chapter 2

Beginning an Intervention Plan

Jerome is a struggling fourth-grade reader. His current reading proficiency is more similar to a beginning second-grader than a mid-year fourth-grader. It’s not that Jerome cannot read. He can. But he cannot read fourth-grade–level texts.
He cannot read fourth-grade texts accurately. He cannot read the texts fluently. He cannot read the texts with comprehension. Nonetheless, Jerome has a backpack full of fourth-grade–level texts. He has a fourth-grade reading anthology, science book, and social studies book, and a fourth-grade–level novel, *James and The Giant Peach*, that his district expects all fourth-graders to complete.

But Jerome cannot read any of these books. So why would anyone have given Jerome books that he or she must know Jerome cannot read? Why doesn’t Jerome have a desk filled with books written at a second-grade level that cover the core curriculum content for fourth grade? It isn’t that such texts are not available. It isn’t that such texts are substantially more expensive than purchasing hard books that Jerome cannot read.

So why is Jerome’s backpack filled with books he cannot read? I will argue it is primarily because school districts have come to think of intervention for struggling readers as something accomplished in a session outside

> Good intervention design must include a focus on classroom reading lessons.
the classroom, a session one period long, a session taught by someone other than Jerome’s classroom teacher. School districts have adopted this model, I believe, because federal education policy has long supported such designs (Allington, 2006a).

The current situation in many schools is that struggling readers participate in 30 to 60 minutes of appropriate reading intervention instruction and then spend the remaining five hours a day sitting in classrooms with texts they cannot read, cannot learn to read from, cannot learn science or social studies from (Allington, 2002d). If we enter any school and select any struggling reader (a remedial reader, a pupil with a learning disability, an English language learner) to observe in a general education classroom—a student like Jerome—we typically find that the student has a desk (or a backpack, or a locker) filled with books he or she cannot read. In other words, most struggling readers find themselves spending most of the school day in learning environments that no theory or empirical evidence suggests are likely to lead to any substantial learning.

**Why Struggling Readers Usually Continue to Struggle Year after Year**

If struggling readers are provided with appropriate instruction only 10 percent of the school day (30 minutes of intervention), one doesn’t need to hire a consultant to determine why these struggling readers fail to exhibit the accelerated reading growth that is necessary for them to catch up with their better reading peers. One doesn’t need to hire a consultant to determine why certain subgroups fail to make adequate yearly progress if a school’s intervention design results in students from these subgroups sitting daily in classrooms with books on their desks that they cannot read.

In every case, such as Jerome’s, struggling readers have been improving their reading skills at the rate of less than one year per every year of school. This occurs even when these students participate in an intervention. The crux of the problem for schools is that Congress has mandated that we figure out
how to double or triple their rate of learning to read. That is, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) requires that educators do something that will dramatically enhance the development of reading proficiency for any and all students who are currently reading below grade level. Although I have been a critic of the NCLB law (Allington, 2002a), I must note that this focus on accelerating the development of reading proficiency is both research based and necessary. In other words, most schools have implemented some sort of plan that provides struggling readers with a type of intervention but not with the kind of intervention (or classroom lessons) that is likely to dramatically accelerate reading development. In Jerome’s case, and most others, he gets some appropriate reading instruction, but he gets less than half as much as his achieving classmates do because his only appropriate reading instruction comes during the 30-minute daily intervention session. Certainly 30 minutes daily is better than no appropriate reading instruction but still far less than is provided to the on-level and above-level readers in his school. No one should think that the school has designed anything for Jerome that is likely to help him catch up his reading skills. Jerome, like most poor readers will simply continue to fall further and further behind each year, even with the intervention effort.

**Time to end one-size-fits-all interventions**

None of the intervention programs were equally effective for all of the children studied. There may be individual characteristics of children that predispose them to more or less success with a particular program. Research examining this possibility is underway, but it’s already clear that we need to move away from a “one-size-fits-all” mentality and apply continuous assessment approaches that evaluate how well an instructional program is working with particular youngsters. (Lyon et al., 2001, p. 277)

What is worse, in too many schools even the supplemental reading instruction is designed to use classroom curriculum texts—that science book or reading anthology or trade book—that the struggling reader cannot
read. In other words, the intervention design is one that expects the reading specialists and special education teachers to use the classroom texts in the supplemental intervention lessons (O’Connor, Bell, Harty, Larkin, Sackor, & Zigmond, 2002). This design calls for kids like Jerome to take their classroom textbooks with them when they travel to the special education resource or remedial reading room. Or the design is based on the premise that the specialist teachers will use these textbooks when working with struggling readers in the general education classroom.

No matter, it seems, that those texts are inevitably too difficult. No matter that effective lesson design always begins with selecting texts that are of an appropriate level of difficulty given the skills and development of the learner. This basic design flaw prevails even though we have compelling research evidence demonstrating that using classroom texts—too hard texts—in interventions produces little or no benefit (Allington, 2006c). In a study by O’Connor and colleagues (2002) we see yet another demonstration that using grade-level classroom texts with the truly struggling readers simply doesn’t work. On the other hand, O’Connor and colleagues demonstrated that using appropriately difficult texts, books at the students’ reading level, produced substantive reading growth. Recently, Mathes and colleagues demonstrated that pairing effective supplementary reading instruction with appropriate classroom lessons produces even better gains (Mathes, Denton, Fletcher, Anthony, Francis, & Schatsneider, 2005). None of these findings should be surprising, however. What should be surprising is finding so many schools that still provide struggling readers with texts that are too hard, day after day, in subject after subject.

As a first and most minimal step, we must ensure that supplementary reading interventions for struggling readers are designed in a manner consistent with the scientific evidence. That means, again at minimum, we would not be expecting special education or remedial reading teachers to use the too difficult general education texts that many struggling readers are provided. Instead, struggling readers must be given texts that are appropriately difficult, given their level of reading development. Intervention lessons will incorporate these appropriate texts into the core intervention design.

Whenever possible we might select intervention texts that also link to the grade-level curriculum goals and standards (Gelzheiser, 2005; Mathson, 2006). If the social studies focus in the general education classroom is on
state or provincial history, we can work to select texts on those topics that
are written at a level that is appropriate for the struggling readers from that
classroom. If the language arts curriculum includes the study of biography as
a genre, we can locate biographies of appropriate difficulty for use with the
struggling readers. In many respects this should be largely the responsibility
of the general education staff, but in too many school districts there seems to
be scant recognition of any responsibility for supplying appropriate texts for
struggling readers. Thus, it may fall to specialist teachers to locate such texts,
hopefully in collaboration with the general education teachers who also teach
the struggling readers. The goal is to ensure that struggling readers have texts
in their hands, all day long, that they can read — texts they can learn science
and social studies content from, texts they can learn to read from, texts that
are at an appropriate level of complexity.

An Evidence-Based Intervention
Effort Is Not Enough

Thinking that supplemental reading interventions alone are the solution to
the problems exhibited by struggling readers must be reconsidered. It isn’t
that such interventions are unnecessary but that they are simply insufficient.
All kids, but the focus here is on a certain group of children, need books they
can read — accurately, fluently, and with strong comprehension — in their
hands all day long in order to exhibit maximum educational growth.

This means that school districts cannot continue to rely on one-size-
fits-all curriculum plans and a daily, single period, supplemental intervention
if accelerating academic development of struggling readers is their goal.
Districts cannot simply purchase grade-level sets of materials — reading
anthologies, science books, social studies books — and hope to achieve the
goal of accelerating academic development of students who struggle with
schooling. There is nothing “scientific” about a decision that content
teachers will be provided with 25 copies of grade-level texts. There is no
scientific evidence that putting all students in a single instructional material
results in anything other than many students being left behind (Allington,
2002d).
Likewise, districts cannot develop a single intervention design, especially one that relies heavily on a single commercial product and material. There is no reason to expect that any single intervention focus will be appropriate for all students who struggle with reading. Some struggling readers do have underdeveloped decoding proficiencies, for instance, but a greater number can decode accurately yet understand little of what they read (Buly & Valencia, 2002; Pinnell et al., 1995; Leach, Scarborough, & Rescorda, 2003). Some comprehend narrative texts far more easily than informational texts. Some exhibit dramatic limits in the number of word meanings they know. Some seem to be able to locate literal information in a text but cannot summarize that same text or synthesize it with other texts previously read. Struggling readers vary on many dimensions, and schools that simply view intervention as requiring all struggling readers to spend 30 minutes each day working with a single product or material will leave many students behind. As NICHD researcher Donna Scanlon has noted,

However, there are now packaged programs on the market that do not encourage the kind of individualization and responsiveness that characterizes our instructional approach. . . . Cycling students through programs that are not responsive to their needs has the potential to lead to more children being identified as learning disabled rather than fewer. (“New York State Reading Association,” 2007, p. 11)

There is no evidence to suggest that effective teaching does not always involve selecting and using curriculum materials appropriate to the academic development of the student. In studies of the nation’s most effective teachers, those teachers routinely created “multi-sourced, multi-level” curriculum plans (Allington & Johnston, 2002; Keene, 2002; Langer, 2001) that provided struggling readers in those classrooms with books they could successfully read. That was one of the reasons that struggling readers thrived in their classrooms. I worry that in too many districts struggling readers will continue to struggle because intervention has not been planned as an all-day-long affair. I worry that too many struggling readers spend their days in classrooms using one-size-fits-all curriculum plans—plans that fail to come even close
to “fitting” the struggling readers in the classrooms, plans that fail the evidence-based criteria.

The most powerful intervention designs begin by focusing on the match between the student and curriculum material, all day long. The traditional intervention design often allowed the district to adopt a single fourth-grade social studies textbook—a book almost always too difficult for struggling readers to learn social studies from (Chall & Conard, 1991). And with the single text adoption, we almost always see whole-class instruction, which is the least effective method of teaching. However, when districts begin to consider an all-day-long intervention design, we see an emphasis on adopting multi-
level texts as the basic curriculum. And then we more often see small group instruction common in daily practice. When districts emphasize intervention all day long, we see an increase in side-by-side teaching as teachers spend more time instructing and monitoring individual students. Using multilevel texts in a multisourced curriculum plan literally requires a move away from whole-class lesson designs.

How classroom instruction is organized is also important. The more effective classrooms have a distribution of whole-class, small group, and side-by-side instruction (Pressley, 2006; Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 2000). The more effective schools simply have more classrooms where whole-class lessons do not dominate. The proportion of the school day allotted to whole-class instruction is a predictor of a school’s academic achievement. The more whole-class teaching offered, the lower the academic achievement in that school.

Looking at Your School’s Instructional Responses to Struggling Readers

We know a lot about effective instruction for struggling readers. To see how well some of the most basic evidence-based principles have been implemented in your school, I’ve developed two simple data-gathering tools. The first provides data on whether struggling readers in your school have books in their hands that they can read—books that allow struggling readers to learn science and social studies content and that also foster reading growth. The data you can gather using this tool will provide insight on how well your school is responding to the needs of struggling readers.

The second tool provides a snapshot of how lessons are organized in your school. Basically, this tool allows you to examine the distribution of whole-class, small group, and side-by-side lessons in general education classrooms. The organization of instruction is another important factor in how responsive the general education classroom lessons are to the needs of struggling readers. It seems necessary to examine the nature of classroom instruction along with reorganizing the school’s reading intervention program.
These two tools provide some very basic information about the lives of struggling readers in your building or district. By beginning with the quality of classroom instruction, you can begin at the root of the problem. Ignoring the quality of classroom instruction provided to struggling readers omits most of their school day from any plan to help these kids catch up with their peers. Omitting 5 of the 6 hours a day that struggling readers spend in school is a bad plan. Next, both of the data-gathering tools are described and their use detailed.

**Reader/Text Matching Tool**

Begin by gathering the materials listed in the Reader/Text Matching list. Now create a list of all of the struggling readers who attend your school. This list would include those pupils with disabilities and English language learners who exhibit reading difficulties, as well as any student enrolled in a remedial reading program. Once you have the list of struggling readers created, select a 10 percent random sample from the struggling readers attending your school. The easiest method is simply to print out a list of the struggling readers and then select every tenth student on that list.

Figure 2.1 provides an example from a small-town elementary school with 54 struggling readers. I created the tally worksheet simply by drawing 5 columns of roughly equal width for recording data for each student. The goal is a representative sample of struggling readers. The 5 students at James...
Elementary School were selected from the 54 students who were receiving Title I remedial reading and resource room special education services.

Once the five students had been selected, I met with each student and spent 15 to 20 minutes with each, collecting words correct per minute (wcpm), accuracy, and fluency data using instructional texts found in each student’s desk. I selected four texts for each student (e.g., a core reading anthology, a science book, a social studies book, and so on).

Following the general guidelines for collecting wcpm data, I then had each student read aloud for one minute from each text. I selected where they began to read and marked that spot with a light slash mark. At the end of the minute I placed a slash mark at that point where the student was when the one-minute timer sounded. Later, I counted the total words read during

> Figure 2.1  Reader-text inventory for struggling readers at James Elementary School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>WCPM</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Appropriate Books %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malik 2</td>
<td>31 40</td>
<td>88 91</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 44</td>
<td>92 94</td>
<td>P F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simone 3</td>
<td>48 49</td>
<td>92 92</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 45</td>
<td>93 87</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney 3</td>
<td>61 44</td>
<td>94 89</td>
<td>F P</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52 51</td>
<td>91 92</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell 4</td>
<td>63 71</td>
<td>88 93</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 77</td>
<td>94 92</td>
<td>F F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RaShonda 5</td>
<td>69 73</td>
<td>90 92</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81 76</td>
<td>93 92</td>
<td>F F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the one-minute period and then subtracted all the words that were mispronounced (creating the wcpm data).

While the student read aloud, I kept track of the number of misreadings on my fingers. What you need to keep track of is how many words are misread or simply skipped. When the reading was finished, I put that number on a sticky note and stuck it on the page the student read. I also indicated the fluency rating on the sticky note.

Fluency ratings follow a simple scheme: Good means the student read in phrases with expression. Fair means the student read in phrases but without much expression. Poor means the student typically read word-by-word with little phrasing or expression.

I used the total number of words read in each book and the errors recorded for each text to calculate the wcpm and accuracy data (Mercer & Mercer, 2001) and entered them, along with the fluency rating, on the worksheet (see James Elementary School example).

After the data for each student were gathered, calculated, and entered onto the sheet, I could complete the final column on the worksheet. The key question this procedure tries to answer is: How many of the struggling readers have classroom texts appropriate to their level of reading development?

On the James Elementary School worksheet I derived the percentage data in the final column by looking at how many books could be read at an appropriate wcpm, the average rate for a typical reader at each grade level (Hiebert & Fisher, 2006), and with a 99 percent accuracy and with Fair to Good fluency. This is the traditional independent level—the level of difficulty where students can typically be expected to read a text and understand, or learn, its content with little teacher support (Walker, 2004). This accuracy level may seem high, but consider that a typical fourth-grade novel, say historical fiction, will have between 250 and 300 running words on each page. A 2 percent error rate (98 percent accuracy) means that 5 or 6 words will be misread or unreadable on every page! In a 20-page chapter, the student would encounter 100 to 120 words he or she cannot read. And fourth-grade school textbooks have twice as many words per page, creating the possibility that a reader reading at 98 percent accuracy would be unable to correctly read 10 to 12 words per page, or 200+ words per chapter. That is a lot of words to miss even if accuracy seems high. Using the 99 percent accuracy standard reduces the number of errors above by half—a much more manageable number.
As illustrated in Figure 2.1, struggling readers at James Elementary School are in trouble. None of the struggling students has even a single book that would be considered an appropriate level of complexity. In other words, 100 percent of the texts these students were given are simply too hard for them to learn to read or for them to learn content. Few of these struggling readers are likely to exhibit accelerated reading development, regardless of the nature of the supplemental reading intervention programs they participate in. Most of them are unlikely to acquire much science or social studies knowledge—unlikely because these struggling readers have books in their hands that they cannot learn to read from and that they cannot learn social studies or science or literature from.

Every school should conduct such an assessment of the match between reading levels and the texts students have in their desks. You will need a good idea of the quality of daily instruction each and every struggling reader receives and looking at the reader-text match is a fairly easy way to do that. The question of who will gather such data in your school is up to you. Perhaps a school administrator could do the data collection or one of the specialist teachers.

Here I focused simply on a small group of struggling readers. I selected a 10 percent random sample of the struggling readers because I was interested in developing a data gathering procedure that could be completed in a single morning. You may have a substantially larger number of struggling readers in your building or want to evaluate the matches for a larger percentage of struggling readers. Just remember that you do not usually need to know the reader-text match for every struggling reader. Instead, the goal is to gather sufficient data to draw some firm conclusions about the nature of the classroom lessons these kids are participating in, all day long.

Classroom Lessons Organization Tool

Next, you might gather data on general education classroom lesson organization and delivery. To do this I prepared a second data sheet (see Figure 2.2) using some of the same materials used to create the reader/text matching tool. This sheet has five columns. The first column is a listing of each of the general education classrooms at James Elementary School. The second column is where you mark when you observe a whole class lesson; the third
### Figure 2.2  Instructional groupings at James Elementary School during the week of January 5 through 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom</th>
<th>Whole Class</th>
<th>Small Group</th>
<th>Side-by-Side</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ka</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>K K</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kb</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>K K K K K K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School: **James Elementary**  
Date: **January 5 - 9**
column is where you note observing a small group lesson. The fourth column is where you indicate having observed side-by-side teaching (this is when the teacher is working with an individual student). The final column lists the percentage of observations that whole-class lessons were observed.

The data displays in Figure 2.2 were developed from twice-daily quick classroom observations done over the period of one week. In other words, I asked the principal to walk through the building twice each day (varying the time of day the walk-throughs occurred). On each walk-through, she simply entered each classroom and observed the lesson delivery. Then she placed the tally mark in the appropriate column (WC = whole class, SG = small group, S×S = side-by-side). At the end of the week it was obvious that too many teachers delivered too many lessons in whole-group formats.

In other words, little balance in lesson organization was observed in many classrooms, but other classroom teachers did vary the instructional delivery. Research indicates that all students, but especially struggling readers, benefit greatly from this balanced instructional delivery approach (Allington & Johnston, 2002; Pressley, 2006; Taylor et al., 2000).

**The Case of James Elementary School**

It would be tough to be a struggling reader at James Elementary School, regardless of how effectively designed the intervention programs might be. It would be tough because the best most struggling readers can hope for is one short period daily of effective instruction offered in the intervention programs (and five longer periods where too-hard texts will limit the possibility of learning content or learning to read). Given the focus on whole-class lessons, where everyone is provided the same grade-level text, struggling readers at James Elementary spend most of their school day (4 to 5 hours) sitting in instructional environments that no theory nor any empirical evidence suggests will advance their academic development.

Unfortunately, no intervention product or package will have much impact on the outcomes for the struggling readers at James Elementary School. This school will continue to fail to meet the federal adequate yearly progress (AYP) goals for their economically disadvantaged students and their pupils with disabilities. In too many schools like James Elementary, there will be a gnashing of teeth and strident complaining that it is not fair to expect all
students to achieve. No one at James Elementary School or at schools like James Elementary seems to have a clue as to why struggling readers struggle so at their school. No one.

The staff at James Elementary wonder why struggling readers who are lucky to be participating a daily, very small group, personalized reading intervention sessions still never seem to catch up with their achieving peers. No one seems to notice that it is only during that single period each day that the struggling readers are provided with texts and lessons that theory and research support. The other 5 hours each day are largely comprised of texts and lessons that are over their heads. The other 5 hours each day offer lessons that work best for the highest achieving students and don’t work at all to help those students who struggle.

No one should expect struggling readers to double or triple their rate of reading acquisition if educators create schools where these children spend most of their time in classrooms where the texts are too hard for them to read. Struggling readers need a full day of powerful and appropriate instructional activities. Before designing your intervention effort, evaluate how many struggling readers will be struggling all day long because they have texts in their hands they cannot read.

Summary

There has been much concern for a focus on “scientific” reading instruction as the best path to ameliorating the inequities in reading achievement typically observed in schools. I support that focus. But little of the guidance provided thus far has focused on the critical factors of reader/text matches and the organizational delivery of classroom instruction. We have had evidence for some 60 years about the importance of these aspects of instructional design (Betts, 1946). Yet, as I walk through schools, even those with substantial federal funding, I too often see classrooms stocked with textbooks that are simply inappropriately difficult for some, if not many, of the students. I too commonly observe a steady reliance on whole-class lessons using these one-size-fits-all curriculum materials. I walk through schools where the only appropriate reading instruction struggling readers receive is that single
period each day of supplemental reading instruction. And in these schools no one seems to have noticed that most struggling readers spend most of their school day in instructional environments where no theory would predict they would learn very much.

This is not rocket science. We need to reconceptualize interventions for struggling readers as something that must occur all day long. Intervention cannot just consist of a few minutes working with a specialist teacher. All students need texts of an appropriate level of complexity all day long to thrive in school. In too many schools the texts in students’ hands are appropriate for the highest-achieving half of the students. In too many schools we have a curriculum plan that ensures the rich get richer because it is only the best readers who have books in their hands that they can read accurately, fluently, and with understanding. Only the better readers can learn from these books.

When we redesign schools so all students have backpacks (or lockers) full of books they can read accurately, fluently, and with comprehension, we will have schools where fewer students struggle. Only when students have books they can read in their hands all day long can we expect supplemental interventions to make any difference.

Once we have a more differentiated set of curriculum materials, then we might expect a better balance of whole-class, small group, and side-by-side lessons. All students benefit from small group and side-by-side teaching, but it is the struggling readers who seem to benefit most. Perhaps it is because it is these students who have the greatest need for explicit teaching and scaffolded instructional support. It is the struggling learners who are the most instructionally needy and thus benefit the most from the more personalized instruction.

Recent federal legislation has placed a new accountability pressure on U.S. schools to demonstrate that instruction benefits all students relatively equally. Most schools currently work better for higher-achieving students than for lower-achieving students. In other words, some students grow more academically each year and others grow less. In most schools struggling readers fall further behind each year. These schools work better for the higher-achieving students because the curriculum materials and instructional plans are best suited to the needs of those students. Unless that trend ends, many schools will face federal sanctions for failing to create schools that work well for every student.
For too long we have focused our attention primarily on the nature and effects of supplementary intervention programs as one way to address the needs of struggling readers. For too long we have labeled struggling readers and focused on their weaknesses as the root of the problem. Until we recognize that appropriate instruction has to be available to struggling readers all day long, it is unlikely we will meet the challenges of the new legislation and the moral obligation to end the struggles of our struggling readers. Until schools are organized in ways that ameliorate the struggles student face, rather than create those struggles for them, too many students will be left behind.