

READING COMPREHENSION DURING REMOTE LEARNING


Master Capstone Project


In what way does reading intervention Benchmark Literacy in virtual small group guided reading instruction impact student's reading level while remote learning?

Jeffry O. Rhodes

Submitted to the
Graduate School of Education
City University of Seattle
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master in Teaching

I give permission to City University to store and use this MIT Project for teaching purposes.

Submitted by  June 28, 2021
Jeffry O. Rhodes Date

Approved by  June 28, 2021
Charlotte Cochran, Ph.D. Date


Approved by  June 28, 2021
Vicki Butler, Ed.D. Date

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	<i>ii</i>
Abstract	4
Introduction	5
Problem Statement	5
Rationale	6
Literature Review	6
Question	14
Theory of Change	15
Methodology	15
Participants	15
Intervention	16
Assessments	18
Results	21
Discussion	22
Conclusion	22
Implication	23
Recommendations	23
References	24
Appendices	36

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to dedicate this research study to my wife Meagan. I could not have done this research study without her unconditional support and encouragement. Her patience, kindness and unwavering love have been an inspiration.

I would like to thank my two children Roslyn and Russell for letting their dad go back to school for the last 18 months. The two of them have been so patient with me and their mother when she had to step in and watch them for many nights and weekends. I would also like to thank my mother and father, Pamela and Kenneth Rhodes, for their support in completing this study and supporting my education. Thank you to my Father and Mother in Law Vicki and Leigh Carlson who have been my number one supporter and biggest advocate from day one. I would also like to thank my mentor teacher, Carrie Alexander, who has helped me grow and let me use her classroom as a research project. Thank you to all the fifth grade classroom students and parents for letting me be a part of this very challenging academic year.

Finally, I would also like to thank the community of staff at City University of Seattle. Susan Gray with the MIT program, Dr. Charlotte Cochran my research advisor and Dr. Ewa Krawczyk in the writing center for being the most supportive, honest and remarkable advisors helping make a significant impact on my education.

Abstract

During the past year, students were out of the classroom and started learning on their computer screens from home. Many students stopped reading all together and when they returned to school virtual reading instruction was problematic. This is an action research study. The focus was to determine if Benchmark Literacy reading intervention had an impact on students' reading comprehension. The participants in this study were seventeen students in a fifth grade classroom. Benchmark Literacy reading intervention was implemented during small virtual reading groups. Before the intervention was implemented and after seven weeks of learning instruction, the Fountas & Pinnell reading assessment was used to assess the students reading level and reading comprehension to measure if there was a change in their reading level. The results indicated that most students' reading comprehension level increased by the end of the study.

Introduction

During the last year the Coronavirus (COVID-19) shutdowns thrust a majority of student' into learning remotely for the first time. The global pandemic caused schools and districts to move into remote learning models for the remainder of the academic year. Students were not able to physically be in school and turned on their computers to learn for the first time in their lives (Hash, 2021). This action research project was created to understand and measure students' reading level and reading comprehension using the Fountas and Pinnell (F&P) assessment before and after implementing Benchmark Literacy reading intervention during remote learning.

Benchmark Literacy curriculum has been used in elementary schools in the state of Virginia and research from Benchmark Literacy (2013) showed to improve students reading fluency and comprehension at a better rate than the students who used literacy programs from other publishers. It was both a blessing and a curse for students' who transitioned from the traditional classroom to the home -virtual classroom in 2020, as this was the first time most students had to focus and learn in their own homes (Shamir-Inbalf, 2021). Van Allen (2019) stated many students struggle with online research and comprehension skills. However, Watson (2010) argued schools simply needed to cater to students' natural learning interests and strengths.

Problem Statement

The problem was fifth grade students were not meeting reading comprehension standards during remote learning. Clemens (2020) stated reading is one of the primary ways in which students acquire new knowledge and skills, which makes reading comprehension central to academic success. Students' early reading achievement predicts key developmental outcomes later in life such as subsequent math and science achievement (Garcia, 2014).

Rationale

The importance of students meeting standards in school is vital to developing their confidence and ability to gain knowledge. Snyder (2016) stated that poor reading comprehension among United States (U.S.) children and youth is an ongoing concern. Nationally representative data showed stagnant performance in reading achievement over the past decades, with only about one third of students exhibiting proficient reading skill (Snyder, 2016). Poor reading achievement is associated with adversities in a number of areas, including educational progress, employment opportunities, and health outcomes (Ritchie, 2013). Reading at a young age has a significant impact on learning in school and success later in life. School curriculum and reading interventions emphasizes that vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension lead to higher learning. Reading comprehension requires complex skills and processes that promote both academic and lifelong learning (National Reading Panel, 2000). The importance of this study is to understand how Benchmark Literacy curriculum will impact reading comprehension in students.

Literature Review

In the early months of 2020 the Coronavirus pandemic spread across the U.S. and other countries around the world. People were asked to quarantine and stay away from public places. Restaurants were closed, public sporting events were cancelled and schools across the globe were required to shut doors to students. No one knew what the future of public education looked like and students' futures are at risk (Lancet, 2020). While many aspects of the pandemic are overwhelming, estimating its impact on education is extremely difficult (Kuhfield, 2020). The majority of school districts provided some remote instruction during the last months of the previous school year and the beginning of this school year (Lake, 2020). However, Kuhfield

(2020) stated it remains unclear how effective remote learning was, given that most elementary school teachers and students had little experience with online instruction and that large gaps in technology access exist in many parts of the country. Additionally, during the extended school closure, many working parents were struggling to educate and care for their children (Harris, 2020).

For students to have such a long time away from the in-classroom experience, the fear was that students were going to have academic erosion (Gewertz, 2020). There were differences in learning remote and learning in the classroom. One of the major interruptions to in-class learning was not being able to have students' experience learning in person (Caton, 2021). As faculty members grappled with the intricacies of learning management systems, unfamiliar conferencing technologies, and new protocols for coursework and tests, more often than not, teachers struggled (Education Sciences, 2021). As June (2020) acknowledged the frustrations from faculty and administrators regarding their emergency response was not ideal. They did, however, agreed on one key metric; roughly sixty percent of faculty members and administrators said the spring's courses were worse than their face-to-face counterparts in the fall (June, 2020).

While remote distance learning presented challenges in every subject and grade level, teachers and researchers have said that early reading instruction was especially problematic (Schwartz, 2020). Van Allen (2019) mentioned that many students struggle with online research and comprehension skills. Schwartz (2020) commented on education during the Coronavirus pandemic stated that researchers for the Northwest Evaluation Association project that Coronavirus closures could lead to much greater learning loss in reading what usually occurs during the traditional summer slide.

Remote Learning

Synchronous online education occurs when the students and faculty member are in different locations geographically and interaction occurs simultaneously through the internet at scheduled times (Olt, 2018). This spring, America took an involuntary crash course in remote learning (Petrilli, 2020). With the school year now winding down in the late spring of 2020, the overwhelming feeling was teachers and administrators failed their students (Hobbs, 2020). Teachers, administrators and parents wondered how this failure across the country in most districts affected student learning.

Watson (2020) stated, it might never be known until after the pandemic, when students' academic performance can be measured compared to other years. School districts closed campuses in March 2020 in response to the Coronavirus pandemic. There was practically no time for planning or training. The United States launched a grand experiment to educate more than 50 million students from kindergarten through 12th grade using technology (Gillespie, 2020) It remains unclear how effective remote learning was (Watson, 2020).

As the Coronavirus pandemic upended the 2019–2020 school year and continued into 2020-2021, education systems scrambled to meet the needs of students and families with little available data on how school closures may impact learning (Kuhfield, 2020). The problems accumulated almost immediately. Hobbs (2020) stated there were students with no computers or internet access. Birch and Lewis (2020) stated students were burned-out from remote learning online during the pandemic. Teachers had no experience with remote learning. Many parents were not available to help as they were working from home and in many places and students simply did not show up online (Hobbs, 2020). However, Kaden (2020) stated the forced move to online learning may have been the catalyst to create a new, more effective hybrid model of

educating students in the future. Not one single model for online learning will provide equitable educational opportunities for all and virtual learning cannot be seen as a cheap fix for the ongoing financial crisis in funding education (Kaden, 2020).

Inequality in the education system was rampant in the United States (U.S.) during the COVID-19 pandemic (Sahlberg, 2021). Haeck and Lefebvre (2020) stated administrators had no successful way to find out why problems of inequality were accumulating. Soon many districts were not requiring students to do any work at all, increasing the risk of millions of students having substantial gaps in their learning. Hobbs (2020) stated many of the nation's largest school districts, including Los Angeles and Chicago, concerned about inequities in internet access and parental involvement, have told teachers not to give students failing final grades or anything lower than what they had before the shutdown. In April 2020, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2020) in Washington State enacted temporary emergency rules that required school districts to continue grading students during the school facility closure. Districts were able to select the grading system that best fit their context, with some requirements, including a prohibition on issuing "F" grades (OSPI, 2020). When schools abruptly shifted to online learning to curtail the Coronavirus spread, districts scrambled to provide continuity of instruction.

The in-classroom experience is vitally important and as Bellafante (2020) stated, multi-sensory instruction turns out to be highly important. Being able to look at words and letters on chalkboards, to have constant interaction, direct physical contact with books, to stand up and make utterances and watch other children do the same thing was extremely important (Bellafante, 2020). Bellafante (2020) also added this was obviously much more muted on a computer. Educators were facing a challenging time, having to repeatedly pivot as quarantine guidelines were changing every day (Ohi, 2020).

Parents and teachers alike are worried that too much screen time was preventing growth in students' reading level (Harris, 2020). Students are not motivated to increase the amount of reading they are doing and are distracted by other media, especially social media. Future teachers are challenged to motivate children to read and not be distracted by games on the screen while remote learning (Chamberlain, 2020). Students were exposed to increased screen time during the Coronavirus pandemic shutdowns, and the challenge was to understand how teachers and students would continue to build on existing relationships (Birch & Lewis, 2020).

Instruction

According to Anderson (1985), the single most important activity for building knowledge for their eventual success in reading is reading aloud to children. The best instructional strategies can be applied to all grade levels and offer the building blocks for quality instruction by motivating, engaging, and promoting children to enjoy learning while continuously being driven to achieve (Cuevas, 2020). Regardless of the instructional strategy approach a teacher utilizes, the goal has remained constant; teachers want their children to build a strong literacy foundation, love, and enjoyment of reading, obtain knowledge through literacy curriculum (Okonkwo, 2020). However, Hoffman (2020) argued for the importance of working with teachers in literacy teaching in elementary schools from a subject area point of view; where the curriculum is mostly focused on literacy as a tool for disciplinary studies and social change, with a specific focus on the use of composition, argument, and informational texts. As Cuevas (2019) pointed out, building a strong literacy foundation in children has had a significant impact and gain on a child's phonological awareness, alphabetical knowledge, and story comprehension.

Fluency and practicing reading fluency together is an essential aspect of best instructional strategies to master reading comprehension and acquisition of the fluency is not only an indicator

of the reading comprehension while reading out loud, but also an important necessity for the reading comprehension in silent reading (Uysal, 2018). Children with reading fluency avoid reading word-for-word, which diminishes reading comprehension of the text since the child is focused on reading each word separately rather than its meaning as a sentence (Kim, 2020). Evanchan (2010) confirmed reading fluency is a vital link in the chain for reading comprehension.

According to Benchmark Literacy (2013) the intervention has been shown as a cornerstone for improvement in students' reading fluency and comprehension. Benchmark Literacy (2013) stated the performance of students improved in 2013 from 2012 when given to intermediate grades. Benchmark Literacy brought a new enthusiasm and excitement out in the teachers as well as students. Benchmark Literacy (2013) states their curriculum can easily tie into other subjects such as social studies, reading and writing curriculums.

Gibson (2016) from Missouri Baptist University stated that interventions are not a substitute for in-class reading instruction. Interventions differ from everyday reading instruction in that they are designed to meet the needs of students who are experiencing difficulties in learning to read or who have reading disabilities. Interventions for primary and secondary level students are designed to meet the needs of a multitude of learners that include ELLs and students with learning disabilities (Gibson, 2016). Students who do not need services from the school are at a bit of an advantage. Angelico (2020) mentioned inequity of learning is prevalent for students who do need services and is exacerbated through remote learning.

When Clemons (2020) stated reading is one of the primary ways in which students acquire new knowledge and skills, which makes reading comprehension central to academic success and reading comprehension being one of the primary focus elements of research. It was

concluded that having an intervention like Benchmark Literacy would be pivotal for students learning. The Benchmark Literacy (2013) intervention is measured by whether the students can read a passage, comprehend what they just read, and then relate the passage to something in their own lives and correlate the reading to questions answered by the researcher.

Reading Comprehension

Activating background knowledge allows the students to connect with the text and have and personal interest in their learning. Students learn content-area concepts through texts when they can comprehend them (Quinn, 2015). Discussing background knowledge after reading can bring forth discussions based on the text that would further enhance understanding (Wexler, 2021). Kearns and Lyon (2021) stated students benefit and succeed when teachers provide two critical types of knowledge, background world knowledge and vocabulary word knowledge.

Preece and Levy (2018) stated reading with children has a positive impact on a range of areas including language development and literacy skills. Students' need opportunities to explore how their own perspectives, values and assumptions compare with those in the texts they encounter. Making connections helps students make meaning of what they are reading to something in their own life (Schrijvers, 2019). When students make connections to the texts when reading, it helps them make sense of what they read, retain the information, and engage more with the text itself. For example, students with reading difficulty but who know a lot about baseball, given texts about baseball, comprehends those texts better than students with stronger reading skills but less baseball knowledge (Recht, 1988).

Clemens (2021) stated several factors make measuring reading comprehension difficult. First, any attempt to measure reading comprehension was challenging because a reader's accurate mental representation of text is not something that can be directly observed as it occurs.

Consequently, Fogarty (2017) stated measurement relied on indirect assessment of students' understanding after reading, which requires an examiner to make assumptions about the quality and adequacy of reading comprehension that occurred.

An effective literacy program that includes a strong literacy foundation encompasses all the components critical to the students, such as understanding language and how to read and write text (Behizadeh, 2019). Smith (2008) added essential teaching strategy for high quality and productive literacy program utilizes daily and ongoing language arts, phonemic awareness, phonics, building vocabulary, alphabetical knowledge, self-expression, reading comprehension, drawing, and writing. Miller (2020) stated that different technology offered quality instruction for online learning.

Technology

It has been complex and difficult for students to learn remotely, however, the students have been able to learn a valuable skill in using technology to stay in communication and learn from their teachers (Lederman, 2020). Zhu (2020) concluded that technology improved reading comprehension and language skills. Even though many students these days are extremely technology savvy that does not ensure they did well with remote learning (Becker, 2020). Some education experts including Zebroff (2017), an education professor at Simon Fraser University in Canada, say the level of functional illiteracy in the North American appears to be reaching epidemic levels. Within the COVID-19 pandemic era, education institutions are preparing robustly for digital pedagogy (Naidoo, 2020). Johannes (2020) stated there is a huge gap between what students can do for leisure on their cell phones and gaming systems and how good they are at using a device for educational tasks such as reading a document, answering a question or figuring out a problem. Technology and mobile technology are also implemented as

supplemental teaching tools in an era of technological advances to engage further and reinforce what was learned on a specific day (Churchill, 2020).

Mental Health

The COVID-19 pandemic presents unforeseen challenges to families. In taking an active role in their children's academic progress, parents can assist in ensuring their children have the support they require to achieve their full potential (Elgart, 2021). However, the findings from Fontenelle-Tereshchuk (2021) showed that parents had a special concern for the mental health of their children during the transition into lockdown and the ramifications of such experiences in the future as students return to school at the start of the academic year under a different climate. Carpenter (2020) concluded parents were generally positive about the experience. Parents in private and charter schools reported a more positive experience than those in traditional public schools. Mental health can predict academic achievement (Sara, 2021). It's important to keep good mental health as Zaccoletti (2019) stated emotions and mental health are related with reading comprehension performance. Boyes (2016) concluded that children with reading difficulties are at elevated risk for mental health problems. Associations between reading difficulties and mental health differ substantially across studies, raising the possibility that these assumptions may be exacerbated by other factors (Boyes, 2016). Henderson (2021) stated there is more support now for expanding online learning for students who need it and for more funding into programs that are online based.

Question

In what way does reading intervention Benchmark Literacy during virtual small group guided reading instruction impact students' reading level while remote learning?

Theory of Change

The belief was that the intervention will increase students' reading level after seven weeks of small reading group instruction. The researcher believes students' who participate in this study will have a high probability of increased reading level. The long term goal for this research study was for students to maintain reading groups with an intervention that can be measured over time.

Methodology

Context

The fifth grade elementary school classroom in this study was located in an upper middle class suburban area in the Pacific Northwest. Less than two percent of the total school population received free or reduced cost lunch. The school represented in this study had a demographic of over fifty percent White/Caucasian, thirty seven percent Asian American, six percent Hispanic or Latino, six percent as Native American and one percent Black/African American (OSPI, 2021).

Participants

For this action research project, the participants and their parents gave permission for the researcher to use their reading level data. Of the twenty-six students in the classroom seventeen students participated in the study. Of the seventeen students, eight identify as male and nine identify as female. Of the seventeen participating students, eight identify as White/Caucasian, six identify as Asian American Pacific Islander and three identify as African American. There are no students on an Individual Education Plan (IEP) and one student received accommodations for a 504 Plan. The participants were ten to eleven years in age and were in a fifth grade general education classroom in the Pacific Northwest.

Intervention

Benchmark Literacy (2013) was used as part of the students' small, guided reading groups. Benchmark Literacy is a series of books written about different subject matters. The non-fiction books are based on relevant grade level themes such as science, math, history and geographical places. Benchmark Literacy also includes guided reading group instructions for the researcher about how deliver content and provide directions to the students which encourages deeper understanding of the text. Every book in the Benchmark Literacy series has a letter grade associated with reading level of the text in the book. The intervention was comprehensive, authentic, while making connections with real life situations.

Weeks 1-3

During the first week of the intervention, the students were asked to have the book downloaded and opened on their computer desktop. The researcher also shared the book with the students over Zoom in case students were unable to download the book. The first session with the students included reviewing the book from the front to back, with the option to ask any questions about the text. At the end of the first session, the researcher and the students reviewed the glossary terms for each individual book. There was no reading aloud during the first session.

During weeks two and three, the students took turns reading aloud. Each participant read one page or passage and then passed along reading responsibilities to the next fifth grader. Each student had equal opportunities to participate. At the end of each read aloud, the researcher would ask each reader to give a summative review of the passage just read. At the end of week 3, the goal was to have each small group be completed with the introduction, chapter one and chapter two of the Benchmark Literacy book.

Weeks 4-5

During weeks four and five, the sessions began with the researcher asking one student to read aloud and then pass along reading responsibilities to the next fifth grader in the small group. During week four, we finished the session by discussing a summary of the chapter. The researcher asked questions from Benchmark Literacy teacher's guide that was to be asked to each student about the corresponding chapter the small group read. Every participant was asked to share one summary about the chapter before completing the session.

During week five the students were asked to draw conclusions about the chapter they read aloud. The students were asked to find facts or details in the text that were not stated but inferred. The researcher wrote down the participants' answers on a piece of paper and shared with the group. The students then analyzed and discussed the information and decided if the assumptions were true. The last step during week five was to develop a conclusion. The conclusion was discussed and agreed upon on by a show of hands. After a consensus was reached the session was complete.

Weeks 6-7

During week six, each session began by having students read aloud, then passed along reading responsibilities to the next fifth grader in the small group. For week six, the researcher asked the students what the authors' purpose was for writing the chapter or text they just read. The students were asked if the authors' intention was to entertain, inform, explain, describe or persuade. The students were asked to provide examples from the text to support their decision. The session was completed once each person in the group had shared.

During week seven of the intervention, the students finished reading the book then engaged in summary discussion. There was no summative assessment given at the end of the book.

Assessment

Once the seven weeks of Benchmark Literacy intervention was completed the Fountas & Pinnell (F&P) (2021) reading assessment guidelines were used to assess students' comprehension and reading level. The students were graded on a scale from A – Z and given a story to read based on their previous score from grade four. The participants in this study, who attended the school for every year of elementary school, were given an F&P assessment every year, three times a year. The entire class was given an F&P assessment in September. The second assessment was given after the return from winter break. This was the first step in gathering reading level data from the participating students. The final assessment was administered after the seven week Benchmark Literacy intervention.

Fifth grade students were given an instructional expectation level based on the F&P text level gradient (Fountas& Pinnell, 2021). The goal was for students to be at a level T for the first assessment. Each student was given ten minutes to read an F&P passage from the grade level measured at beginning of the year in September 2020. Students' were instructed to read the passage aloud for the first half of the passage and then read the second half silently. After they have read the passage they were asked to give a synopsis of what they just read. This was the first part of the comprehensive assessment.

Students were measured on their reading accuracy rate, the number of self-corrections, and fluency rate. The researcher wrote down the quantitative score on the F&P recording sheet provided. The first assessment including accuracy rate, number of self corrections, fluency and

the reading rate data were recorded on the sheet that corresponds with each book from Benchmark Literacy. The students' accuracy rate was based on the percentage of mistakes made in the oral reading portion. The number of self corrections was recorded on the form and the researcher assessed the fluency score.

The second half of the assessment was conversational. The students were asked a series of three questions based on the text and key understandings. The purpose for the comprehensive conversation was to analyze if the students understood text, as well as content beyond the text. Based on the prompts and the answers given by the student, they were given a score between 0-3.

The number zero represents unsatisfactory understanding of the text or that they did not respond to the question at all. A score of one reflected a limited understanding of the text and mentioned a few facts. A score of two represented a satisfactory understanding of the text and includes important information and ideas, but neglects the key understandings. A score of three showed excellent understanding of the text and includes all of the information and main ideas behind the text. The second data set was recorded and the researcher recorded the data on the research data sheet that corresponded with the book read.

The quantitative scores for the first oral part of the assessment and the qualitative scores from the comprehension part were combined in order to determine the reading level. Reading levels were completed and recorded on the research data collection document Appendix A.

The action researcher recorded the students' first score to assess the students' baseline reading level for this study. After seven weeks of guided small reading groups with Benchmark Literacy the F&P assessment was administered again. The researcher scored the assessment and

placed the score on the research data collection document Appendix A. At the conclusion of the study, the researcher analyzed the data.

Standard or Accelerated Increase

The researcher aimed to investigate whether there was a change in reading level after seven weeks of the Benchmark Literacy intervention implemented while remote learning. The focus of the study intended to quantify data after the second assessment had been recorded on Appendix A. The researcher analyzed whether the student had experienced an increase, decrease or no change in reading level. If the data recorded reflected an increased reading level of two or more reading levels after the second assessment then student will be marked as having an accelerated increase. A two level increase in lettered reading level would constitute an increase in two numbered score.

An increase in one reading level will be noted as a standard increase. A one level increase in lettered reading level would constitute an increase in one numbered score. A recorded one-level increase was typical and standard for an F&P assessment over the course of a school year and shows the intervention as having a short term constructive outcome.

Decrease

After the conclusion of the study, if the participant showed a decrease or no signs of reading comprehension improvement, the student will be marked with a decrease in reading level. For this study, there were no students who recorded a decrease in reading level.

No Change

At the conclusion of the assessment if the data recorded did not give evidence of an increased or decreased reading level, the student will be marked as no change. A no change score on the recorded sheet was noted as a net-negative as the intervention did not attain its desired

results. There is an exception to this rule in the fact that students who are at a level Z reading level when the action research records its first assessment score cannot gain a level as there are no additional levels to gain (Fountas & Pinnell, 2021).

Results

Scoring

The results showed Students A, D, I, L, M, N & O having an accelerated increase, or two letter grade increase, in reading level. Forty-one percent of participants in the total study recorded an accelerated increase. The seven participants with an accelerated increase four identified as male and three identified as female. The seven participants who scored an accelerated increase were all reading at grade level with. Six of the seven were reading at grade level when the intervention started. An accelerated increase was a positive result for the student and the Benchmark Literacy intervention.

Students B, C, E, G, H, J, P & Q scored a standard gain and increased one level after the second assessment. Forty-seven percent of the students participating in this study had a standard increase in reading level. Of the eight students, three identified as male and five identified as female. This is important because of the students who scored an increase in reading level, seven were male and eight were female. The results were almost identical for both standard and accelerated increases. Seven of the eight participants who scored a standard increase were reading at grade level.

There were two students, one male and one female, who showed no change in reading level after the second assessment. One of the students who scored no change was reading at a level Z at the beginning of study and was unable to increase another level because this student had reached the limit of increase. The other student was reading at grade level and,

unfortunately, did not have any change. This was the only student not to have an accelerated or standard increase.

Discussion

Return of Students to Classroom

The students who gave permission to be a part of this study were all learning remotely during the beginning of school year in September 2020. The school district continued to comply with the Center for Disease Control (CDC) guidelines pertaining to COVID-19 protocol. The first assessment for this research study was conducted with all students learning virtually. The students continued to be remote until April 1st 2021 when 15 of the 26 students in class changed their status from full time Remote-Students to Hybrid-Student. The fifteen Hybrid-Students students would come to school at 9:00 AM and learn in the classroom for the first half of the day. The students left at 12:30 PM. In the afternoon, the students would login at 2:00 PM for remote learning the remainder of the day until 3:20 PM. Virtual small reading groups continued with Benchmark Literacy in the afternoon over Zoom and conducted the research with the expectation to complete the 2nd assessment “as if” students were remote learning. With the 2nd assessment completed virtually, the legitimacy of this action research project remains intact.

Conclusions

The Benchmark Literacy intervention worked to help students increase reading level. With eighty-eight percent of participants experiencing an increase, the conclusion to this study is Benchmark Literacy works as a successful reading comprehension intervention. Since one participant was unable to increase after the intervention was implemented the researcher concluded that Benchmark Literacy could be implemented in any classroom with relative success.

Implications or relevance

Benchmark Literacy intervention showed an 88% success rate for fifth graders after seven weeks on virtual instruction. This is important because as Clemons (2020) stated, reading comprehension is key to academic success. More participants had positive outcomes with the Benchmark Literacy intervention than those who did not. The recorded data showed standard or accelerated increase for students who were reading at grade level and those who were not reading at grade level. The implication is the Benchmark Literacy intervention would work for any classroom that used it for small guided reading groups.

Limitations

There were two limitations to this study. One limitation was that it was only seven weeks long. If the action research was longer, the participants who participated in this study, would have more reading groups completed and more practice with Benchmark Literacy intervention. This would produce better data. The other limitation was that it was only conducted in one classroom and not multiple classrooms. Participants in this study could benefit from having an entire years worth of data. The sample size was small and could not be generalized over an entire student population.

Recommendations

There are two recommendations for this study. One recommendation would be to conduct the study over the span of one academic year with three separate F&P assessments. The second recommendation would be to conduct the study in other fifth grade classes or other grade levels.

References

- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education: The National Institute of Education. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED253865>
- Angelico, T. (2020). The pandemic and educational inequality in Australia: Timely Opportunity to Reform Education. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 20(14), 105-110. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/pandemic-educational-inequality-australia-timely/docview/2492325323/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Becker, J. D., & Levin, D. A. (2020). Like moths to a flame: unsecured networks, tech-savvy students, and district policy. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 23(2), 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1555458919899458>
- Bellafante, G. (2020). Are we losing a generation of children to remote learning: BIG CITY. *The New York Times*. <https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/docview/2457886478?https://search.proquest.com/central&pq-origsite=summon>
- Benchmark Literacy (2013) Scientifically based research study fairfax county (VA) public schools. *Benchmarkeducation.com*. <http://blnewstandards.benchmarkeducation.com/pdf/BL-ResearchResults2013.pdf>
- Behizadeh, N. (2019). Realizing powerful writing pedagogy in U.S. public schools. *Pedagogies : an International Journal*, 14(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2019.1671847>

- Birch, R., & Lewis, K. (2020). Building partnerships to support teachers with distance learning during the Covid-19 pandemic: cohorts, confidence, and microteaching. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 29(1), 149-157. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/building-partnerships-support-teachers-with/docview/2478108710/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Boyes, M., Leitao, S., Claessen, M. & Badcock, N. (2016). Why are reading difficulties associated with mental health problems? *Dyslexia*, 22(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1531>
- California Approves Benchmark Education's K-6 Literacy Systems. (2015, Aug 20). *Wireless News* <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/wire-feeds/california-approves-benchmark-educations-k-6/docview/1705328950/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Carpenter, D., & Dunn, J. (2020). We're all teachers now: Remote learning during COVID-19. *Journal of School Choice*, 14(4), 567-594 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2020.1822727>
- Caton, J. B., Chung, S., Adeniji, N., Hom, J., Brar, K., Gallant, A., Bryant, M., Hain, A., Basaviah, P., & Hosamani, P. (2021). Student engagement in the online classroom: comparing preclinical medical student question-asking behaviors in a videoconference versus in-person learning environment. *FASEB BioAdvances*, 3(2), 110-117.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1096/fba.2020-00089>

- Chamberlain, L., Lacina, J., Bintz, W. P., & Jimerson, J. B. (2020). Literacy in lockdown: Learning and teaching during COVID-19 school closures. *The Reading Teacher*, 74(3), 243–253. <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1961>
- Churchill, N. (2020). Development of students' digital literacy skills through digital storytelling with mobile devices. *Educational Media International*, 57(3). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2020.1833680>
- Clark, H. (2020). After COVID-19, a future for the world's children?, *The Lancet*. 396(10247), 298-300. [http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1016/S0140-6736\(20\)31481-1](http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31481-1)
- Clemens, N. H., Hsiao, Y.-Y., Lee, K., Martinez-Lincoln, A., Moore, C., Toste, J., & Simmons, L. (2021). The differential importance of component skills on reading comprehension test performance among struggling adolescent readers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 54(3), 155–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219420932139>
- Cuevas, A. (2020). *Exploring first and second-grade teachers' perceptions of best instructional strategies in regard to underprivileged first and second-grade children: A qualitative case study* (Order No. 28150316). <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/dissertations-theses/exploring-first-second-grade-teachers-perceptions/docview/2463597625/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Elgart, M. A. (2021). Learning upended: How Americans experienced the shift to remote instruction. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(5), 48–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721721992566>
- Evanchan, G. (2010). Fluency is a vital link in the comprehension chain. *Ohio Reading Teacher*, 40(1), 11-18. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/fluency-is-vital-link-comprehension-chain/docview/577071584/se-2?accountid=1230>

- Fogarty, M. (2017). The impact of a technology-mediated intervention on adolescents' reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Educational Effectiveness*, 10, 326–353.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19345747.2016.1227412>
- Fontenelle-Tereshchuk, D. (2021). Mental health and the COVID-19 crisis: The hopes and concerns for children as schools re-open. *Interchange (Toronto. 1984)*, 52(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-020-09413-1>
- Fountas & Pinnell (2013) F&P level gradient: Grade goals.
<https://www.fountasandpinnell.com/textlevelgradient/>
- García, J. R., & Cain, K. (2014). Decoding and reading comprehension: A meta-analysis to identify which reader and assessment characteristics influence the strength of the relationship in English. *Review of Educational Research*, 84 (1), 74 – 111.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/003465431349961>
- Gewertz, C. (2020, May 28). Instruction during COVID-19: Less learning time drives fears of academic erosion. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2020/05/27/instruction-during-covid-19-less-learning-time-drives.html>
- Gibson, N. R. (2016). Effects of intervention on reading levels of children from kindergarten through third grade (Order No. 10075472).
<https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/docview/1777347105?accountid=1230>

- Gillespie, D. L., Meyers, L. A., Lachmann, M., Redd, S. C., & Zenilman, J. M. (2021). The experience of 2 independent schools with in-person learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The Journal of School Health*, 91(5), 347-355.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1111/josh.13008>
- Gillis, A., & Krull, L. M. (2020). COVID-19 Remote learning transition in spring 2020: Class structures, student perceptions, and inequality in college courses. *Teaching Sociology*, 48(4), 283–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055X20954263>
- Haeck, C. & Lefebvre, P. (2020). Pandemic school closures may increase inequality in test scores. *Canadian Public Policy*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.3138/cpp.2020-055>
- Harris, E. A. (2020, April 27). It was just too much: How remote learning is breaking parents. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/27/nyregion/coronavirus-homeschooling-parents.html>
- Hash, P. M. (2021). Remote learning in school bands during the COVID-19 shutdown. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 68(4), 381–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429420967008>
- Henderson, M. B. (2021). Amid pandemic, support soars for online learning, parent poll shows. *Education Next*, 21(1) <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/amid-pandemic-support-soars-online-learning/docview/2475144907/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Herold, B. (2020). The disparities in remote learning under coronavirus (in charts). *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2020/04/10/the-disparities-in-remote-learning-under-coronavirus.html>

- Hill, H. C., & Loeb, S. (2020). How to contend with pandemic learning loss. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2020/05/28/how-to-contend-with-pandemic-learning-loss.html>
- Hobbs, T. D., & Hawkins, L. (2020). America's grand experiment in remote learning fails. *Wall Street Journal*. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/docview/2412390282?accountid=1230>
- Hoffman, J. V., Lammert, C., DeJulio, S., Tily, S. E., & Svrcek, N. S. (2020). Preservice teachers engaging elementary students in an activist literacy curriculum. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 55(1), 9-31. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/preservice-teachers-engaging-elementary-students/docview/2450654291/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Johannes, N., Vuorre, M., & Przybylski, A. K. (2020). Video game play is positively correlated with well-being. *PsyArXiv Preprints*. <https://doi.org/10.31234/osf.io/qrjza>
- June, A. (2020). Did the scramble to remote learning work? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 66(36). <https://www.proquest.com/docview/2493229756?accountid=1230>
- Kaden, U. (2020). COVID-19 school closure-related changes to the professional life of a K–12 teacher. *Education Sciences*, 10(6), 165. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10060165>
- Kearns, D. M., Lyon, C. P., & Pollack, M. S. (2021). Teaching world and word knowledge to access content-area texts in co-taught classrooms. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 56(4), 208–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451220944371>

- Kim, Y. G. (2020). Hierarchical and dynamic relations of language and cognitive skills to reading comprehension: Testing the direct and indirect effects model of reading (DIER). *Journal of Educational Psychology, 112*(4), 667-684.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1037/edu0000407>
- Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Liu, J. (2020). Projecting the potential impact of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. *Educational Researcher, 49*(8), 549–565. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X20965918>
- Lake, R., Dusseault, B. (2020). Remote classes are in session for more school districts, but attendance plans are still absent. *Center for Reinventing Public Education*. <https://www.crpe.org/thelens/remote-classes-are-session-more-school-districts-attendance-plans-are-still-absent>
- Lederman, D. (2020) The shift to remote learning: The human element. *Inside Higher Ed*, March 25, 2020. <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2020/03/25/how-shift-remote-learning-might-affect-students-instructors-and>
- Marshall, D. T., Shannon, D. M., & Love, S. M. (2020). How teachers experienced the COVID-19 transition to remote instruction. *Phi Delta Kappan, 102*(3), 46–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721720970702>
- Miller, T., MacLaren, K., & Xu, H. (2020). Online learning: Practices, perceptions, and technology. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology, 46*(1)
<https://doi.org/10.21432/cjlt27894>
- Naidoo, J. (2020). Postgraduate mathematics education students' experiences of using digital platforms for learning within the COVID-19 pandemic era. *Pythagoras (Pretoria, South Africa), 41*(1), e1-e11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/pythagoras.v41i1.568>

National Reading Panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups (No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2020). *Reopening Washington Schools 2020: District Planning Guide*. Washington. <https://www.k12.wa.us/about-ospi/workgroups-committees/currently-meetingworkgroups/reopening-washington-schools-2020-21-workgroup>

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (2021) *Report card: School #105134*. <https://washingtonstatereportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/ReportCard/ViewSchoolOrDistrict/105134>

Ohi, D. R. (2021). Connecting with young learners during the pandemic (and a thank you to school librarians). *Knowledge Quest*, 49(5), 54-56. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/connecting-with-young-learners-during-pandemic/docview/2516948200/se-2?accountid=1230>

Okonkwo, A. F., & Obeka, N. O. (2020). Assessing literacy curriculum variables for equitable student achievement in public and private universal basic education schools in ebonyi state. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 20(4), 164-172. <https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/assessing-literacy-curriculum-variables-equitable/docview/2437438562/se-2?accountid=1230>

- Olt, P. A. (2018). Virtually there: distant freshmen in classes through synchronous online education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 43(5), 381-395.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1007/s10755-018-9437-z>
- Petrilli, M. J. (2020). The new accountability assignment. *Education Next*, 20(4)
<https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/scholarly-journals/new-accountability-assignment/docview/2475144982/se-2?accountid=1230>
- Preece, J., & Levy, R. (2020). Understanding the barriers and motivations to shared reading with young children: The role of enjoyment and feedback. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 20(4), 631–654. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468798418779216>
- Quinn, J. M., Wagner, R. K., Petscher, Y., & Lopez, D. (2015). Developmental relations between vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension: A latent change score modeling study. *Child Development*, 86, 159–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12292>
- Recht, D. R. & Leslie, L. (1988). Effect of prior knowledge on good and poor readers' memory of text. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 16–20. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.80.1.16>
- Ritchie, S. J., & Bates, T. C. (2013). Enduring links from childhood mathematics and reading achievement to adult socioeconomic status. *Psychological Science*, 24(7), 1301-1308.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612466268>
- Russo, J., Bobis, J., Downton, A., Livy, S., & Sullivan, P. (2021). Primary teacher attitudes towards productive struggle in mathematics in remote learning versus classroom-based settings. *Education Sciences*, 11(2), 35.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.3390/educsci11020035>

- Sahlberg, P. (2021). Does the pandemic help us make education more equitable? *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10671-020-09284-4>
- Sara, A., Mimmi, B., & Sydsjö Gunilla. (2021). Mental health and academic performance: A study on selection and causation effects from childhood to early adulthood. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 56(5), 857-866.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00127-020-01934-5>
- Shamir-Inbal, T., & Blau, I. (2021). Facilitating emergency remote K-12 teaching in computing-enhanced virtual learning environments during COVID-19 pandemic - blessing or curse? *Journal of Educational Computing Research*. 73563312199278.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0735633121992781>
- Schrijvers, M., Janssen, T., Fialho, O., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2019). Gaining insight into human nature: A review of literature classroom intervention studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(1), 3–45. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318812914>
- Schwartz, S. (2020). Early reading instruction takes a hit during COVID-19: While remote distance learning has presented challenges in every subject and grade level, some teachers and researchers say that early reading instruction is especially problematic. *Education Week*, 39(35), 8. <http://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/docview/2412429008?accountid=1230>
- Smith, J. H. (2008). What successful literacy teachers do: research-based strategies for teachers, reading coaches, and instructional planners. *Choice*, 45(8), 1389.
<https://proxy.cityu.edu/login?url=https://www-proquest-com.proxy.cityu.edu/trade-journals/what-successful-literacy-teachers-do-research/docview/225732456/se-2?accountid=1230>

- Snyder, T. D., de Brey, C., & Dillow, S. A. (2016). Digest of education statistics 2014, NCES 2016-006. *Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.*
- <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED565675>
- Thomas, D., & Dyches, J. (2019). The hidden curriculum of reading intervention: a critical content analysis of Fountas & Pinnell's leveled literacy intervention. *Journal of Curriculum Studies: JCS*, 51(5), 601–618.
- <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1616116>
- Uysal, P., & Bilge, H. (2018). An investigation on the relationship between reading fluency and level of reading comprehension according to the type of texts. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 11(2), 161-172.
- <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.26822/iejee.2019248590>
- Van Allen, J., & Zygouris-Coe, V. (2019). Using guided reading to teach internet inquiry skills: a case study of one elementary school teacher's experience. *Reading Psychology*, 40(5), 425–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2019.1623961>
- Watson, A., Kehler, M., & Martino, W. (2010). The problem of boys' literacy underachievement: Raising some questions. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 53(5), 356-361.
- <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1598/JAAL.53.5.1>
- Watson, E., Marin, L. F., White, L. N., Macciota, R., & Lefsrud, L. M. (2020). Blended learning in an upper year engineering course: The relationship between students' program year, interactions with online material, and academic performance. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 11(3), 1-21.
- <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1282536>

- Wexler, J. (2021). Improving instruction in co-taught classrooms to support reading comprehension. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 56(4), 195–199.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451220944212>
- Zaccoletti, S., Altoè, G., & Mason, L. (2019). The interplay of reading-related emotions and updating in reading comprehension performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 90(3) 663-682
<https://bpspsychub.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/bjep.12324>
- Zebroff, D., & Kaufman, D. (2017). Texting, reading, and other daily habits associated with adolescents' literacy levels. *Education and Information Technologies*, 22(5), 2197-2216.
doi: <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1007/s10639-016-9544-3>
- Zhu, X., Chen, B., Rukmini, M. A., Hong, S., & Zhang, R. Z. (2020). Reading and connecting: using social annotation in online classes. *Information and Learning Science*, 121(5), 261-271. <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.cityu.edu/10.1108/ILS-04-2020-0117>

Appendix A

Appendix A			5 th Grade Standard	Does Not Meet	Appr.	Meets	Exceeds
Researcher: Jeffrey Rhodes			1 st Assessment	Below T	T	U – W	X +
			2 nd Assessment	Below U	U	V – X	Y +
Year 2021							
Student	Special Services	1st Assessment	2nd Assessment	Change in Level			
Student A		W	Y	+2			
Student B		X	Y	+1			
Student C		T	U	+1			
Student D		U	W	+2			
Student E		W	X	+1			
Student F		Z	Z	0			
Student G		X	Y	+1			
Student H		Y	Z	+1			
Student I	504	S	U	+2			
Student J		W	X	+1			
Student K		U	U	0			
Student L		T	V	+2			
Student M		U	W	+2			
Student N		X	Y	+2			
Student O		Y	Z	+2			
Student P		S	T	+1			
Student Q		X	Y	+1			