



The Effectiveness of the Reading Remedial Program among Grades 1 and 2 Levels

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.21467865

Lournivi Marie A. Singco

Independent Researcher

ABSTRACT

The study determined the effectiveness of the reading remedial program among first and second graders. It analyzed the performance profile of the students based on the results of the CEM achievement test and their reading performance. Focus group discussion was utilized to gather qualitative data from the teachers involved in the implementation of the program. The findings served as the basis for a proposed enhanced remedial program in reading that can strengthen the reading fluency and comprehension skills of the students. The study was anchored on John Fleming's model of effective teaching. Fleming's teaching model advocated for more explicit, direct teaching as opposed to the dominant, inquiry based teaching methods of today. It emphasizes descriptive-analytical research design. The study was conducted in School A, a private basic educational institution in Central Visayas. Samples utilized for the comparative study was the scholastic grades of grade one and two pupils who were admitted to the reading remedial program of the school while teachers who handled the remedial sessions served as the research respondents for the focus group discussion. The learners' reading achievement test results and their first quarter grade in reading were the bases for the recommendation for remediation. The first quarter grade was then compared with their grades in the subsequent quarters to determine the significant mean gain of their reading performance. Results revealed that there was no significant difference in the reading performance. The themes from the remedial program teachers' focus group showed that lack of collaboration, insufficient time allotment and inconsistency of the implementation and monitoring of the program, and having multilevel assignments of the teachers were the implied factors. In conclusion, the program was not effective. A proposed enhancement of the reading remedial program was suggested.

Keywords: Reading remedial program, reading performance, reading fluency, reading comprehension, CEM Achievement Test, program effectiveness, Grade 1 and Grade 2 learners, focus group discussion

Introduction

Today's technology does not only provides the learners with the new set of information but opens up immense opportunity to expand one's imagination and creativity to discover and innovate new things. Thus, the competition in the global economy is terrible and one has to be smart enough to efficaciously trudge on. One of the highlighted skills for the 21st century learners to master in order to navigate successfully in the fast changing and highly digitalized society is communication which substantially include both oral and written. This inevitably suggests mastering of the foundation skills laid in the primary levels. Acquisition of the basic reading skills in particular is highly indispensable. As quoted by Hulya (2012), reading is a basic life skill. Child's success in school and ultimately for life is greatly influence by his ability to read (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985). The later achievement of children rests in their capability to read proficiently and their ability to grasp and understand what they read. Rance (2006) pointed out that reading provides an opportunity of knowledge that leads to obtaining success.

Nonetheless, students vary in their capacity to acquire the reading skills. There are those who successfully thrive while others barely reach the minimum required skills at the particular level. As quoted by Hausheer (2011), at least one of the five students has significant difficulty in acquiring reading skills (Therrien, 2004). Left on their own, they will ultimately lag way behind from their peers. They may successfully be promoted to next grade level but not be as confident as the others. Consequently, this feeling of inadequacy might be manifested in some maladaptive if



not disruptive behaviors in the class and or at home or the society at large. As presented by Morgan et al. (2008) researchers have established that academic underachievement and behavior problems frequently occur at the same time (e.g., Hinshaw, 1992; Reid, Gonzalez, Nordness, Trout, & Epstein, 2004; Rutter & Yule, 1970; Trout, Nordless, Pierce, & Epstein, 2003) and the link with reading difficulties is particularly well established (e.g., Arnold et al., 2005; Kauffman, Cullinan & Epstein, 1987; McGee, Williams, Share, Anderson, & Silva, 1986).

Literature shows that this difficulty starts early on. The National Research Council of their 1998 report shows that reading difficulties is highly prevalent in childhood. As Nelson-Royes (2012) explicitly stressed that about 40% of all children are facing the challenges to learn how to read. As presented by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2013), 65% of the fourth-grade students are reading below the “proficient” level, that is, these students were unable to “integrate and interpret text and apply their understanding of the text to draw conclusions and make evaluation” (p.6) (Dally et al, 2015). Similarly, this reality is also very evident in our country. Luz (2007) revealed that only one-sixth to one-third of the pupils can read independently at the desired grade level. By the end of Grade 6, over one-third was identified as “frustrated” readers and the other one-third “instructional” readers. Both levels are below the desired reading level at the end of the elementary cycle. These data were obtained from the elementary schools in the Division of Manila where school facilities are better off than the rest of country.

Thus, remediation of these very fundamental skills is crucial and urgent. As presented by Wanzeck and Vaughn (2008), several findings in reading intervention researches showed that a higher percentage of students acquire the necessary skills to become successful readers when early identification and appropriate interventions are carried out (e.g. Foorman, Francis, Fletcher, Schatschneider, & Mehta, 1998; Torgesen et al., 1999; Vellutino et al., 1996). Antilla (2013) mentioned that if a child reaches first grade in elementary with deficiency in reading, the school, teachers, and principal should be able to recognize these problems and create various interventions to help the child in reading literacy and comprehension skill development. In this way, it can guarantee the academic success of all students.

Nelson-Royes (2012) outlined the five components of effective reading instruction based on the researches reviewed by The National Reading Panel (NRP) in the year 2000:

1) Phonemic Awareness. This is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate the individual sounds in spoken words, and the understanding that sounds of spoken language work together to make words. In other words, this is the auditory aspect and does not involve words in print. Children who have phonemic awareness skills are likely to have an easier time learning to read in contrast to children who have not yet mastered the skills. Scientific research shows that these maybe taught and learned, children learn to read and improves their ability to read words and their reading comprehension, help children to spell by segmenting words into phonemes, most helpful when children are taught to manipulate phonemes by using the letters of the alphabet and is most valuable when the focal point is merely on one or two types of phoneme manipulation rather than on numerous types.

2) Phonics. The ability to decipher the relationship between the letters of the written language and the sounds of spoken language. Knowledge of these associations helps children identify familiar words accurately and automatically and decipher new words. This can be taught explicitly or implicitly. Explicit phonics entails telling children directly the sounds of individual letters. Implicit phonics encourages children to make sounds that correspond to letters from accumulated auditory and visual exposure to words containing those letters. Educators must blend these techniques for children to learn how to decode words. Phonics instructions basically teaches children the relationships between the looks of the letters (graphemes) of written language and the individual sounds (phonemes) of spoken language. It also teaches children to apply these relationships when words.

3) Vocabulary Development. Refers to the words children must know to read effectively. Vocabulary can be classified as oral or reading vocabulary. Oral vocabulary refers to words that individuals use in speaking or words that individuals identify inn listening. Reading, vocabulary refers to words identified or used print. Children use the words that they have heard to make sense of the words they notice in print. Different types of texts and varying levels of



difficulty can be used to accomplish several purposes to meet various children's needs. By matching text types with children's reading development, educators are better able to support children's reading progress.

4) Reading Fluency. This is the ability to read text accurately and quickly with expression. Reading fluency is the bridge that links words recognition and comprehension. Fluency develops as a result of numerous chances to practice reading with a high degree of success. By repeatedly reading out loud to children provides a model for their oral reading and fluency. When children take note of role models of fluent reading, they learn how a reader's tone helps written text make sense.

5) Reading Comprehension. This is the competence to understand and gain meaning from what has been read. To read with clear comprehension, children need a variety of interrelated skills. On the most basic reading level, children must be capable of deciphering and making sense out words. After succeeding past the basic deciphering skills, children encounter added challenges. They must be able to understand, recall, and apply what they read.

Nelson-Royes (2012) stressed further that there is no single approach to reading that will meet the needs of all children. Nonetheless, there are ways that we can take note to better assist the struggling readers. Remedial teaching consists of meeting where the students are. It is to teach in which the learner and the learner's learning needs are addressed. It must be grounded on a careful identification of deficiencies through proper assessment. Moreover, giving feedback on the student reader's progress from the teacher is essential. Concurring to Crowe (2005), studies establish that giving a feedback encourages better performance on children's reading abilities specifically on word accuracy, fluency and comprehension. Additionally, it is very essential to monitor student's progress. As quoted by National Educational Psychological Service, regular assessment and on-going monitoring of student literacy achievement is associated with positive outcomes (Solity 2000; Shanahan, 2005; Eurydice Network, 2011). Other essential factor that may have significant impact with struggling readers is through small-group instruction. Small-group must consist of children with similar reading abilities. Within these groups, books and instructions are matched to the readers, so that the level of challenge is adequate but not overwhelming. This permits educators to easily sustain the focus and attention of children who may otherwise disengaged (Nelson-Royes, 2012). Finally, struggling readers may benefit from collaborative effort between home and school. Educators must offer guidance to parents and caregivers to help them assist their children at home. Conversely, parents and caregivers must offer guidance to teachers to help them stimulate children at school. Supportive home environments nurture motivation for reading, which leads to further voluntary reading and improved reading success (Nelson-Royes, 2012).

Acknowledging the presence of these struggling readers in our midst, the school designed its own Reading Remedial Program. The program was initially crafted by its enthusiastic Guidance Counselors endorsed by the subject area coordinator and was duly approved by the Principal. The rationale was to provide extra reading help and instruction for struggling readers among Grade 1 to 2 pupils and to facilitate better comprehension for Grade 3 to 6 pupils by establishing the necessary foundation in vocabulary. The program fosters collaboration among Guidance Counselors, Principal, English Subject Area Coordinator, Reading and English teachers, Advisers, Psychometrician, librarians and parents (Remedial Program Rationale, 2014).

Results of the CEM (Center for Educational Measurement) K to 12 English Achievement Test taken in the previous grade level (for resident students), admission test results (for the new students), and the first quarter grades were the bases of the selection of students. Those students whose performance descriptions in the achievement test fall under Needs Improvement and Moving Towards Average were enlisted. On the other hand, those new students whose admission performance were reconsidered (meaning did not satisfactorily meet the required cut-off but were admitted) were also counted in the program. Finally, teachers recommend students based on the pre-test (using a teacher-made test) results, performance in the oral reading and reading comprehension assessment, class standing and the first quarter grade.



After crafting the final list of the students for the program, letters were sent to parents and orientation of students followed. Roughly six months (September – February) the students underwent a one-hour session, five times a week, after their last subject in the afternoon.

After four years of its implementation, scientific evaluation of the program is somewhat long overdue but not too late yet. Thus, this study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Remedial Program. Since the population was somewhat large enough, the researchers sought to concentrate its effort to look into the Grades 1 and 2 levels since these are two critical levels for early intervention. Specifically, this study sought to find out whether there is a significant mean gain in the reading performance of students.

Methodology

A total of 106 students were involved in the study; 56 were grade 1 students (Male=42; Female=14) and 50 grade 2 (Male=37; Female=13). These were the students recommended for the reading remedial program for the four consecutive school years (SY 2014-2015 up to SY 2017-2018). Results of the achievement test (CEM K to 12 English Achievement Test) and or academic performance (1st Quarter Grade in Reading) were the selection criteria. The 1st Quarter grade was then compared with their grades in the subsequent quarters to determine the significant mean gain in their reading performance. Moreover, focus group discussion with the teachers handling the program was carried over to gather qualitative data that will validate the results.

Results and Discussion

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 below show the profiles of the Grade 1 and 2 students recommended for the Reading Remedial Program in terms of gender. It can be gleamed that majority of the students recommended for the Reading remedial program were males. This somehow confirms various researches done on gender differences in terms of reading performance. Typically, males outnumber the girls with reading problems. Several biological and environmental hypotheses have been proposed including the X-linked recessive inheritance, differences in brain functioning due to differential exposure or sensitivity to androgens, immunological factors, sexual imprinting, perinatal complications and differential resilience to neural insult (Hawke et al, 2009).

Table 1.1 Profile of the Grade 1 Students Recommended for the Reading Remedial Program in terms of Gender

Grade 1		SY 2014-2015		SY 2015-2016		SY 2016-2017		SY 2017-2018	
Profile	Variables	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gender	Male	14	87.5%	16	64.0%	7	87.5%	5	71.4%
	Female	2	33.3%	9	36.0%	1	12.5%	2	28.6%
	Total	16	100.0%	25	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%

Table 1.2 Profile of the Grade 2 Students Recommended for the Reading Remedial Program in terms of Gender

Grade 2		SY 2014-2015		SY 2015-2016		SY 2016-2017		SY 2017-2018	
Profile	Variables	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Gender	Male	10	58.8%	10	76.9%	8	80.0%	9	90.0%
	Female	7	41.2%	3	23.1%	2	20.0%	1	10.0%
	Total	17	100.0%	13	100.0%	10	100.0%	10	100.0%

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 present the profile of the Grade 1 and 2 students recommended for the Remedial



Program in terms of the CEM English K to 12 Achievement Test. As seen in the tables, most of the Grade 1 students across the school years obtained a Moving towards Average performance. A number of the grade 2 students obtained Average performance particularly in the first 2 consecutive school years. The presence of these Average performing students in the program can be explained in terms of their academic performance. The CEM English K to 12 Achievement test includes the grammar, vocabulary and Reading comprehension content areas. However, the teachers based their recommendation on the students' Reading grades which do not include the grammar competencies for these are taught separately.

Table 2.1. Profile of the Grade 1 Students Recommended for the Remedial Program in terms of the CEM English K to 12 Achievement Test

Grade 1		SY 2014-2015		SY 2015-2016		SY 2016-2017		SY 2017-2018	
Profile	Variables	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Test Performance Description	Excellent	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Approaching Excellence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Average	6	37.5%	6	24.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Moving Towards Average	9	56.25%	7	28.0%	7	87.5%	4	57.14%
	Needs Improvement	1	6.25%	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	0	0.0%
	No Test Results	0	0	12	48.0%	0	0.0%	3	42.86%
	Total	16	100.0%	25	100.0%	8	100.0%	7	100.0%

Table 2.2. Profile of the Grade 2 Students Recommended for the Remedial Program in terms of the CEM English K to 12 Achievement Test

Grade 2		SY 2014-2015		SY 2015-2016		SY 2016-2017		SY 2017-2018	
Profile	Variables	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Test Performance Description	Excellent	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Approaching Excellence	0	0.0%	2	15.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	Average	10	58.82%	8	61.5%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%
	Moving Towards Average	2	11.8%	3	23.1%	9	90.0%	5	50.0%
	Needs Improvement	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	1	10.0%	1	10.0%
	No Test Results	3	17.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%
	Total	17	100.0%	13	100.0%	10	100.0%	10	100.0%

Tables 3.1; 3.2; 3.3 and 3.4 indicate the quarterly mean grades and the statistical difference between first quarter and the succeeding quarters of Grade 1 students for four consecutive school years. As indicated in the tables, the range of the mean grade is 76.06 (First Quarter of SY 2014-2015) to 84.06 (Fourth Quarter of the SY 2015-2016). Most of the mean grade belongs to Approaching Proficiency level (a grade of 80-84). This means that most of these students have acquired the basic skills yet, they are not proficient enough as expected.



It can be further noticed that there was no significant mean gain from the first quarter grade and the succeeding quarter grades. This is true across the four consecutive school years. This means that an improvement in their Reading performance was not evident despite undergoing Reading remediation.

Table 3.1. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 1 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2014-2015

Grade 1		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2014-2015					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	76.06 (Developing)	4.09	1.75	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	78.50 (Developing)				
	Third	79.50 (Developing)	0.00	1.75		No significant Difference
	Fourth	78.56 (Developing)	0.01	1.75		No significant Difference

Table 3.2. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 1 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2015-2016

Grade 1		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2015-2016					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	80.06 (Approaching to Proficiency)	0.00	1.75	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	81.82 (Approaching Proficiency)				
	Third	81.59 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.01	1.75		No significant Difference
	Fourth	84.06 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.01	1.75		No significant Difference

Table 3.3. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 1 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2016-2017

Grade 1		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2016-2017					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	80.50 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.12	1.89	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	79.63 (Developing)				



	Third	79.75 (Developing)	0.21	1.89		No significant Difference
	Fourth	81.38 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.19	1.89		No significant Difference

Table 3.4. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 1 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2017-2018

Grade 1		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2017-2018					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	78.43 (Developing)	0.04	1.94	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	80.71 (Approaching Proficiency)				No significant Difference
	Third	80.00 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.04	1.94		No significant Difference
	Fourth	80.57 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.00	1.94		No significant Difference

Tables 3.5, 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 illustrate the quarterly mean grades and the statistical difference between first quarter and the succeeding quarters of Grade 2 students for the School Year 2014-2015 up to School Year 2017-2018. It can be seen that most of the mean grade fall under Approaching Proficiency level (a grade of 80-84) with 76.70 (Second Quarter of School Year 2016-2017) as the lowest and 84.60 (Fourth Quarter of School Year 2015-2016). This means that most of the students have the fundamental reading skills yet, they lack mastery. Looking into the specific details, the researchers found out that most of these students were the same students recommended for remediation in the Grade 1 level. This would mean that they failed to successfully master the required skills.

The tables further show that there was no significant mean gain from the first quarter grade and the succeeding quarter grades. This is evident across the four consecutive school years. This means that there was no progress in their performance even after being remediated.

Table 3.5. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 2 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2014-2015

Grade 2		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2014-2015					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	82.35 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.44	1.75	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	81.18 (Approaching Proficiency)				No significant Difference
	Third	82.94 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.24	1.75		No significant Difference



	Fourth	81.24 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.11	1.75		No significant Difference
--	--------	---------------------------------------	------	------	--	------------------------------

Table 3.6. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 2 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2015-2016

Grade 2		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2015-2016					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	80.38 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.11	1.78	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	81.38 (Approaching Proficiency)				
	Third	84.31 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.00	1.78		No significant Difference
	Fourth	84.62 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.00	1.78		No significant Difference

Table 3.7. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 2 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2016-2017

Grade 2		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2016-2017					
Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	78.40 (Developing)	0.01	1.83	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	81.20 (Approaching Proficiency)				
	Third	82.20 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.00	1.83		No significant Difference
	Fourth	80.90 (Approaching Proficiency)	0.02	1.83		No significant Difference

Table 3.8. Quarterly Mean Grades of Grade 2 Students and its Statistical Difference SY 2017-2018

Grade 2		Quarterly Grade	Computed t	Critical t	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Profile	SY 2017-2018					



Mean of the Reading Quarterly Grade	First	78.40 (Developing)	0.04	1.81	Failed to reject Ho	No significant Difference
	Second	76.70 (Developing)				No significant Difference
	Third	77.40 (Developing)	0.13	1.81		No significant Difference
	Fourth	79.30 (Developing)	0.19	1.81		No significant Difference

The findings above show that Reading Remedial Program was not effective. There was no significant mean gain in the students' Reading performance. This can be attributed to array of factors. Table 4 below shows the results of the focus group discussion with the teachers who handled the Reading Remedial program. It can be perceived that lack of collaboration is one of the loop holes in the implementation of the program. This comes in two forms, collaboration among teachers themselves and collaboration between teachers and parents. There should be an avenue for the remedial teachers to discuss various issues regarding the program which includes the content, methods and materials for helping and preventing reading difficulties. Moreover, there was no organized special session for the Reading remedial teachers and parents of these students to discuss the specific learning needs.

Another factor that transpired during the discussion was time allotment. The respondents expressed the conflict of the Reading Remedial schedule with that of the other subjects. Hence, there was no continuity of learning where students can reinforce their skills and the concepts.

There was no effective monitoring system. The respondents expressed that during the initial implementation of the program, the guidance counselor took the initiative in monitoring and making follow up with the students. However, in the succeeding school year, there was no proper monitoring done. Since there was no proper monitoring, some of the assigned teachers were not able to conduct the sessions regularly due to other school-related commitments.

Table 4. Teachers' challenges, perceptions, and suggestions

Challenges
• Lack of Collaboration: There was no organized sessions for orientation of the teachers who were assigned to handle the remedial program. Thus, there was no productive collaboration and unified learning goals to meet. Other teachers were not the assigned subject teacher for the intended grade level. Moreover, provision of parent-teacher collaboration was not evident. There was no formal conference set between the parents and teachers for this particular purpose. • Time allotment was insufficient and inconsistent. Other subjects also provide their own remedial sessions which conflicts the English remedial sessions. Teachers handling the remedial sessions were not faithful in following their schedule due to other priorities. • Monitoring of the program. There was no assigned person accountable to monitor and follow-up the implementation of the program. • Multi-level assignment. Teachers handled different grade levels that consequently affect their curricular preparations.



Perceptions

- Effective to help the struggling students, however, teacher's commitment to hold the sessions is very crucial.
- The program has not been stabilize since its commencement. Certain groups were not handled well by the assigned teachers.
- Very happy to handle the remediation program but yet discontented with the outcome.
- Very useful in bridging the learning gaps of the students. However, some teachers were hindered by other school activities to faithfully handle the sessions.

Suggestions

- Setting up periodic conference with the parents to provide venue for feed backing and collaboration.
- Close monitoring of the implementation of the program and subsequent feed backing among subject teacher, adviser, guidance counselor and parents.
- Provision of pretest and posttest to monitor students' progress. Oral reading inventory be carried out.
- Intensify the program especially in the Grade 1 level by providing more contact hours.
- Certificate of recognition be given to students who attended the program consistently.

Recommendations:

1. Set clear objectives of Reading and Comprehension Remedial Program. It must be patterned according to the five areas of effective reading instruction set by the National Reading Panel (NRP) 2000 such as Phonemic awareness, Phonics, Vocabulary, Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension. This must be reflected in the curriculum map intended for the remedial program. This likewise serves as a road map for teachers and learners to stay on to the path to academic success and likewise encourage learners that they are heading on the correct track to acquire the expected learning outcomes. With this, it can aid teachers in fostering, implementing, evaluating and adapting the instruction that are appropriate for the learning needs of the students.

Roskos K. and Neuman S. B. (2014) as cited in Stahl & Nagy (2006) mentioned that the extent of a student's word knowledge is intensely associated to reading competence both in the primary and in the next levels. To comprehend a text, therefore, relies on being able to transform letter-sounds into known words and understand texts (Roskos K. and Neuman S. B. 2014) as cited in Kamil, (2004) Word-Identification methods, such as decoding and the use of analogy (Ehri, 2002) are essential in recognizing unfamiliar words. Reading a word is carried out in a sequential process where the reader blends sounds together to form words and segments from their parts. This can be done by segmenting and blending individual phonemes. To be able to decode words correctly, readers should basically be able to (a) recognize the sounds of the letters or letter combinations, (b) combine phonemes, (c) read words in common patterns or phonograms and (d) use both letter-sound and meaning cues to identify the correct pronunciation and denotation of the word found in the text. Subsequently, word knowledge provides a strong foundation in learning to read. Roskos K. and Neuman S. B. (2014) as cited in (Beck & McKeown, 2007) stated that it makes a significant impact transition from a beginning reading from oral to written forms and is critical to the comprehension development of a proficient reader.

2. Provision of an assessment tool that measures the actual reading level of the students. This proposed assessment tool comprised following skills:

Skill 1: Letter Sound Identification

Learning Competency : to identify the sounds of the letters in the alphabet

Skill 2: Letter Identification

Learning Competency : to identify the letters in the alphabet

Skill 3 Rhyming Words

Learning Competency : to discriminate sounds and identify the words that sound alike



Skill 4 Phonemic Awareness

Learning Competency: to identify initial; medial and final sounds; blend and segment words.

Skill 5 Vocabulary

Learning Competency: to recognize synonym and antonym of a word

Skill 6 Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension Skills

Learning Competencies: Reading with accuracy and fluency; noting details; Identifying the cause and effect and Making Inferences

The students' reading ability must be categorized in three levels: Beginning, Developing and Advanced.

Levels of Reading Skills

ADVANCED	The learners get 116-135 of the overall score
DEVELOPING	The learners get 71% to 75% of the overall score in the Reading Skill Assessment or the learners obtain the score 96 to 115 out of 135.
BEGINNING	This is the lowest reading level. The learners get 70% and below of the overall the score 0-95.

**School uses 70% criterion*

In doing so, the students can be practically grouped according to their appropriate performance level. Thus, it would be easier and clear for the teacher to set learning goals. Consequently, this can be communicated to the parents or caregivers affluently. Likewise, collaboration among Remedial teachers is reinforced.

3. Usage of Explicit Instruction. Explicit instruction is efficient since it is a systematic planned order for teaching that is framed in a consistent sequence from easy to difficult learning goals, starting at the baseline performance of the students. This is anchored on John Fleming's model. Teachers are expected to completely direct student skill acquisition. The instruction encompasses directly imparting or demonstrating to the students the content or skill that they need to acquire. In response, the students are expected to demonstrate the specified skill. Thus, teacher-student interaction is encouraged.

4. Hold a conference among stakeholders. This includes the principal; Subject Area coordinator; Remedial teachers; guidance counselor; adviser and parents about the Reading and Comprehension Remedial Program. Parent's involvement is a must. According to (Barnard, 2004), a better performance of students greatly lies upon the parental involvement in their children's learning to achieve better academic performance

5. Remedial Teachers should provide monthly feedback to parents on the learning difficulties or progress of the students. Hudson, R.; Lane, H. and Pullen, P. (2005) stated that regular and consistent observation can help out in monitoring and evaluating the student's development and identify students' individual learning needs.

6. The school should appropriate a budget for teachers' trainings specifically on teaching reading and appropriate learning materials. It is a shared responsibility of teachers and school administrators to implement better school programs that will lead to a better students' teaching (Louis & Wahlstrom, 2011). DuFour, R. and Mattos, M. (2013) mentioned that school can take part in helping in ensuring that remedial teachers are provided with the necessary resources and support they need to achieve their objectives.

7. Proper monitoring in the implementation of the program must be observed. Since is a student-support program. It is appropriate to assign the guidance counselor to spearhead in the systematic monitoring and evaluation of the program.



8. Provision for pretest and posttest using a standardized assessment tool, preferably the CEM K to 12 English Achievement Test. By doing so, students achievement will be clearly establish thus the school can be guided in making necessary adjustment to the various aspects that affects students' performance.

References

- .Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E., Scott, J., (1988). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading*. Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading. Retrieved July 17, 2018 From https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/17553/ctrstreadtechrepv01988i00443_opt.pdf?sequence=1
- Antilla,J.A (2013). *The effects of early literacy development on academic success in the education setting and implications for educational leaders and teachers*. Retrieved July 8, 2018. From http://www.nmu.edu/education/sites/DrupalEducation/files/UserFiles/Antilla_Julie_MP.pdf.
- Barnard, W. M. (2004). *Parent involvement in elementary school and educational attainment*. Children and Youth Services Review, 26,39-62
- Bursuck, W. D., Smith, T., Munk, D., Damer, M., Mehlig, L., & Perry, J. (2004). *Evaluating the impact of a prevention-based model of reading on children who are at risk*. Remedial and Special Education, 25, 303-313
- Crowe, L. K. (2005). *Comparison of two oral reading feedback strategies in improving reading comprehension of school-age children with low reading ability*. Remedial and Special Education, 26, 32-42
- Daly III,E.J.; Neugebauer, S.; Chafouleas, S. and Skinner, C. H. (2015). *Interventions for reading problems: Designing and evaluating effective strategies*. New York : A Division of Guilford Publications, Inc.
- DuFour, R., & Marzano, R. (2013). *How do principals really improve schools?*. Retrieved July 30, 2018 From: www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/apr13/vol70/num07. How Do Principals Really Improve Schools?
- Disabil, J.L. (2015). *Are reading and behavior problems risk factors for each other?* Retrieved July 15, 2018 From <http://europepmc.org/articles/PMC4422059> Are reading and behavior problems risk factors for each other?
- Hausheer, R.; Hansen A., and Doumas,D. (N.D.). *Improving reading fluency and comprehension among elementary students: evaluation of a school remedial reading program*. Retrieved July 21, 2018. From <http://jsc.montana.edu/articles/v9n9.pdf>
- Hudson, R.; Lane, H. and Pullen, P. (2005). *Reading fluency assessment and instruction:What,.why and how?* Retrieved July 28, 2018 From http://fcrr.org/publications/publicationspdfs/hudson_lane_pullen_readingfluency_2005.pdf
- Hulya,K. (2012). *Improving reading skills through effective reading strategies*. Retrieved July 16, 2018 From https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257718591_Improving_Reading_Skills_Through_Effective_Reading_Strategies.
- Lawson, K. (2012). *The real power of parental reading aloud: exploring the affective and attentional dimensions*. Australian Journal of Education 56(3), 257. Retrieved July 20, 2018 From <http://Gogalegroup.com>



- Linnakyla, P., Malin, A., Taube, K. (2004). *Factors behind low reading literacy achievement*. Scandinavian Journal of Education Research, 48, 231-248.
- Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Luz, J.M. (2007). *A nation of nonreaders*. Retrieved July 10, 2018. From <http://pcij.org/stories/a-nation-of-nonreaders/>.
- McCardle, P., Scarborough, H. S., Catts, H. W. (2001). *Predicting, explaining, and preventing children's reading difficulties*. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 16, 230-239
- Nelson-Royes, Andrea M. (2012). *Transforming early learners into superb readers*, Rowman & Littlefield Education, Lanham. New York.
- Roberts, J., Jurgens, J. & Burchinal, M. (2005). *The role of home literacy practices in preschool children's language and emergent literacy skills*. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research. 48(2), 345-359
- Roskos Kathleen, Neuman Susan B. (2014). *Best practices in reading: A 21st century skill update*. The Reading Teacher, 67(7), 507–511. doi: 10.1002/trtr.1248
- Therrien, W. J. (2004). *Fluency and comprehension gains as a result of remedial reading*. Remedial and Special Education, 25, 252-261.
- Wanzek, J., & Vaughn, S. (2008). *Response to varying amounts of time in reading intervention for students demonstrating insufficient response to intervention*. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 41, 126–142.