Early intervention and quality instruction are the keys to assisting struggling readers. However, determining how and where intervention-based instruction should occur is still a matter of debate.

In a recent literacy workshop for elementary educators, the researchers noted common concerns among classroom teachers and reading specialists when the presenter asked participants to identify factors that affect the quality of literacy instruction. There was silence for several seconds before several teachers responded in unison, “Time.” The management of time in the classroom for language development activities, as well as how to differentiate instruction for the needs of readers at all levels, seemed to be of utmost concern for this group of teachers. The reality is that regardless of the quality of any program or teacher, there will always be students who need supplementary instruction designed to meet their specific needs.

Fortunately, education is not an isolated endeavor. Although some decisions regarding resources and reading programs are mandated by administrators or district leaders, the classroom teacher has the responsibility to make sure that the instructional needs of all students are met. This is a daunting task, as students are at varying skill levels in each subject area. For example, in a typical third-grade class, most students are able to comprehend grade-level material independently, while another group of students in the class may be reading one or more levels behind, and another group may need to be challenged because they can understand material three years ahead of the rest of the class. Valencia and Buly (2004) asserted that it is the teacher’s responsibility to ensure that the individualized needs of struggling readers are addressed; however, classroom teachers are not expected to meet these needs alone. Research supports that some students will need expert, intensive intervention for sustained periods of time—possibly throughout their entire school careers—if they are to attain and maintain on-level reading proficiencies (Allington, 2004). Many schools provide some form of intervention support for at-risk students, including daily sessions with reading specialists through separated intervention or within the regular classroom.

Reading specialists have the responsibility of providing level-specific reading services to struggling readers. Bean (2004) suggested that reading specialists in today’s schools are taking on additional roles. For example, many reading specialists are in an excellent position to assume the role of reading coach and mentor to classroom teachers in schools with many struggling readers. The goal of this article is to provide the advantages and disadvantages of separated instruction versus classroom support models as seen by teachers and researchers. We first provide the roles and responsibilities of reading specialists, determine the impact of the No Child Left Behind Act, identify possible models, and share feedback from teachers currently in classrooms.

Roles of an Elementary Reading Specialist

Reading specialists can play a critical role in the professional development of teachers (Dole, 2004), as they have extensive knowledge about the reading process and about high-quality reading instruction.
It is evident that they have an important role to play in school leadership and instructional intervention in many schools (Bean, Cassidy, Grumet, Shelton, & Wallis, 2002; Quatroche, Bean, & Hamilton, 2001). It is not surprising that reading specialists have taken on the responsibility of providing quality instruction for all students. In the 1940s, reading specialists were referred to as “remedial” reading teachers and most recently as Title I reading teachers; however, reading specialists in today’s schools have assumed additional roles (Bean, 2004). The International Reading Association expects reading specialists to be highly qualified literacy professionals who have prior experience as classroom teachers. Reading specialists are often responsible for supporting, supplementing, and extending quality classroom teaching. They also communicate effectively with key stakeholders (e.g., parents).

A reading specialist may be available in some schools to provide intervention for the groups that are developmentally reading below grade level, but how is this resource being used? Is it possible for classroom teachers to effectively use reading specialists to support instruction for all students in a class? What are the benefits of separated instruction for specific groups of students? Although most classrooms would benefit in some way from additional literacy support, the deciding factor for which students or which classrooms are assigned to a reading specialist often is determined by test results. It is not surprising that instructional groups change because of achievement test results; however, other reading performance factors are usually considered by the classroom teacher and reading specialist.

The Impact of No Child Left Behind on Reading Intervention

Every year thousands of students take standardized tests and state reading tests, and every year thousands of students fail them (Valencia & Buly, 2004). With the implementation of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which mandates testing all children from grades 3 to 8 every year, these numbers will grow exponentially and, unfortunately, alarming numbers of schools and students will be labeled as in need of improvement. The key provisions of NCLB include performance expectations in reading. Each state “must set annual targets that will lead to the goal of all students reaching proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2013–14” (U.S. Department of Education, 2006, p. 12). In the meantime, districts are expected to determine where improvement is needed in comprehensive instruction to address the five target areas identified by the National Reading Panel (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000): comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, phonemic awareness, and phonics.

According to recent reports from the Title I executive summary (U.S. Department of Education, 2006), there are concerns regarding intervention-based reading programs implemented in schools because there is little known about the effectiveness of these reading programs for struggling readers. As students are assessed by the state, and in the schools by teachers or reading specialists, there may be students identified who need additional intervention to overcome achievement gaps. Under the Response to Intervention process, to which many schools are now making the transition, “students who continue to struggle despite receiving initial intervention instruction will require more intense, targeted interventions” from reading specialists (Mesmer & Mesmer, 2008, p. 283). These students frequently continue to fall further behind because they do not possess the requisite skills to achieve (Dole, 2004).

To address this concern, schools are struggling to find solutions for improved performance in reading. For example, some schools have eliminated sustained silent reading in favor of more time for explicit instruction (Edmondson & Shannon, 2002), while other districts are buying special programs or
mandating specific interventions. It is common to find teachers spending enormous amounts of time preparing students for these high-stakes tests (Olson, 2001).

The U.S. Department of Education (2006) identified at least 10 characteristics of effective reading intervention, including the following: small group size of three to six students who share the same reading difficulties, daily intervention for at least 30 minutes, intervention that addresses all five essential components of reading instruction, instruction that is explicit and direct but engaging and fast paced, feedback for students when errors are made, and many opportunities for students to respond to questions. Most important, intervention decisions are data driven. Therefore, ongoing assessment data determine the intensity and duration of the reading intervention, which is based on degree of reading risk. Although there are resources available to choose effective programs, there continues to be debate regarding how interventions should be implemented. There are proponents who believe that interventions should evolve in the classroom, with a reading specialist available to support all students during literacy instruction. The alternative would be to allow small groups of students to leave the classroom to work with a reading specialist for a block of time each day.

**Approaches to Reading Intervention**

**Separated Intervention**

There are several reasons why schools may prefer to implement separated (pull-out) reading intervention programs. First, they may want to target a specific group of students who may benefit from the individualized attention and quiet setting associated with this approach. Bean (2004) asserted that this approach may be beneficial when instruction is provided by a highly qualified teacher and instruction is tailored to address the individualized needs of students. Second, some reading intervention programs are designed for individualized instruction away from the classroom. Examples include Reading Recovery and Success for All (Allington, 2001). In addition, students receiving small-group, separated instruction may develop an increase in reading confidence by practicing specific skills and reading aloud with peers who share similar literacy development levels (Bean, 2004).

Unfortunately, separated instruction has been associated with a negative connotation since the 1930s and 1940s when students were sorted into ability groups and assigned to special reading teachers who would use instructionism-based approaches designed to drill until mastery is achieved (Bean, 2004; Johnson, 2004; Primeaux, 2000). According to Primeaux (2000), reading specialists are now trained to apply constructivist approaches that use students’ current skill level as a starting point, requiring an ongoing cycle of authentic assessment, planning, and guided instruction using appropriate texts.

Additional concerns regarding separated instruction include the fact that children who experience reading difficulties are frequently separated from (pulled out of) their classrooms for level-specific reading instruction (Bean, 2004). Another concern is that separated instruction tends to lack integration with the regular classroom, which may result in a lack of communication between the teachers and reading specialists (Bean, 2004).

**Classroom Support**

Highly qualified teachers are needed to intervene effectively on the literacy skills of struggling readers (Dole, 2004). High-quality reading instruction is essential in every primary-grade classroom in schools with many struggling readers. This high-quality instruction is expected to minimize the number of students who will need intervention or supplementary instruction and will also minimize the number of students recommended for special education services.

One approach for involving reading specialists in the classroom is referred to as student-focused coaching, which is based on encouraging collaborative problem solving between classroom teachers and reading specialists to address an identified problem, such as a student’s lack of progress in acquiring a specific academic skill (Hasbrouck & Denton, 2007). In this model, the grade-level teaching teams...
and reading specialists plan and collect data together to learn from observing student responses to interventions and instructional strategies developed collaboratively with teachers. Additional benefits of in-class reading intervention include less stigma and less negative attention for students who formerly left the classroom for reading services and the ability to maximize instructional time efficiently (Bean, 2004; Ziolkowska, 2007).

A school in Illinois implemented a similar collaboration-based program and improved student test scores on statewide tests using a building-wide support model named after the Anna School District. The Anna Plan involved taking strategies that were previously used only in Reading Recovery and Title I pull-out interventions and adapting strategies for use in primary-grade classrooms with flexible, daily guided reading groups:

In the reading room, four small groups operate simultaneously, with each one being taught either by the classroom teacher or one of the reading specialists.... The four groups are fluid with students moving from one group to another as their needs dictate. (Miles, Stegle, Hubbs, Henk, & Mallette, 2004, p. 322)

In addition, students are assigned to groups based on Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA) levels, and leveled texts are used for instruction using an established reading plan for day 1 through day 5, including introduction of the text, comprehension minilessons, working with words, writing, and collaborative planning among reading specialists and teachers while another teacher conducts whole-group literacy activities.

The inclusion of reading specialists in the classroom presents special challenges, which may include conflicting philosophies and teaching styles. Overcrowded classrooms may also be a problem, as it limits areas needed for additional instruction. The dynamics of performing in a regular classroom may be too challenging and distracting for some students who have attention difficulties. In addition, collaborative planning, as described in the Anna Plan, between the classroom teacher and reading specialist may be limited.

**Teacher Perspectives**

In response to expectations for data-driven instructional decisions and accountability, school districts are looking for ways to use best practices to improve student achievement. The setting for this study was a suburban district in a Midwestern state with an enrollment of more than 10,000 students in grades K–12. Elementary students are identified for participation in the school reading intervention program using a matrix that looks at students’ performance in the classroom based on teacher observations, scores from diagnostic or standardized tests, and DRA levels. Students who did not pass the third-grade achievement test in the fall or spring are also selected. Current policies require a parent or guardian to sign a permission form prior to beginning intervention with a specialist. A majority of reading specialists schedule selected students to meet daily in a small-group setting away from the regular classroom for 30 minutes of supplemental literacy instruction.

**Methodology**

**Participants**

The researchers designed and distributed a survey comprised of short answers and scaled responses to given statements (see Figure 1). A voluntary and anonymous sample of 50 classroom teachers was selected to allow for two teachers from each grade level at each of the five elementary buildings to provide feedback. Additional surveys were given to 14 elementary reading specialists in the district. Out of 64 total surveys distributed through the school mail system, 47 were completed and returned, producing a 73% response rate. A majority of the respondents were veteran classroom teachers or reading specialists, with 70% reporting they have taught for at least six years. Of these respondents, 26% have more than 21 years of experience teaching.

The survey asked participants to respond to prompts including the following: (a) the number of below-average readers a teacher or reading specialist worked with, (b) an indication of reading intervention preferences, (c) an evaluation of whether the preferred intervention was used, (d) identification of at least two positive and two negative aspects of separated instruction versus classroom support, and (e) key issues regarding the separated versus classroom support interventions and student needs. A Likert 5-point scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree was used. Participants were also asked to list additional questions or comments.
### Figure 1
Reading Intervention Survey

Current position: ________________________________________________________________

School building: ______________________________________________________________

Total years of teaching experience: 1  2–5  6–10  11–20  21+  21+

1. **Classroom teachers only**: How many below-average and/or at-risk readers are in your class this year?
   
   ________ out of _________ total students (for example: 5 out of 23)

   **Reading specialists only**: How many students do you work with at each grade level?
   
   K    1st    2nd    3rd    4th

2. At this time, which method do you prefer for your below-average and/or at-risk readers?
   
   - [ ] Inclusion with a reading specialist in the classroom.
   - [ ] Separated instruction (pull-out) or small-group intervention with a reading specialist.
   - [ ] A combination of both approaches.

3. Is your preferred method currently used in your setting?  [ ] Yes  [ ] No

4. When you think of **pull-out reading instruction**, list two positive and two negative aspects of this form.
   
   Positive: ____________________________________________

   Negative: ____________________________________________

5. When you think of **inclusion for reading instruction**, list two positive and two negative aspects of this form.
   
   Positive: ____________________________________________

   Negative: ____________________________________________

6. Please indicate whether you strongly agree (SA), agree (A), feel undecided (U), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with these statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who are pulled out of the classroom miss instruction and/or time to work on assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading lessons taught in intervention should match the ones that are being taught in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading specialists and classroom teachers communicate effectively regarding the readers they work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same students qualify for reading service year after year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents often have concerns about allowing students to participate in intervention programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More state or federal funding of intervention programs will help at-risk readers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes a day is enough time for students to work with a reading specialist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please list additional comments or questions you may have regarding this topic:
**Analysis of Results**

According to the responses provided by the 12 reading specialists, the number of students a full-time reading specialist works with each day may range from 47 to 82, depending on the needs of the building, the number of reading specialists, and the number of classrooms serviced. The average number of students in a classroom was 25, and the number of below-average or at-risk readers in each classroom ranged from 2 to 10, as reported by the classroom teachers. A majority of classroom teachers, or 57%, would prefer to have a combination of classroom support and separated instruction interventions; however, only half of these teachers currently have the option. A majority of the reading specialists, or 58%, would also prefer a combination of intervention models.

Relevant to student outcomes, the classroom teachers and reading specialists both agreed that 30 minutes a day is not enough time for students to work with a reading specialist, although this is the amount of time allotted in most classroom schedules for reading intervention. This is important because it gives insight to quality of instruction and the efficiency of the services provided. The teachers and reading specialists indicated that collaborative endeavors benefit all students, as having another adult in the classroom can assist student performance in reading.

Open-ended responses from the survey were coded and sorted according to the nature of the positive and negative aspects stated by classroom teachers and reading specialists. In regard to separated instruction, classroom teachers’ responses for listing two positive aspects included small-group benefits, individualized attention, benefits of reading specialist instruction, impact on instruction for students remaining in the classroom, ability grouping, quietness, and daily reading consistency (see Table 1). However, negative aspects of separated instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive aspects listed</th>
<th>Negative aspects listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small-group benefits:</strong> Instruction without distractions from the class; taking time and not worrying about keeping up with other groups; students get small-group instruction and this allows them to feel comfortable to read; they are not as distracted by other stimuli in the classroom</td>
<td><strong>Limited communication:</strong> Communication between regular education teacher and reading teacher limited; sometimes we might not be at the same level because of time crunches and we do not see each other; overlapping titles of books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individualized attention:</strong> One-to-one ratio; ability to focus on students’ individual needs</td>
<td><strong>Scheduling and accessibility:</strong> Scheduling can be difficult; higher readers miss out on an opportunity to meet with a reading specialist to challenge them; time lapse in between traveling from room to room; not all at risk get serviced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading specialist instruction:</strong> More chance to actively participate; better opportunity for interaction in a small-group setting; students get a preview or reinforcement of what is being done in class; pinpoint strategies needed for improvement; they work with a specialist and get fabulous support and instruction; extra time spent on concepts; reading teacher is specialized; reports of how students progress; direct instruction</td>
<td><strong>Socialization:</strong> Removed from peers; other children want a turn to leave; being labeled as a “reader” by other students; some don’t like being pulled out; self-esteem issues; child starts to realize they go to reading for a reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom benefits:</strong> Allows the regular education teacher to do more difficult large-group lessons; smaller class size</td>
<td><strong>Classroom schedules and routines:</strong> Watching what to teach so kids don’t have to catch up; missing whole-group instruction; missing class work; with 20–25% of the class gone, I don’t introduce new material while they are gone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability grouping:</strong> Homogeneous group moves at same speed; reading level improved; leveled groups</td>
<td><strong>Limited reading with classroom teacher:</strong> Difficult for classroom teacher to take reading grade for that 30 minutes; I see less of them to monitor progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quietness:</strong> Quiet environment for students; less noise—easier to concentrate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily reading sessions:</strong> Regular schedule; chance to meet more times/on a daily basis; more classes can be served</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
listed by classroom teachers included limited communication between the “regular” teacher and reading specialist, concerns related to scheduling and classroom routines, impact on student socialization as a result of peer labeling, and limited time for intervention students to read with the classroom teacher.

The positive and negative aspects listed by reading specialists regarding separated instruction were similar; however, reading specialists also noted attention to specific needs and materials available as positive aspects, as well as concerns for students as they travel to and from the classroom to the reading room (see Table 2). In addressing the positive factors of separated intervention, classroom teachers and reading specialists most frequently cited the benefits of individualized attention in a small-group setting, followed by a quieter or less distracting work area, and increased participation and opportunities for students to feel successful. The negative factors of separated intervention included the fact that students miss whole-group classroom instruction or activities with peers, the difficulties with scheduling, and the stigma associated with being labeled as a “reader” and leaving the classroom.

The comments by classroom teachers and reading specialists regarding the advantages and disadvantages of in-classroom support (see Tables 3 and 4) were focused on three areas: differentiating instruction, the physical learning environment, and potential for student improvement. Classroom teachers and reading specialists listed the following benefits of classroom support: (a) the opportunity for flexible grouping and peer reading models, (b) increased collaboration and communication between the reading specialist and classroom teacher, and (c) having the reading specialists available in the classroom as a resource for the classroom teacher as well as readers at all ability levels. The drawbacks to in-classroom support instruction cited by teachers and reading specialists included the following: (a) an
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**Table 2**

**Reading Specialists’ Survey Comments Regarding Separated Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive aspects listed</th>
<th>Negative aspects listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attention to specific needs:</strong> Give more attention to group; learn the child’s specific needs better and can address them</td>
<td><strong>Professional interaction limited:</strong> No opportunity for modeling for the classroom teacher by the reading specialist; lack of communication between specialist and classroom teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less distractions:</strong> At-risk readers are often more distractible—focus can be better</td>
<td><strong>Limited number of students benefit:</strong> No positive peer role models for readers; working with less students; limited, not flexible, grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More time learning:</strong> No lost time changing classes; less waste of time</td>
<td><strong>Transition time:</strong> Travel time equals less work time; kids lose time in traveling to the reading room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials available:</strong> Materials are easily accessible, which means more flexibility with materials on hand for impromptu lessons or something a reader needs</td>
<td><strong>Potential for problems:</strong> Materials forgotten in classroom; students moving in/out of the building without supervision (modular classrooms outside); some students tend to act out in front of a small peer group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control:</strong> I control the structure and behavioral expectations; more space if classroom teacher’s room is small or poorly managed</td>
<td><strong>Student confidence:</strong> Older students sometimes feel labeled or embarrassed; pulled away from classmates; some kids feel singled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional benefits:</strong> Students receive a double dose of reading instruction; intense instruction geared at small group; reading specialist can plan own lessons for at-risk readers; very distracted students and very low-performing students can use alternative approaches</td>
<td><strong>Scheduling whole-group instruction:</strong> Classroom teacher is limited to what can be done while the students are out; miss assignment work time and sometimes instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quiettleness:</strong> Quiet atmosphere; quiet working environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active participation:</strong> They can feel successful; students more willing to open up in reading discussions; small group allows students more opportunity to ask questions and participate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increased number of distractions by noise and space limitations, (b) inadequate planning time or a general lack of interest in collaboration, and (c) fewer opportunities for providing one-on-one instruction or remediation. The varied responses may possibly be attributed to the teaching styles, needs of students, or dynamics of the classroom.

As noted in Table 5, the scaled responses to the position statements were similar between classroom teachers and reading specialists, with the exception of the first statement. More than half of the classroom teachers agreed or strongly agreed that students who receive separated intervention miss classroom instruction or time to work on assignments, while more than half of the reading specialists disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

Although the classroom teachers and reading specialists are aware of the positive and negative aspects of each form of intervention, the teachers are always willing to seek a variety of options and implement practices that will benefit the needs of all students. Teachers and reading specialists are visiting other reading programs or going to professional development events together to identify effective strategies that will benefit struggling readers. For example, in one building, the principal redesigned building schedules to allow for uninterrupted blocks of literacy instruction, using the reading specialists as guided reading group models in the classroom. In another building at the third- and fourth-grade levels, classroom teachers are rotating students for specialist intervention based on need by using flexible grouping rather than keeping a static group from September to June. All buildings have implemented some form of before- or after-school intervention program, allowing for specialized instruction to prepare students for achievement tests or to provide skill reinforcement as needed.
Conclusions and Recommendations for Further Study

As educators, we constantly encounter students who struggle with reading. These students frequently fail standardized tests, and typically their needs cannot be met by the standard school curriculum. These struggling readers are instructionally needy. It is imperative that schools examine how reading instruction is implemented at each grade level. This may include having a reading specialist available at each grade level in each building, including one who works primarily with at-risk kindergarten students as a form of early intervention. A survey comment from a kindergarten teacher said, “Sometimes early intervention helps some children not need reading [intervention] in first and second grade,” while another kindergarten teacher lamented that her students “do not receive enough intervention time because it is prioritized by fourth grade on down,” because of the emphasis on statewide testing in the third and fourth grades.

Before trying a new approach to reading intervention in the classroom, it is important for a teacher or instructional team to reflect on responses to the following questions:

- What is the data telling us about our current methods? Are students who are receiving intervention services making progress as measured by formative and summative assessments?
- Can I make changes to my instructional routine to allow for more blocks of time for guided reading, and will a reading specialist be available to model effective guided reading lessons and strategies?
- As a grade level, or as a school, what are the best practices that we are currently using for effective reading instruction? Do we need to revisit these approaches or provide training for new staff members?
It is important to note that the results of the survey are a reflection of each teacher's perceptions, shaped by years of experience and professionalism regarding how to deliver instruction appropriate to the differentiated literacy skills of each child. Determining which reading intervention approach is best depends on the needs of students, the facilities and qualified personnel available, and the willingness of classroom teachers and reading specialists to collaborate to maximize quality instructional time and resources to improve student achievement.
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**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pull-out students miss classroom instruction and/or time to work on assignments.</td>
<td>CT 20% RS 8%</td>
<td>CT 40% RS 8%</td>
<td>CT 17% RS 8%</td>
<td>CT 20% RS 58%</td>
<td>CT 3% RS 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention reading lessons should match the lessons taught in the classroom.</td>
<td>CT 14% RS 16%</td>
<td>CT 34% RS 25%</td>
<td>CT 14% RS 16%</td>
<td>CT 29% RS 25%</td>
<td>CT 9% RS 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading specialists and classroom teachers communicate effectively.</td>
<td>CT 51% RS 42%</td>
<td>CT 31% RS 50%</td>
<td>CT 12% RS 0%</td>
<td>CT 3% RS 8%</td>
<td>CT 3% RS 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same students qualify for reading service every year.</td>
<td>CT 9% RS 0%</td>
<td>CT 29% RS 34%</td>
<td>CT 9% RS 16%</td>
<td>CT 37% RS 50%</td>
<td>CT 16% RS 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents have concerns about intervention programs.</td>
<td>CT 9% RS 16%</td>
<td>CT 29% RS 16%</td>
<td>CT 9% RS 8%</td>
<td>CT 37% RS 42%</td>
<td>CT 16% RS 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More funding is needed for reading intervention programs.</td>
<td>CT 40% RS 50%</td>
<td>CT 40% RS 25%</td>
<td>CT 17% RS 25%</td>
<td>CT 0% RS 0%</td>
<td>CT 3% RS 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes a day is enough time for students to work with a reading specialist.</td>
<td>CT 20% RS 8%</td>
<td>CT 23% RS 16%</td>
<td>CT 26% RS 26%</td>
<td>CT 26% RS 42%</td>
<td>CT 5% RS 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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