Sustaining the gains from literacy intervention: a case study of the practice of two schools using the Better Reading Partners programme.

Sharon Hellyer

MA in Literacy Learning and Literacy Difficulties

Report

University of London
Institute of Education

September 2014

Acknowledgements

Abstract

With the Government's drive to narrow the attainment gap of pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds schools need to identify the needs of the pupils who are falling behind. This flexible mixed-methods case study looks at two schools that received training the Better Reading Partners intervention programme more than two years ago. The aim was to see if gains made were sustained by looking at quantitative data. The findings show that gains made were sustained for most pupils. Qualitative data was then explored for the practices the two case schools employed to see how they sustained the gains. Assessment, reading intervention approaches and school factors of leadership, professional development and working with parents, was identified as having an impact on pupil's outcomes. Suggestions for further research are made.

Contents

List of tables and figures

List of appendices

Chapter one

Introduction

The Oxford Declaration (World Literacy Summit, 2014) acknowledged that improving the literacy of women and girls would reduce the global costs of illiteracy. It demanded that marginalized members of society had the opportunity to develop competencies, and that basic literacy is a human right. It challenged the international community to raise awareness of illiteracy issues in their part of the world.

With literacy skills an individual gains control over their life, without them, their life experience is dramatically narrowed affecting personal success and happiness, their family life and the community they live in (National Literacy Trust, 2009). A low level of literacy is defined as leaving Primary School at National Curriculum level 3 or below (KPMG, 2009) Much has been reported about the cost of low levels of literacy not only to the individual in terms of health and life chances but also to the national economy, in the UK alone the cost of illiteracy was put at £81m per year (KPMG, 2009).

With the general election only a year away the National Literacy Trust (2009) produced a manifesto for change they believed was practical, cost-effective and sustainable. Four challenges were proposed for the next Government as ways of tackling poor literacy skills:

1. Ensure that every child develops the speaking and listening.

skills they need.

2. Enable every parent to be their child's first and best teacher

3. Ensure that every pupil is a motivated reader, and uses their skills to interact in a digital age.

4. Every individual must know that literacy can change their life and bring new opportunities.

With a new Government elected in 2010, fundamental changes to the UK educational system were introduced and a determination that schools close the attainment gap between pupils from the poorest background and those from better off backgrounds (DfE, 2014b). One of the ways chosen to do this has been to raise the floor standards of Key Stage 2 results in English and Maths from 60% to 65% in 2014; this means that 65% of pupils leaving primary school must be at a level 4 when the outcomes of maths, reading and writing are combined. In order to do this schools are required to identify as early as possible pupils (KPMG, 2009) who are in danger of falling behind and provide the relevant intervention to support that pupil to make progress.

With the rise in floor standards and the acknowledgement that children requiring additional support costs, pupil premium funding was increased. This money is given to school and is currently £953 per primary pupil rising to £1,300 in 2014/15. Any pupil who has registered for free school meals (FSM) in the last 6 years is eligible. Schools are required to show how they have spent the money to help disadvantaged pupils to ensure efficacy (DfE, 2014a) and one way of doing this is through an evidence based intervention programme.

Reports by Ofsted (DfE: 2010, 2012 and 2013) raised issues around the attainment of some pupils in primary and the importance of getting the basic reading skills in place by the end of Key Stage One. Effective reading intervention starts with the assumption that the child has not made progress because the teacher has not found the right way for them to learn (Clay, 2005; McKenzie, 1999). Reading is a complex and demanding activity (Clay, 2005; Garcia-Madruga, Elousua, Gil, Gomez-Veiga, Vila, Orgales, Contreras, Rodriguez, Melero & Duque, 2013) and requires a range of skills and strategies to get to the meaning of the text (Clay, 1998). Here the term 'reading' is used to mean reading comprehension, being able to understand the message being conveyed through continuous text (Brooks, 2007; Hurry, 2000; Hudson, Isakson, Richman, Lane & Arriaza-Allen, 2011; Wolf, 2011). Identifying those pupils who are at risk of underachievement and providing support early on in their experience of education is important if they are to make the expected progress and attainment.

As a primary teacher, then English Adviser for the LA and later a Reading Recovery Teacher Leader, I developed an interest in how schools develop approaches to teaching literacy in order to improve children's life chances. I was particularly interested in the leadership of schools and how the principles of an intervention are scaled-up to become part of the whole school approach to teaching literacy and how schools engage parents to support their children when attending intervention sessions. Parental engagement in terms of 'good parenting in the home' (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003, p4) has a significant positive effect on children's achievement and yet research on parental views

of literacy development (National Literacy Trust, 2012) showed that 1/3 of parents believed that the development of skills lay with someone else: teacher or child-minder for example.

This report describes the settings of the two case schools and the political climate in which they operate. I begin with a literature review of relevant research providing a conceptual framework for the case study, including a description of effective intervention, methods of, identifying children needing additional provision and the school practices which influence the effectiveness of reading intervention. In Chapter 3 I describe the methodological approaches used to explore the cases and in Chapters four and five I share and discuss my main findings. I conclude the report with a discussion of the findings and suggest further areas for possible research.

Chapter 2
Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The research literature applicable to this study is reviewed to yield a conceptual framework. This framework is taken into account to identify what might make an effective reading intervention, in the context of the Government's drive to close the attainment gap. In this review I explore the current Government's policy on reading and the statutory approaches to teaching it. I also look at the factors that contribute to the need for additional provision for some pupils. I will then explore what might make an effective intervention programme, what research suggests makes an intervention successful and what needs to be in place for an effective whole school approach to teaching reading. The key themes identified are:

- The policy and teaching of reading;

- Assessing the need for additional provision;

- Strengths and limitations of reading intervention approaches and

- Implications for school practices.

2.2 The policy and teaching of reading

Many studies illustrate the complex nature of reading, the broad curriculum required and what can influence its success. These include research into the role of spoken language (Locke, Ginsborg and Peers, 2002; Snowling & Hulme, 2006); the importance of being able to infer (Oakhill, Barnes & Bryant,

2001; Nation and Angell, 2006); and how rapid recognition of words affects comprehension (Castles and Nation, 2008).

The aims of the English programmes of study in the National Curriculum (DfE, 2013) are to ensure that children leave school being able 'to read easily, fluently and with good understanding' as well as being articulate speakers (DfE, 2013, p3). The policy presents schools with statutory guidance on how pupils should be taught to read through two dimensions: decoding and language comprehension. It is a statutory requirement that pupils are taught phonics to aid the 'speedy recognition of words' (DfE, 2013, p3). The theory being that, in order to read, letter/sound correspondence needs to be understood so that words can be worked out (DfE, 2013). It is not that other aspects of reading are ignored - the policy states that pupils are expected to check for sense, infer, predict and use of prior knowledge to comprehend - but the introduction of the Phonics Screening Check (DfE, 2012), the results of which are reported to the Local Authorities for the purpose of monitoring and accountability, places phonics teaching and testing firmly at the heart of the Government's commitment to this methodology. However this high stakes accountability testing has been demonstrated to narrow the literacy curriculum (Johnston and Costello, 2005) and this has implications for assessing the need for intervention and additional provision.

Research shows that pupils who are identified as poor readers do have poor alphabetic and phonetic knowledge (Ehri, 1995; Hurry, 2000; Vellutino, Fletcher, Snowling & Scanlon, 2004) and that with explicit teaching of phonics

word recognition improves (Ehri, 1995; Nation, 2008; Watts and Gardner, 2013). Moreover, teaching reading of words using phonic knowledge is reasonably easy (Stuart, Stainthorp & Snowling, 2008). However, word recognition does not necessarily lead to comprehension (Hurry, 2000; Watts and Gardner, 2013; Torgerson, Brooks and Hall, 2006), and the teaching of comprehension is much more difficult (Stuart, Stainthorp & Snowling, 2008).

2.3   Assessing the need for additional provision

So for those pupils who struggle with reading, early identification and additional provision is required (Douetil, Hobsbaum & Maidment, cited in Burroughs-Lange & Ince, 2013) and pupils' needs should be matched carefully against the specifics of the chosen scheme used (Brooks, 2007; Cain, 2010). In a study comparing a variety of reading assessments to test the validity of another, Cain and Oakhill (2006) concluded that comprehension has many different skills and there is no one best way to help us understand an individual's comprehension (Cain and Oakhill, 2006, p 705). In addition to this, what also needs to be taken into account is what the teachers bring to the assessment process in terms of their understanding of literacy development (McNaughton, 2001) and the principles behind the assessment tool (Johnston and Costello, 2005).

Teachers assess for progress and attainment and should regularly evaluate the assessment instrument and procedures (Cain and Oakhill, 2006) and be aware of the methodology behind the assessment's design (Hurry, 2000; Nation, 2004) for example if reading accuracy and comprehension are not

measured separately a mis-diagnosis could occur (Nation, 2004). Assessing how the child decodes words does not give a full picture of reading skill, as it omits information about reading comprehension (Clay, 2005; Locke, Ginsborg & Peers, 2002; Nation and Angell, 2006; Torgerson et at, 2006). Care is therefore needed when selecting assessments to screen children who might need literacy intervention but equally important is that the intervention closely matches the needs of the individual pupil (Hurry, 2000; Cates, Thomason, Havey & McCormick, 2007; Goulandris and Snowling, 1995; Cain and Oakhill 2006; Brooks, 2007).

2.4   Effective reading intervention

The promising benefits of early intervention are if the child receives instruction that develops their processing skills, they will continue to use them in class, enabling the child to work at the same level as their peers and therefore get better at reading because they will be reading more (Stanovich, 1986). This potentially reduces the need for longer-term intervention as the longer a reading problem is not detected or addressed the more difficult it will be to remedy (Schwartz, 2005). However, often interventions focus on one facet of reading which is easily measurable (Ferguson, Currie, Paul and Topping, 2011).

A broad curriculum of reading: phonics, re-reading and using continuous texts for example need to be included and require coordinated training (Rose, 2006; Brooks, 2007) to provide a framework for the development of reading within the whole school (Hurry, 2000; ACER, 2013).

For an intervention to be effective it needs to have long-term gains. Evidence-based interventions which contribute towards aspects of the broad curriculum such as phonic programmes (Brooks, 2007) or those which cover the broad curriculum such as Reading Recovery and BRP (Brooks, 2007) have shown to have long-term impact (Hurry, 2012).

2.5   School factors that lead to effective outcomes from intervention.

Sharing the knowledge and principles behind intervention programmes with all staff has the potential to change school practice and become part of the schools provision to be successful in addressing the needs of pupils (Burroughs-Lange, 2013, cited in Burroughs-Lange & Ince, 2013). This is likely to present challenges as new knowledge brings different values (Burroughs-Lange, ibid) within an education system that is constantly changing (Amott, Hindmarsh & Morris, 2013).

2.5.1 Leadership of intervention

When there is a whole school approach and effective leadership, then high levels of achievement are seen (Leithwood, Harris and Hopkins, 2008) and schools that adapt the curriculum and interventions to meet the needs of their pupils are more effective (Ofsted, 2011). Advice given to schools through the School Improvement Programme Handbook (2009a) identifies processes focusing on the skills, knowledge and understanding that teachers and headteachers need to improve learning and strengthen leadership. However,

this document focuses on strategies with little guidance on how the school is to manage the changes in relationships that will undoubtedly take place. For an intervention to influence whole school practice then innovation needs to take place and the leader of the intervention will need to understand the change process, which is likely to include resistance before coherence is achieved (Brookfield, 1986; Argyris, 1991; Fullan, 2001). Changes in relationships will undoubtedly occur and leadership is more successful when the change process is understood. Shared commitment contributes to a greater coherence in understanding and practice (Fullan, 2001; Barber, Whelan & Clark 2010) and also requires active support of leadership at all levels if the school is going to become a professional learning community (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace & Thomas, 2006; Skerrett, 2010).

Leading on interventions demands more than relying on sharing lesson plans and materials if capacity through depth of knowledge and sustainability through ownership is to be achieved. Strong leadership enables capacity for the intervention to be a tool for improving literacy (Amott et al, 2013) and sustain excellence in school practices that address identified needs of pupils (Ofsted, 2010) without losing the principles and fidelity to the programme (Amott et al, 2013; Moss, 2009).

2.5.2 Schools as learning communities - Professional development

For an intervention to be effective, the teacher must understand the skills of the pupil and how these will help the pupils problem-solve (Hurry, 2000; Clay, 2005). To do this the teacher must have a depth of understanding in literacy

development that will enable them to help the pupil learn to read (Hurry 2000). Pupils who require one to one support are likely to need a trained specialist to work with them (Hurry, 2000; Brooks, 2007). Whether the intervention is being delivered by researchers (Oakhill, 1983), trained teachers (Ferguson et al, 2011), trained TAs (Snowling & Hulme, 2011) or a mix of adults (Hudson, Isakson, Richman, Lane & Allen, 2011) for research purposes, they all demonstrate that for an intervention to be effective the depth of knowledge and understanding of what is being observed are important if there is to be an impact; therefore an investment in professional development is key (Hurry 2000; Rose, 2006; ACER, 2013).

In learning from the intervention principles, schools move from a community of practice where groups of people share and operate with set routines and negotiated and shared meaning for example (Fullan et al, 2005; Skerrett, 2010) to being a learning community where they share meaning about their practice and use this to inquire and create new meanings to improve practice (Stoll et al, 2006). Sharing the principles of effective evidence-based interventions brings professional development to staff as it impacts on teaching and learning (ACER, 2013) so scaling up from small-scale success brings innovativeness, as tacit knowledge becomes organisational knowledge (Fullan, 2001).

What is important is that teachers see themselves as learners too and understand what learning is and how they learn (Brookfield, 1986). This understanding moves schools from a problem-solving way of operating to a

learning community, reflecting critically on their own behaviours (Argyris, 1991).

2.5.3 Working in collaboration with parents

The part that parents play in their child's education will be highly individual, being bound up with who the child is, how the parents view themselves and what they want for their children (Ramaekers & Suissa, 2011). Research has found that parental involvement has a positive significant impact on their child's achievement so engaging parents and keeping them engaged is important (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003; Siraj-Blatchford & Blatchford, 2009; DCSF, 2009b).

Pupils who have low social economic status (SES) have been found to be particularly vulnerable to underachievement and are more likely to require interventions (Siraj-Blatchford & Blatchford, 2009; Hurry, 2000; KPMG, 2010). That is not to say that parents from low SES do not have high aspirations for their children (Mohr, Zygmunt & Clark, 2012) but pupils in this group are significantly lower in attainment by age 11 (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003; Siraj-Blatchford & Blatchford, 2009).

Parents who are not confident in supporting their children are likely to need intervention themselves which could be in the form of literacy classes or parenting classes (Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003; DCSF 2009b). Although Desforges and Abouchaar (2003) concluded that parental interventions and their impact on pupil achievement was weak and could not be securely commented upon, a report by DCSF (2009b) aimed to address this. They concluded that initial enthusiasm of parents was not always enough to result

in practical changes at home. Where there was success was when activities were based on general principles of supporting children's learning and matched parents' philosophies (DCSF 2009b).

Moreover, practices in engaging parents to support their children need to address the 'hard-to-reach' parents who lack confidence or have work patterns that restrict the time they can give to attend school based sessions (DCSF, 2009b).   This requires training of teachers as they work with parents whose backgrounds are different to their own (DCSF, 2009b). Engaging and collaborating with parents requires good relationships if they are to be convinced to stay involved for an impact to be seen (Siraj-Blatchford & Blatchford, 2009).

Summary

The ways in which reading is taught is determined by policy. However even when policy is followed carefully there will be children who need some additional support in order to keep up with their peers because reading is a complex skill. Appropriate assessments need to be used to identify the best intervention to address pupils' needs. However factors in the school context might play a part in the success of the intervention and how well the students' gains in reading are sustained following the intervention. Leadership, professional development and engagement of parent support may be key factors. In the next chapter I will discuss the design of the research and the data methods in this case study.

Chapter 3

Research Methods

3.1 Introduction

In the current climate of change Government education policy and the raising of floor targets, the achievement gap between the lowest and highest attaining pupils has the potential to get bigger. So the impact of any intervention needs to be seen quickly and for the programme to have efficacy, the gains made need to be sustained. This study looks specifically at Better Reading Partners (Education Works, 2005, Appendix 3.1) commonly referred to as BRP. BRP is a reading comprehension intervention programme and can be delivered by trained TAs, parents and volunteers to address the needs of pupils who are working at just below national curriculum expectations. In this chapter I discuss the research design used to explore whether gains made in a reading intervention programme are sustained and school practices that may contribute to those gains being sustained. I outline the data collection methods used in the study and how the data were analysed. Ethical responses to the treatment of participants and data are discussed and I also consider aspects relating to validity and trustworthiness of the data and data interpretation.

3.2 Research Question

I was interested in exploring to what extent gains are made with a reading intervention programme and how the schools' practices ensure they are sustained. Based on my reading of related research, two types of questions were used to help shape the study. Variance questions using quantitative data

allows comparison of outcomes (Maxwell, cited in Robson, 2011) and process

questions look at the qualitative data identifies operational links (Yin, 2013)

These included:

- How is the intervention lead in school?

- How the schools encourage parents to support their children
  with their reading?

- What is the impact of parental support?

3.3 Design

First I considered the research question and what I wanted the study to

achieve. I identified that qualitative and quantitative data was required to

explore the question and consulted Robson's (2011) view of the mixed

methods approach. Some science-based researchers argue that the mixed

methods of qualitative and quantitative data, are not compatible (Punch, 2009;

Robson, 2011) as they cannot study the same thing (Robson, 2011) being two

paradigms of research. However, the mixed method design uses the

strengths from both views and allows the research to take place in

'naturalistic' setting as the situation is not being contrived for the purpose of

the research (Punch, 2009) and is a less intensive approach (Punch, 2009;

Robson, 2011).

The study was designed to determine progress through pre and post-test

results of the pupils who attended BRP sessions. Quantitative data was used

to provide a narrative (Robson, 2011; Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011) of the

practices each school employed to ensure that any progress made by pupils

attending BRP sessions was maintained. The approaches were explored so that internal generalisations about each setting could be made rather than statistical generalisations, which would rely on representative samples, which this study does not (Robson, 2011; Yin2014).

Qualitative methods were used to explore and understand the context of the study (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011; Punch, 2009) through discussions and analysis of school documents and plans.

3.4 Methods of data collection

Collecting quality data (Punch, 2009) from multiple sources means findings can be corroborated and triangulated; this strengthens the construct validity (Yin, 2013); clarify meanings (Flick, 1992, cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 1998) and provide a holistic approach to the study (Punch, 2009).

Although some criticize this approach viewing it as reductionist and potentially losing sight of the bigger picture, this study looks at behaviours and practices that are not context-free (Punch, 2009). In identifying the type of data required from the schools boundaries were set which aimed to reduce confusion and ambiguity (Yin, 2013). It was anticipated that data collection would be replicated in both settings in 'an attempt to confirm the structures and mechanisms identified' (Robson, 2011; p38) as being good school practice (DfE, 2009). In preparation for data collection a letter was sent addressed to the headteachers of two schools setting out the qualitative and quantitative data required for the study (Appendix 3.2). A table (Appendix

3.3) was created to identify the sources likely to give evidence and keep me on track as I collected data (Yin, 2013).

3.4.1 Quantitative data

Annonymised quantitative data was collected to establish the entry and exit levels of pupils who attended BRP sessions and allowed numerical measurement of progress (Punch, 2009, Robson, 2011, Yin, 2013). In order to determine if gains were made annonymised data from assessments undertaken in February 2014 were also collected. This gave an indication of whether pupils were assessed to be on track to reach expected national curriculum outcomes at the end of the year.

3.4.2 Qualitative data

Qualitative data can be described as using words (Punch, 2009; Robson, 2005; Yin, 2003) that cannot be converted into numerical data readily (Yin, 2003). Consideration was given to the type of data schools use to inform, evaluate and monitor their practices to understand the context within which they work. The qualitative data in this study requested document scrutiny of the school development plan (SDP), semi-structured interviews, and a journal to record outcomes of discussions and identify possible further points for inquiry.

1. School development plan

School Development Plans (SDP) are working documents and not created specifically for the research (Yin, 2014) and provide an understanding of the

context in which they are produced (Punch, 2009). They reflect outcomes of conversations between parties: staff/staff, staff/TAs, staff/parents and other data produced by the school in terms of professional development of staff.

2. Semi-structured interview

Interviews are a flexible way of finding things out and are often used in mixed-method studies (Gillham, 2000; Robson, 2011). They require two levels of operation from the interviewer: the 'verbal line of enquiry' and the 'mental line of enquiry' (Yin, 2013, p91). These two types of questions can be difficult to manage as whilst verbally asking the question, the interviewer needs be aware of what course of events the answers might be pertaining to (Yin, 2013).

Although validity of interviews and the data collected has been called into question, as they cannot be assumed to be the 'unmediated expressions of respondents' real opinions' (Robson, 2011, p279), Yin, (2013) asserts that the interview is the most important sources of evidence for case studies as the 'guided conversation' (Yin, 2013, p110). Whilst being aware that I could not be sure of which direction the interview would take (Gillham, 2000), the aim was to use questions initially as a structure for fact finding and prompts for discussions (Robson, 2011).

3. Research journal

Conversations between the RRTt and SENCO and myself were important to address the objectives of the study and minimise mis-interpretation of data

collected (Yin, 2014). An informal log of discussions was kept and used to raise questions for further discussion (Gillham, 2000) as the research progressed.

3.5 Participants

Two schools were approached as they had received BRP training more than two years ago and would have long-term data. School A is a smaller than average primary school with 50% of pupils coming from military families, which means that mobility of pupils is high. The number of pupils registered for free school meals (FSM) is low but pupil premium funding is high due to the number of pupils from forces families. School B is a larger than average primary school and also has high mobility, with the number of pupils registered for FSM above the national average. Both schools received a judgment of 'good' at their last Ofsted inspections.

A letter was sent to the headteacher (Appendix 3.2), who passed it the SENCO from school A and Reading Recovery teacher in School B. It was agreed between all those involved, that if other participants were to be contacted in relation to the study then consent would be sought from the headteacher before an approach was made. However, although parental involvement and pupils' data were discussed, no one individual was identified or approached.

3.6 Ethical issues

Ethical considerations were given to both schools and pupils. In a letter sent to the schools setting out the aim of the study a request that the collection of quantitative and qualitative data (Appendix 3.2) was anonymised before being sent to myself was made, so that individual pupils could not be identified. Schools were assured that they would be referred to as either School A or School B to protect their identity.

Consideration was also given to the amount of time that the Reading Recovery teacher and SENCO may or may not be available for discussions and so any meetings that took place were at agreed times at the schools premises to reduce time taken out of school by the participants. Questions were prepared prior to visits to reduce 'bureaucratic burden' and the impact on the workload of participants (BERA, 2011).

Findings of the data analysis were shared with each school to allow for any concerns to be raised prior to printing about how their schools are presented and the data is interpreted (Stake, cited in Denzin and Lincoln, 1998).

Confidentiality was assured by emphasising that data collected was to identify school practices and the impact of gains made through an intervention programme. Schools were informed that they could withdraw without prejudice at any time without a reason.

3.7 Pilot

Having identified the data required to explore the research question a pilot of data collection methods was undertaken to identify any unforeseen problems that may arise (Robson, 2005). It was noticed that four different types of standardised tests were used between the schools over the years: YARC, BAS, APS and book levels. I decided that the data would easier to analyse if it were translated into National Curriculum levels, as this is what is used for reporting attainment. It is acknowledged that standardised tests are the optimum assessment tool for comparison and that translating standardised assessments to teacher assessment, which are not truly triangulated until external marking takes place in Key Stage 2 is in danger of weakening the data.

Questions developed as a starting point for discussions with Reading Recovery teacher and SENCO were also piloted with another headteacher who made recommendations to reduce repetition of some of the questions. These suggestions were taken on and the questions were amended (Appendix 3.4).

3.8 Data analysis

Notes made in response to semi-structured interviews were analysed for information relating to the research question in particular about school practices.

The quantitative data collected was based on teacher assessments using the schools internal assessment systems – APP and optional SAT papers – for the initial identification of children for BRP then further assessments are undertaken. Validity of these assessments was constructed through whole school approaches to the assessment process. An agreement on the award of a National Curriculum level[1] is done in each school through moderation at staff meetings.

3.9 Validity and trustworthiness

Threats to this study were identified in terms of the validity of the data collected at pre and post intervention. In converting the raw standardised data into National Curriculum levels it could be argued that this threatens the validity of the description due to inaccuracy of the data in the translation (Robson, 2005). All effort was made to cross check conversions of one type of standardised data to another to ensure that there was consistency for reporting. To reduce a misinterpretation that could be made of what was observed, I recorded as accurately as possible conversations had and made sure they were anonymised; any summaries made of conversations were clarified first to avoid any misrepresentations and omissions.

Summary

This flexible, mixed-methods case study was selected to explore the gains made after pupils attended the BRP intervention programme and the practices of two schools that ensure gains made are sustained. By exploring

---

[1] National Curriculum levels established in 1999 by the then Labour Government will no longer be used to determine attainment. In September 2014 the Coalition

quantitative data in the form of pre and post intervention scores and the

schools teacher assessment data from February, allowed for an analysis to

see if gains were sustained. Qualitative data was also collected through the

use of semi-structured interviews, an informal journal and a request for the

schools' development plan. Data collected was analysed to see if there was a

correlation between themes identified in Chapter 2 and the schools' practices.

Chapter 4

Results

This study sought to explore the research question:

How does a reading intervention impact on reading outcomes and what are the school practices that ensure that children continue to make expected progress following the intervention?

In this chapter I present the findings from the quantitative data in the form of pre and post intervention measures and qualitative data in the form of school documents, semi-structured interviews and notes made during discussions. I use the data collected to explore possible links between the data sources and the theoretical concepts and themes of assessment, effective intervention, whole school approaches including leadership and working with parents identified in discussed in Chapter 2. First I present my findings from the quantitative data to explore the gains made.

4.1 Gains made

When quantitative data was first collected it was found that each school had used different assessment tools each year so was recorded in different ways. So a decision had to be made about converting the data to a common category. Although major problems can arise when converting categories into another (Gorad, 2006, cited in Robson, 2011), Robson (2011) advises that it should not inhibit an analysis as long as what is being done is understood. As long as it will shed light on what is being explored, it is the interpretation

that is important. A decision was made that the data would be converted to national curriculum levels, as this is what is reported at the end of each academic year. I was aware that these are based on teacher assessment and are not standardised which would be the optimum measure.

Further decisions had to be made when I realized that some tracking and final data was missing.   Some pupils had attended BRP sessions but had left the schools so tracking from intervention outcomes to February teacher assessment outcomes was not available. Whilst it is not ideal (Robson, 2011) data lines that were not complete were removed. This decision was based on the fact that my study is to see any long-term gains; so having only half the data for a minority pupils, could potentially skew the final analysis.

Initial data shows that pupils across both schools made on average a national curriculum level progress after attending an average of 26 BRP sessions between both schools (see table 4.1).

Table 4.1: Range of national curriculum levels of children on entry to BRP in both schools.

Year Group	End of year expectations	Range of pupils starting points School A	Range of pupils starting points School B
Y1	1A	W	P8 -1B
Y2	2B	W – 1A	P8 -1A
Y3	3C	1A – 2B	1A -2B
Y4	3A	2B	1B – 3B
Y5	4B	1B – 3C	No pupils
Y6	5C	3C – 4B	3A – 4B

Whilst initially this looked positive, further investigation revealed a more complex picture. BRP is intended for pupils working at just below

expectations in year groups 1 – 8. Defining this as 1 sub-level below national curriculum levels an analysis of the data revealed that the starting points of some pupils fell outside the remit of the programme.

I then considered how many of the pupils were on track at the February 2014 assessment window. Of the 161 pupils who have attended BRP sessions since 2010, 73 were already at or above the end of year expectations. Of the remaining 88 pupils, 32 were on track to be at expected outcomes when the assessments take place in the summer, as they were only 1 sub-level below end of year expectations. This means that 56 pupils were two or more sub-levels below end of year expectations at the February assessment.

Government policy focuses on closing the attainment gap of the pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds (DfE, 2014a), who are identified as those being eligible for free school meals (FSM). Data was explored to determine the impact of the BRP programme in narrowing the gap in this group and also explored for numbers of boys, girls and EAL[2] pupils (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2:Break down of boys, girls, EAL and pupils eligible for FSM.

Year	No of pupils	Girls	Boys	FSM (where data available)	EAL (where data available)
2010-2011	33	16	17	10	9
2011-2012	56	31	25	15	6
2012-2013	59	35	24	13	4

---

[2] EAL – English as an additional language

Although it was not clear how many of the FSM or EAL pupils were boys or girls, it does give an indication of how the cohorts were sub-divided. Where data was available a further exploration was undertaken of the progress of the pupils registered as eligible for FSM. The table below shows the number of pupils eligible for FSM and how many are on track or above at the February assessment (see table 4.3)

Table 4.3: Number of FSM pupils on track or above national end of year expectations

Year	FSM	On track or above	Y6
2010- 2011	10	7	4B
2011-2012	15	7	4B
2012-2013	13	6	0

The column titled 'Y6' shows the levels at which 2 pupils were at the time of the assessment, which is still considered to be on track. However, with the current push on progress the expectation is that if there has been no additional support, progress of 2 sub-levels per year, would put Year 6 expectations at level 5C +.

It would appear from the quantitative data that although the starting levels of some pupils are below the levels for who BRP is intended, gains are made and sustained. Having studied the quantitative data I turned my attention to the schools' practices to explore what may have contributed to the sustained gains from the BRP intervention.

4.2 School practices

I explore school practices under the themes of assessment, interventions used, leadership and engaging parents.

First I explore the assessments used to identify children who require additional provision.

4.3 Assessment

Data collected from both schools, showed that formative assessments take place twice a year - October, and February. These are teacher assessments and in the form of APP and the schools' own assessment practices based on APP to check for progress and set targets for the next term.   Optional SATs are used for the end of years three, four and five providing a summative assessment that determines year on year attainment. Summative assessments for year six take place in May in the form of optional SATs and for years three, four and five optional SATs which are administered in June. Pupils in year one are assessed using teacher assessment relating to either the Foundation Stage Profiles or APP depending on where the pupils are.

When a pupil has been identified through teacher assessment or general concerns raised by observations in the classroom, that they are vulnerable to underachievement then further assessments are carried out by the Reading Recovery teacher in School B and the SENCO in School A.

School A uses standardised assessment tool YARC (2009), to identify delays in reading age, but this do not necessarily assess specific issues with reading

comprehension. This tool was introduced to the school when BRP started, as it is the assessment tool referred to by BRP to record pre and post intervention data. The SENCO noted the current year (2013-2014) reported outcomes of this intervention have changed from reading age to more detailed comprehension, accuracy and word rate. This data cannot be translated into national curriculum levels but the advantage is that it does give an age-standardised score. Gains recorded show on average a 19 month gain in comprehension over the average of 26 lessons. Other assessment tools used are the WESforD (Wiltshire Learning Support Services, 2012), which assesses and identifies pupils who need more phonological teaching.

School B has a large number of pupils requiring intervention and has adapted its assessment procedures over time. Past assessments used have been Book Bands (IOE, 2007) and BAS 3 (2011), both of which are standardised but:

'To administer assessments to a growing number of pupils, as I was the only one who could do the BAS (3), was very time consuming.' (Interview 12.03.13. Reading Recovery teacher).

The school adapted its practice to using Average Point Scores (APS) - this is based on an expectation of pupils making three sub-levels of progress in each year (DfE, 2013), and was already established in the school. This combined with pupil progress meetings are now used to assess the specific needs of

pupils, which led the Reading Recovery teacher to comment *'This is more manageable!' Reading Recovery teacher (Interview. 12.03.13).*

Findings appear to show that these schools monitor and evaluate the assessment tools used (Cain and Oakhill, 2006) and adapted their assessment practices to make assessment more manageable and provide a more refined picture of pupils where necessary.

4.4 Interventions

In order for interventions to be effective they need to match accurately the needs of the child (Hurry, 2000; Brooks, 2007; ACER, 2013). A semi-structured interview (Appendix 3.4) was prepared and used as a starting point for discussions with the Reading Recovery teacher and SENCO. It was useful as a way of keeping focused on the verbal questioning whilst mentally building a case (Yin, 2013) and being mindful of responses that may shed new light for the study (Gillham, 2000). Both respondents indicated that the schools have a range of interventions. School A's intervention strategies include: additional guided reading sessions, phonic sessions, WESforD (Wiltshire Learning Support Service, 2004) programme or more 1:1 reading. Pupils attend these sessions in either the first instance because the teacher raised concerns and an assessment relevant to the programme confirmed this, or a pupil attended another intervention programme and progress was seen to be slowing.

School B provided a document showing the strategic management of literacy in the school, which clearly indicates the route for literacy interventions and

who is leading them. As well as a monitored phonics programme the document shows a range of interventions. Reading Recovery[3], BRP, or a school developed programme of reading partners using principles of BRP were cited as provision for additional support.   The document supplied by the School B shows that class teacher, Reading Recovery teacher and deputy headteacher take decisions about the best intervention programme for a pupil collectively.

4.5 Leadership

I had hoped to access the SDP for each school in order to ascertain priorities and the processes of how they were to be addressed through the monitoring and evaluation cycle, topics of staff meetings, which would involve professional conversations. However, this was not possible for either school. School A was focusing on maths and did not have a current plan for literacy and School B provided a specific literacy plan and a strategic literacy management document.

In the semi-structured interview the Reading Recovery teacher and SENCO reflected on how confident teachers were to raise concerns about pupils literacy difficulties. Responses show that in both schools teachers raise concerns at any point during the year and that staff understood and appreciated the part that interventions have to play in the teaching of reading and the attainment of pupils. *'Teachers are confident to raise concerns about a pupils progress that means a scrutiny of the child's work takes place,*

---

[3] Reading Recovery – an intervention programme for pupils ages 5.9 – 6.3 who are identified as working in the lowest 5% of the class.

because they understand what the intervention can offer. It is not a comment on their teaching.' (Interview with SENCO, School A. 11.03.13. Appendix 4.1)

Part of the leadership role of the Reading Recovery teacher and the SENCO is to monitor the adults working with pupils. Monitoring to ensure programme principles are being adhered to takes time, particularly when partners are not trained teachers (Hurry, 2000). In School A an experienced Reading Recovery teacher and BRP trainer monitored the BRP programme. Both the SENCO from School A and Reading Recovery teacher from School B, expressed concerns (Interviews, 11.03.13 & 12.03.13) that to monitor and support programme delivery is time consuming and felt that more time was needed, particularly to form stronger positive relationships. School B has as part of an induction programme, an expectation that all new teachers and adults working in the school as a reading partner observe a Reading Recovery lesson as well as attend workshops for training in the BRP programme. Discussions are held afterwards to answer questions and discuss the principles behind reading and the reciprocity with writing, although partners in BRP do not address writing needs.

To ensure efficacy, programme delivery and outcomes are monitored as the SENCO and Reading Recovery teacher are responsible for gathering the pre and post intervention data and entering it onto the schools' data base. The SENCO and Reading Recovery teacher are responsible for monitoring and supporting TAs and adults who deliver the BRP programme.

4.6 Working with parents

BRP is an intervention programme that can be delivered by trained adults, including parents (Education Works, 2005) and as such requires commitment to good relationships. In the semi-structured interview (Appendix 3.4) a discussion about the role of parents in supporting children and delivering the BRP programme the SENCO (Interview, 11.03.13) and Reading Recovery teacher (Interview, 12.03.13) both felt that they felt they had a good relationship with parents. They believed that most children, who attended the BRP sessions, were heard to read at home. School A does not record formally those children who are heard read at home, so a comparison of parental impact could be undertaken. A home/school diary gives School A an indication of whether parents are hearing their children read. Where parents are not recording hearing their children read, the school responds to the individual need of the child and gives extra reading support. School B however, keeps a formal record of which parents attend the workshops and the impact that parental support has on their child's progress. Out of the 120 pupils who have received BRP since 2010, 54 are noted to have had parents making a point of reading with their children at home after receiving guidance on how to do this from the Reading Recovery teacher. Analyses of the February 2014 assessments shows that those children who received parental support 31 have either already reached the end of year national expectation for their year group or are on track to. The other children were either 2 or 3 sub-levels below at the February assessment.

The Action Plan from School B has recruiting parents to train as BRP partners as a focus and priority of the school. Workshops are held when needed to help parents support their children with reading when they first enter school in the Reception year. They are also run again when children are in need of receiving additional provision to support parents in helping their child.

Data provided by School B highlighted two groups of pupils: one group who had attended BRP sessions more than once because tracking showed a plateau in their progress; another group who go on to attend BRP sessions automatically after attending Reading Recovery sessions. Twenty-three pupils have attended BRP twice or more since 2010. Of those, ten are recorded as having received parental support at home. Three pupils received support the first time they attended BRP but not in subsequent attendance, 2 received support from home for both rounds of sessions.

Summary

The study set out to explore the impact a reading intervention makes and what the school practices are to sustain those gains made. Themes identified in Chapter 2 provided a conceptual framework and were used as a reference when looking at the findings. Evidence suggests pupils attending BRP do make gains and that most sustain them. The schools have systems that assess and track progress of pupils and identify those who are not working at expected levels and provide additional support. Assessment tools used to identify entry and exit levels at the start of the intervention are used as a measurement of progress rather than identifying the specific needs of the

children. The schools appear to operate slightly differently in how the

intervention programmes are led. In School A the SENCO leads the

interventions with outside monitoring of the BRP programme, when it was

running. In School B the Reading Recovery teacher monitors a section of the

interventions available in the school with SLT taking on monitoring of other

intervention programmes. In the next chapter I discuss the findings and offer

an interpretation against the framework identified in Chapter 2.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this case study was to see how gains made from the BRP reading intervention programme were sustained and what practices the case schools employed to ensure this. Quantitative data were analysed for sustained gains and qualitative data was collected in the form of school documents (where available) and semi-structured interviews along with a journal for informal note taking to look at school practices. I will now discuss the findings in relation to the conceptual framework and the themes of gains made, assessment and leadership that are outlined in the literature review in Chapter 2.

5.1 Gains made

Quantitative data collected shows that those pupils who attended the BRP sessions did make gains. Teacher assessments undertaken in February, 2014 shows that most pupils sustained gains. Evidence suggests that the majority of pupils were on track or ahead of the end of year national curriculum expectations. This was born out by the Optional SAT data at the end of years 3 – 5 where pupils are required to work independently when taking the test. It could be said that the final 'moderation' of the schools assessment practices is in the year 6 reading SATs as papers are currently marked externally.

5.2 Assessment

A range of assessment processes enabled the schools to identify pupils'

attainment and therefore those who would need additional provision.

Formative assessments were used to track progress; teacher assessments

were on going throughout the year and at the end of year one and summative

assessments were used to track end of year attainment through Optional

SATs in years two, three, four, five and six. Standardised assessments for

example YARC (2007), was used to determine where pupils were in terms of

their acquisition of reading comprehension skills and to measure progress

when they had been identified as needing additional support.

However, standardised tests only show where a pupil is in relation to other

pupils of the same age (Goulandris and Snowling, 1995). The issue is that the

trajectory for development in the elements of reading comprehension is

different (Oakhill, et al, 2003). Therefore teachers' understanding of what the

assessment tools tell them about their pupils comprehension, (Johnston &

Costello, 2005; Cain & Oakhill, 2006; Hurry, 2000) is important for accurate

diagnosis of reading difficulty. However, schools have to make decisions

about which assessment tools they are going to use.   For one school it was

equally about the time required for administration rather than the information

the assessment tool gave about the individual needs of the pupil, as they had

a large number of pupils who were identified as needing additional support.

The Reading Recovery teacher and the SENCO both administered the

standardised assessments to ensure that, although it might not give a

diagnosis, at least the administration would be consistent and, it was felt,

more reliable. So although Cain & Oakhill (2006) recommend a regular evaluation of their assessment tools and practices to ensure that they useful, practicalities need consideration too.

5.3 Intervention

Both case schools had a range of interventions that they could draw upon. These included support for phonics training, reading comprehension and specialist interventions. Where available, documents showed a clear structure of the intervention process and who was responsible. However, challenges to the fidelity, efficacy and effectiveness of the BRP programme were identified when some pupils' gains were not sustained and they needed to attend the BRP sessions again. This could be that, for some pupils their starting points were outside the suggested boundaries of the BRP programme i.e two or more sub-levels below national curriculum expectations. Indeed the pupils starting at both schools have been reported in the past as being below national expectations, which is going to have implications throughout the school in terms of progress required. So to say that gains made at the end of the intervention were not enough, meaning that technically the intervention did not match the needs of the children, does not tell the whole story.

Success of intervention programmes is as dependent on the quality of the teacher as it is on the components of literacy it addresses (Ferguson, et al, 2011). So when pupils need additional support decisions need to be made about which components of reading the pupil needs training in, which intervention would be most appropriate, and the resources available in terms

of who is trained and available to work with pupils. In some instances in the absence of anything else, because BRP trains pupils in a broad curriculum of English it is the best option available.

5.4 Leadership

Both the Reading Recovery teacher and the SENCO saw their role in terms of monitoring intervention programmes and adults who work with pupils, supporting adults who work with pupils and working with teachers to identify and provide guidance on how to support a pupil in the classroom.   Both the Reading Recovery teacher and the SENCO have received training and qualifications that recognise them as experts in their field. When discussing the expectations of their role they both felt that more time was needed for monitoring and supporting adults and teachers and they wished to build stronger/more productive relationships with those who work with pupils.

Both Reading Recovery teacher and SENCO have provided CPD for staff, but how these practices have been developed in the classroom was not observed. Where reading partners are trained to take a running record an analysis of the reading behaviours the pupil is using to gain meaning from text can be achieved. A bigger impact of this practice would be if teachers were using running records too; it gives a common language for teacher and partner to discuss a pupil's reading ability, and an opportunity to deepen understanding of literacy development. Conversations that deepen knowledge and create meaning would enable the class teachers to build on what is being taught in

the intervention (Fullan, 2001) and not view the intervention as an add-on (Burroughs-Lange, 2013, cited in Burroughs-Lange & Ince, 2013).

Where CPD takes place to add depth of understanding to literacy knowledge of teachers and scale-up from the intervention to class to whole-school practice to become 'normalised' (Burroughs-Lange, cited in Burroughs-Lange & Ince 2013) would require time as development is not a linear process (Amott et al, 2013).

5.5 Parents

Although both case schools felt they had a good relationship with parents, they wanted to engage some parents more and some more parents. Documentary evidence showed that one school had 'engaging parents' as a specific target along with running intervention training programmes for those whose children will be attending the BRP sessions. Although Desforges and Abouchaar, (2003) report that the impact of parent intervention programmes on pupils attainment is weak, where data was available in the case schools, more than 50% of pupils whose parents did support them having attended intervention sessions, did reach expected levels. What is not known is which parent has attended the sessions as research has shown that the mother's education has a strong impact on the literacy of her children (World Literacy Summit, 2014; Desforges & Abouchaar, 2003; DCSF, 2009b).

Gains made by pupils attending BRP sessions show that they are mostly sustained, but this does not give the whole picture. Challenges to provide

additional support means that sometimes the decision has to be based on what is available. This can mean that demands placed on some interventions threaten the fidelity and efficacy of the programme if they come close to what the pupil needs rather than exactly what is needed. Interventions can provide professional development deepening knowledge about literacy development and in doing so could reduce the need for intervention later on.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

A flexible, mixed methods case study design was used as a holistic approach (Punch, 2009; Robson, 2011; Yin, 2013) to explore how gains made by pupils attending BRP sessions are sustained by the practices employed by schools. However, the study reveals the complex nature of schools and their practices in how they identify and address the needs of their pupils are bigger than this research acknowledges.

Gains made were sustained for many pupils who attended BRP sessions. With schools undertaking regular assessments and tracking pupil's data, those who are vulnerable to underachievement or plateauing can be identified and a programme put in place. Adaptation of the use of standardised assessments were to improve the information the tools used gives them and for practical reasons. However, unless a specific programme had its own assessment, standardised tests used were to monitor progress rather than diagnose reading difficulty.

Investment of resources in terms of personnel to deliver the intervention and key areas including assessment, curriculum and pedagogy need to be considered (Hurry, 2000; ACER, 2013). How schools determine which intervention programmes they will invest in, and whether they are looking for short or long term gains might be an interesting follow-up study, particularly as educational demands are constantly changing.

For intervention to be effective studies have shown that evidence-based programmes and whole school practice is essential. It needs to involve distributed leadership with school-wide professional development to deliver and maintain the methodology (Stoll, Bolam, McMahon, Wallace & Thomas, 2006). The school that is a learning community (Stoll et al, 2006; Skerrett, 2007; DfE, 2009a) has children as its reason for existing (Fullan, Cuttress, Kilcher, 2005), and values those involved.

This study did not interview parents or teachers so how the school communities would describe themselves as either schools of practice or a learning community is not determinable. What would be interesting would be if teachers see themselves as learners and what they understand by this and how this can contribute to the development of school practices. As with other adults working in the school particularly the volunteers what is it that makes them engage with the school and be willing to support pupils other than their own? Whilst it was not the remit of this study to talk to parents, volunteers, TAs or other adults who work in the schools it does mean that the results can only be looked at in terms of what the schools chose to share and were able to share for the purposes of this study. If I were to do this again I would spend more time in schools with a view to talking with other the adults to get 'under the skin' of school practice and how it views itself.

With the Government's focus on narrowing the attainment gap (DfE, 2013), it could be that more pupils will require some form of intervention. Interventions

can innovate practice where they are part of the whole school approach to literacy. Embedding the knowledge that the principles behind the intervention give would enable schools to be more dynamic in their own learning (Fullan 2001). It would be interesting to know how the intervention specifically contributes to the class teacher's learning about literacy development and the influences on pupil's outcomes as practices change.

Word count: 10,031

References

Amott, P., Hindmarsh, V. & Morris, H. (2013). Creatively responding to the imperative of scaling up Every Child a Reader. In Burroughs-Lange, S. & Ince, A., (2013) *Reading Recovery and Every Child a Reader. History, policy and practice*. IOE Press.

Argyris, C. (1991) Teaching Smart People How to Learn. *Harvard Business Review*. May – June 99-109

Australian Council for Educational Research (2013) Literacy and Numeracy Interventions in the Early Years of Schooling: A Literature Review *NSW Department of Education and Communities*

Barber, Sir M., Whelan, F., Clark, M. (2010). Capturing the leadership premium. How the world's top school systems are building leadership capacity for the future. *Mckinsey & Co*

Bew, (2011) Independent Review of Key Stage 2 testing, assessment and accountability
Final Report. *Crown Copyright.*

Baker, S., Bickler S. & Bodman, S. (2007) *Book Bands for Guided Reading: A handbook to support Foundation and Key Stage 1 teachers*. IOE. London.

British Educational Research Association (2011) *Ethical Guidelines.*

Brooks, G. (2007) What works well for pupils with literacy difficulties? 3rd Ed. DCSF.

Brookfield, S. D. (1986*) Understanding and Facilitating Adult Learning*. Milton Keynes: OU Press.

Burroughs-Lange, S (2013) From Innovation to Normalisation. In Burroughs-Lange, S. & Ince, A., (2013) *Reading Recovery and Every Child a Reader. History, policy and practice*. IOE Press.

Burroughs-Lange,S., Douteil, J., & Hobsbaum, A. (2013) How Every Child a Reader grew from Reading Recovery. In Burroughs-Lange, S. & Ince, A., (2013) *Reading Recovery and Every Child a Reader. History, policy and practice*. IOE Press.

Butt, R. & Lowe, K. (2012) Teaching assistants and class teachers: differing perceptions, role confusion and the benefits of skills-based training, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, **16, (2),** 207-219

British Ability Scales: Third Edition (BAS3)

Cain, K. (2010) 'Summary: Written and spoken language' in *Reading Development and Difficulties.* 14-20, London: BPS Blackwell.

Cain, K., Oakhill, J., Barnes, M. & Bryant, P. (2001) Comprehension skill, inference-making ability, and their relation to knowledge. *Memory & Cognition*. 29 (6) p 850-859

Castles, A. & Nation, P. (2008) Learning to be a good orthographic reader. Journal of Research in Reading. **31 (1)** 1 - 7

Cates PhD, G.L., Thomason, K., Havey, M. & McCormick, C. (2007) A Preliminary Investigation of the Effects of Reading Fluency Interventions on Comprehension, *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, **23 (1)** 133-154

Clay, M. (2005) *Literacy Lessons Designed for Individuals. Part One.* New Zealand; Pearson Education Ltd

Clay, M. (1998) *By Different Paths to Common Outcomes*. York: Stenhouse

Desforges, Prof. C. & Albouchaar. A. (2003) Impact of Parental Involvement, Parental Support and Family Education on Pupil Achievements and Adjustment: A Literature Review. DES

DCSF (2008) Impact of Parental Involvement in Childrens' Education. http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/http://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DCSF-Parental_Involvement.pdf last accessed: 13.08.13

DCSF (2009a) Improving Schools Programme Handbook.

DCSF (2009b) Supporting parents with their children's 'at home' learning and development. Research Report.

DfE (2010) Review of best practice in parental engagement. https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/182508/DFE-RR156.pdf last accessed: 18.08.13

DfE (2012) Assessment framework for the development of the Year 1 phonics screening check. Crown Copyright.

DfE (2013) Raising the achievement of disadvantaged children https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/raising-the-achievement-of-disadvantaged-children last accessed: 18.08.13

DfE (2014a) Pupil Premium: funding for schools and alternative provision.
https://www.gov.uk/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings last accessed 12/08/14

DfE (2014b) Reforming assessment and accountability for primary schools Government response to consultation on primary school assessment and accountability. Crown Copyright

Education Works (2011) Better Reading Partners Trainer file

Ehri, L. C. (1995) Phases of development inlearning to read words by sight. *Journal of Research in Reading.* 18 (2) p 116 - 125

Fullan, M. (2001) *Leading in a culture of change*. Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M., Cutress, C. & Kilcher, A. (2005) 8 Forces for Leaders of Change. JSD. **26 (4)** 54-64

Ferguson, N., Currie, L-A., Paul, M., & Topping, K. (2011) The longitudinal impact of a comprehensive literacy intervention. *Educational Research*, **53 (3)**, 237-256

Garcia-Madruga, J. A., Elousa, M.R., Gil, L., Gomez-Veiga, I., Vila, J. O., Orjales, I., Contreras, A., Rodriguez, R., Melero, M.A. & Duque, G. (2013) Reading Comprehension and Working Memory's Executive Processes: An Intervention Study in Primary School Students. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 48 (2) p 155 - 174

Gillham, B. (2000) *The Research Interview*. London and New York. Continuum

Goulandris, N. & Snowling, M.J. (1995) Assessing reading skills. In Funnell, E. & Stuart, M. (Eds) *Learning to read: psychology and the classroom*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hennink, H., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2011) *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: Sage

Hudson, R.F., Isadson, C., Richman, T., Lane, H., & Arriasza-Allen, S. (2011) An Examination of a Small-Group Decoding Intervention for Struggling Readers: Comparing Accuracy and Automaticity Criteria. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 26 (1) p 15 - 27

Hurry, J. (2000) Intervention Strategies to Support Pupils with Difficulties in Literacy during KS1. *Institute of Education – Research Review* p 1-34

Hurry, J. (2012) *The impact of Reading Recovery five years after intervention*. Institute of Education

Johnston, P. & Costello, P. (2005) Principles for Literacy Assessent. *Reading Research Quarterly*. **40** (2) 256-267

Leithwood, K., Harris, A. & Hopkins. D. (2008) Seven strong claims about successful school leadership, *School Leadership & Management: Formerly School Organisation*, **28** (1), 27-42

Locke, A., Ginsborg J. & Peers, I. (2001) Development and disadvantage: implications for the early years and beyond. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. **37** 3-15.

Manifesto for Literacy (2009). *National Literacy Trust*. http://www.literacytrust.org.uk/assets/0000/2584/manifestoforliteracyfullversion.pdf

McNaughton, S. (2001) Co-Constructing Expertise: The Development of Parents' and Teachers' Ideas about Literacy Practices and the Transition to School *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* **1 (40)**

Mohr, J., Zygmunt, E. & Clark, P (2012) Becoming Good Human Beings: Low-Income Mothers' Dreams for Children and Their Insight into Children's Needs. (Accessed online: http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/v14n2/mohr.html last accessed 12.03.13)

Moss, G. (2009) The politics of literacy in the context of large-scale education reform. Research Papers in Education, 24 (2), 155 - 74

Nation, K. and Angell, P. (2006) Learning to read and learning to comprehend. London Review of Education **4** (1) 77-87

Nation, K. (2004) in M.H. Snowling and C.Hulme (2006) *The Science of Reading*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

National Curriculum in England (2013) DfE

Ofsted (2010) *Reading by Six. How the best schools do it.* Ofsted publications. http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/reading-six-how-best-schools-do-it Last accessed: 20.03.13

Ofsted (2012a) A guide to improving schools. Ofsted publications http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/surveys-and-good-practice/i/Improving%20schools.pdf Last accessed: 20.03.13

Ofsted (2012b) *The report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services & Skills.* Schools. Ofsted publications.
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/report-of-her-majestys-chief-inspector-of-education-childrens-services-and-skills-schools Last accessed: 20.03.13

Punch, K. (2009) *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*. London: Sage

Ramaekers, S. & Suissa, J. (2011) Parents as 'educators': languages of education, pedagogy and 'parenting', *Ethics and Education*, **6, (2),** 197-212

Robson, C. (2011) Third Edition *Real World Reseach.* Chichester: Wiley

Rose, J. (2006). Independent review of the teaching of early reading: final report. DfES Publications

Schwartz, R. (2005) Literacy Learning of at risk First Grade Students in the Reading Recovery Early Intervention. Journal of Educational Psychology, **97**, (2)

Skerrett, A. (2009) 'There's going to be a community. There's going to be knowledge' Designs for learning in a standardised age. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. **26** 648-655

Siraj-Blatchford, I. & Siraj-Blatchford, J. (2009) Improving children's attainment through a better quality of family-based support for early learning. *Centre for Excellence and Outcomes in Children and Young People's Services*.

Snowling. M.J & Hulme, C. (2006) Language skills, learning to read and reading interventions. London Review of Education. **4** (1) p 63 - 76

Stake, R. (2003) 'Case Studies' in Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (Eds) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. London: Sage

Stanovich, K. (1986) Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*. Fall p 360 - 406

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., McMahon, A., Wallace, M. & Thomas, S. (2006) Professional learning communities: A review of the literature. *Journal of Educational Change* **7** 221 - 258

Stuart, M., Stainthorp, R. & Snowling, M. (2008) Literacy as a Complex Activity: Deconstructing the Simple View of Reading. *Literacy*. 42 (2) p 59 - 66

Torgerson, C.J., Brooks, G. & Hall, J. (2006) A Systematic Review of the Research Literature on the Use of Phonics in the Teaching of Reading and Spelling. Research Report RR711. *The University of Sheffield*.

Vellutino, F.R., Fletcher, J.M., Snowling, M.J. & Scanlon, D. M. (2004) Specific reading disability (dyslexia): what have we learned in the past four decades? Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry. **45** 1 p 2 – 40.

Watts, Z. & Gardner, P. (2013) Is systematic synthetic phonics enough? Examining the benefit of intensive teaching of high frequency words (HFW) in a year one class, Education 3-13: *International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education*, 41:1

Webster, R., Blatchford, P., Bassett, P., Brown, P., Martin, C., and Russell, A., Double standards and first principles: framing teaching assistant support for pupils with special educational needs. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*. 25, (4), 319-336

Weymes, E. (2002) Relationships not leadership sustain successful organisations, *Journal of Change Management,* **3, (4)**, 319-331

Williams, M., Thorogood, L., & Jones, D. (2002) How School Volunteers can Help to Raise Standards and Enthusiasm for Literacy, *Early Child Development and Care*, **172, (4)**, 371-377,

Wiltshire Learning Support Service (2004) Wiltshire Early Screening for Dyslexia
http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/sen-wesford-2-1st-edition.pdf Date last accessed: 18.03.13

Wolf, U. (2011) Effects of a Randomised Reading Intervention Study: An Application of Structural Equation Modelling. Published online 27 September 2011 in *Wiley Online Library*. Last accessed 12.03.13

World Literacy Summit. (2014) www.worldliteracy2014.org Date last accessed: 13.03.14

York Assessment of Reading for Comprehension: Early Reading and Passage Reading Primary. (2009) GL Assessment.

Yin, R. (2014) *Case Study Research*. London: Sage.

Appendix 3.1

BRP is a short-term programme to provide intensive 1:1 support for those pupils who are in danger of falling behind and working no lower than National Curriculum level 3 (1999). It is for pupils who can read but not efficiently or without comprehension and enjoyment (Education Works, 2005). Adults working with children who are not necessarily trained teachers, including TAs, parents, governors and volunteers, can deliver BRP. This report looks at the impact of BRP, what gains are sustained and what the schools do as part of their practice to ensure progress.

In order to select pupils for the BRP programme the schools need to determine those children who are working at just below the 'average' level of the class, or no lower than yellow level in Book Bands use standardised assessments[4].

---

[4] Book Banding (IOE) is a system used in schools to level books based on text characteristics, learning opportunities, repeated vocabulary and text layout.

Appendix 3.2 Letter to headteacher

Sharon Hellyer
KP Education

Dear Headteacher,

Thank you for taking time to read this request to consider participating in a study I am conducting as part of my MA in Literacy and Learning Difficulties at the University of London under the supervision of Helen Morris. I would like to provide you with more information about this project and what your involvement would entail if you decide to take part.

As we know the current Governments focus on closing gaps in attainment the role of intervention programmes has become more important. Boosting Reading Potential (previously Better Reading Partnership) was developed to address the needs of those children working at just below the age related expectations and could be delivered by volunteers and supported by a trained Reading Recovery teacher.

The purpose of this study is to explore:

1) What gains are made by pupils entering the programme at the end of the initial intervention, are these sustained at a) the end of the academic year and b) in subsequent years;

2) What is the role of the Reading Recovery trained teacher in leading and managing the programme and

3) What are the policies for engaging parents in supporting their pupils who receive the BRP programme?

Study Procedure:

As part of the procedure I would like to visit the school to look at data and have discussions with the Reading Recovery teacher. These will be done in agreement with yourselves, as I understand that schools are very busy places and certain times of the year present more pressures. I am seeking permission to collect the data below:

a) Pre and post BRP data for pupils the group of who have received the intervention programme in years 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 where available. This will in the form of group averages and range of results.
b) The school development plan (SDP) to analyse how often CPD takes place, the focus, timescales and the role of the Reading Recovery teacher in the monitoring and evaluation cycle.
c) End of year assessment data to track those pupils in the identified group who have received BRP and their subsequent attainment.

d) Timetabling of workshops for volunteers.
e) Agreements had between the school and parents in relation to their children receiving BRP.
f) School policies for intervention and literacy.

Length of study (time):

The study is due on 1st September 2014, so it is anticipated that data and information will be collected by end of May 2014.

 Risks:

The risks to participants of this study are minimal. These risks are similar to those you experience when disclosing work-related information to others. You may decline to answer any or all questions and you may terminate your involvement at any time if you choose.

Benefits:

It is hoped that the information obtained from this study may be used as a basis to explore the practices used in the school to develop practices in closing gaps for underachieving pupils and possibly as an example to support other schools looking to develop their practices in closing the attainment gap.

Confidentiality:

Responses will be anonymous. Every effort will be made by myself to preserve your confidentiality including the following:

Assigning code names/numbers for participants that will be used on all researcher notes and documents.

• Notes, interview transcriptions, and transcribed notes and any other identifying participant information will be kept in a locked file cabinet in my personal possession. When no longer necessary for research, all materials will be destroyed,
• Information from this research will be used solely for the purpose of this study and any publications that may result from this study. All other participants involved in this study will not be identified and their anonymity will be maintained.
• I would like to request that the school anonymise data collected so that children cannot be identified.
• Participants have the opportunity to obtain a transcribed copy of their interview. Participants should tell the researcher if a copy of the interview is desired. It is not the intention to have structured or semi-structured interviews, but that informal discussions take place with notes taken. I will make sure that whatever is written will be run past the participants to make sure that the reporting will be accurate.

Contact details:

Should you have any questions about the research or any related matters, please contact me at SharonHellyer7@gmail.com or mobile: 07878182425

Voluntary Participation:

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do decide to take part in this study, a consent form will need to be signed which is at the end of this letter and you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. You are free to not answer any question or questions if you choose. This will not affect the relationship you have with me.

Unforeseeable Risks:

There may be risks that are not anticipated. However every effort will be made to minimize any risks and where I am unsure, advice will be sought.

Costs To Subject:

There are no costs to you for your participation in this study

Compensation:

There is no monetary compensation to you for your participation in this study.

Consent:

By signing this consent form, I confirm that I have read and understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving a reason and without cost. I understand that I will be given a copy of this consent form. I voluntarily agree to take part in this study.

Signature _____

Date _____

Kinds regards,

Sharon Hellyer

KP Education

Sharonhellyer7@gmail.com

Appendix 3.3. Table of questions and data identified to answer.

	What the school does to encourage parents to support their children who are receiving BRP?	What is the role of the RRT is establishing a whole school approach to embed, monitor and evaluate BRP?	What gains are made by pupils receiving BRP?
DfE (2013) Raising the achievement of disadvantaged children https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/r			
Historical data 2009-2010, 2010-2011 pre and post assessment			Pre and post test; Number of pupils
School tracker data	What is the impact of parental support on progress and sustained gains?		Gains made; Gains sustained over years
School SDP – diary dates for PDMs		What are the focus of the PDMs?	
Monitoring and evaluation cycle.	How often is parental support given? How is parental support determined?	How many/how often are PDMs given to BRP to embed and develop school practice in teaching literacy?	What is the schools monitoring and evaluation cycle?
SDP – workshops for parents of children receiving BRP	Cycle; Attendance; Focus of workshop (hearing/teaching)		
Informal Discussions with RRT	Informal discussions to take place with RRT will be part of the process rather than interviews. Comments heard and any observations made will be logged informally. (Gillham, 2002)		

Appendix 3.4 questions used for semi-structured interviews

	Question	
1	In 2009/2010 (changed to 2010-2011) how many pupils received BRP?	
2	What assessment criteria were used to determine BRP was appropriate?	
3	What were the starting points of the pupils?	
4	Post intervention what gains were made?	
5	At the end of the academic year were gains made sustained?	
6	At the end of the subsequent academic years were gains made sustained?	
7	Of those who did not made adequate gains what other provision was provided for them?	
8	How was BRP introduced to staff?	
9	Are there expectations around staff coming to observe either the BRP or Reading Recovery lesson (where possible) as part of school practice/CPD?	
10	Is there time for discussion around what has been observed and how it may be useful in not only teaching the child observed as part of the lesson, but also taking some of the practice into whole class teaching?	
11	Was the collective impact of BRP shared with staff?	
12	What assessments are used to track attainment?	
13	How often are pupil progress meetings held?	
14	What happens if a pupil who has received BRP is seen to be slowing down in attainment?	
15	At what point was BRP rolled out to volunteers?	
16	How many volunteers are working with pupils?	
17	What is the focus of PDMs in regard to literacy and underachieving pupils?	