reading materials. In all of the schools (100\%) reading is under the auspices of the English department, but the reading instructional needs of students are not always met solely within the context of the English class. This is supported by the fact that five out of the six schools (83\%) offer specific reading classes, especially when addressing the instructional needs of students in need of remediation. Although English classes can have as part of their instructional goals to address reading skills, the focus of instruction is broader including the learning of grammar and writing, and sometimes focusing on specific and limited literary works. The time factor, mentioned by five out of the five instructional leaders interviewed, becomes a source of interference with the teaching of reading.

Reading instruction, of course, does not have to be limited to what occurs in a reading class or in an English class. Reading instruction can take place in content area

\(^2\)Roe, Stoodt, and Burns, 11.
classes such as math, science, and social studies. Of the five instructional leaders interviewed, 80% (4 out of five) mentioned the importance of all teachers having some responsibility for teaching students to become better readers. The importance content area literacy “defined as the level of reading and writing skill necessary to read, comprehend, and react to appropriate instructional material in a given subject area,” was emphasized by these four instructional leaders. However, only two of these schools had written goals which focused on content area literacy or teaching reading across the curriculum.

In the following tables, the factors common to the design of the reading programs of the award winning schools were compared along with some of the demographical information available on the schools in the school report card (see table 24 and table 25). The comparisons are not meant to show causation but to show the relationship between the factors.

---

Table 24. Comparison of the Design Factors of the Reading Programs of the 1996 Illinois Public High Schools Recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Identified</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class for entering freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class for other students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading Class</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Reading Instruction spoken Goal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Reading Instruction Written Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Written Reading Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Reading Program</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring for Upperclassmen in Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English and Reading Teacher in lower level English class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X = Present in the schools Reading Program
Table 25. Comparison of the Performance and Demographics of the 1996 Illinois Public High Schools Recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Identified</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Do not meet state goals</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Do meet state goals</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>40-45%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>50-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeds state goals</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Reading Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students Tested</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense per Pupil</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to $11,500</td>
<td>to $11,500</td>
<td>to $6000</td>
<td>to $6000</td>
<td>to $10,500</td>
<td>to $10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(# of students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years of Teacher Experience</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with Masters and Above</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25. Comparison of the Performance and Demographics of the 1996 Illinois Public High Schools Recognized as Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Identified</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School C</th>
<th>School D</th>
<th>School E</th>
<th>School F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Do not meet state goals</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Do meet state goals</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>40-45%</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
<td>50-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Exceeds state goals</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Reading Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students Tested</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense per Pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to $11,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$6000</td>
<td>$6000</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size (# of students)</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Years of Teacher Experience</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with Masters and and Above</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<1% = The number is greater than 0 and less than 1%

Source: 1996 Illinois School Report Cards of the Participating Schools
2. What Role does The Principal have in the Supervision of Reading Instruction?

The instructional leaders have varying amounts of involvement in the supervision of reading instruction. Out of the five instructional leaders interviewed, four (80%) seemed to have a role in the supervision of reading instruction. The role of the principals in the supervision of reading instruction is centered around organizing for instruction. In organizing for instruction they are aware of assessment results of students, the classes offered at the school, and they work with teachers to set goals to increase student achievement. The instructional leaders also were all aware of staff development opportunities in and outside of the district to assist teachers in improving reading instruction. None of the principals of the schools have the responsibility for directly observing and evaluating reading instruction.

The associate principal of School E evaluates and observes reading instruction and reading teachers, but in the four (80% of the) other schools the English Division Chairperson has the responsibility for the observation and evaluation of reading instruction and reading teachers. Because of the various amount of involvement the instructional leaders have with the supervision of reading instruction, their answers varied significantly when asked, "What do you observe when evaluating reading instruction?" The instructional leaders schools A and D examined assessment. The instructional leaders of schools B and E delineated specific things they would observe the reading
teacher and students doing. The instructional leader of School C did not describe a role which he or she assumed, but the role of a good teacher.

The role of the instructional leaders in the supervision of reading instruction is based on expertise as instructional leaders and not on any specific expertise in the area of reading. Of the five instructional leaders interviewed, only one had any formal training in teaching reading and that was limited to one college course. As previously identified the instructional leader's supervision of reading instruction involved:

1. Having an understanding of student skills through assessment and communication with teachers
2. Setting building goals and objectives to address student instructional needs
3. Securing the necessary resources to assist teachers in meeting student instructional needs
4. Making time available to discuss student achievement and addressing areas of weakness
5. Encouraging teachers to develop ideas
6. Using self-identified instructional strengths to work with others to address the instructional needs of students
7. Being aware of staff development opportunities related to reading instruction

Perhaps the supervision instruction in these award winning high schools is influenced by the size of the schools. As indicated in table 25, the student population of the schools is between 1000 and 3000 students. With a class
average ranging between 19 and 23, it is not logistically feasible that the principal directly observe and evaluate all of the teachers in the building and guide them to appropriate staff development opportunities (see table 25). Although the principal is ultimately responsible for the evaluation of all teachers, the departmentalization of high schools disperses this responsibility among other administrators. This does not negate the need for the principal to have knowledge of reading instruction, because the principal is still in the role of developing goals and organizing for instruction.
3. What are the Underlying Philosophical Beliefs of the Reading Programs?

Written philosophies of reading instruction were nonexistent. In examining the philosophical statements made by the instructional leaders about their reading programs, each was consistent with improving student reading skills and comprehension. However, the methods and the reason behind improving student reading skills were varied. The following statements include the instructional leaders's perception of their respective school's philosophy of reading instruction:

School A  With the responsibility of reading instruction belonging to everyone, School A will improve the reading skills of students as much as possible before they graduate using content area reading instruction, a variety of written materials, and will teach students how to demonstrate their skills on tests of achievement.

School B  All students will be able to participate in the regular English Program and in the interim, those in need of remedial instruction will have their deficits targeted and remediated while increasing their self esteem and learning an appreciation for reading.

School C  Reading is important to students throughout the curriculum and accordingly they should learn to read in all classes; it is critical to a student's success wherever they go and in whatever direction their talent takes them.
School D  Give the students a solid foundation at the early elementary school level and they are going to be successful readers on through. For those students who for some reason, are not successful, we need to teach them to understand what they read.

School E  All teachers are teachers of reading and should make it part of their normal course of instruction individualizing instruction, using both whole language and the phonetic approach so student can become better readers. The students who need more instruction should be identified and assisted in learning to read better.
4. What Pedagogy is Advocated for Reading Instruction?

The specific methods mentioned by the two instructional leaders who are directly involved in observing and evaluating reading teachers consisted of:

School B
1. The use of prereading activities
2. How students are assisted with decoding words
3. Class discussion
4. The use of classroom materials
5. Questioning strategies used by the teacher
6. Time given to specific students

School E
1. Consistency between planning and lesson implementation
2. Individualization of instruction
3. Reading with students
4. Corrective techniques while students are reading orally
5. Student participation
6. Application of concepts through discussion and writing

This list is probably not exhaustive, but includes those things which the instructional leaders stated when asked about the supervision of reading instruction.

All of the instructional leaders interviewed did express ideas on how reading instruction could be improved in their respective schools. This seems to indicate that there is awareness of what is occurring with reading instruction. Their ideas were varied and seemed to based on the instructional needs of each school: 1) School A would further
develop their reading program and material to assist teachers with reading instruction; 2) School B would assess student reading skills at the beginning of every course; 3) School C would increase the amount of technical reading done by students; 4) School D would reinstate remedial reading classes; and 5) School E would reduce class size and encourage all teachers to be teachers of reading.

The instructional leaders, with the exception of the ones directly involved in the observation and supervision of reading instruction, did not identify specific methods of instruction. All of the instructional leaders did, however, support the idea of content area reading and remedial instruction for students who were not reading as well as expected.

5. Who is responsible for reading instruction and assessment?

The responsibility for reading instruction was said to belong to all teachers in schools A and C, while the instructional leaders of school B, D, and E said that currently the responsibility for reading instruction belonged to the English department. The instructional leaders of schools B and E expressed that reading instruction should belong to all of the teachers.

Although classroom teachers administer the assessments to students, the principals of the schools seem to have some involvement with using the assessment to develop goals for reading instruction and to organize for instruction. With emphasis placed on test scores as source of evaluating a
school's academic program, the instructional leaders have cause to be aware of student achievement and to play an active role in working with others to increase student achievement.

6. **What are the identified course objectives?**

Classes are designed to address a variety of instructional needs and so the course objectives for these classes are somewhat varied. To get an overview of the instructional objectives, the course descriptions were examined in the course description books of schools A, B, C, E, and through a document for School F. Although the identified course objectives in the course description book are not extensive, they do focus on some of the main objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class (Schools A and B)</td>
<td>Reinforce literacy skills of students two or more years below grade level... Practical reading and study skills will be taught using assignments given in the student’s core courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class (School C)</td>
<td>Reading, study, and library skills which will enhance the students’ chance for success in high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class (School E)</td>
<td>Emphasizes reading in the content area... Integrates materials and skills from all high school subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Course</td>
<td>Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class (School E)</td>
<td>Using high interest material at their instructional level students will progress through levels at their own rate. Large group, small group and individualized instruction will be used to accompany an integrated studies approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remedial Reading Class (School F)</td>
<td>Students are tested to diagnose their reading weakness so that individualized reading instruction can be made available... Emphasis of this class is on the development of comprehension and vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading Class (Schools A and B)</td>
<td>Reading comprehension and flexibility are expanded through an emphasis on the techniques of speed, overview, and critical reading... Also develops vocabulary and efficient study skills... Use of individualized diagnostic testing, evaluation and student-teacher conferences to motivate students to increase reading and writing standards, abilities, and speed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading Class (Schools A and B)</td>
<td>[Students have] the opportunity to expand their reading experiences. It helps students to develop independence in selecting reading material and fosters a more positive attitude toward reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26 Continued. Course Objectives According to the Course Descriptions of the Award Winning Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Reading Class</td>
<td>Students will work on comprehension rate based on their needs at the appropriate level. Comprehension skills which will be stressed include finding main ideas and details of paragraphs, inference skills, vocabulary development, and paragraph organization. Study skills will also be incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td>Comprehension skills will include finding the main ideas and details of paragraphs, developing vocabulary, drawing conclusions, and more efficient reading skills and various study skills will also be emphasized. Students will develop skills for improving reading speed without losing flexibility. Focus on techniques to improve previewing, to understand phrase reading, to develop skimming and techniques for what has been read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: For Schools A, B, C, and E the course description book of the school. For school F, a document provided about reading instruction in the district.

7. Where does reading instruction take place?

There are specific classes designed to address the reading instructional needs of students in five out the six schools. The one school without a specific reading class does have a venue for addressing the reading instructional needs of students in the small low level reading classes and in the program designed to help remediate student skills in all academic areas. There has been the need in most cases to offer additional reading instruction to students in a class
specifically designed for reading, perhaps because of the instructional needs of students can not be met within the context of the English classroom.

Three of the six schools (50%) have classes designed to assist "better readers" in further developing their skills. In examining the course description books, the English classes at each of the schools do have reading instruction written into their objectives. There is also a certain amount of reading instruction that takes place in the context of the regular classroom in effort to help students comprehend content material. This instruction can be more focused when teachers are aware of what they can do to help students become better readers.

8. Who is the targeted population for reading instruction?

Reading courses are offered to students in these award winning schools in grades 9 through 12, with majority (5 out of 6) of schools (A, B, C, E, and F) offering a remedial reading class to entering freshman. In three of the schools (A, B, and E) there are both developmental and remedial reading classes offered to 10th graders. Developmental reading instruction continues in the same three schools all of the way through 12th grade. Remedial reading classes are offered to upperclassmen in two of the schools (A and B). Only school F offers tutoring in reading to upperclassmen.
Conclusions

1. The principals of the public high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence seem to assume a managerial role in the reading programs of their respective schools. Because of the size of the award winning schools, it seems very appropriate that the principals have a managerial role in organizing and planning for instruction. In their managerial role, the principals 1) examine test scores measuring student performance; 2) have general understanding of student strengths and weaknesses and how those strengths and weakness compare with students in other schools; 3) get feedback about reading instruction and student performance from those more closely involved with observing and evaluating reading instruction; 4) support the efforts of teachers to deliver effective reading instruction by securing resources, encouraging teacher ideas, and being aware of staff development opportunities; and 5) set goals to improve or maintain student performance.

2. It does appear that some principals take a more active managerial role while others maintain a more general awareness of the importance of reading. In the schools which seem to be viewed by the instructional leaders as having a limited need for reading instruction, the instructional leader did not seem as actively involved in managing the program.

3. The principals have little formal training in observing reading instruction or in teaching reading. The principals do not claim to be specialist with an intimate
knowledge of reading instruction. Only one principal had a
course on the teaching of reading. A second principal had
attended a workshop on the teaching of reading. Accordingly,
the principals do not necessarily know specific methods to
increase student reading achievement.

4. Much of the specific knowledge about reading
instruction is left to those who supervise and
evaluate reading teachers, and in the majority of
cases, as a part of their responsibilities as head of
the English department.

5. When one considers formative evaluation, the
role of the principals in these award school seems
limited to communicating to the evaluators reading
instructional goals based on assessment of students
and articulation with teachers.

6. The importance of reading was recognized by
the instructional leaders of the schools.
Despite the amount of involvement the instructional leaders
have in their respective school's reading program, each of
them expressed that reading instruction is important to the
academic achievement of their students.

7. All of the instructional leaders interviewed
expressed ideas on how reading instruction could be
improved in their respective schools, seeming to
indicate an awareness of what is occurring with
reading instruction.

8. The reading programs of the Illinois public
high schools recognized as 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of
Excellence are designed according to the context in
which instruction is being delivered.
The reading classes in the award winning schools focus on remedial, developmental, and content area reading instruction. All of these components, however, are not found in all of the schools.

9. All of the schools have a way of addressing the instructional needs of students in the area of reading whether it be through small class sizes, an array of reading course offerings, content area reading instruction, or the program to address the instructional needs of students who may need remediation in reading and other areas.

10. Remedial reading instruction is found within all of the schools in the study. It is especially emphasized at the freshman level where there is a concerted effort to improve student skills.

11. There is not as much of an emphasis on developmental reading instruction as placed upon remedial instruction, but there are specific developmental classes in fifty percent of the award winning schools in this study.

12. Although content area reading instruction was viewed as a way to deliver reading instruction, there was little supportive written documentation. The reading instruction which takes place in the content areas of the award winning schools could be done as written in specific instructional materials, because of the skills or preferences of individual teachers and/or because the emphasis placed on the need for content area reading within
the departments or by the instructional leaders. It was not possible, however, to examine school documents and develop an understanding of how much content area reading instruction was taking place in the schools nor to glean from conversations with the instructional leaders the actual role of the content area teacher.

13. **Schools which had relatively low scores on the Illinois Goals Assessment Program (IGAP) in reading, when compared to the other award winning schools, had a larger number and variety of reading classes actively trying to increase student reading achievement.**

14. **Most of the award winning schools have scores on standardized test of achievement which exceed the state averages.**

In the one school which has relatively low scores, the principal is assuming a very active role in finding ways to increase student achievement. Because the performance in reading might be considered to be good for most students, does not mean that student performance can not improve. There were students in all of the schools whom did not meet state goals of the Illinois Goals Assessment Program.
Implications

1. It would seem that since reading instruction affects learning and achievement to some extent in all academic areas, principals could use more specific knowledge about reading instruction. It would seem prudent for principals to be able interact with other staff members about reading instruction from a strong base of knowledge. Interacting with teachers from a strong knowledge base could influence how they respond to the implementation of specific methods or procedures. From a strong knowledge base goals can be written and progress toward goals could be more effectively assessed. The perception or the actual decline of student reading skills would be able to be more effectively addressed by a principal who viewed the reading program from an informed knowledge base.

2. In order to increase their knowledge of reading, staff development in reading should be available for principals. The staff development program for principals should include information principals need to effectively manage the reading programs in their building including interpreting test results, observation of reading instruction, improving student reading skills, and setting goals which lead to improved performance among other things. The staff development program in reading for principals would definitely need to take into consideration the role of the principal as a school manager.
3. It is important that principals have quality reading specialists working closely with them to help evaluate student performance, interpret test scores, and have viable ideas as to how student performance can be improved.

Reading specialist should be able to give teachers information about specific instructional techniques which can be incorporated into their content area resulting in increased student performance in reading. A reading specialist confined to a specific classroom would not be able to have a broad perspective of what is happening in school with reading instruction nor be on hand to assist teachers in addressing the reading instructional needs of students.

4. A reading specialist given the responsibility to observe content area instruction, with awareness of student performance in reading, would be in a position to give specific information to teachers and work in conjunction with them to increase student performance. A reading specialist in such a position would be able to focus on reading improvement not only in the English department, but in all academic areas.

5. Some students are in need of instruction beyond what is available to them in content area classes including their English class as indicated by the presence of remedial reading instruction in the Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence which participated in this study.

For students in need of reading instruction, a reading teacher can help them learn strategies to become better
readers. Students who build up a repertoire of strategies do not necessarily readily use those strategies without some guidance in deciding which strategies are most useful in a specific situation. It would seem that using the strategies they learn in a reading class would be more effective if these skills could be reinforced with guided practice in their content area classes.

6. If a content area teacher was aware of a student needing assistance in reading and had a resource person to help them assist students, this would allow students to become better and more effective readers.

Content area teachers should have assistance in helping students become better readers in their content area. This would help to address the lack of time available to content area teachers to focus on reading, thus eliminating or significantly decreasing time as a factor interfering with reading instruction as identified by the instructional leaders in this study.

It is important to recognize that being a teacher in an English class is not the same as being a reading specialist. This not to say that some English teachers don't have an understanding of reading instruction, but to say with their time is divided into areas which do not focus solely on reading instruction. Even more so, principals in their managerial roles have many areas both academic and extra curricular in which to focus their attention and time. The reading skills of students however can impact their performance in all academic areas. Therefore an
understanding of student reading skills, instructional needs, and instructional strategies is necessary. In a society which increasingly focuses on the decline of basic skills such as reading, it would seem that reading expertise should be a valued commodity.

Implications for Further Study

To gain more depth in understanding reading instruction at the high school level, there are many implications for future study. It would be advantageous to study 1) the role of the reading specialist in high schools; 2) the specific activities of those with responsibility for supervision of reading instruction; 3) the amount of time English teachers devote to reading instruction; 4) the training of those given responsibility for the evaluation and supervision of the reading program; and 5) content area teachers role and views on reading instruction. It would also be very interesting to examine the reading programs and student performance in schools where the principal has a strong background in reading (experience teaching reading, educational preparation, or self educated to a great extent) and compare the program and student performance in schools in which the principal does not have a strong background in reading.
APPENDIX A
LIST OF PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS
Illinois Public High School Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence
1996 Award Winners

Champaign Central High School
610 West University Avenue
Champaign, IL 61820
Mr. Don Hansen
(217)351-3911

Elk Grove High School
500 W. Elk Grove Blvd.
Elk Grove Village, IL 60007-4272
708-718-4400
Mr. Raymond D. Broderick

Homewood Flossmoor Community High School
999 Kedzie Ave.
Flossmoor, IL 60422
(708)799-3000
Dr. Anthony R. Moriarty

James B. Conant High School
700 E Cougar Trl
Hoffman Estates IL 60194
(708)885-4366
Mr. Joseph F. Schlender

Rolling Meadows High School
2901 W. Central Rd
Rolling Meadows, IL 60008-2536
(708)259-9640
Dr. John H. Elliot

St. Charles High School
1020 Dunham Road
Saint Charles, IL
(708)584-1100
Dr. Francis J. Kostel
APPENDIX B
DATA COLLECTION AND DATA ANALYSIS INSTRUMENTS
Dear

I am writing to you because your school is one of the six Illinois public high schools awarded the 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence Award. I am a Ph.D. doctoral candidate at Loyola University of Chicago in Supervision and Administration in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Program. I am interested in studying the design and supervision of the reading programs in the six public high schools in Illinois who were recipients of 1996 Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence Award. With many high schools experiencing declining reading test scores, and the need to provide more effective reading instruction, I hope that this study will assist other schools in trying to design and supervise their reading programs.

There are two ways in which I vitally need your assistance. First, I would be interested in interviewing you concerning the design and supervision of your school’s reading program. The interview would take approximately forty five minutes of your time. I am willing to schedule the interview at your convenience. My goal, however, is to have my interviews completed by the mid-August. I hope there is some time between now and then when we could schedule a time to meet. Secondly, in order to prepare for the interview and thoroughly study the design and supervision of you reading program, I would like to obtain a copy of the following documents if you have them available: 1. Mission statement(s) related to reading instruction; 2. Reading course description(s) or program design information; 3. A scope and sequence of skills for reading instruction; 4. School improvement plan information related to reading instruction; 5. If you use a specific text for reading or class novels, a list of the titles; and 6. 1996 School Report Card. If possible, I would appreciate receiving this written documentation before the interview. I will gladly come to your school to pick up the information. Collection of this data and my interview with you will enable me to compare and contrast school philosophies concerning reading, pedagogy, supervision, and design of the reading programs.

When reporting the findings of this study, individuals interviewed and school names will be kept confidential. I will be willing to share all findings with the participating schools maintaining this confidentiality. I would hope that you will find the time to participate. I will be contacting you within the next week to schedule a time to meet with you between now and the mid-August. My dissertation director is
Dr. Janis Fine (847)853-3357 and Dr. Steven Miller (847)853-3531 is assisting me with the methodology of my study if you need to verify any information concerning the content, purpose, or design of my study. Thank-you for consideration.

Sincerely,

Jerry Lee Anderson
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS

Personal Data
1. How long have you been principal of this school?
2. What other administrative experience do you have?
3. Were you the principal when your school won the 1996 Blue Ribbon School of Excellence Award?
4. Why do you feel your school was selected for this award?
5. What are your strengths as an instructional leader?
6. Describe your background or training in teaching reading and/or supervising reading instruction?

Reading Program Philosophy and Design:
7. What is the philosophy of reading instruction at your school?
8. Who is responsible for reading instruction at your school?
9. How would you describe your reading program?

Students:
10. How would you describe your students as readers?
11. What instructional needs do your students have in the area of reading?
12. What strengths do your students have in the area of reading?
13. What weaknesses do your students have in the area of reading?

Supervision of Reading Instruction:
14. How do you supervise reading instruction in your school?
15. What do you look for when evaluating reading instruction?
16. What are some of the strengths that your teachers have in the area of reading instruction?
17. How could you improve your current reading program?
18. How would you help a new teacher incorporate reading instruction into his or her classroom?
19. Would you describe any school or district staff development centered on reading instruction?
20. Describe anything you feel might hinder reading instruction in your school.
21. How would you assess whether or not your reading program is meeting its goals and objectives?

Reading Instruction in High School
22. What do you feel reading instruction should accomplish at the high school level?
23. How should reading instruction be organized in order to be effective at the high school level?
DOCUMENT ANALYSIS FORM

Information From The School Report Card

School Name: 
Education Fund Expenditure / of overall budget
School Size: Students
Expenditure per Student / (District/State)
High School Graduation Rate / (School/State)

Racial/Ethnic Composition:
Teachers(District/State):
White / Black / Hispanic / 
Asian/Pacific Islander / Native American / 
Total / 

Students(School/State):
White / Black / Hispanic / 
Asian/Pacific Islander / Native American / 
Total / 

Percentage of: Low Income Students / (School/State)
Limited English Proficient / (School/State)

Average Class Size: / students/teacher (School/State)

Attendance / (School/State)
Student Mobility / (School/State)
Chronic Truancy / (School/State)

Teacher/Administrator Characteristics (District/State)
Average Teaching Experience / yrs
Teachers w/ Bachelors / 
Teachers w/ Masters and Above / 
Pupil Teacher Ratio / 
Pupil-Administrator Ratio / 

IGAP Scores in Reading Grade10(School/State):
Score / Band / Percent Tested /

IGAP Performance Standards in Reading (School/State)
Percent Do Not Meet State Goals / 
Percent Meeting State Goals / 
Percent Exceeding State Goals / 

ACT Scores in Reading:
Students who completed a Core H.S. Program:
 / (School State)
All Students Tested / (School/State)
PHILOSOPHY OF THE READING PROGRAM:

STATEMENT(S)

READING CLASSES

CLASS TITLE
TARGETED POPULATION:
CLASS DESCRIPTION:
COURSE OBJECTIVES:

CLASS TITLE
TARGETED POPULATION:
CLASS DESCRIPTION:
COURSE OBJECTIVES:

CLASS TITLE
TARGETED POPULATION:
CLASS DESCRIPTION:
COURSE OBJECTIVES:
INDEPENDENT READING PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

TITLE:
TARGETED POPULATION:
DESCRIPTION:

OBJECTIVES:

CONTENT AREA READING PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

TITLE:
DESCRIPTION:

OBJECTIVES:

PARTICIPANTS:
COMPUTER ASSISTED READING INSTRUCTION

TARGETED POPULATION:
RATIONALE:
DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM(S):

TITLE AND DESCRIPTION OF COMPUTER READING PROGRAMS USED:

READING LAB
TARGETED POPULATION:
PURPOSE:

STIPULATIONS FOR USE OF LAB:

LAB SET UP:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Interview Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Student Skills</td>
<td>ASSK</td>
<td>1,4,7</td>
<td>10,11,12,13,15,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ribbon Schools Award</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Objectives</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,22,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation - Reading Program</td>
<td>EVA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,17,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation - Reading Teacher</td>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,16,17,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of Instruction</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1,3,7,8</td>
<td>7,17,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>LEAD</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>1,2,5,6,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor - Content Area Teacher</td>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor - Reading Specialist District Level</td>
<td>IRS</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor - Reading Teacher</td>
<td>IRT</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>INTF</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8</td>
<td>13,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Assistance/Involvement</td>
<td>PAR</td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
<td>7,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Beliefs</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6,7</td>
<td>7,9,10,22,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading - Remedial Instruction</td>
<td>REM</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Approach -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Instruction</td>
<td>RGIF</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Assisted Instruction</td>
<td>RCOM</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Instruction</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Reading</td>
<td>RIND</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Instructional Strategy</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area Reading</td>
<td>RCA</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Lab</td>
<td>RLAB</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,8,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Principal</td>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>1,2,7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Teacher</td>
<td>ROT</td>
<td>2,7</td>
<td>7,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>STFD</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
<td>7,17,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reading Strengths</td>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>7,10,11,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reading Weaknesses</td>
<td>SRW</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>10,11,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Skills</td>
<td>SSK</td>
<td>4,6</td>
<td>10,11,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Reading Program</td>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5</td>
<td>7,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Goal</td>
<td>SUPG</td>
<td>1,2,4</td>
<td>14,19,21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Process</td>
<td>SUPP</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>5,6,14,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Skills</td>
<td>SUPSK</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>1,25,6,14,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Training</td>
<td>SUPTR</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>1,2,5,6,14,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Population</td>
<td>TARP</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>10,11,12,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Experience</td>
<td>TE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Strengths</td>
<td>TSTR</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Skills</td>
<td>TSK</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>16,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 1 Reading Program</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5,6</td>
<td>7,8,9,23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

PURPOSE
1. To identify commonalities and differences in the design and supervision of reading programs of high schools recognized for academic excellence.

2. To increase the amount of information available on reading instruction in high school.

3. To compare and contrast the perspective of the instructional leader (principal) to the written documentation about reading instruction.

4. To identify how supervision of instruction takes place in area of reading.

CONTEXT
- Literature on reading approaches
- Literature on the design and organization of reading programs
- Literature on the role of the instructional leader in reading instruction
- Literature on Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence
- Background in teaching reading in various instructional environments.
- Literature on Models of Supervision used in supervising reading instruction.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:
1) How are the reading programs designed and supervised in Illinois high school Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence?
2) What are the underlying philosophical beliefs?
3) What pedagogy is advocated for reading instruction?
4) What are the identified course objectives?
5) Where does reading instruction take place?
6) Who is the targeted population for reading instruction?
7) Who is responsible for reading instruction and assessment?
8) What role does the principal have in the supervision of reading instruction?

METHODS
Interviews with high school principals of Blue Ribbon Schools of Excellence
Descriptive analysis of the organization and design of reading programs as found in school documents

VALIDITY
-Triangulation of sources (principals and school documents, methods (interview and a descriptive study), and theories of reading instruction and supervision)
-Comparison with other programs in the literature
-Search for discrepant evidence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SCHOOL A PROFILE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expense/Pupil</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Experience</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers with Masters and Above</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%White Teachers/Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Black Teachers/Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Hispanic Teachers/Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Native American Teachers/Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil Administrator Ratio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Low Income Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited English Proficiency Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronic Truancy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropouts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IGAP Reading Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do not meet state goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do meet state goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Exceeds state goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT Reading Scores</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students Tested</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.
*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.
Table 2A

SCHOOL B PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>1500-2000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense/Pupil</td>
<td>$10,500 to $11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>19-20 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Experience</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with Masters and Above</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%White Teachers/Students</td>
<td>99% / 70-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Black Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&lt;1% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Hispanic Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&lt;1% / 10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&lt;1% / 10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Native American Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&lt;1% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Administrator Ratio</td>
<td>145-165:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low Income Students</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency Rate</td>
<td>8-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>93-94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Truancy</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>85-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAP Reading Score</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do not meet state goals</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do meet state goals</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Exceeds state goals</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Reading Scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Curriculum</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students Tested</td>
<td>21-22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 3A</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL C PROFILE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment</strong></td>
<td>2000-3000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expense/Pupil</strong></td>
<td>$5000 to $6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Size</strong></td>
<td>20-21 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Experience</strong></td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers with Masters and Above</strong></td>
<td>55-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%White Teachers/Students</strong></td>
<td>99% / 90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Black Teachers/Students</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Hispanic Teachers/Students</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Native American Teachers/Students</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</strong></td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil Administrator Ratio</strong></td>
<td>250-270:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Low Income Students</strong></td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Limited English Proficiency Rate</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong></td>
<td>93-94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chronic Truancy</strong></td>
<td>1-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dropouts</strong></td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduation Rate</strong></td>
<td>90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IGAP Reading Score</strong></td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Do not meet state goals</strong></td>
<td>15-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Do meet state goals</strong></td>
<td>45-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%Exceeds state goals</strong></td>
<td>30-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACT Reading Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Students Tested</strong></td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.*
Table 4A  
**SCHOOL D PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>1000-1500 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense/Pupil</td>
<td>$5000 to $6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>21-22 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Experience</td>
<td>10-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with Masters and Above</td>
<td>55-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%White Teachers/Students</td>
<td>89% / 65-70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Black Teachers/Students</td>
<td>9% / 25-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Hispanic Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&gt;1% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&gt;1% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Native American Teachers/Students</td>
<td>0% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>18-19:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Administrator Ratio</td>
<td>210-230:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low Income Students</td>
<td>10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency Rate</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>92-93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Truancy</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>4-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>80-85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAP Reading Score</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do not meet state goals</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do meet state goals</td>
<td>40-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Exceeds state goals</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACT Reading Scores

- Core Curriculum: 24-25
- All Students Tested: 24-25

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.*
Table 5A

SCHOOL E PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>2000-3000 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense/Pupil</td>
<td>$9,000 to $10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>22-23 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Experience</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with Masters and Above</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%White Teachers/Students</td>
<td>92% / 70-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Black Teachers/Students</td>
<td>7% / 20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Hispanic Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&gt;1% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students</td>
<td>0% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Native American Teachers/Students</td>
<td>0% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>17-18:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Administrator Ratio</td>
<td>250-270:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low Income Students</td>
<td>5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency Rate</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>92-93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Truancy</td>
<td>1-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAP Reading Score</td>
<td>250-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do not meet state goals</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do meet state goals</td>
<td>45-50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Exceeds state goals</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACT Reading Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Curriculum</th>
<th>All Students Tested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.
*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.
### Table 6A

**SCHOOL F PROFILE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>2000-3000 students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense/Pupil</td>
<td>$9,000 to $10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td>22-23 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Experience</td>
<td>15-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers with Masters and Above</td>
<td>75-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%White Teachers/Students</td>
<td>96% / 75-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Black Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&gt;1% / 1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Hispanic Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&gt;1% / 5-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students</td>
<td>&gt;1% / 10-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Native American Teachers/Students</td>
<td>0% / &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil-Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>18-19:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Administrator Ratio</td>
<td>210-230:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Low Income Students</td>
<td>1-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency Rate</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>94-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Truancy</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>1-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>90-95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAP Reading Score</td>
<td>240-250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do not meet state goals</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Do meet state goals</td>
<td>50-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Exceeds state goals</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Reading Scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Curriculum</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students Tested</td>
<td>21-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.

*Source: The 1996 school report cards of the participating schools.*
| **Table 6A** |  
| **STATE OF ILLINOIS SCHOOL PROFILE** |  
| Enrollment | 1,906,599 students  
| Operating Expense/Pupil | $5,933  
| Class Size | 19.5 students  
| Teacher Experience | 14.4 years  
| Teachers with Masters and Above | 44.2%  
| %White Teachers/Students | 84.6% / 64%  
| %Black Teachers/Students | 11.8% / 20.6%  
| %Hispanic Teachers/Students | 2.8% / 12.2%  
| %Asian/Pacific Islander Teachers/Students | .7% / 3.1%  
| %Native American Teachers/Students | .1% / .1%  
| Pupil-Teacher Ratio | 17.9:1  
| Pupil Administrator Ratio | 253.2:1  
| %Low Income Students | 34.9%  
| Limited English Proficiency Rate | 5.9%  
| Attendance | 93.5%  
| Chronic Truancy | 2.3%  
| Dropouts | 6.5%  
| Graduation Rate | 80.5%  
| IGAP Reading Score | 223  
| %Do not meet state goals | 35%  
| %Do meet state goals | 44%  
| %Exceeds state goals | 22%  
| ACT Reading Scores |  
| Core Curriculum | 23.2  
| All Students Tested | 21.5  

+Less than 1% is between 0 and 1%. Greater than 1% is between 1% and 2%.  
*Source: The 1996 School Report Cards of the participating schools.*
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