University of Northern Iowa

UNI ScholarWorks

2023

Understanding Student Perceptions of Supplemental Instruction: Student Perceptions of Supplemental Instruction Implemented in Order to Overcome Perceived Skill Deficits

Andrew Miehe
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Understanding Student Perceptions of Supplemental Instruction: *Student*

Perceptions of Supplemental Instruction Implemented in Order to Overcome Perceived

Skill Deficits

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Andrew Miehe

University of Northern Iowa

December 2023

Abstract

Supplemental instruction has become so prevalent that it is simply a thing educators do to students without the students' input or their understanding of its purpose. This prevalence combined with a lack of understanding on the part of the students could create problems around programmatic success and student motivation in addition to the potential of limiting access to coursework. Due to the fact that there is not an abundance of research focused on the student perceptions of supplemental instruction there is consensus that this perspective is often absent despite its critical role (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012).

The proliferation of supplemental programming would indicate that these measures are necessary though the programming is not the success that educators had hoped for despite the dedication of countless resources in the forms of time, staffing, curriculum, and training. One missing element to the work has been the inclusion of student perspectives in the planning and implementation of supplemental programming.

This qualitative study looks to dig deeper into student perspectives regarding multiple aspects of supplemental instruction including the identification process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity for students involved in supplemental programming to access other course offerings. Data was collected through the use of classroom observations, artifact collection, and focus group interviews. This data was then analyzed and is presented in a descriptive qualitative study focusing on the phenomenon of supplemental instruction through the perspectives of students enrolled in a comprehensive urban high school in the midwestern United States.

This Study by: Andrew Miehe

Entitled: Understanding Student Perceptions of Supplemental Instruction

has been approved as meeting the dissertation requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Education

_____   _____
Date   Dr. Matt Townsley, Chair, Dissertation Committee

_____   _____
Date   Dr. Scott Ellison Dissertation Committee Member

_____   _____
Date   Dr. Kenneth Hayes, Dissertation Committee Member

_____   _____
Date   Dr. Shuaib Meacham, Chair, Recital Committee

_____   _____
Date   Dr. Stephanie Huffman, Dean, Graduate College

Dedication

I am dedicating this project to my family. My wife Christa has always seen strengths and potential in me that I am unable to see myself. Her support and love are why I continued to work to the end of this project. There were times when I am certain I was not present as needed or I was difficult to deal with. When I was diving into research or struggling through another night class Christa always encouraged me to stay the course and continue the work and I am forever grateful for her support. One of the greatest moments of this journey was walking out of the Schindler building after completing my successful defense to see Christa parked next to my car - she has a knack for the perfect surprise.

Our amazing kids Evangeline and Clark have also been a part of this team from the beginning and their support and encouragement certainly kept me going forward when it would have been easy to fold. They endured jumbled schedules, missing dad at games and practices, late pick ups, missed events, and cold dinners while I completed this project and they never complained once. They both encouraged me to finish and in turn taught me a lesson about commitment and perseverance that I hope they are able to apply to their own journeys.

I am more proud of these three individuals than they will ever know and I appreciate all that they have done to help me get to the end of this particular adventure. Thanks kids and Christa for your constant support and encouragement, without the three of you pushing me I may have stepped off the train and not continued my journey.

Acknowledgements

Beginning at the University of Northern Iowa twenty five years ago as an undergraduate student transferring from a community college I have never been treated as anything other than a scholar and I am grateful for this welcoming and enlightening environment. This journey has included many amazing instructors and I would be remiss in not acknowledging Dr. Denise Schares, Dr. Dewitt Jones, and Dr. Kim Huckstadt for jump starting my Ed.D pursuit.

I would also like to acknowledge my dissertation committee consisting of committee chair Dr. Matt Townsley, Methodologist Dr. Scott Ellison, and members Dr. Kenneth Hayes and Dr. Shuaib Meacham. Dr. Townsley's high energy and naturally caffeinated approach to learning along with his consistent encouragement when I felt that the work had stalled or my enthusiasm for the project was non-existent surely pulled me along to the end of the journey and I cannot thank him enough. Dr. Ellison's guidance and enthusiasm for qualitative research directed to the betterment of education and educators throughout my Ed.D programming is also appreciated. His intellectual approach to all things related to this project and his consistent questioning and reframing of ideas truly pushed me. I very much appreciate Dr. Ellison's acceptance of me as a scholar and colleague in this work.

I would also like to acknowledge Kat Wohlpart, her eagle eye and commitment to detail has helped me polish this finished product and I so appreciate her expertise, thanks Kat, UNI and their students and faculty are lucky to have you on their team.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

The objective of this qualitative study is to investigate student perspectives on the use of supplemental instruction as a method to increase student achievement and close skill gaps. Through the execution of a qualitative research project employing a descriptive qualitative study focused on the phenomenon of supplemental instruction from student perspectives, the research will reveal areas of improvement that will benefit both students and educational leaders. Supplemental instruction has become so prevalent that it is simply a thing educators do to students without the students' input or understanding of the supplemental instruction's purpose (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012). This prevalence and lack of understanding may combine to create problems around ineffective resource allocation, decreased student motivation, and at times may restrict student access to alternative coursework.

Supplemental instruction is employed throughout the public-school system in the United States. Simply stated, supplemental instruction is any instruction that takes place either in addition to or after initial instruction has taken place. Tier two supplemental instruction is targeted instruction focused on remediation for small groups of students, in most cases this tiered level of instruction would support roughly fifteen percent of a school or grade level's total population (Burns, 2008). Lastly, tier three focuses on individualized and intensive instruction employing problem solving models (Burns, 2008).

Student perspectives regarding supplemental instruction, the identification process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity to explore other

course offerings are the focal points of this research. It is believed that a better understanding of these critical elements could lead to changes in practice that will ultimately benefit students in similar settings.

This qualitative study looks to dig deeper into student perspectives regarding multiple aspects of supplemental instruction including the identification process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity for students involved in supplemental programming to access other course offerings. Data was collected through the use of classroom observations, artifact collections, and focus group interviews. This data was then analyzed and presented in a descriptive qualitative study focusing on the phenomenon of supplemental instruction through the perceptions of students enrolled in a comprehensive urban high school in the midwestern United States.

Statement of the Problem

Imagine working in an urban comprehensive high school as a beginning teacher. It becomes clear that there are students who are not being successful and those students could benefit from additional support. Those struggling students are given additional coursework, additional instructional support, and additional time in core instructional areas yet they are still not successful based on the current measures. The urban classroom teacher sees the need for something to change but simply cannot fathom taking on this charge alone as it feels overwhelming. The educator sees the need for programmatic reform but wonders how the students feel about their placement in supplemental instruction. Does this supplemental instruction feel punitive? Is it helpful? Are these students motivated to succeed in this supplemental setting?

Fast forward twenty-two years and that same educator finds themselves as the leader of a large urban high school. The concerns around some students' inability to be successful using current measures coupled with their continued exposure to more time, more instructional support, and more resources still exist. The difference is that with many more years of experience a new lens can be applied to the problem. It is clear that the students' perceptions about this assistance or their identification as being in need of this assistance have not been solicited. As an administrator the educator now has control over factors such as the master schedule, staffing, curriculum, programming, and resource allocations. It is time to act and work to find ways to make supplemental instruction a successful experience for students.

How as educators, and more specifically as urban educational leaders in the United States, can we work to help students dig their way out of a position of inferiority perpetuated through the use of programming in the form of "Response to Intervention" or "Multi-Tiered Systems of Support"? Perceived skill gaps and opportunity gaps need to be focused on and closed with a mindfulness as to how we will give all students every opportunity to achieve at the same levels of success as their peers. In this research there will be a continued focus on student perspectives regarding supplemental instruction, the selection process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity to explore other course offerings.

In light of perceived skill gaps and overall performance concerns, legislators have assisted in the creation of federal programs such as No Child Left Behind and the Every Student Succeeds Act. No Child Left Behind was signed into law in 2002 and was an

update to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. This put nearly forty years between federal acts to update and reform schools and, unfortunately, No Child Left Behind was not able to meet its goal of one hundred percent proficiency in all schools (Public School Review, 2022). Though the reform efforts of No Child Left Behind were well intended and did focus on closing achievement gaps for all students, the federal program fell short of its goal of one hundred percent proficiency rates for all students. After thirteen years No Child Left Behind was replaced with the Every Student Succeeds Act. This update to legislation provided support to high schools who were graduating two-thirds or fewer of their students and provided support to schools with traditionally underserved populations who were underperforming (Public School Review, 2022). One major difference between No Child Left Behind and Every Student Succeeds was that the latter granted the ability of the individual school districts and buildings to identify and implement the reforms they believed would help their students be successful.

Although the efforts of No Child Left Behind and the Every Student Succeeds Act were well intended and each included assistance as well as a focus on all students, the success of each of these efforts has been limited. The Every Student Succeeds Act has a strong relationship with supplemental instruction, explicitly being tied to the multi-tiered systems of support for decision makers model of supplemental instruction (National Association of School Psychologists, 2022*).* Large sweeping reforms such as these can, at times, feel overwhelming and difficult to implement at the grassroots or building level. It is this feeling of helplessness that contributes to public school leaders looking for answers and guidance in their work to educate and empower classroom teachers and in turn help students grow academically.

Skill gaps have been a focus area in education research for decades (Gregory et al., 2010). These gaps appear to have a multitude of potential causes which makes it difficult to identify reforms and strategies that are effective and sustainable for all students. This is a circumstance that must be addressed considering the strong positive relationship between the amount of time students are engaged in academic learning and the resulting student achievement (Gregory et al., 2010).

When contemplating three thousand years of educational wisdom (Ulich, 2013) it is clear that education, and specifically school reform, is an ongoing process. Some of the reforms are necessitated by a cultural shift in the understanding of education's purpose or goals. Other reforms are made necessary by a change in societal norms and acceptance of programming as it relates to public education's role regarding social justice, inclusion, and equity. To put it simply, educational reform is driven by society's view of education's purpose and those views generally fall into two categories; perpetuating the economic goals of our country, or promoting social justice through equity of opportunity (Dougherty & Lombardi, 2016). The resurgence of career and technical education in the public school system has shown an increased interest in providing employers and businesses with a prepared workforce (Dougherty & Lombardi, 2016). At the same time a highlighted focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion has revived a focus on education as a tool to improve equity through education and opportunity.

Rationale for Dissertation Study

This qualitative study investigates student perspectives regarding multiple aspects of supplemental instruction including the selection process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that

supplemental instruction has on the opportunity for students involved in supplemental programming to access other course offerings. The hope is that this will allow the identification of effective strategies or transferable characteristics that would assist large urban high schools in their search for programming that would effectively close perceived skill gaps for all students.

Targeted supplemental programming in public education typically focuses on the disciplines of reading and math. When research into supplemental instruction takes place, persistently low achievement in reading is frequently evidenced (Cantrell et al., 2016). In 2012, Berkeley et al. explained that over seventy percent of secondary readers require some type of remediation in reading. In 2015, Hunt et al. highlighted the fact that fifty nine percent of fourth grade students were not proficient in mathematics as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 2007, and more recent data would reveal an even larger percentage of students not currently meeting proficiency as measured by this same assessment. Additionally, the National Center for Educational Statistics reports that in 2019 only 41% of fourth grade students and 34% of eighth grade students performed at or above NAEP proficiency in math (National Center for Educational Statistics, n.d.). In regards to reading achievement, the National Center for Educational Statistics reports that in 2019 only thirty five percent of fourth grade students and thirty four percent of eighth grade students performed at or above NAEP proficiency in reading (NAEP, 2021). Research has also produced data to support the fact that literacy gaps widen significantly as students move on to the secondary years (Filderman et al., 2019). Closing achievement gaps, meeting federal mandates regarding student

progress, and school choice legislation have made remediation and supplemental instruction a priority for many school districts (Harding et al., 2012).

For the purpose of this research study, I am engaging in a qualitative look at student perceptions of supplemental instruction as a way to close perceived skill gaps. Working to gain a better understanding of student perceptions of supplemental instruction including their perceptions of the program, their understanding and perspective on the identification process for students, how students feel about being identified as in need of supplemental instruction, and how effective students feel the program is in regards to helping them be successful in the classroom will be the focus.

My Professional Interactions with Supplemental Instruction

The focus of this research will be student perspectives regarding supplemental instruction, the selection process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity to explore other course offerings. My interest in supplemental instruction has always been a factor in my work but my belief in the ability to make a lasting and impactful improvement was minimal prior to the 2019-2020 school year and subsequent shut down in public education due to the Covid pandemic. Once this life changing event took place I noticed a growing need for remediation due to a culmination of factors including but not limited to students' reduced access to content experts during shutdowns, an increase in virtual and self guided online learning, alternating "A/B" schedules, and the shift in priorities for families and students during the pandemic. For many families education and student achievement took a back seat to student health and wellbeing, both mentally and physically. The stars aligned and the timing of these events

shone a spotlight on past practices and strategies used in order to assist students who had perceived skill gaps. With secondary students persistently achieving at low levels and the growing concern over motivation of students (Cantrell et al., 2014) it is critical that student perspectives be considered and solutions be found to help students succeed academically.

Supplemental instruction is employed throughout the public-school system in the United States. Recent trends and a move towards systematic programing such as Response to Intervention (RtI) and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) have highlighted supplemental instruction with three tiers of instruction. There is a more intense focus on two categories; tier two, and tier three (Hunt, 2013). Tier one instruction consists of universal instruction delivered to all students, regardless of proficiency level, focused on a common core curriculum and effective instructional practices (Burns, 2008).

After working in public education for the past 22 years I have been able to witness, participate in, and ultimately influence curriculum and instruction in a variety of settings. Having taught in a behavior focused program, a traditional classroom, and at multiple levels in grades six through twelve I have been able to gain first-hand experience with, and knowledge of, supplemental instruction in the public school setting. I have seen many resources including time, capital, curriculum, and schedule space poured into supplemental instruction with little impact to closing skill gaps for students. I have also seen students subjected to taking additional coursework in a content area that is already frustrating to them which may have created reluctant learners without the desired results of closing skill gaps.

My belief is that educators and students have become so accustomed to the use of supplemental instruction that it is simply a way of doing business. The regularity or normalcy of supplemental instruction has misled or numbed parents and students to the purpose of these interventions. Additionally, I believe that students pay little attention to the implications of being identified as needing additional support. These implications include but are not limited to the loss of access to alternative electives due to a full schedule, a reduction in core credits earned as most supplemental courses are not eligible for core credits, and the tracking that can impact a student's academic career once they are recommended for supplemental instruction.

All of my experiences combined have given me a chance to see the need for understanding and improvement when it comes to the implementation of supplemental instruction. Sustained implementation of supplemental instruction in order to close perceived skill gaps and increase student achievement and proficiency are intriguing to me on many levels. My research is focused on student perspectives regarding supplemental instruction, the identification process that educators use in order to select students for this programming, and how students respond to the programming on a personal level.

The Need for Reform

There exists a cyclical nature regarding the indicators for success. Each year students are being left behind or dismissed as inferior or unequal to their peers, identified as being in need of supplemental support and subjected to programming that the students themselves most often do not fully understand. These assessments and qualifications for a student to be referred to supplemental instruction are often based on metrics such as

average daily attendance, standardized test scores, teacher perceptions on presumed competency, and academic history.

The current investigation of achievement gaps reveals that this concern is truly more of an educational debt owed to students as opposed to a deficit or defect on the part of the students themselves (Annamma et al., 2018). The achievement gaps that educators so often refer to are not usually given an origin, rather solutions are sought to close those gaps in isolation. Additionally, work in reforms such as Response to Interventions and Multi-Tiered Systems of Support are generally focused on the learner as well as the system in which those students are learning which can make it difficult for practitioners to isolate contributing factors. It is important to identify and acknowledge the origins of these gaps, and to include the students' perspectives in order to create impactful reforms, the alternative is our current reality that includes identifying the need for reform and not the root causes.

Barriers to Reform

Pressure groups and public officials frequently press traditional ideas on school boards, administrators, and teachers (Cohen, 1998). Sawchuk (2021) offers that school board meetings have become ground zero for our nation's political and social debates. The nature of our public-school systems in the United States combined with the way these groups are organized may also serve as a barrier to educators' ability to universally implement reform. Being decentralized, fragmented, and sprawling across such a large country (Cohen, 1998) causes difficulty with any uniform effort. The United States is a country that prides itself on the idea of local control and in no other instance is this more evident than our public-school system. It is certainly true that there are federal and state

guidelines that must be adhered to, though beyond these guidelines most districts have the authority and autonomy to create and implement reforms they see as necessary, ignore reforms they do not believe they would benefit from or that do not align with their local interests, and create professional development plans on their own. Local school boards, for instance, are able to adopt textbooks and curriculum, set graduation requirements that may exceed state requirements, approve course offerings, accept contractual agreements between bargaining units, and make a variety of other decisions that do not need approval by any other authority. This local control can be an advantage as some communities look to customize programming, and at the same time it makes uniform reform nearly impossible (Cohen, 1998).

The autonomy of teachers in the classroom is another possible barrier to reform (Cohen, 1998). Classroom teachers have the ability to insert their voice and their biases into their classroom and curriculum daily. The design, style, and implementation of lesson plans is just one area where teachers generally have autonomy to create and use what they are comfortable with, which may not work for all students. Classroom teachers face many challenges and it is sometimes argued that many teachers would engage in reforms but they simply do not have the opportunities or energy to try something new (Cohen, 1998). This attitude or belief is sometimes joined by the "this too shall pass" mantra of classroom teachers who believe reforms are most often going to be ineffective even before those reforms are implemented, if they wait long enough the reform will be discontinued. Classroom teachers have the influence and the ability to be either catalysts or barriers to the success of educational reforms.

Significance of the work

My hope is that this study will result in school leaders making better use of resources and engaging students in conversation in order to increase the effectiveness of educational programming and ultimately making a positive impact on student achievement, by allowing educational leaders in urban high schools to evaluate their current programs for supplemental instruction. I believe this work could also lead to educational leaders making informed decisions that will help their students and instructors achieve their ultimate goal of student success. This work may also provide data that can shape future decisions on supplemental instruction all while ensuring students do not feel their experiences with supplemental instruction are punitive which may lead to increased motivation to succeed as well as the narrowing of skill gaps for those students identified as in need of supplemental instruction.

Closing Achievement Gaps

Knowing that perceived skill gaps exist and understanding that these gaps do not exist due to any type of inherited intelligence nor an accepted definition of the term intelligence (Bell, 1995), addressing these perceived skill gaps has become more important than ever. The failure to narrow these gaps points to a lack of appropriate policy response, the neglect of decades of research across multiple disciplines on child development, and the waste of critical opportunities to close these gaps (Garcia & Weiss, 2015). The opportunities to close these achievement gaps present themselves daily in the public schools of the United States. It is crucial to equip educational leaders and teachers with the strategies that they need to implement in order to help our students to be successful, it is also critical to motivate the students to be successful. Supplemental

instruction has been called upon in many instances to help with this work, Hock and Deshler (2003) explain that students without basic literacy skills need supplemental instruction that is focused on specific skills and sustained in order to help them catch up with their peers. Research suggests that inequalities in opportunity and outcomes begin early and usually persist throughout students' K–12 years and beyond (Garcia & Weiss, 2015). A system of reform to address achievement gaps would require a multifaceted approach including a student perspective.

In many cases, students and their families see the schools themselves as unwelcoming. Obstacles such as language barriers, immigration status, or historically negative interactions keep some families from engaging in school or with school officials (Sosa-Provencio et al., 2018). This information would indicate an opportunity for the inclusion of a student voice. Here again, student perspectives regarding supplemental instruction, the selection process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity to explore other course offerings could help educators make more informed decisions about resource allocation and improve practices. The current study focuses on the following research questions:

Research *Questions*

1. What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?

2. In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?

3. What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?

Theoretical Framework

A social constructivist framework will help guide the research being conducted. Culture and context play a critical role in understanding what takes place in society and in the construction of knowledge (Kim, 2001). The research being conducted asks students to explain their understanding of supplemental instruction and as they have been experiencing this in the social setting of a classroom, within the culture of their peers; therefore, this framework is appropriate. In this research the constructed reality of the participants is critical to the work. The students' beliefs about instructor and peer perceptions of their academic abilities as well as the culture of the supplemental setting will both be a focus of the study. This thinking is relatable to the theories of Vygotsky, Bruner, and Bandura in the area of developmental constructivism (Kim, 2001).

The influence of culture can have a significant impact on learning and how learning occurs, students must have an understanding of themselves as well as those around them in order to begin learning (Powell & Kalina, 2009). This research will specifically focus on students' perceptions of themselves as learners, their beliefs about others' perception of them as learners, and their personal interaction with systemic supplemental instruction. Additionally, the culture of supplemental instruction itself will be investigated through the lens of student participants. Traditional constructivists such as Vygostky (Powell & Kalina, 2009) reinforced this belief that culture influences students and how they learn to a large degree. When looking at the effectiveness of supplemental instruction this framework will be important to keep in mind. Examining student

perspectives, motivation to be successful, and effectiveness of programming will be impacted by the influences that students believe the culture of their program and instruction have on their day to day interactions with supplemental instruction. This will necessitate a look at the culture of the building and programming review which will be done by completing focus group interviews and classroom observations. The communication between students and educational leaders can at times be non-existent which can lead to ineffective programming. Powell and Kalina (2009) explain that communication is a key to student success and that all participants need to be on the same page in their understanding.

Adams (2006) addresses educational interventions and initiatives explaining that though their success is often measured in terms of assessment results there is new thinking focused on a desire to increase the quality of learning, explaining that students need first to learn about learning prior to making sense of their own experiences. This thinking combined with the idea of students needing to know themselves prior to learning explained by Powell and Kalinal (2009) highlights the importance of motivation and more specifically intrinsic motivation for students in regards to their interactions with supplemental instruction. Social Constructivist Christopher M. Clark (1998) explains that learning is both active and social and that the process of learning can feel risky or uncomfortable and these ideas are exactly what this research is meant to explore. Asking students to reflect on their experiences with each other in the supplemental setting, how they feel they perform in these settings academically, and how they believe others perceive their involvement as well as the use of focus groups feed this idea of active social learning. Students have success in settings where they experience trust and care,

mutual respect, reassurance, and challenge (Clark, 1998) and the focus group questions will explore these ideas. The focus group will also allow students to explore the risks they take when working to be successful as well as any uncomfortable feelings they may have about supplemental instruction.

This dissertation will explore relevant literature regarding supplemental instruction while paying special attention to a variety of programming implemented in an effort to increase student achievement. The focus of the literature review will be on instructional delivery methods, the timing of supplemental instruction during the day and whether or not supplemental instruction is mandated as opposed to being encouraged. Following the review of literature will be an outline of the qualitative research approach diving into methodological work. Due to the fact that this research project will depict processes and understandings through detailed description and analysis (Rossman & Rallis, 2017) a descriptive qualitative study will serve as the methodological approach that anchors the research and findings. Once this groundwork has been established the reader will be able to see a shift to the presentation of research collected in the form of focus group data, observation data, and documents relevant to the work collected for research purposes. Finally, there will be a summary of the work complete with implications for future research as well as implications for educational leaders and practitioners in regards to best practices. At the completion of this research, it is the author's intention to draw some conclusions and make recommendations for future research and practical application of the information uncovered.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The focus of this research on supplemental instruction at the secondary level creates some difficulties as the terminology "supplemental instruction" is fairly universal and vague in the educational world. The overall focus on student achievement and student academic success connects all supplemental programming in their purpose and intended outcomes regardless of their design or implementation strategy. Due to the fact that supplemental instruction is connected in its purpose and there exists a proliferation of styles and systems of supplemental instruction. There will be a focus on one system or style of supplemental instruction as the focus of this research, as opposed to multiple styles and systems being explored. The universally focused outcomes of supplemental instruction combined with the proliferation of systems and programs give this particular research an unintended yet welcome exposure to multiple examples and experiences though for the purposes of narrowing the focus this particular research will focus on Reading Workshop which is a supplemental reading program offered during the regularly scheduled school day.

This dissertation will explore relevant literature regarding supplemental instruction while paying special attention to a variety of programming implemented in an effort to increase student achievement. The majority of available literature has a focus on post secondary supplemental instruction. Reviewing literature relevant to supplemental instructional practices requires a dive into the historical context of educational reforms. The focus will be on instructional delivery methods, the timing of supplemental instruction during the day, and whether or not supplemental instruction is mandated as opposed to being encouraged.

The Need for Reform

In 1635, the first free public school supported by taxpayer dollars was opened (Public School Review, 2022). Looking back at nearly 400 years of public education it is understandable to see reforms have been necessary. In addition to the necessity of reforms, the focus of these reforms has changed and continues to evolve over time. Currently, there are concerns generated over the state of education and the inability of our educational system and its leaders to address perceived skill gaps. There have been multiple efforts to change instructional practices (Cohen, 1998) but these efforts are only the beginning of what is necessary to truly achieve reform. These reform efforts can be difficult as the purpose of education can, at times, feel like a moving target. There are times when society has pushed for public education to enlighten the youth of the United States and create life-long learners. At odds with this is a shift to preparing students to play a role in industry by supplying a competent workforce to employers. Both of these theories can be argued as viable outcomes for education and each comes from a different perspective regarding the desire of society in regards to the purpose of education.

Reform Examples

In the United States there have been numerous reforms, or attempts at reforms, over the past one hundred years regarding curriculum and instruction, policies, and programming. These reforms have different goals depending on the framework or purpose of education they are meant to support. Some reforms such as the previously mentioned No Child Left Behind sought to ensure all students scored at high levels on standardized achievement tests while closing achievement gaps. Others such as a recent

rebirth of career and technical education look to supply a workforce to area businesses and increase the graduation rates all while creating economic contributors.

Generally speaking, these reforms take on a fairly "top down" direction as either federal or state governments create programming and mandates that are most often tied to funding. States work to meet these mandates and push them down to the level of individual school districts where there is generally local control. Though the number of reforms and programs can be extensive, most educators and school districts have remained unable to close educational deficits or perceived skill gaps.

Achievement Gaps

Some education researchers such as Gregory et al. (2010) refer to others' work to explain that what is widely referred to as an achievement gap could more properly be termed an educational debt due to the fact that opportunities in the United States have never been equalized for all racial and ethnic groups. In their 2010 journal article, "*The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap: Two Sides of the Same Coin*," Gregory, et al. explain that students who face academic challenges may become frustrated and have a lower confidence level which can combine to create a higher rate of school disruption leading to more incidences of discipline and suspensions.

These achievement gaps or educational deficits are only one indicator of the need for reform in education. Garcia and Weiss (2015) explain in their work that a student's socioeconomic status is one of the most reliable predictors of educational success. The authors point out that there is a strong relationship between social class, test scores, educational attainment, and college attendance and completion. Their article goes on to reference "The Coleman Report" which according to the Civil Rights Act of 1964,

section 402, required that the commissioner of education, James Coleman, conduct a survey and report to the President of the United States and Congress "concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions." The authors continue by explaining that researchers and policymakers have understood the critical impacts of race, poverty, and segregation on educational attainment for decades (Garcia & Weiss, 2015). The persistence of achievement gaps despite the implementation of multiple programs and strategies along with the proliferation of literature to support these gaps suggest a need for reform.

Delivery Methods and Structures

Although there are many studies and journal articles focused on the programmatic details such as instructional delivery methods, the timing of supplemental instruction during the day and whether or not supplemental instruction is mandated or encouraged, there is not a lot of research regarding student perspectives on the topic. Supplemental instruction can be employed through a variety of delivery methods and structures (Harding et al., 2012). These methods range from direct and scripted forms of instruction to a more hands-off student led approach. Berkeley et al. (2012) employed a direct instruction strategy that focused specifically on the use of Corrective Reading as a strategy to improve reading skills. In contrast to a direct instruction approach, a computer-based model with very limited direct instruction has also been employed and reviewed (Burns et al., 2012). In addition to these two seemingly opposite approaches to supplemental instructional strategy, one relying on direct instruction and one relying on individual student-led review, a mixed model approach has also been reviewed. Harding

et al. (2012) saw a mixed model of instruction yield the highest number of hours of participation from its student participants when compared to other models.

The structure of supplemental programming is also an area that currently has available research for review. A review of the literature revealed examples of programming delivered after regular school hours while some districts and school leaders worked to adjust schedules in order to allow for supplemental instruction during the regular school day as a class taken for high school credit (Berkeley et al., 2012). While these programs were requirements, other programs offered supplemental instruction as an additional support students volunteered for outside of the school day (Burns et al., 2012).

Supplemental instruction is employed throughout the public-school system in the United States. Simply stated, this is any instruction that takes place either in addition to or after initial instruction. Tier two supplemental instruction is targeted instruction focused on remediation for small groups of students, in most cases this tiered level of instruction would support roughly fifteen percent of a school or grade level's total population (Burns, 2008). Lastly, tier three focuses on individual and intensive instruction employing problem solving models (Burns, 2008).

Supplemental Models

As discussed previously, there are a multitude of supplemental instructional models that are employed in the secondary setting. Many of these models, if not most, fall under the universal umbrella of response to intervention frequently referred to in books, journals, and scholarly articles as RTI. The term Response to Intervention has been used to describe supplemental instruction at all levels of public education though for this study the focus will be on the secondary level, specifically high school grades nine

through twelve. In 2016 Preston et al. explained that Response to Intervention emerged as a result of the 2004 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The National Center for Response to Intervention goes on to explain this systematic approach to increasing student achievement which outlines three levels or "tiers" of intervention that include a progression where the interventions become more focused and intense as the number of students needing these interventions decreases. This explanation is frequently accompanied by a graphic depiction of a triangle with eighty percent of all students represented in tier one, fifteen percent of all students represented in tier two, and five percent of all students represented in tier three. Response to Intervention involves targeting specific skill areas with increasingly intensive research based interventions in order to eliminate barriers for learners (Bender, 2009).

An evolution of RtI that has been combined with Positive Behaviors Interventions and Supports, or PBIS and has seen an increase in implementation is the Multi Tiered System of Support or MTSS. MTSS has its roots in the data focused practices of RtI offering a multi-tiered system of supports. In MTSS, tier one is focused on school wide, differentiated, universal instruction while tiers two and three focus on increasingly intensive individualized interventions (Batsche, et al. 2005). Torgensen (2007) explained that due to an increasing influence from Response to Intervention and mandates from No Child Left Behind, MTSS and RtI have recently been used interchangeably in the education world.

One obstacle to successful implementation of supplemental instruction has been a lack of research at the secondary level. In 2010, Sansosti et al. explained that despite an increase in the interest of applying response to intervention (RTI) at the secondary level,

research in this domain is not robust. This is of particular interest due to the fact that federal regulations such as the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act as well as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 both include support of the methodologies and practices of response to intervention. Sansosti et al. refer to other experts in the field when they elaborate on the idea that despite the fact that the use of response to intervention practices have taken off and spread "like wildfire" the research to support best practices of implementation for secondary schools is limited at best (p. 2). Other research such as a dissertation completed by Epler-Brooks (2021) also point towards a need for more research on the topic of response to intervention and whether or not it can make an impact on closing achievement gaps. Epler-Brooks goes on to explain that an increase in the use of RTI at the secondary level would definitely support research into its effectiveness at this level in order to better understand how RTI delivery models function at this level and to gain an understanding of the diagnostic practices, strategies and collection of data at the secondary level (p. 3).

After establishing the need for further research into response to intervention through a review of current literature a focus on common barriers to implementation of RTI at the secondary level was identified. Several authors and studies have listed necessary components that must be considered in order for RTI to be effective at the secondary level. Johnson et al. (2009) explain that in order for RTI to be successful a school must not only put the necessary components in place but must also integrate those components (p. 6). The authors go on to list several critical components including a strong general education program, specific interventions focused on targeted skills, an integrated assessment and instruction system, flexibility in scheduling, and the inclusion

of policies to support supplemental instruction, but there is no mention of student perspective or input. Similarly, Sansosti et al. (2010) list six key components to the implementation of a successful RTI model but do not reference student perspectives or input. Additionally, Fullan (2007) identifies multiple factors that can serve as either barriers or facilitators of change in education. As Sansosti et al. further explains and summarizes these barriers and facilitator; these include the characteristics of the change (the need for change, the complexity of change, quality of change), local characteristics (staff beliefs, board decisions, district factors), and external factors (court decisions, legislation, funding), and though that work is comprehensive it does not include any reference to student perspectives.

Despite a concerted effort and focus on the use of evidence-based practices in the implementation of supplemental instruction there remains a lack of successful outcomes for students. Callender (2014) explained that secondary schools may lack clear and effective plans for identifying and implementing interventions for students in need. The author goes on to outline the need for a systemic approach that includes an extensive list of key components that include a system that meets the needs of all students, universal screening and placement of students, differentiated instruction, implementations of research-based strategies, frequent progress monitoring, ongoing professional development, data driven evaluation of programming, and problem-solving teams. Similarities in key components necessary for successful implementation of supplemental instruction include differentiation, universal assessment and identification, and a systematic approach. These authors list their critical elements along with core beliefs

about RTI that should be in place which include a universal system that meets the needs of all students, yet there is not a reference student input.

Johnson et al. (2009) reference a national model RTI site identification project from 2003 that identified similarities in nineteen secondary schools that had seen success implementing RTI and though they shared four characteristics (focus on leader requirements to develop the system, commit to a multi-year process, program evaluation, and improved student outcomes), student input was not one of them. There are now and will continue to be multiple approaches to supplemental instruction as a means to closing achievement gaps and increasing student performance. Through a review of literature, it appears that there is no one formula for success though most programmatic changes would fall under the umbrella of RTI. Knowing this, multiple models were reviewed for this work.

Each of these models, scheduled classes taken for credit, as well as a volunteer after-hours session, were examined with the determination from Burns et al. (2012) that the supplemental instruction would be most effective if it were part of a total system as opposed to an after-hours or voluntary session. Increasing the amount of time allowed for interventions was a suggestion made by Hunt et al. in 2015 and though an increase in the amount of time allowed for interventions is suggested consistently (Duffy, 2007; Hunt et al., 2015; Johnson et al., 2009; Sansosti et al., 2010), there are no quantitative metrics or specific amounts of time suggested. Wilkerson et al.'s (2016) qualitative study regarding methods of delivery noted that the most commonly employed structure reported for supplemental instruction was a specific class focused on remediation scheduled during the regular school day.

The literature suggests that there are some common methods employed in order to identify students as in need of supplemental instruction at all levels. Often these identification methods include a combination of standardized assessments, common formative assessments, and instructor input (Burns, 2012; Cantrell et al., 2014; Harding et al., 2012; Wilkerson et al., 2016). Generally speaking, an assessment score is used to determine whether or not students were in need of supplemental instruction or whether they were placed in the experimental or control group of a study examining the effects of a particular program or strategy. These determinations regarding the need for supplemental instruction are often solidified using standardized test scores generated from assessments such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress, a variety of state assessments including the Maryland State Assessment (Cantrell et al., 2014; Harding et al., 2012; Hunt, 2013) as well as a variety of other assessments focused on specific skills. Berkeley et al. (2012) used data generated from the Test of Word Reading Efficiency as well as the Reading Fluency Benchmark Assessor. These assessments as identification tool commonalities hold true for mathematics as well. Burns et al. (2012) used the STAR math assessment in order to identify students who they believed would benefit from supplemental instruction. A less prevalent methodology for identifying students for supplemental instruction was based on teacher recommendations (Wilkerson et al., 2016). The lack of reliability or validity in a teacher recommendation may limit this method's use.

Assessment Tools Employed for Supplemental Instruction

When looking at the selection of assessment tools used for supplemental instruction, reliability and validity would be considered to be previously established on

state and national standardized tests. This established reliability and validity explain the prevalence of standardized assessments in the literature as it eliminates either the need to create an assessment or the need to evaluate an already existing assessment. This is true at all grade levels as the identification procedures are similar regardless of grade level. Additionally, it is suggested that a combination of measures including curriculum-based assessment, computer adaptive testing, and mastery measures be used together in order to provide the most holistic view of student progress (Filderman et al., 2019). Assessment tools such as the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills also include a variety of measures and are used to establish baseline data as well as monitor progress (Pindiprolu & Forbush, 2009). Cantrell et al. (2013) described using both quantitative data as well as qualitative data reviewing motivation to measure success of supplemental instruction. This variety and combination of measures offer a robust look at the effectiveness of supplemental programming. One potential drawback to the use of combined measures is the reduction in opportunities for identification or isolation of contributing factors to success or failure. With most studies using a classic experimental design the employment of mixed measures may make identification of the cause and effect relationship more difficult.

A Variety of Methodologies

Reviewing the research methodology employed by recent studies focused on supplemental instruction revealed a clear division of methodologies in research design. Quantitative and qualitative methodologies were each used in varying degrees dependent on the focus of the research. The quantitative research design most often employed was an experimental quantitative design using a control group and an experimental group.

Most commonly described as a Pretest-Intervention-Posttest Control Group design (Hunt, 2013), this is most often used when the focus of the research or study is outcome oriented. This methodology was used in a variety of studies investigating the effectiveness of different supplemental instructional programming at a variety of levels (Benner et al., 2011; Berkeley et al., 2012; Burns, 2012; Duhon et al., 2012; Harding et al., 2012; Hunt et al., 2015). In most instances, the experimental design relies on standardized assessments to generate pre-test and post-test results in order to compare and measure student growth after the application of a treatment.

Qualitative methodological approaches were also used to understand student perspectives of supplemental instruction. A qualitative approach was used to interview students regarding their interest and engagement in reading (Cantrell et al., 2013). A qualitative approach to examine student interest in supplemental instruction in alternative education was also reviewed (Wilkerson et al., 2016). Wilkerson et al. completed a qualitative study that identified barriers to successful implementation of supplemental instruction such as time, resources, and fidelity of implementation while noting that supplemental instruction in the form of a scheduled program during the instructional day was most successful according to their research. Filderman et al. (2019) reviewed a four-step process secondary teachers could follow within reading interventions in order to better understand the data driven decision making process and its role in supplemental instruction. These qualitative examples generally focus on the perceptions of programming (Wilkerson et al., 2016), the engagement of students (Cantrell et al., 2013), and the systems in place to support supplemental instruction (Filderman et al., 2019).

Not surprisingly, each methodological choice in study design was dictated by the questions asked or the answers sought by the researchers. If the focus of the study was on measurable outcomes and whether or not a certain intervention was successful, a quantitative study was employed. If the focus was on something less concrete such as perceptions or applications a qualitative study was generally the methodology used.

Due to the fact that there is not an abundance of work focused on the student perceptions of supplemental instruction and the consensus that this perspective is often absent though critical, (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012) the current study will focus on this area as a way to enlighten educators in an attempt to enhance the programming, the structure, and the perceptions of students in the hopes of capitalizing on the continued investment in supplemental instruction.

Chapter 3: Methods

This chapter introduces the methodology employed for the research which was guided by the focus on a phenomenon taking place in a real-life setting. After outlining the methodology, the data collection methods will be explained followed by the method for and reasoning behind the subject selection for this qualitative study. Next the site and participants will be described in detail prior to data analysis being discussed. One of the more important pieces of this chapter will be my positionality in the study as an educational leader with the ability to apply the knowledge gained from this project.

A focus on the phenomenon of supplemental instruction with the use of student perspectives to inform the research on the selection process for supplemental instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that supplemental instruction has on the opportunity to explore other course offerings will drive this work. This multifaceted problem of practice is the catalyst for all research and examination of results.

This study's focus on a teaching and learning process, supplemental instruction, student experiences, and educational practices this work lends itself to a descriptive qualitative study as described by employing both textural and structural descriptions (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Saldana and Omasta (2022) shared that qualitative inquiry highlights the importance of individual expression as they expanded on this sharing that this methodology is chosen when insight into subjects' lives is necessary to answer research questions which aligns perfectly with this study. This particular descriptive qualitative study will seek to understand the phenomenon of supplemental instruction and student perspectives of this instruction through the intensive study of implementation in

an urban high school in the midwestern United States. Traditional interview questions were posed regarding what is going on in the case, what the students are doing, how the students are doing it, and what the outcomes are (Rossman & Rallis, 2017). Additionally, the aspect of students with perceived skill gaps has been explored thereby asking how the patterns of action and interaction in this case affect relationships and whether or not these patterns of action produce inequalities (Rossman & Rallis, 2017).

Multiple forms of data were collected and examined in this study which included but were not limited to; classroom observations as well as focus group interviews and artifact collection. This qualitative data collection has allowed for the creation of a robust data pool in order to examine the phenomenon of supplemental instruction in an urban high school from the perspective of the students involved with the phenomenon.

Koh and Owen (2000) explain that descriptive research generates data, both qualitative and quantitative, that define the state of nature at a point in time which is the snapshot being taken at the time of this study. In 2016 Bogdan and Biklen discussed descriptive qualitative research having an anchor in the naturalistic collection of data that takes place in a real world setting which aligns with this work which took place throughout several months of observations and focus group interviews in the participants' natural setting including their classroom and conference . The specific phenomenon to be studied is the phenomenon of supplemental instruction, the parameters bounding the study are a supplemental reading curriculum, specifically a supplemental course entitled "Reading Workshop". This course is taught during the regular instructional day in an urban high school with the research taking place during the 2022-2023 school year. Student participants range in grade level from ninth through twelfth grade with the intent

to elicit a wide age range of student perceptions of this phenomenon. The employment of multiple forms of data while identifying multiple participants and identifying themes in order to make assertions regarding supplemental instruction will serve to answer the question of transferability of findings. This step by step work as outlined by Creswell and Poth (2018) as well as Yin (2009) has allowed the research to stay on track and focus on the desire to reveal how the implementation of supplemental instruction impacts students and specifically what their perspectives are regarding this work in relation to their personal educational journeys.

Due to the close examination of students' perception of supplemental instruction, this descriptive qualitative study lends itself to a specific issue which is the effectiveness of supplemental instructional programming and the return on the investment of resources and time. Additionally, the study will be using embedded analysis to look specifically at the relationship between supplemental instruction and students.

Ultimately this work has resulted in an in-depth descriptive qualitative study that looks at the phenomenon of supplemental instruction in order to determine student perceptions of the effectiveness of such programming. Student perceptions in relation to the selection process and the impact this has on their educational journey as well as student motivation and barriers to success have also been examined and findings are shared in a way that will serve educators, students, and institutions in their quest to see students experience personal success.

Research Questions

Working to connect the research questions to the social constructivist framework has allowed for a focused approach. In 1998, Christopher M. Clark outlined several

important aspects to social constructivism and adolescents as they navigate their personal educational experiences. A focus on student identity, student autonomy, and student competence allow for a deeper understanding of how students perceive themselves. Aligning with this work there are research questions that focus on these three specific areas: student identity, autonomy, and competence.

- What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?

- In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?

- What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?

Procedures

Data Sources

Multiple sources were used to gather data that include but are not limited to classroom observations, focus groups, and a variety of artifacts collected from school staff as well as institutional manuals and handbooks. The use of a variety of data is significant in order to help substantiate the work and any claims made in regards to student perspectives.

Participants

Purposeful subject selection was employed in order to identify participants for this study in an effort to explore the phenomenon of supplemental instruction. Creswell (2013) outlines this method as a way to support the focused inquiry of a specific or

targeted phenomenon. Focusing solely on students enrolled in Reading Workshop, which is a supplemental reading course, a class list of students was consulted in order to identify prospective students to participate in the study. As students who are currently or have previously been enrolled in supplemental instruction are the focus, this group of students made up both the focus group interviewed as well as the students observed in classroom observations.

There were some difficulties in participant identification and multiple factors played a role in these struggles. The scope of the study was limited to one particular content area of supplemental instruction and further narrowed to include one section of this instruction which significantly reduced the participant pool to a possible fourteen students. These students are all minors and needed to have informed consent granted by their guardians in order to participate in the study. This process was a little more labor intensive than anticipated as consent forms were largely ignored when mailed directly to potential participant residences and once signed the forms were not always returned in a timely manner. Ultimately I was able to work with five students who had guardians sign and return their informed consent paperwork and this group of participants engaged with me during two separate focus group interviews.

The following is a general demographic description of each of the focus group participants. ZP is a white male student who is in his third year of high school. He reports that he has been participating in a Reading Workshop for six semesters which is each year he has been enrolled in Quality High School. LE is also a white male in his third year of high school. He also reports that he has been participating in a Reading Workshop for six semesters. IB is an African American female who is in her second year of high

school and she reports that she has been in a Reading Workshop for four semesters. LT is identified with two or more races (African American and White) and is in her second year of high school, she also reports having been in a Reading Workshop for four semesters. Finally, PK is a white female in her first year of high school and she reports being in a Reading Workshop for two semesters. It should be noted that each of these participants has been enrolled in a Reading Workshop for each semester that they have been enrolled at Quality High School.

Observations

The classroom observations were conducted within the same classroom setting and during the same classroom session each time ensuring consistency with participants and observations. A field work observation log in the form of a graphic organizer was employed during each observation as a tool to collect data and for reference after each observation. The protocol was consistent and reflective journaling took place after each session in order to put thoughts and observations together in one place. These classroom observations were conducted after informed consent requests were sent to prospective participants and each of these observations lasted approximately fifty minutes. In total there were eight formal observations completed in addition to approximately six casual observations made while visiting the classroom to speak to the instructor for any research purposes. In addition to the formal observation protocol graphic organizers each observation was scripted with a journal entry completed after each observation in order to collect data and preserve any thoughts, questions, and to reflect on the activities and conversations observed. This data was all reviewed while reflecting on routines, rituals, and rules as well as roles and responsibilities (Saldana & Omasta, 2022).

Focus Group Interviews

Within the focus groups a social constructivist theory was highlighted as students were asked questions that would reveal details regarding their own identities as learners, their perceived level of autonomy, and their perceived competencies related to reading achievement. Students who are currently enrolled in supplemental reading instruction made up these focus groups and were interviewed using a standardized protocol (Appendix B). Five students involved in supplemental instruction created the focus groups so that data could be collected in an attempt to learn more about their schema regarding supplemental instruction, the selection process for supplemental instruction, their feelings towards the programming they are or have been involved in, their motivation to participate and succeed, and finally their suggestions for future supplemental programming.

Informed consent forms for all participants and their guardians to complete (Appendix C) explained the purpose of the research and the project in detail and ensured that the research would minimize any negative impact. The participants and their data are integral to the work and could ultimately help improve the effectiveness of supplemental instruction not only at Quality High School but at other institutions as well.

The focus group interviews were conducted on campus at Quality High School during the regular school day. This site selection coupled with the protection of participant time allowed for better access to the participants while at the same time allowing the participants to be relaxed and comfortable in a familiar environment. A neutral space on campus was used for all focus group interviews and meetings. In this case, a conference room area in the office made the most sense for conducting the

interviews as this allowed for a familiar and confidential space that was also large enough to accommodate the group. The diversity at Quality High School allowed for perspectives of minority and non-minority students to be represented and the focus group had a diverse composite of three female students, two males students, two minority students and three nonminority students.

The initial focus group interview was conducted after I introduced myself and the research project to the participants. The second focus group interview was composed of the same participants after I completed eight classroom observation sessions . Data was recorded via hand written notes for the classroom observations while the focus group interviews included both audio recording and video recording. The focus group interviews were then transcribed. Transcriptions were used to guide the comparisons and were read multiple times each both while coding and after coding took place. Through the identification of themes and coding consistencies regarding student perspectives on supplemental instruction in the areas of student understanding of supplemental instruction, specifically Reading Workshop, student perceptions on the selection process for supplemental instruction, and student motivation for success in supplemental instruction will all be considered.

The use of two focus group interviews serve as important data sources in the study. This data collection vehicle allows for the collection of data from students who may be reluctant to share individually or may be too shy to conduct an individual interview but may still want to have their opinions heard (Rossman & Rallis, 2017). The focus group interview also allows for participants to share experiences that may trigger recollections and insights from other participants enriching the data collected (Rossman

& Rallis, 2017). Additionally, the focus groups are an efficient way to gather data from a multitude of diverse students with unique experiences regarding supplemental instruction.

These focus group sessions were audio and video recorded using digital equipment in order to allow for multiple reviews and data checks. These recordings along with the transcription of the focus group interactions serve as a way to continually review the data collected and member check claims throughout the life of the study. These focus group recordings also present an opportunity to lend even more student voice to the work. These focus group interviews evolved into student led discussions allowing for even more open and unrestricted discussions and explanations.

Artifact Collection

Data collection also took place in the form of artifact collection. The supplemental instruction model at Quality High School includes semester-long courses to support reading and math as well as a small group push-in model in each of these content areas. This study focuses on the semester-long course in reading instruction. This model of supplemental instruction includes instructional decision-making meetings in the form of professional learning communities. These meetings along with the protocols, procedures, and policies helped generate artifacts in the form of student referrals, course catalogs, instructional materials, and instructor or administrator correspondence that generated data and informed the study. These artifacts were collected and reviewed as parallels were identified to support the data collection that takes place with the classroom observations and focus group interviews. Each of these artifacts was secured through the district request for permission to conduct research which gave me access to participants and materials. The use of field observations, focus group interviews, and artifact

collection allowed me to employ three of the four forms of data referenced by Creswell and Poth (2018), specifically observations, interviews, and documents.

Research Site Description

This study took place at Quality High School which is situated in an urban setting in Iowa. This site location allowed for a variety of opportunities to engage diverse student populations and increase the opportunities for participant responses. The research site currently has an enrollment of approximately 1640 students with 50 percent of the students being identified as white, 19 percent identified as African American, fourteen percent identified as Hispanic, seven percent identified as more than one race, and ten percent as either Asian or Native Hawaiian.

One goal was to get an understanding of student perceptions of supplemental instruction; another goal was to discover student perceptions and knowledge of the selection process for that instruction. I believe this site selection offers the opportunity to accomplish these goals due to the large and diverse population of the student body. A third goal is to identify student perceptions of the effectiveness of supplemental instruction's ability to motivate students to close skill gaps and ultimately be successful in either reading or math.

Participant focus was on students who were either currently enrolled or had previously been enrolled in or referred to a supplemental instructional course or program. Specifically the study is focusing on students enrolled in a supplemental reading course that takes place within their regularly scheduled school day. This course is an English elective that students are enrolled in who need additional support in the area of reading with focuses on both reading fluency and reading comprehension. A variety of students

were solicited for the study in order to obtain multiple perspectives in regards to

perceptions of supplemental instruction's effectiveness. Engaging students on multiple

levels, focus group interview and observations, allowed for a better understanding of their

perspectives regarding supplemental instruction, the selection process for supplemental

instruction, student motivation to succeed in supplemental instruction, and the impact that

supplemental instruction has on the opportunity to explore other course offerings. I

believe that factors such as the amount of time spent in supplemental instruction, personal

knowledge of the selection process, and an understanding of the purpose behind

supplemental instruction impacted the data I collected from these participants.

      The instructors for this supplemental reading course were not intended to be a

large part of the research though they did play a critical role in both the collection of

historical data and access to the research site and participants. Instructor A has been

leading the supplemental reading program at Quality High School for the past ten years

and this is their sole curricular assignment. Instructor A has also assisted with the

development of Instructor B who has been teaching in the supplemental instruction

program for approximately five years and has other curricular obligations in the English

department at Quality High School.

      The classroom itself is extremely well stocked with books of all varieties and at

first glance appears to be more of a library than a classroom. The oversized classroom

seats thirty with three rows of five tables made to seat two students at each table. The side

walls are lined with bookcases that are overflowing with books while the front and back

walls are covered with posters and materials encouraging students to read and touting the

importance of reading. There is also a space in the back of the room that appears to be a

sort of shrine to students who have completed their supplemental reading program and graduated. The back of the classroom is also the space that warehouses the students' individual folders used for progress monitoring by the students. The overall feel of the classroom has an unmistakable and purposeful feel of a "reading" room.

Each session observed started out with the same formula as the instructor prepared students for the session. An active board at the front of the room would have an opening slide reminding students to put their phones away, have their IDs on, and have their page numbers out and ready. Once the session starts students instinctively begin to read independently while the instructor goes around the room to get a report from each student as to how many pages they had read since the previous session. These reports are more often than not met with affirmation and asset language from the instructor praising the students' efforts. After this opening activity there would be a reminder about any upcoming activities and then a transition to the activity for the period. The period always included a variety of whole group instruction, small group instruction, collaborative work, independent work, and one on one instructor and student engagements. The inclusion of book talks were very common as were collaborative efforts to tackle some more advanced materials.

Data Analysis

Thematic and in vivo coding were the main foci of the focus group interview data analysis. In vivo coding which uses the exact words of the participants was a valuable tool in this research and assisted in the development of the themes that were used in further data analysis. Students were asked about their understanding of, and feelings towards educational practices that they may not completely understand and as such the

ability to capture their exact words gave credibility and authenticity to the research. The nexus of the research is student voice and in vivo coding served as the platform for this work. Both deductive and inductive codes were ultimately employed. From this use of a hybrid coding approach, themes were developed in order to help with the organization of the data and identify commonalities and enhance thematic coding. Due to the research being concerned with understanding feelings, motivations and perceptions surrounding the experience of receiving supplemental instruction, this project was best suited to a hybrid coding approach.

A priori coding was also employed for the focus group sessions. Saldana and Omasta (2022) explain that codes and categories formulated prior to the field work or analysis are referred to as a priori codes and categories. The use of a priori coding organized data collected in a manner that kept the focus narrow enough to filter through the focus group responses. In this work coding such as "understanding of supplemental instruction", "motivation to succeed", "identification process", and "negative impact" as well as "student identity", "student autonomy", and "competency" were used to help focus the research on specific findings. These specific findings focused on student identity, student autonomy, and student competence allowing the work to continually tie to the theoretical framework in an attempt to connect certain aspects of supplemental instruction to social constructivism allowing for a comprehensive analysis of how students perceive themselves.

In vivo coding was employed in order to pull data from the transcripts that assisted in identifying themes. The focus here is not necessarily on the success of the supplemental program as much as it is on the student perceptions in relation to this work.

After themes were identified through the participant responses as well as the methodological framework focus on student identity, autonomy, and competence hybrid coding was employed that used both inductive and deductive coding. For these reasons in vivo coding was used at different times, which allows the codes to emerge as the data is analyzed. It is also important to the work that predetermined codes were used in order to continually focus the data analysis, for this reason deductive coding aligning with the themes of student identity, autonomy, and competence were also employed. Additionally, a constant comparative analysis was employed in order to create themes to inform the work.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness in this study was established through the triangulation of data between the focus group sessions, the use of thick descriptions from classroom observations, adding contextual details to the observations, and the collection of artifacts relevant to the implementation of supplemental instruction taking place at the research site. Dependability relied upon the creation of codes with consistent application to the transcripts and a final coding catalog, consistent themes, and member checking with participants from the focus group interviews which allowed participants to play a role as a "co-researcher" inviting them to review and make comments on the data analysis (Saldaña 2015, p. 81). One month after the conclusion of the final focus group interview member checking took place which involved having focus group members review codes as well as findings drawn from the data they provided. During this review the participants believed that the codes accurately categorized their responses, they also felt that the

summative findings were an accurate representation of the information they provided during each of the focus group interview sessions.

Researcher Positionality

My position in this particular study is critical to the work itself. As the building leader of Quality High School, I have daily access to the participants and the data that informs the work and the findings. I have been an administrator in the Quality School District for seventeen school years and have overseen, implemented, and observed multiple programs focused on closing achievement gaps and increasing student performance through the use of supplemental instruction. I have also been engaged in the identification of students perceived as in need of this supplemental instruction. I manage the building schedule at Quality High School which includes embedded supplemental instruction in the areas of math (math lab) and reading (Reading Workshop). In addition to ensuring the availability of these embedded courses I also manage the implementation of additional time to allow for supplemental instruction outside of students' credit earning schedule. I have seen first-hand the large investment of time and resources over the past sixteen years with a minimal return on that investment. The lack of progress in meeting goals of closing perceived skill gaps has prompted me to look for answers that lie with the participants themselves, the students.

My personal relationships with the research participants, the data collected for research, and the data analysis with the purpose of helping students succeed, along with my opinions regarding programming and implementation all play a role on my reflexive positionality of this work (Saldana & Omasta 2022). My work with students, staff, and parents over the past seventeen years as an educational leader have included a fluid move

from one system of supplemental instruction to the next without a resounding success being declared in any iteration. For this reason, I am working to uncover an untapped resource in reaching out to the students in order to understand their thoughts on the process.

Application of Findings

This study is significant in a number of ways. First and foremost, this study provides a student perspective on the implementation of supplemental instruction which is a perspective that is seemingly missing in the quest to eliminate skill gaps. I believe that students have particular feelings towards the processes that identify students for supplemental instruction as well as the impact the instruction itself has on them emotionally and academically.

Ultimately, I believe that this study allows educational leaders in urban high schools an opportunity to evaluate their current programs for supplemental instruction and make informed decisions that will help their students and instructors achieve their ultimate goal of student success. This study is also able to provide data that can shape future decisions on supplemental instruction that may increase programmatic effectiveness. Ensuring that students do not feel their experiences with supplemental instruction are punitive may ultimately result in an increased motivation to succeed as well as the narrowing of skill gaps for those students identified as in need of supplemental instruction. My hope is that this study will result in school leaders making better use of resources and engaging students in conversation in order to increase the effectiveness of educational programming and ultimately making a positive impact on student achievement.

Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter will describe the data collected through the examination of artifacts, the completion of class observations, and the completion of two focus group interview sessions. First, the participants who contributed to the study will be described in further detail. Next a description of the course that serves as supplemental reading instruction, Reading Workshop, will be described in further detail. Following this information there will be an analysis of the data collected in relation to the research questions used to drive this study which include the following:

1. What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?

2. In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?

3. What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?

Finally, each research question will be addressed with a focused response.

Participant Descriptions

Five students were interviewed in a focus group setting after the completion of classroom observations, The five students interviewed included two male students (ZP, LE), and three female students (IB, LT, PK). Though these students each have unique backgrounds and a variety of responses to the questions asked there were similarities that came through during the research phase of this project in regards to the participants. For this reason the following information will inform the reader in relation to the individuals

interviewed and relied upon for member checking.

ZP is a junior at Quality High School who has been in Reading Workshop for six semesters. ZP has been in the Quality School District for his entire academic career and states that he is unsure how he was selected for Reading Workshop but that he chooses to remain in the program.

LE is also a junior at Quality High School who has been in Reading Workshop for six semesters. LE moved to the Quality School District and began at Quality High School his freshman year and reports being enrolled in Reading Workshop since he started at Quality High School; he is unsure about how he was selected for the class. LE reports that he chooses to stay in the program for a variety of reasons one of which was an appreciation for vocabulary as they explained "You get to read and you get to learn a lot of new vocabulary and I think it is generally fun to just you know like use words that you normally wouldn't use like the word squalid, it means dirty which is another expression that you can use to make it sound more funny." Another reason LE chose to continue with Reading Workshop was that they believed the class was fun and interactive when they feel other classes are not that way.

IB is a sophomore at Quality High School who has been in Reading Workshop for four semesters. IB moved to Quality School District her freshman year and reports being enrolled in Reading Workshop since she started at Quality High School, she is unsure about how she was selected for the class. IB reports that she chooses to stay in the class due to the class being "an easy credit".

LT is also a sophomore at Quality High School who has been in Reading Workshop for four semesters. LT moved to Quality School District in elementary school

and reports being enrolled in Reading Workshop as a result of her Individualized Education Plan. LT reports that she had the opportunity to discontinue Reading Workshop but chose to continue for multiple reasons stating "It's like, it's kind of like home to be in there, I'm excited to be in that class, it is like quiet, it's not too loud and you kind of get to sit by yourself and it like gives me a reason to read, I like reading but I am not going to do it if I don't have to".

PK is a freshman at Quality High School who has been in Reading Workshop for two semesters. PK moved to Quality School District in the fall of her freshman year and reports being enrolled in Reading Workshop due to her Individualized Education Plan and her former schedule at her previous school having a parallel class referred to as "English Enhancement".

Reading Workshop Description

This descriptive qualitative study focused on student perspectives of supplemental instruction was narrowed in order to focus on one particular form of supplemental instruction. The focus was on a class offered within the instructional day where students' schedules were adjusted to allow students to be scheduled into this particular supplemental course referred to as Reading Workshop. Reading Workshop is based on Second Chance Reading which is a curriculum intended to be a targeted two year intervention for students who were two to five years behind their grade level in reading according to Central Rivers AEA (2023). The Quality School District publishes their high school program of studies annually after having the school board review and approve all course offerings. In this program of studies Reading Workshop is listed as open to grades nine through eleven and is described with the following:

Reading Workshop is designed to improve a student's reading comprehension, increase reading fluency (words read per minute) and develop knowledge, usage and mastery of vocabulary. One reading lesson per month focuses on a specific career from each of the academies. This may be repeated for elective credit. The credit for this class does NOT fulfill one of the eight required English credits.

Though the description above is fairly accurate it was noted through conversations with staff at Quality High school that the academy structure referenced in the description is no longer employed. The students in Reading Workshop spend a majority of their academic time practicing their reading skills with the guidance and support of their teacher who is a certified reading instructor that has a background and training in the Second Chance Reading curriculum. During several classroom observations multiple modes of instruction and learning were observed. There are times that the students read and analyzed material together in a whole group setting with the instructor guiding and supporting the discussion, there were times that the students work independently reading passages and completing formative assessments charting their own progress, and there were times that students were working one on one with the instructor conducting individual book talks and reviewing material that they are reading. Throughout all of these different types of engagement there was a large amount of formative assessment and feedback taking place. These formative assessments ranged from the informal book talks arranged by the instructor to get individual updates on reading and comprehension from each student to more formal assessments in the form of Jamestown Readers completed during work time. The classroom observed for this study was completely filled with reading materials ranging from young adult fiction, periodicals, adult fiction, nonfiction, and biographies. The learning environment is very focused on reading and the participants of this study used terminology like comprehension and fluency during our

focus group interviews.

In advance of focusing on student perceptions and feelings regarding the selection process for this particular supplemental reading course, Reading Workshop, I believe it is important to acknowledge the information gathered from the instructors of the course regarding the selection process. The selection process for Reading Workshop proved to be relatively mysterious at Quality High School. When looking at the program of studies there are no references to or mentions of either a selection process, or prerequisites for the course. Additionally the program of studies does not overtly address the fact that this is a supplemental reading course meant to be taken as a second tier support. When asking the teachers of this supplemental program how students are selected to participate there are a variety of responses. Instructor A replied to this question with the following:

> *I know that many students are placed in Reading Workshop because they have an IEP with a reading goal. I'm not positive what specifically is in the reading goal that has them in Mrs. Q's class as opposed to mine. I know that SH also puts quite a few ELL students in my classroom too. Other than that, this is one of the big mysteries and I long ago decided it was not my place to question it. I accept every kiddo and do my best to get them further along than where they are when they cross the threshold.*

Instructor B went on to share that in the past there had been a more structured selection process. Instructor B stated that Quality High School had previously relied on a student composite created using standardized testing scores from the Stanford Reading Assessment, the Iowa Assessment, and from teacher recommendations. The Stanford Reading Assessment is no longer used and the Iowa Assessment has transformed into the Iowa Assessment for Student Progress. As assessments and their uses changed there were no adjustments made to the identification process for the course and this is a contributing factor to the lack of clarity on how students are identified as in need of Reading

Workshop.

Research Questions

The following section will focus on each of the individual research questions and how they were answered using the research. The data collected resulted from the completion of multiple classroom observations along with two separate focus group interviews that included the same participants. The classroom observations were conducted prior to and following the first focus group interview. Using these data collection tools, each of the three research questions is addressed here.

What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?

When using student data drawn directly from the focus group interviews a similar pattern developed with students having a variety of responses to the question of how they were selected for or identified as in need of supplemental reading support, specifically Reading Workshop. The focus here is not necessarily on the success of the supplemental program as much as it is on the student perceptions in relation to this work and to being selected for or scheduled into the supplemental program, Reading Workshop.

When participants were asked how they were selected for Reading Workshop and how they were informed of that decision there were some parallels that emerged. Interestingly, it was revealed that four of the five participants (PK, LE, IB, LT) transferred to the Quality School District from either a different state or a neighboring community and those students believed they were scheduled into Reading Workshop partially based on this circumstance. This common characteristic of transferring into Quality High School was accompanied by the common characteristic of participants

having individualized education plans, or IEPs. Of the five participants taking part in the focus group interviews, four shared that they currently had an IEP (PK, LT, ZP, LE) and the fifth, IB, stated that they did initially have an IEP when they were scheduled into Reading Workshop though they had since met their goals and were consequently staffed out of their IEP.

Quality High School students were unclear about the qualifying criteria for selection to the Reading Workshop course and conferring with the teaching staff involved in the program did not provide clarity either. A review of the data generated revealed the fact that students involved in Reading Workshop had differing views on how they were identified as needing the supplemental programming. ZP and PK believed their assignment to the program to be random while the others believed the identification to be purposeful. When asked about being scheduled into the course one participant, ZP, replied: "I had multiple choices and that was one and it defaulted to it", another participant, PK, shared "I think it was like randomly honestly because I had multiple things in my schedule an this was like the lease of my expectations but then I ended up getting it so". Other participants, when asked the same question, replied in a manner that points to a more purposeful selection. Two participants, LT and LE, stated that their individualized education plans were what led to their selection for and scheduling into Reading Workshop. Though these examples highlighted some discrepancy in thought among the participants, there were common themes regarding student perceptions that were exposed as well.

Ultimately when looking at student feelings and perceptions regarding the selection process for Reading Workshop, participants felt that the selection process was

based on student performance and each felt that they were in Reading Workshop in order to work on their fluency and comprehension skills in reading. As described previously, the identification process for students as well as the communication component between staff, students, and guardians appears to have evolved, or in this case, devolved over time. What was once a linear process as described by Instructor B now appears to be less linear and poorly communicated. Knowing this information made the discussion on selection interesting as each participant shared what they believed to be the reasoning behind their inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop. Each of the participants were willing to share their experiences in the selection process and none of the participants reported any type of conference, connection, or explanation from an adult at Quality High School explaining their placement in supplemental instruction or Reading Workshop.

There were no negative responses or feelings regarding the selection process rather there were multiple positive responses. Supporting the positive responses from interviews are notes from observations where the instructor refers to veterans in the class stating "you veterans will remember and know where I am going with this" during one session. Veterans were referred to a few more times highlighting students who have chosen to continue in the program. Further evidence of positive experiences was shared when PK stated "It's helped with like my spelling and stuff and my grades have gone up and I think it is because of reading workshop", LT stated Reading Workshop "made me have more good grades", and LE replied "I'd have to agree on that, I am better than I was". Each of these quotes pulled from the focus group interviews indicate that student perceptions are consistent regarding their selection for participation in supplemental

instruction. LT further explained their involvement in the program stating "oh yeah I chose to come back, freshman year I was placed in there but I have been in there two other years by choice". The first conclusion to be drawn out here is the idea that the selection process does take into account individual needs regarding reading skills and ability. The participants believed that there is a purpose to their being selected for Reading Workshop and that their selection was appropriate. One interesting note on the selection process highlighted by participants was their belief that their guardians were not knowledgeable in regards to Reading Workshop. This idea supported the assertion that the selection process may indeed be mysterious. When asked directly what their guardians knew about Reading Workshop IB stated "nothing, like nothing", LT added that her mother did not know anything about Reading Workshop other than that it was helping her (LT) become a better reader though her mother does not know how or why LT was selected to be in the class.

The second conclusion in regards to the selection process and the participants' needing to be in supplemental instruction was focused on the participants' satisfaction with the supplemental instruction they are receiving through Read Workshop. The participants are happy with the results they are getting from the supplemental instruction in Reading Workshop as they report academic improvement that is not limited to reading but includes multiple content areas. Participant PK shared the following in regards to Reading Workshop making an impact that spanned multiple curricular areas: "I mean you like kind of like I guess you could say catch up on some like skills and stuff in like other classes like it like helps you with other classes maybe more than just like English and stuff It will help you with more classes and more understanding of that." There is further

evidence to support the participants satisfaction with being selected which includes participants' success in other curricular areas including Social Studies and Science as well as their other English classes. Overall the feelings and perceptions of the participants regarding the selection process were that the process was purposeful and their experiences with selection were positive despite there being a lack of clarity or understanding on the process itself.

In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?

The way in which participants identify themselves became an interest when the participants' self reflections came through during the conversations that took place in each of the focus groups. These conversations brought this theme to the forefront as participants shared different aspects of their learning and ultimately shared how they identify themselves as learners. When asking the participants about their perceptions of supplemental instruction, specifically Reading Workshop, it became clear that the participants saw themselves as active players in the entire process as opposed to passively receiving instruction, the participants identified as learners with unique characteristics and unique reasons for participation in the program. The research completed and data collected clearly point to the participants feeling that their experiences with supplemental instruction have shaped them into successful students with an increased competency in the area of reading who are now more autonomous in multiple aspects of their learning due to their experiences with Reading Workshop.

After having experienced supplemental instruction through their participation in Reading Workshop participants described feeling successful as students, their focus

group interviews provided more than qualitative data in the form of responses, rather their smiles and ease with each other while describing themselves as successful students could be felt in the room. Each participant shared an instance where they felt they had increased their competency in reading, either in comprehension, fluency, or in both areas. Ultimately these participants described ways in which their experiences with supplemental instruction have helped them to feel like and become more autonomous learners.

Participant LE identified himself as a "reader" and a lover of audio books. They made multiple statements about their new love of reading and were very proud of their Audible subscription. LE went on to talk about their newfound interest in vocabulary and the use of new and interesting words. LE now identifies themselves as a success and as a reader. Participant LT identified themselves as a success. They shared that they had been put on a thirty day trial to see if they were ready to leave the Reading Workshop program and though they did meet their goals and were ready, they chose to stay due to the feeling of success they experienced. Participant IB was discussing their identity as a student and their desire for success. They mentioned remaining in Reading Workshop to continue growing their skills, to increase their grade point average, and summed this up by saying "It is kind of like your decision if you want to be better or not, if you want to be a better reader then you have to try". IB identified themselves as a student who cares about their grade point average and getting into college. ZP responded to a question about how they identify themselves as students by saying "I used to not be good at really anything so…" when a follow question probed this response ZP affirmed that they do indeed identify themselves as a better student than they were prior to engaging in Reading Workshop.

The next theme to emerge in regards to shaping the participants as learners highlights the participants' view of their own competency. Here, competency is extended beyond the supplemental instruction setting in Reading Workshop and includes other academic content areas as well as life outside the walls of Quality High School.

More than one participant shared that they feel more confident and more capable in other classes due to their experiences in Reading Workshop. LE discussed social studies in particular, sharing that the textbook in that class was very large and could be difficult though he credits Reading Workshop with an increase in his competency and ability in that class. When asked specifically about an increase in competency LE went on to say "Uh like reading documents and writing papers is a lot easier, I used to be super slow at it and I am still not great but I can type a lot more and not have to rely on other people to do it for me". ZP had a similar experience to share stating "Um in like World History I was never a fast reader but because of this class I got to read faster and faster and we always had this giant book and then I got to read faster." LT shared that they feel their experiences in Reading Workshop have been a boost to their competency in other classes as well stating "I would say in general I'm like, I'm slow but ever since I got started in reading workshop it's been easier for me to like concentrate in class and it's like, it's made a bigger, it's not just about reading, it's helped me in all of my other classes and got me to understand more". The theme of competency flowed throughout the data with each participant sharing different ideas and stories of an increase in their competency in multiple content areas.

Finally, the theme of autonomy emerged as a focus of the participants and how they have been shaped as learners by their experiences with Reading Workshop. The data

focus here is on the participants' autonomy as it relates to their inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop as well as the participants' work in Reading Workshop. The data supports the participants' feelings of autonomous decision making in regards to their inclusion in Reading Workshop, their choice of materials to read as part of Reading Workshop, and their personal choice to either continue or discontinue their involvement in the supplemental instruction.

The first area of autonomy to be highlighted during research was the idea of student choice when it comes to the participants' ability to choose the materials they read and the participants' involvement in goal setting. Students are given some formative and summative assessments that are prescribed by the instructor but the majority of the materials read and employed for supplemental instruction are chosen by the participants themselves. LE explained that the students are able to choose the books they read for class and if the goals that are set (by the student) are not met they can work with the teacher to make adjustments, this is a solid example of autonomy in goal setting to go along with text choice. PK added to this by explaining that participants also monitor their own progress in Reading Workshop through self evaluation with Jamestown readers. Jamestown readers are a commercially produced supplemental instruction aid created by McGraw-Hill education that are designed to give students additional practice and support in their independent reading. PK explained that this is the "the kind of independent thing she (teacher) wants you to do".

The second area of autonomy to be explored focuses on student choice when it comes to involvement in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop. Each of the five participants that engaged in the focus group interviews were engaged in

Reading Workshop voluntarily when the research was undertaken. Each had been enrolled previously, met goals, had success, and then chose to remain in the supplemental instruction setting. This choice to continue enrollment in the supplemental instruction course, Reading Workshop, is not unique to this study's participants though it was a common characteristic for the group. The participants who volunteered for the study were selected solely on the criteria that they be enrolled in Reading Workshop and the commonality of their continued enrollment serves as evidence to support the proliferation of student continued enrollment after having met goals and had success. LE explained that "You kind of have a choice it's based on performance, you can ask like how you can get out and you can be told that you have to be at this level of learning in order to do it and if you can prove that then you can leave if you really want". With that being said LE had chosen to remain in Reading Workshop for a variety of reasons. LT was put on a thirty day trial and was successful which they explained gave them the option to drop Reading Workshop and they chose to stay. Each of the other participants chose to add Reading Workshop to their schedule for the future despite successfully meeting their goals. This freedom of choice or autonomy is a large part of the program.

While examining a composite of the ways that Reading Workshop has shaped the students as learners in regards to identity, competency, and autonomy, data supports and highlights students' success and a desire to continue to grow academically in multiple curricular areas. PK shared that they felt Reading Workshop helped in both reading and writing stating "I would say it helps me with like reading and writing cause I used to be terrible at both of those things". A focus on programmatic benefits gave LE an opportunity to be complimentary of the focus on vocabulary, they shared "You get to

read and you get to learn a lot of new vocabulary and I think it is generally fun to just you

know like use words that you normally wouldn't use like the word squalid, it means dirty

which is another expression that you can use to make it sound more funny."

Shifting to more generally applicable benefits of the supplemental programming

both LT and IB explained that there were different ways Reading Workshop has

supported them as learners, LT shared that "It helps your comprehension and with your

fluency" and IB followed that comment up stating "It is kind of like your decision like if

you want to be better or not, if you want to be a better reader then you have to try." While

inquiring about the benefits of Reading Workshop as related to other curricular areas ZP

was quick to point out their improvement in History class stating "Um in like World

History I was never a fast reader but because of this class I got to read faster and faster

and we always had this giant book and then I got to read faster."

These quotes taken directly from the participants in the focus group interviews

show that the students have invested in their learning and in their academic improvement

that is the focus of the supplemental program, Reading Workshop. These participants

understand the purpose of Reading Workshop and they have experienced the benefits of

the program. A focus on the ways participants' experiences with supplemental instruction

has shaped these students as learners makes it difficult to argue that Reading Workshop

has not had a positive effect on each of the students who participated in this study.

As discussed previously, student placement into Reading Workshop does not

appear to be consistent or clearly outlined to participants, their guardians, or the

instructors. With that being said it did become apparent that the students involved in this

study often chose to remain in the supplemental course even after the completion of a

successful semester with their individualized goals being met. To ensure this was not unique to the participants, an instructor was also asked about continued engagement in the program and they shared that there are many "veterans" in the program who remain for a variety of reasons even after having had success, met goals, and made progress.

According to one teacher, each participant had spent two to six semesters in Reading Workshop. Knowing that this supplemental program is designed to recover reading fluency and comprehension skills and understanding that students are able to discontinue their participation once they have met their goals I asked participants what drove them to continue with the class. The student participants shared that they enjoy the class, they believe it has a positive impact on them academically, and they ultimately choose to remain in Reading Workshop as their choice regardless of how they were initially identified as needing the supplemental support.

Going beyond the data gathered in the focus group interviews has revealed that these students were regular attenders who also regularly participated in class discussions and activities. This evidence was gathered through classroom observations and substantiated through the review of observation protocol and reflective notes. These characteristics reinforce the fact that these particular students were invested in their academic improvement which was offered by Reading Workshop. Each of the five participants from the focus group interviews attended class each of the eight times an observation was conducted. Additionally there were multiple opportunities for students to complete independent tasks and each of the five participants were diligent in this work, one such opportunity took place at the start of a classroom observation where students started the class with an independent reading activity using Jamestown readers which are

a timed reading assessment that the teacher employed as a progress monitoring tool for fluency and comprehension. Participants were very focused and were working through the reader while the teacher worked with individual students when needed though for the most part this is an activity done individually with the instructor acting as support. Ultimately when working to answer the question of how being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners, the data gathered through the focus group interviews as well as the observations would all suggest that the supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop had a positive impact on these students as learners their identity as students, their competency, and their autonomy as learners as well.

What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?

Next, I will highlight the barriers that student participants felt their inclusion in supplemental instruction, specifically Reading Workshop, presented to them as learners. I will also highlight the motivations that were perceived by students through that same inclusion in supplemental instruction. The data gathered from the focus group interviews along with artifacts in the form of the Quality High School Program of Studies as well as classroom observations all support the clear division between barriers and motivations. Additionally, the data from these three sources isolates identifiable themes within both barriers and motivations for students within supplemental instruction. These will be highlighted in the following paragraphs.

Beginning with the perceived barriers existing within supplemental instruction, the data pointed to two distinct themes. First there exists a barrier in regards to scheduling and the impacts or limitations the inclusion in supplemental instruction creates when it

comes to students schedules. Secondly, the students involved in this study felt that there is a perception that students who are not enrolled in supplemental instruction believe those who are involved in Reading Workshop are not as academically successful as those students who are not directly involved in supplemental instruction or scheduled into Reading Workshop.

When asked about barriers created by the inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop, multiple participants described some frustrations around their daily schedules and the limits this inclusion puts on their course selection. Participants reported having to choose between reading workshop and other courses thereby limiting their ability to engage in alternative electives. PK shared that they had to choose between a physical education class they wanted to explore and Reading Workshop. LT explained how Reading Workshop does take up an "extra space" in their schedule and that they had tried to take a culinary arts class three separate times unsuccessfully due to Reading workshop. LT went on to explain that the benefits of Reading Workshop made the fact that it takes up an extra space in their schedule bearable stating "I mean it does take up an extra space in your schedule if you don't enjoy the class but most of the stuff that I slightly dislike really does help, it might be annoying but it's worth it."

Ultimately, each participant shared that there were some barriers created by Reading Workshop explaining that they felt their inclusion in Reading Workshop did limit their class choices by taking a space in their daily schedule. This ranged from being limited to a particular lunch shift to not being able to take specific preferred courses due to being selected for inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading

Workshop. A review of Quality School District's program of studies in reference to graduation requirements (Appendix G) reveals that the English requirements do not include Reading Workshop. This information combined with the number of credits required in each core area supports the assertion from participants that their inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop does indeed create a barrier to access to alternate coursework. For example, PK explained that they were scheduled in a conflicting fitness class they desired and when given the choice they chose to remain in Reading Workshop. As stated previously, LT shared that Reading Workshop takes up an extra space in their schedule as well. IB shared the following: "It has gotten in the way of me like wanting to do extra things like one time I wanted to switch my class and they said I couldn't". Lastly, LT shared some frustration around Reading Workshop taking a space that would normally allow for a fun elective, she stated "Like I signed up for African American History or Women history or like one of my friends has art, gym, and African American History, you know the funnest class I have on my schedule is health class". IB continued the idea of scheduling being difficult when they shared "last year I messed up, my grades were really bad my GPA was really bad and this year I wanted to be in a credit recovery class but I can't because I have reading workshop and I can't do fun stuff like a video class." This supports the idea that involvement in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop does restrict student choice and can act as a barrier as students may not want to participate due to these restrictions or limitations.

The second theme in regards to a barrier created by inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop was a perception of the participants that students who are not engaged in supplemental instruction believe those who are involved

are not as academically successful as those students who are not directly involved in supplemental instruction or scheduled into Reading Workshop. LT shared that students who are not involved in Reading Workshop perceive themselves as "smarter" than the students who are involved in Reading Workshop. They stated "Some people think just because they are not in reading workshop they are smarter than you, same thing with math lab." IB elaborated on those feelings in regards to others' perceptions of students who are included in supplemental instruction stating "Yes, like people try to laugh at you for walking in there but you can't tell everyone is the same in there and you can't tell who is in there because they have to be and who is in there because they want to be, we are all just the same and all doing the same thing trying to reach a goal."

The data collected suggests that the barriers created by inclusion in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop definitely exist and are clearly separated into two categories, either scheduling or others' perceptions of students in Reading Workshop. These situations did present themselves as barriers evidenced by the participants who at times would have preferred to be in a different elective but were unable to make those requests meet their schedule. In other ways the participants shared frustration over other students' perceptions of their ability with LT stating "some people think just because they are not in Reading Workshop they are smarter than you, same thing with math lab". Even though these barriers exist and are very real, and they may have considered quitting or not re-enrolling, the participants each shared that the motivations to succeed and the benefits of the programming far outweigh these barriers.

Though these barriers exist and were discussed by the participants in the focus groups interviews the motivations derived from supplemental instruction were the focus

of this discussion. When asked about barriers LT replied "... I mean not really, there might be some minor ones but the pros outweigh the cons for me at least". When broken down comments made during the focus group interviews that align with motivations outnumbered those aligned with barriers by more than three times.

When shifting the focus to responses regarding what motivations may exist for students involved in supplemental instruction through Reading Workshop the data suggests there are multiple motivations. The data compiled through the completion of two focus group interviews separated the motivations experienced by participants into four categories which include participants' concern for their future, motivation for general academic improvement, student concern for grades and credits, and a focus on student concern in regards to teacher approval.

When asked directly "What motivates you to be successful in Reading Workshop" participants each shared multiple motivations. There was a distinctive focus on the participants' future in each focus group interview session with some variation on whether that focus was on graduation or on the participants' motivation to succeed beyond high school. The motivational focus on their future would be supported by the program of studies that highlights Reading Workshop as an elective credit which helps meet the graduation requirements for Quality School District. Three of the five participants, LE, IB, and ZP, specifically named graduation as a motivator during the focus group sessions. In addition to this there were two participants, LT and PK, who stated that they are motivated to succeed in Reading Workshop due to the benefits it provides them in regards to future employment. PK was the most vocal when tying their participation in supplemental instruction to their future plans relaying "Like what I want

to be when I am older, like obviously the reading helps because like no matter like what you want to be you are going to have to read something or understand things and it like gives you more knowledge about things and words in there and like more bigger words and stuff, like words you have but you can extend them and your words and stuff" "and it kind of like makes me like it kind of helps me like on what I like want to be when I am older and like what I want to do and stuff like that".

The next theme to be drawn out of the data regarding participant motivation in regards to their involvement in supplemental instruction through Reading Workshop was the motivation for general academic improvement. Participants repeatedly touched on the improvements they have made to their reading and comprehension due to their involvement with Reading Workshop as well as the benefits they have experienced in other classes as a result of their participation in this supplemental instruction. The fact that each participant has volunteered to continue their participation in the program demonstrates their motivation to succeed. Information gathered from the course instructor revealed that the fact that students continued to self enroll is not unique, rather it happens fairly regularly and for a variety of reasons ranging from the students' appreciation of the curriculum's structure, the positive relationships built between the student and instructor, and the desire of the participants to continue to grow their reading skills. This voluntary commitment to the program combined with the information shared and the examples given show that these students are motivated to participate and be successful in Reading Workshop due to the impact the program has on participants' general academic improvement. When coding for this response general academic improvement with specific details was coded twenty four times versus four, five, and six instances of the

other motivations being coded. One example of how academic success has motivated the participants to continue working towards success and to continue in the Reading Workshop comes from LE who said, " I would say it helps me with like reading and writing cause I used to be terrible at both of those things, I can definitely write papers and other stuff I used to have to ask for help a lot". PK also shared her motivation to continue and to be successful in Reading Workshop when she stated the following "I mean you like kind of like I guess you could say catch up on some like skills and stuff in like other classes like it like helps you with other classes maybe more than just like English and stuff It will help you with more classes and more understanding of that". LT was vocal in this area as well sharing "I would say in general I'm like, I'm slow but ever since I got started in reading workshop it's been easier for me to like concentrate in class and it's like, it's made a bigger, it's not just about reading, it's helped me in all of my other classes and got me to understand more, It's helped with like my spelling and stuff and my grades have gone up and I think it is because of reading workshop".

An additional motivational theme to emerge from the focus group interviews was the theme of extrinsic rewards. There were times when the participants were discussing motivation to succeed and the idea of maintaining a high grade point average or obtaining a high letter grade were at the forefront of the discussion. Participants also discussed the fact that they believe their participation in this supplemental instruction program, Reading Workshop, has allowed them to earn what they perceive as a "free" credit. This idea of a "free" credit was based on the fact that the participants were already involved in the program so at least they were also earning a credit while engaging in the supplemental instruction. As mentioned previously, the selection process for inclusion in

this supplemental programming does not always involve the student so the feeling that they are at least earning a credit for being assigned to Reading Workshop was a common sentiment among the participants. When asked about continuing in the program IB shared that "It be an easy credit". Continuing this theme, participants discussed the "easy letter grade" and how their involvement improved their grade point average. PK emphasized this idea stating "and like to get an easy letter grade to like add up to improve your GPA and stuff like that" and IB supported this notion sharing "If I can be honest, um, I want my GPA to stay at a decent you now 3 point something so that when I want to get accepted later to like UNI I can get accepted". This theme of grades, grade point average, and credits was common among all of the participants in the focus group interviews and the program of studied referenced previously would support these motivations as the Reading Workshop is described as an elective course earning students a credit based on a standard four point scale that can be applied towards graduation.

The final theme in regards to the participants' motivation when it comes to supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop was the idea of not wanting to disappoint the instructor. The participants each expressed a desire to please the instructor of the supplemental programming and went so far as to say that it is difficult to find teachers who really care about their success and they did not want to disappoint their instructor. The resounding theme to emerge here was a trust, appreciation, and respect for the instructor manifesting itself as a central motivator to the participants' success in the supplemental program, Reading Workshop.

The completion of multiple classroom observations gave me the opportunity to witness the very positive classroom culture that has been created in this supplemental

instruction setting and I was not surprised at all to hear participants share that some of

their motivation came from not wanting to disappoint their teacher. Each observation has

evidence in the notes referencing strong relationships between the students and the

teacher as well as highlighting the positive climate created by the teacher. Asset language

and positive affirmations from the teacher throughout the class observations were

common and the participants of this study clearly hold their supplemental instruction

teacher in high regard. For example, during one observation where students were reading

an article on the use of animal testing for science and consumer products, the reading was

difficult and the instructor responded with asset language and encouragement even

explaining to the class that they had to personally re-read some portions of the material.

The instructor then went on to share with students the following: "the reading is tough

but you guys got this, we will get the notes together". The classroom observations

allowed me to observe a very high level of energy from the teacher and the journal notes

from those visits include the following excerpt to illustrate this point:

> *Teacher has a book talk one on one with ZP and this is a great way to see*
>
> *the support the students have. There is clearly a strong relationship here*
>
> *as ZP is excited and animated when sharing about the book and the*
>
> *teacher uses asset language and supportive phrasing to encourage the*
>
> *discussion. There is also some modeling taking place with a read out loud*
>
> *strategy being used. ZP says that he wishes he could read faster, that*
>
> *speaks to the positive culture in the classroom as I could hear this from*
>
> *the back of the room and he was clearly comfortable sharing this*
>
> *information.*

The engagement of the participants during regular class sessions combined with the participation of each student in class discussions, book talks, and other activities helped emphasize the students' willingness to engage in order to succeed. In addition to these points of data collected during class observations the participants expanded on the idea of not wanting to disappoint their instructor through a variety of responses collected during the focus group interviews. LE shared that "Every time you read like a bunch of pages I mean she'll like acknowledge that it was a good thing like that you have read a lot, and there's been times like we are really behaved that we are like doing curriculum stuff and she will bring in food that she makes." When completing the classroom observations I was able to witness multiple interactions between the participants and the instructor that clearly illustrated a positive relationship. Participants IB and PK strengthened this claim when asked what motivates them to succeed in Reading Workshop they responded with the following information "I would have to say the main reason is that probably all of us work hard is just Mrs. Hahn's like enthusiasm and willingness to help us along the way" and "I mean she will really try to motivate you and talk to you even if you don't succeed". LT expanded on this idea of being motivated by the instructor even further, they shared the following "she even asks you how your day has been sometimes and like how was your break and just how you are in general?" and "If I am being honest I don't know if it is just like reading workshop class, I really think it is the teacher because I had reading workshop two years in a row now and my first year I did not really like it, I did not get much out of it but that was when I was with Mr. XX, no offense to him but when I was with Mrs. Hahn it was like a whole different, like I actually got interested and actually started to like it so I don't know if it is really, I really

just think that it is the teacher."

LE also shared a desire to please the instructor and shared that he would work to avoid disappointing her, it should be noted that when discussing the stern look LE was smiling and laughing, indicating a lightheartedness to the looks the instructor may give. LE shared why he is motivated to succeed in Reading Workshop, "Um, the not to get the stern look from Mrs. H, you do not want to be in the eyes of disappointment but it is also to be successful in my careers later in life too, which you would rather have a lot of jobs where you have to read stuff you don't want to and read things fast and accurate really helps out with that." The feeling of not wanting to disappoint their instructor came through from each of the participants and the support of this through the review of class observation notes made it clear that this motivation was equally important when compared to the other themes.

The importance of the role the teacher plays as a motivation to succeed as well as a motivation to re-enroll or continue in supplemental instruction after having met goals and been successful was a theme that was highlighted throughout the review of data collected in both the focus group interviews and the classroom observation notes. Classroom observation notes specifically point to the teacher being upbeat, using asset language, and clearly having a positive relationship with their students. Reflective journal notes further highlight these ideas with this direct passage from an observation journal:

> *The teacher is very animated, enthusiastic, and engaging. She works at making sure the students are excited and feel motivated to perform in their reading and writing.*

> *She also got into a conversation with me regarding students who love this*
>
> *class and are most likely not aware of the fact that this was supplemental*
>
> *instruction which I found to be interesting*

Throughout the data collection phase of this project it was clear that the positive relationship between the students and the teacher were playing a role in the students' motivation to be successful. The feel of a smaller learning community, the enthusiasm, encouragement, and asset language used, and the overall feeling of care and investment from the teacher is clearly evident in the participants' responses.

Overall Findings

Ultimately the findings of this study did produce answers to each of the three research questions that were posed. Through the examination of the data collected through classroom observations, artifact collection, and focus group interviews I was able to confidently answer each question put forth in this study.

The first focus area of this study was in regards to the participants' feelings and perceptions of the selection process for supplemental instruction, the data collected shows that though the selection process does not appear to be consistent or overtly communicated the participants in this study felt that there was merit to their placement in the Reading Workshop program. This was emphasized by the focus group responses, the instructor comments, and the positive responses regarding this particular research question. The participants are happy with the results they are getting from the supplemental instruction in Reading Workshop as they report academic improvement that is not limited to reading but includes multiple content areas. The feelings and perceptions of the participants regarding the selection process were that the process was purposeful

and positive.

The participants of this study have most definitely been shaped as learners through their experiences with supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop. The analysis of data collected revealed three areas in which participants were impacted which include self identity, competency, and autonomy. Participants identified themselves as readers, learners, and improved students as a result of their participation in Reading Workshop. Participants also reported increased competence in not only reading but in other core areas such as social studies and science. Each participant believed that their experiences in Reading Workshop increased their competence in relation to academics. Autonomy was another area highlighted as an impact participants experienced due to their involvement in Reading Workshop. Students not only experienced Autonomy when it came to student choice of materials, they were also given the opportunity to conduct self assessments and ultimately were able to choose whether or not they continued to participate in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop.

When investigating the motivations and barriers that may exist for high school students who are participating in supplemental instruction some very clear answers came from the participants of this study. First, in regards to barriers, two main themes came to light fairly quickly. The impact that the inclusion in supplemental instruction had on participants' schedules was a barrier that participants universally voiced. This included both access to some elective courses as well as the ability to have flexibility in the participants' daily schedule. The second barrier was in the form of perceptions from others who are not involved in the supplemental instruction or Reading Workshop. Some participants felt that their peers believed them to be less academically inclined due to

their participation in Reading Workshop. Though the perceptions may not clearly present themselves as a barrier to participants' success in supplemental instruction it should be noted that these perceptions did cause participants to question whether or not they wanted to engage or continue to engage in Reading Workshop therefore this is highlighted as a barrier to success.

Motivations to succeed were numerous and uniformly shared by participants in this study. The data compiled pointed to four distinct areas of motivation for the participants of this study. First came participants' concern for their future and future success. Next, participants were motivated to succeed by a desire for general academic improvement. The third distinctive motivator was a concern for grade point averages and earning credits. The final and possibly strongest motivator to present itself was in regards to earning and maintaining their instructor's approval.

Chapter 5: Summaries, Interpretations, and Recommendations

The purpose of this research is to gain a better understanding of student perspectives in regards to supplemental instruction. In this chapter I will be drawing conclusions, making interpretations, and offering recommendations for high school leaders seeking to improve their supplemental instruction programs. These aspects include the feelings and perceptions high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction, the different ways being involved with supplemental instruction has shaped these students as learners, and what motivations or barriers exist for these students within supplemental instruction. Specifically there will be a focus on the responses and findings in regards to the three research questions driving the work which were as follows:

- What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?

- In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?

- What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?

After summarizing the findings this information will be interpreted and explained in the context of Quality High School followed by implications for application of findings to similar settings. Limitations of the study will follow the implications and finally a discussion including recommendations for the future will conclude the chapter.

What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?

The supplemental program used in this study was very much focused on students needing support in the area of reading with the skills of comprehension and fluency as targets for improvement. Supplemental instruction can be employed through a variety of delivery methods and structures (Harding et al., 2012). These methods range from direct and scripted forms of instruction to a more hands-off student led approach. In this study programmatic instruction referred to as Reading Workshop was based on the Second Chance Reading which is a curriculum intended to be a targeted two year intervention for students who were two to five years behind their grade level in reading according to Central Rivers AEA (2023). Though this may appear to be rather pedestrian information it does help highlight the importance of the finding in relation to student and parent understanding of the program itself. The description of Reading Workshop shared publicly in the program of studies for Quality School District does not mention details from the description of Second Chance Reading, specifically the idea that targeted individuals would be two to five years behind grade level in reading. I point these details out as important findings in student perceptions of the selection process for supplemental instruction as the participants of this study did not readily offer a clear understanding of the selection or referral process. In fact, two of the participants, ZP and PK, believed their assignment to Reading Workshop to be random while the others believed their identification for supplemental reading instruction to be purposeful.

Ultimately the participants' understanding of the selection process for supplemental reading instruction was not nearly as clear as I had predicted. The communication between students, staff, and guardians in regards to the programmatic details, including the identification process, appears to have been diluted over time.

When asked what their guardians knew about the program LT quickly replied "nothing, not anything" and though there were not any negative responses or reactions to being selected for Reading Workshop there was also no clear understanding from the participants regarding the process for selection. Not only were there no negative responses to the selection for supplemental instruction, there were actually several positive responses such as PK who stated that the supplemental instruction has helped them with their spelling and they believe their grades have gone up as a result of their inclusion in Reading Workshop.

Both, the lack of understanding around the selection process and the positive reaction to their experiences in Reading Workshop were unexpected outcomes. Going into this study I felt that participants, their guardians, and the instructors would all have a fairly clear understanding of the selection process and this was not the case. Despite the literature suggesting that there are some common methods employed in order to identify students as in need of supplemental instruction at all levels which often include a combination of standardized assessments, common formative assessments, and instructor input (Burns, 2012; Cantrell et.al, 2014; Harding, 2012; Wilkerson et al., 2016), this was not the case in this particular study.

Additionally, I felt that participants may have negative feelings about being identified for supplemental instruction and the research revealed that participants felt there were clear benefits stemming from their involvement and they did not regret nor feel negatively about their involvement or selection for the program. In their 2010 journal article, "*The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap: Two Sides of the Same Coin*," Gregory, et al. explain that students who face academic challenges may become

frustrated and have a lower confidence level which was what I thought I would experience with the participants of this study but instead I encountered students who felt empowered by their experiences. Despite some ambiguity around the selection or identification process, the participants felt that their inclusion in Reading Workshop was a benefit to them as learners.

These findings may have been influenced by the participants' perceptions of their success and growth as a result of their inclusion in Reading Workshop. The results clearly revealed that these participants did not have negative feelings towards their inclusion in supplemental instruction though these findings may not have been universal had participants not experienced success within the programming. In 2013, Cantrell et al. explained that adolescents with difficulty reading often have low reading motivation, expanding to say that some studies have linked student motivation to their reading performance. In this instance the participants of the study were not only motivated but felt that they were successful readers due to their experiences in Reading Workshop. This idea brings to the forefront a limitation that should be addressed in the form of the participants as each participant was able to share a story of success. Surely there are students who, for a variety of reasons, may be or have been involved in Reading Workshop without having success. One may assume that their perceptions on the selection or identification process may vary from those of their successful peers.

In terms of future directions regarding student perceptions of the identification process for supplemental instruction I believe that this is an area that could and should be improved. The fact that the participants of this study, the participants' guardians, and even the staff involved with delivering supplemental instruction were not clear on the

identification process is definitely a concern that should be addressed. Despite Callender (2014) highlighting the need for a systematic approach to universal screening and student placement in supplemental instruction, in this study that shortcoming did not adversely impact the student results or the program's ability to meet its intended purpose. I believe that clearly stating the rationale and criteria for identification of students needing supplemental instruction should be a pillar of any supplemental program as this will increase participant understanding and efficacy within the program though this is not critical to the overall success of such programs.

In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?

The next area of focus for this study was an indepth look at the ways being a part of supplemental instruction has shaped these participants as learners. During the focus group interviews, three themes emerged in regards to how students saw themselves as learners. The first theme was focused on student identity, the next theme highlighted the participants' competency, and the last theme to present itself focused on student autonomy.

When conducting the focus group interviews it became apparent that the participants identified themselves as successful learners who had improved their skills through their experiences in Reading Workshop. In addition to participants' explaining their successes in Reading Workshop, most elaborated to share ways in which they transferred and applied increased skills in fluency and comprehension to their other coursework. The results reveal how the participants identify themselves as successful,

autonomous, motivated learners as well as the impact their experiences with supplemental instruction have had on them in curricular areas other than reading.

Future directions for supplemental reading instruction should also include the focus on transferability of skills as well as the universal benefits that participants experience as a result of being involved in Reading Workshop. Understanding the fact that targeted supplemental programming in public education typically focuses on the disciplines of reading and math and knowing that research has also produced data to support the fact that literacy gaps widen significantly as students move on to the secondary years (Filderman et al., 2019) it is important for all educators to understand that the benefits of supplemental reading instruction go beyond standardized test scores and reading. The participants of this study showed that their increased skills as a result of involvement in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop directly contributed to their success in other classrooms and curricular areas

Participant LE went on to describe themselves as a reader and explained that he is now a successful reader due to their involvement in Reading Workshop. They expanded on this by sharing an affinity for vocabulary and "interesting words" and went on to share an interest in audio books and the app audible. ZP also confirmed that they identify themselves as a better student universally due to their involvement in Reading Workshop, additionally, IB identified themselves as a student who cares about their grade point average after their experience with Reading Workshop and supplemental instruction. The participants unilaterally identified themselves as learners and readers and each of the participants interviewed chose to remain in the program even after having experienced success and met the criteria to discontinue participation. These participants are

discovering that their increased skills in reading are making their other academic endeavors more enjoyable and they have an increased confidence in classrooms and curricular areas outside of reading. In 2016, Cantrell et al. shared that interventions should not only develop students' skills and abilities but should also target aspects of student motivation which is what the research reveals is taking place in Reading Workshop. Participants were motivated by the desire to please an instructor whom they felt had created a positive student and teacher relationship and who took a genuine interest in each of them as learners. This combination of skill development and motivation align directly with the work referenced and examined from Cantrell et al. (2016).

The next theme to emerge had a focus on student competency. Here participants shared examples of ways in which Reading Workshop and supplemental instruction had impacted them beyond the metrics of fluency and comprehension with a focus on transferability and impact across curricular areas. ZP shared a story of transferability of skills when they mentioned how their increased fluency had specifically helped them in their World History class. They went on to share that their large reading load in World History had been intimidating in the past but after their experience with Reading Workshop they were able to read more quickly and freely due to an increased fluency rate and this helped them do better in class. The participants felt an increase in competence and confidence in a variety of curricular settings due to their experiences and success in supplemental instruction. Multiple participants shared that they felt more confident and capable as students in other classes and curricular areas due to their experiences with Reading Workshop and supplemental instruction. LT expanded on this

and explained "It's helped me in all of my other classes and got me to understand more".
This theme of student competency flowed throughout the collection of data and was a
highlight of the work. The importance of this theme is critical to the research as it shows
that supplemental instruction can and does have a transferable impact on students who
participate in programs such as Reading Workshop. Sansoti et al. (2010) shares that RTI
has taken off in the world of secondary education and this is good news for education and
students as the research for this dissertation supports supplemental instruction having
universal benefits for the participants. These results would support a positive outcome for
students engaged in supplemental instruction as well as support for the resources
dedicated to such programming.

  The final theme to emerge in regards to how the participants' experiences with
Reading Workshop and supplemental instruction shaped them as learners was a focus on
the area of participant autonomy. Here participants shared an appreciation for their
autonomy when it came to the specific curriculum of Reading Workshop, their autonomy
when it came to self assessment, and their autonomy when it came to choosing whether
or not to continue with the program after having met goals and experienced success.

  Participant choice in the materials they read for Reading Workshop and autonomy
in assessment were areas that stood out for several participants. As shared previously, LE
explained that the students are able to choose the books they read for class and if the
goals that are set (by the student) are not met they can work with the teacher to make
adjustments, this is a solid example of autonomy in goal setting to go along with text
choice. PK added to this by explaining that participants also monitor their own progress
in Reading Workshop through self evaluation with Jamestown readers. Choosing the

books used for their own learning clearly came through as a way to help participants feel empowered and a way to motivate them to succeed. Individual goal setting and progress monitoring each day by the participants added to this feeling of autonomy and self regulation. This is important information to analyze as it can have positive implications for future educators looking to implement a successful supplemental instruction program. The autonomy of choice played a role in the participants' enjoyment and therefore engagement in the Reading Workshop course partly due to this autonomy. In their 2015 article focusing on the effects of choice in the classroom, Beymer and Thomson share that offering choice is one way to increase student motivation and competence which is supported by this research. This data should also serve as guidance to others seeking guidance on successful supplemental instruction as there is clearly a correlation between student autonomy and the success of programming.

The theme of autonomy was sustained as a focus area when it came to participants continuing with the Reading Workshop program. Each of the participants involved in this study was currently enrolled in Reading Workshop on a voluntary basis at the time of the focus group interviews. The students chose to stay for a variety of reasons ranging from their perception of the class as a credit they can easily earn, the participants' comfort level with the instructor, the participants' experiences with success, and their desire to grow academically. Each participant had spent a minimum of two semesters in Reading Workshop with two having spent six semesters in the program solidifying the idea that participants choose to remain even after having met goals and expectations. What was designed as a semester-long course morphing into a course that the participants choose to continue to engage with is significant as it shows that with the right combination of

pieces in place students will succeed and choose to continue to push themselves to better their skill set.

Consideration for the future in regards to how participants' experiences with supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop should focus on the area of autonomy. Each participant in this study expressed their appreciation for the autonomy given when it came to choosing the materials they read. The participants further expressed their appreciation for the self guided feel of the goal setting process as well as the progress monitoring. I feel that these components should be central to any successful supplemental instruction program as student choice was a driver for success in this study. I would also argue that though there certainly is a responsibility on the part of school officials to have an identification process in place to initially engage students in need of supplemental instruction, it is important that students who wish to continue to participate be allowed to do so.

Student identity, student competency, and student autonomy were all themes that emerged from the stem looking at how participants' experiences with supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop has shaped them as learners. Participants openly identified themselves as readers, learners, and improved students. Participants further explained their identification as learners by sharing their feelings of competence in a variety of academic settings as a result of their involvement in supplemental instruction giving concrete examples of growth and success. Lastly, participants shared feelings of and experiences with autonomy when it came to supplemental instruction and Reading Workshop specifically pointing out areas such as choice of materials to read, self guided goal setting, self assessment, and ultimately having the choice of continuing or

discontinuing involvement in the supplemental program. As Johsnson et al. explained in 2009, in order to have a successful supplemental program in place a school must not only employ the necessary components but must also integrate those components (p. 6). That integration of components such as autonomy and student choice is precisely what took place in this research and should serve as a road map for others looking to implement a successful program.

These revelations in regards to how the supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop has positively impacted the participants help highlight the multiple benefits of the program. It is clear that the participants feel there are multiple academic benefits to being involved in the program from their responses and from their continued voluntary enrollment in Reading Workshop.

Knowing that supplemental instruction can be employed through a variety of delivery methods and structures (Harding et al., 2012), the idea that this particular program works with a specific structure and curriculum in the form of Reading Workshop it was interesting to hear participants' appreciation of the curriculum and results of their involvement. Previous literature provides examples of programming delivered after regular school hours while some districts and school leaders worked to adjust schedules in order to allow for supplemental instruction during the regular school day as a class taken for high school credit (Berkeley et al., 2012). Reading Workshop taking place during regular school hours with the benefit of earning a high school credit serving as supplemental instruction is clearly a success in the opinion of the study's participants.

These findings in regards to the participants' identity, competency, and autonomy when looking at how their experiences with supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop have shaped them as learners do have certain limitations. One area that may be a concern would be the fact that each of the participants proclaimed to have experienced success which is wonderful but there must be other students who were not involved in the study who have had a negative or less positive experience with Reading Workshop. The opinions and ideas from these students would certainly be important in drawing concrete conclusions regarding student perspectives on supplemental instruction though none of the student participants involved in this study claimed to have had a negative experience.

In terms of future directions regarding student perceptions of the supplemental instruction as it relates to student identity, competency, and autonomy I believe that there are multiple areas that should be highlighted as determining factors to student success. One of these areas would be the idea of students identifying themselves as learners and readers. As Urdan and Schoenfelder (2006) point out, motivated behavior in school results due to a combination of characteristics and students who appear to be unmotivated may become willing participants if tasks are tailored to their interest or they feel competent. This idea of motivating the seemingly unmotivated comes through in multiple areas of this particular study and has been demonstrated throughout these findings. I felt this was critical and the Reading Workshop program outlining and reinforcing what it means to be a reader is one of the reasons participants had such a positive response about Reading Workshop and themselves as readers.

What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?

When connecting findings as they relate to the participants' motivations and barriers in regards to supplemental instruction there were clear lines drawn to both barriers to participants' success or desire to participate in Reading Workshop as well as motivations for participants to work towards success. Within the context of each, barriers and motivation, there were subcategories that emerged after analyzing the data collected via focus group interviews as well as classroom observations and artifact collection. A summary of those findings as well as interpretations of the data, limitations of those findings and suggestions for future directions are provided here.

The first barrier to participants having success or continuing with supplemental instruction to present itself was focused on scheduling and the impacts or limitations the inclusion in supplemental instruction can create for the participants. Multiple participants shared frustrations and described different situations where they were either limited in their course selections or they were forced to choose between Reading Workshop and continuing with supplemental instruction or taking other elective courses that they had interest in. PK shared that they had to make certain choices when generating their schedule and LT supported this by sharing that Reading Workshop does take up an "extra space" in their schedule that could be used to take an alternative elective that they may be interested in. Though there were multiple examples of frustration around the participants' inclusion in supplemental instruction making an impact on their scheduling, the participants in this study stated that when forced to choose between other electives and Reading Workshop they chose to schedule into the supplemental instruction. The fact that

most of the participants chose to re engage in supplemental instruction after having completed the required semester does make this barrier more difficult to define that it appears. With this model of supplemental instruction takes place during the regular school day it clearly increases the time participants have to engage in the intervention which Hunt suggested in 2013 and is supported by multiple studies (Duffy, 2007; Johnson et al., 2009; Sansosti et al., 2010) this increase in time for intervention also acts as a barrier or limiter to other course offerings.

The next barrier to student participation in supplemental instruction presented itself as more of a feeling or perception on the part of participants in regards to how students who were not engaged in supplemental instruction viewed them as students. LT was vocal in sharing that they felt students who are not involved in Reading Workshop perceive themselves as smarter than those students who are involved in the program. IB supported this sentiment by sharing that they feel other students try to laugh at those going to Reading Workshop despite the fact that students do not know who is attending as a required support and who is attending as a conscious choice. This data is significant because it points to an area that could be proactively addressed by practitioners looking to implement a successful supplemental instruction program. Through more overt and clear communication Quality High School and Quality School District could have worked to more clearly explain certain aspects of the Reading Workshop program that could include items such as the selection process and criteria for students, the purpose of the program, and the way students can use this program to universally increase their skills in reading to positively impact other curricular areas. This ability to positively impact learners in multiple curricular areas through the use of supplemental instruction is a step in the right

direction as educators continue to reconsider policies and practices aimed at shrinking achievement gaps.

Though the study confirms that each of these barriers exist and each were discussed by the participants in the focus groups interviews, these barriers were not significant enough for any of the participants to choose to discontinue their involvement in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop. When asked about barriers LT replied "... I mean not really, there might be some minor ones but the pros outweigh the cons for me at least".

The motivations to success for participants or the "pros'' as LT put it were the next focus to be examined. Participants shared multiple reasons or motivations for being successful in their work with supplemental instruction and Reading Workshop. These motivations broke down into three distinct categories which included graduation and future plans, academic improvement, and finally a desire to please their instructor.

Three of the five participants specifically named graduation as a motivating factor in their work towards success in supplemental programming. This motivation to graduate was accompanied by a feeling that Reading Workshop was a credit they could earn easily to apply towards graduation. LT replied "What motivates me to be successful in there? To graduate" and IB added that it was an easy letter grade and credit.

In addition to the focus on graduation there existed a focus on the participants' future whether that included employment or continuing their academic career depended on the participant though the focus on the future was a universal motivator for the participants. It was interesting to hear the participants equate success in supplemental instruction with success in their future employment, this was a nice corollary with the

transferability of skill in other curricular areas mentioned previously where participants

see their increased reading skills as an asset in more than just reading class. LT shared

the following: "Like what I want to be when I am older, like obviously the reading helps

because like no matter like what you want to be you are going to have to read something

or understand things and it like gives you more knowledge about things and words in

there and like more bigger words and stuff, like words you have but you can extend them

and your words and stuff".

The final motivator for success for the participants in this study centered around

the instructor of Reading Workshop and the fact that the participants did not want to

disappoint the instructor. Each participant expressed their desire to show the instructor

their ability to make progress with their reading skills and to show their efforts in making

that progress. Trust, respect, and appreciation for the instructor combined to be a central

motivation focusing on the instructor and a desire to please them and honor their work by

showing growth and success. The research revealed that there were strong relationships

built between the participants and instructor when it came to individualized instruction

and assessment and that these relationships accounted for a lot of the success participants

experienced. Characteristics of the instructor included the consistent use of asset

language, individualizing instruction, frequent opportunities for student choice in reading

materials, and a positive classroom environment. LT shared that the instructor frequently

checks in with participants on non curricular topics just asking how they are doing, how

their break was, and how they are in general. Cantrell et.al shared in 2016 that students

described the supplemental instruction setting as a safe space for reading and learning

which mirrors the sentiments of the participants in this particular study exactly, in fact LT

described Reading Workshop as a quiet and calm space. Motivation to please the instructor and an appreciation of the safe space created by the instructor combined to lead the participants of this study to success. The persistence of achievement gaps supports the need for educational leaders to address policy and practice as they search for a successful model of supplemental instruction. The data collected in this study supports the multifaceted nature of the necessary components for successful programming which included a dedicated course taking place during the regular school day and an increase in time to practice skills for participants which are outlined in the discussion of this data (Johnson et al. (2009), Sansosti et al. (2010), Fullan (2007).

Implications in relation to the barriers and motivations that the participants experienced through their interactions with Reading Workshop as a form of supplemental instruction began to emerge as the themes revealed themselves. The research conducted in this study supports the existence of barriers to success or barriers to participation in supplemental instruction in the form of scheduling conflicts and difficulties as well as perceived negative projections by other students towards the participants in Reading Workshop. As for motivations to succeed, the research implies that the participants are indeed motivated to be successful in Reading Workshop due to a combination of their focus on the future and graduation, a desire for academic improvement, and a positive relationship with the instructor of the program.

Future considerations for successful supplemental instructional programming in regards to the topics of barriers and motivation begin with perception from the participants that other students who are not involved in Reading Workshop may think that those students who are have lower skill levels. This could be addressed by Quality

High School and the Quality School District through the demystification of the program and the process for identifying students who qualify for this supplemental instruction. I believe that if the program of studies were more descriptive and the identification process were more clearly defined and communicated to all participants, guardians, and staff a better understanding would exist in regards to the program and its purpose and perceptions of those involved in the program may have more of a positive feel.

The next consideration for the future is a focus on the challenge of having the supplemental instruction program take place during the regular instructional day. As the participants pointed out, Reading Workshop takes a space in their schedule and limits opportunities to enroll in alternative or elective courses. Berkeley et al. (2012) explained that school administrators will at times adjust daily schedules in order to accommodate a course such as Reading Workshop. In 2012, Harding et al. suggested that students who are given autonomy often do not engage in supplemental instruction at a level that would make a positive impact, therefore I would argue that the prescribed class for supplemental instruction has the bigger benefit to students. One way to address this issue may be to look at the possibility of allowing this course to qualify for an English elective credit as opposed to a general elective. An alternative to this would be to limit the number of semesters a student can enroll in the program as most participants in this study had already met their goals, though this does feel counterintuitive to the purpose of creating engaged readers.

Future considerations in reference to the motivations on the part of the participants to either be successful in supplemental programming or to remain engaged in the Reading Workshop program reveal themselves in relation to graduation and future

plans, academic improvement, and the positive relationship between the teacher and the participants in the program. When looking at graduation and future plans I believe the instructor places a strong emphasis on communicating the relationship between the benefits of increasing reading skills and future plans for students. Multiple participants shared that they work hard in Reading Workshop because they know it will help them graduate and it will help them with their future plans. This emphasis by the instructor and the buy-in from the participants is definitely a key to the participants' perception of the programmatic success of Reading Workshop. Looking to the future, any school leader looking to implement a successful supplemental instructional program should pay special attention to the staffing of the instructor positions for these supplemental instruction programs. The data collected here would strongly support the need for instructors who possess and promote a student centered approach to their instruction that allows students to plot, plan, and execute their own paths to success with the instructor acting as a true instructional coach and supporter who takes an interest in each individual's success.

Academic improvement was another motivator that the participants uniformly referred to throughout the research. This academic improvement was not limited to the arenas of supplemental instruction, reading, or Reading Workshop. Each of the participants shared that they felt they were better students, better prepared, and more successful in other curricular areas due to their experiences in supplemental instruction in the form of Reading Workshop. I believe that the Reading Workshop program will continue to be perceived as a success by the participants and that future implications should include the importance of participants seeing the universal application of skills

practiced, gained, and implemented as a result of their engagement in Reading Workshop.

Future implications for the final motivating factor that kept students engaged in the supplemental programming and working towards success, a positive relationship between the instructor and participants, are focused on the instructor and their ability to create a positive classroom culture. The participants of this study were very much aligned in their praise for the instructor and the investment the instructor had in each of them as learners. The participants shared examples of the instructor supporting them, allowing them individual choice, encouraging them, and holding them accountable. There was mention from LT that they had been engaged in Reading Workshop previously with a different instructor and they did not feel successful whereas they now do with their current instructor. Knowing that replicating an individual's personality or passion is an impossibility, I choose to focus on characteristics of the instructor that are able to be replicated. According to the participants in this study, if a supplemental program is going to be a success the instructor will need to invest in the participants, build positive relationships with the participants, and truly get to know the participants as learners.

Limitations

The research conducted and the data examined in this study revealed much about the perspectives of students who are participating in supplemental instruction though this was not all that was revealed. There are also limitations to this work that were exposed through the examination of data collected. One limitation that was exposed would be the sample size of students who were included in the focus groups. Despite much energy and effort the use of purposeful sampling was only able to generate a small sample size in

comparison to the number of students participating in supplemental instruction. This limitation is accompanied by the narrow focus of supplemental instruction in the area of reading only. Targeted supplemental programming in public education typically focuses on the disciplines of Reading and Math therefore the focus on only one discipline in this study limits the ability to universally apply findings.

Additional limitations include the context for the research itself. This particular study was bounded by parameters that included a supplemental instruction class that was offered during the school day and taken for an elective credit that participants can use to apply towards graduation. The participants in this study were identified by the school officials at Quality High School as being in need of this supplemental instruction and were originally scheduled into the Reading Workshop course without their input. In addition to these parameters, the Reading Workshop course where the research was conducted employs the Second Chance Reading curriculum as the specified supplemental program. These parameters do restrict the transferability of findings though general implications are still able to be made.

One final limitation to this particular study would be the success of the participants that engaged in the study. In this research project all of the participants were able to experience success as well as articulate how that success had impacted them as learners. This success is certainly a positive and welcome revelation for the researcher and for educators in general as it reveals the positive impact that supplemental instruction can have on participants at a time when many programs are not yielding the desired results.

Future Directions for Research

A compilation of the data analysis for this research project and the limitations described previously have helped generate discussion on the future direction of research in regards to supplemental instruction, specifically the perceptions of the student engaged in those supplemental programs. In the future I believe there would be value in continuing to pursue the aspect of research that included the strong relationship between the instructor and the participants of this study. It is evident that this relationship played a significant role in the participants' engagement and success with the supplemental instruction program. As Pianta and Stuhlman (2004) pointed out, students who have close and supportive relationships with their instructors are more likely to have academic success. That claim is supported by this research and I believe gives direction for future studies looking for correlation between supplemental instruction success and the dynamics of the relationship between the instructor and the participants. I believe it would also be a benefit for the field of education to examine more closely the aspect of student choice or autonomy in their involvement in supplemental instruction as this was also an area that the participants felt greatly impacted their success in the program.

Conclusions

The initial spark for this study was centered around the fact that the author was a witness to supplemental instruction receiving increased attention over the past twenty years with more and more resources being dedicated to these efforts without much in the way of measurable results for the students experiencing that supplemental instruction. Supplemental instruction has become so prevalent that it is simply a thing educators do to students without the students' input or their understanding of its purpose. It was my belief

that the prevalence combined with a lack of understanding on the part of the students could create problems around programmatic success and student motivation in addition to the potential of limiting access to coursework. At the time of this research there was not an abundance of research focused on the student perceptions of supplemental instruction and there was consensus that this perspective is often absent despite its critical role (Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012).

After concluding this project and having had the opportunity to interview student participants as well as the instructors of supplemental instruction, and reviewing artifacts I am able to say that despite the students' lack of understanding in regards to the programming, the purpose of this programming, or the selection process for supplemental those students involved in this research consistently shared positive experiences when it came to their time with supplemental programming. Though there were some barriers and I was correct in my assertion that these participants did, at times, have limits put on their access to coursework, these limits did not diminish their experience to the point of disengagement or dropping out of their supplemental programming, Reading Workshop. In fact, programmatic success and student motivation were both high which is in contrast to the preconceived thoughts I had entering this project. Though I would normally be disappointed in the fact that my initial hypothesis was proven wrong, I am thrilled that these student participants were able to find success and make growth in not only reading but in all of their educational endeavors due to their experiences with supplemental instruction.

References

Adams, P. (2006). Exploring social constructivism: Theories and practicalities.

Education, 34(3), 243-257.

Annamma, S. A., Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2018). Disability Critical Race Theory:

Exploring the intersectional lineage, emergence, and potential futures of DisCrit

in education. *Review of Research in Education*, *42*(1), 46-71.

https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732x18759041

Batsche, Elliott, J., Graden, J., Grimes, J., Kovaleski, J., Prasse, D., et al. (2005).

Response to intervention: Policy considerations and implementation. Alexandria,

VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Bell, D. A. (1995). Who's afraid of Critical Race Theory. *U. Ill. L. Rev.*, 1995 rs.

Bender, W. (2009). Beyond the RTI Pyramid: Implementation Issues for the First

Five Years: Bloomington, IL: Solution Tree Press.

Benner, G. J., Nelson, J. R., Stage, S. A., & Ralston, N. C. (2011). The influence of

fidelity of implementation on the reading outcomes of middle school students

experiencing reading difficulties. *Remedial and Special Education*, *32*(1), 79-88.

Berkeley, S., Lindstrom, J., Regan, K., Nealy, A., Southall, C., & Stagliano, C. (2012).

An evaluation of supplemental reading instruction for at-risk middle school

readers. *Middle Grades Research Journal, 7*(1), 1.

Beymer, P. N., & Thomson, M. M. (2015). The effects of choice in the classroom: Is

there too little or too much choice? *Support for Learning, 30*(2), 105–120.

https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9604.12086

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2016). *Qualitative Research for Education: An introduction to theories and methods*. Pearson India Education Services.

Bredeson, P. V. (2000). The school principal's role in teacher professional development. *Journal of In-Service Education, 26*(2), 385–401. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580000200114

Burns, M. K. (2008, March). *RTI at the secondary level part 2*. National Association of Secondary School Principals. Retrieved November 22, 2021, from https://www.nassp.org/publication/principal-leadership/.

Burns, M., Kanive, R., & DeGrande, M. (2012). Effect of a computer-delivered math fact intervention as a supplemental intervention for math in third and fourth grades. *Remedial and Special Education, 33*(3), 184-191.

Callender, W. A. (2014). *Using Rti in secondary schools: A training manual for successful implementation*. Corwin, a SAGE Company.

Cantrell, S. C., Almasi, J. F., Carter, J. C., & Rintamaa, M. (2013). Reading intervention in Middle and high schools: Implementation fidelity, teacher efficacy, and student achievement. *Reading Psychology*, *34*(1), 26–58. https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2011.577695

Cantrell, S., Almasi, J., Rintamaa, M., Carter, J., Pennington, J., & Buckman, D. (2014). The impact of supplemental instruction on low-achieving adolescents' reading engagement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 107*(1), 36-58.

Cantrell, S. C., Pennington, J., Rintamaa, M., Osborne, M., Parker, C., & Rudd, M. (2016). Supplemental literacy instruction in high school: What students say

matters for reading engagement. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, *33*(1), 54–70.

https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2015.1081838

Central Rivers Areas Education Agency. (n.d.). *Literacy: Solutions to closing the gap: Second chance reading.* Retrieved April 6, 2023, from

https://www.centralriversaea.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Literacy_-2nd-Chance-Reading-1.pdf

Clark, C. M. (1998). Hello learners: Living social constructivism. *Teaching Education*, *10*(1), 89–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047621980100113

Cohen, D. K. (1998). Teaching practice: plus ça change. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Contributing to educational change: perspectives on research and practice*. Berkeley: McCuchen.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). SAGE.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches* (5th ed.). Sage.

Dougherty, S. M., & Lombardi, A. R. (2016). From vocational education to career readiness: The ongoing work of linking education and the labor market. *Review of Research in Education, 40*(1), 326-355.

https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16678602

Duffy, H. (2007). Meeting the needs of significantly struggling learners in high school: a look at approaches to tiered intervention. *National High School Center*.

Duhon, G. J., House, S. H., & Stinnett, T. A. (2012). Evaluating the generalization of

    math fact fluency gains across paper and computer performance modalities.

    Journal of School Psychology, *50*(3), 335-345.

Epler-Brooks, P. L. (2021). *Response to intervention (Rti) in secondary schools: A*

    comparison of the Rti Service Delivery Model (dissertation). ProQuest LLC.

    Retrieved September 8, 2022, from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED534274.

    Essential components of RTI – a closer look at response to ... - ed. (n.d.).

        https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED526858.pdf

Filderman, M. J., Austin, C. R., & Toste, J. R. (2019). Data-based decision making for

    struggling readers in the secondary grades. *Intervention in School and Clinic*,

    55(1), 3–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451219832991

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. (Chapter 1 & 2). New York: Continuum.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teacher's College
Press.

Garcia, E., Weiss, E. (2015, June 17). Early education gaps by social class and race start

    U.S. children out on unequal footing: A summary of the major findings in

    inequalities at the Starting Gate. Economic Policy

    Institute.https://www.epi.org/publication/early-educatin-gaps-by-social-clas-and-

    race-start-u-s-children-out-on-unequla-footing-a-summary-of-the-major-findings-

    in-inequalities-at-the-starting-gate/

Gregory, A., Skiba, R., & Noguera, P. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline

    gap: Two sides of the same coin? *Educational Researcher, 39*(1),59-68.

Gumus, S. (2013). The Effects of Teacher - And School-Level Factors On Teachers

    Participation In Professional Development Activities: The Role Of Principal l

    Leadership. *Journal of International Education Research (JIER)*, *9*(4), 371–380.

    https://doi.org/10.19030/jier.v9i4.8089

Harding, H., Harrison-Jones, L., & Rebach, H. (2012). A study of the effectiveness of

    supplemental educational services for title I students in Baltimore city public

    schools.*The Journal of Negro Education, 81*(1), 52-66.

Hawkins, R. O., Collins, T., Hernan, C., & Flowers, E. (2017). Using computer-assisted

    instruction to build math fact fluency: An implementation guide. *Intervention in*

    School and Clinic, *52*(3), 141-147.

Hock, M.F., & Deshler, D.D. (2003). Don't forget the adolescents. *Principal Leadership,*

    4(3), 50-56. http://www.nassp.org/tabid/2043/default.aspx

Hunt, J. H., Valentine, C., Bryant, D. P., Pfannenstiel, K. H., & Bryant, B. R. (2015).

    Supplemental mathematics intervention. *Remedial and Special Education*, *37*(2),

    78–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932515597293

Hunt, J. H. (2013). Effects of a supplemental intervention focused in equivalency

    concepts for students with varying abilities. *Remedial and Special Education*,

    35(3), 135–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932513507780

Johnson, E. S., Mellard, D. F., Harris, M. L., & Smith, L. (2009). *How Rti works in*

    Secondary Schools. Corwin Press.

Kim, B. (2001). Social Constructivism.. In M. Orey (Ed.), Emerging perspectives on

    learning, teaching, and technology. Retrieved from

    http://projects.coe.uga.edu/epltt/

Koh, E. T., & Owen, W. L. (2000). *Introduction to nutrition and health research*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Labaree, D. F. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, *34*(1), 39-81. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312034001039

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2006). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Heatherton, Vic.: Hawker Brownlow Education.

Moats, L. C. (2001). When older students can't read. *Educational Leadership*, *58*(6), 36-41.

National Association of School Psychologists (2022). *Essa and MTSS for decision-makers*. (n.d.).Retrieved from https://www.nasponline.org/research-and-policy/policy-priorities/relevant-law/the-every-student-succeeds-act/essa-implementation-resources/essa-and-mtss-for-decision-makers

National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *National Assessment of Educational Progress: Reading*. Retrieved November 18, 2021, from https://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/reading/

O'Donnell, C. L. (2008). Defining, conceptualizing, and measuring fidelity of implementation and its relationship to outcomes in K–12 curriculum intervention research. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(1), 33-84.

Pianta, R. C., & Stuhlman, M.W. (2004). Teacher-child relationships and children's success in the first years of school. *School Psychology Review, 33*(3), 444–458.

Pindiprolu, S. S., & Forbush, D. E. (2009). Evaluating the Promise of Computer-Based Reading Interventions with Students with Reading Difficulties. *Journal on School Educational Technology*, *4*(3), 41-49.

Powell, K. C. & Kalina, C.(2009). Cognitive and social constructivism: Developing tools for an effective classroom. *Education*, *130*(2), 241-250.

Preston, A. I., Wood, C. L., & Stecker, P. M. (2015). Response to intervention: Where it came from and where it's going. *Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth*, *60*(3), 173–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988x.2015.1065399

Public School Review (2022). *Understanding No Child Left Behind.* Retrieved November 18, 2021, from https://www.publicschoolreview.com/blog/understanding-no-child-left-behind

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2017). *An introduction to qualitative research: learning in the field*. SAGE.

Saldaña, J. (2015). *Thinking qualitatively: Methods of mind*. SAGE.

Saldaña, J., Omasta, M. (2022). *Qualitative Research: Analyzing Life.* SAGE

Sansosti, F. J., Telzrow, C., & Noltemeyer, A. (2010). Barriers and Facilitators to Implementing Response to Intervention in Secondary Schools: Qualitative Perspectives of School Psychologists. *School Psychology Forum*, *4*(1), 1–21. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/259889542_Barriers_and_facilitators_to_implementing_response_to_intervention_in_secondary_schools_Qualitative_perspectives_of_school_psychologists

Sawchuk, S. (2021, August 24). *Why school boards are now Hot spots for nasty politics*. EducationWeek.https://www.edweek.org/leadership/why-school-boards-are-now-hot-spots-for-nasty-politics/2021/07

Sosa-Provencio, M. A., Sheahan, A., Desai, S., & Secatero, S. (2018). Tenets of body-soul rooted pedagogy: Teaching for critical consciousness, nourished resistance, and healing. *Critical Studies in Education*, *61*(3), 345-362. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2018.1445653

The Art of Education University (2020). We grow amazing art teachers. https://theartofeducation.edu/

Torgesen, J. K. (2007). Catch them before they fall: Early identification and intervention to prevent reading failure for young children. Paper presented to educators and parents in Durango, CO.

Tracey, D.H., & Morrow, L.M. (2017). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models.* The Guilford Press.

Ulich, R. (2013). *Three thousand years of educational wisdom: Selections from great documents*. Harvard University Press

Urdan, T., & Schoenfelder, E. (2006). Classroom effects on student motivation: Goal structures, social relationships, and competence beliefs. *Journal of School Psychology*, *44*(5), 331–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.04.003

Vaughn, S., Fletcher, J. M., Francis, D. J., Denton, C. A., Wanzek, J., Wexler, J., ... & Romain, M. A. (2008). Response to intervention with older students with reading difficulties. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *18*(3), 338-345.

Wilkerson, K. L., Yan, M.-C., Perzigian, A. B., & Cakiroglu, O. (2016). Supplementary

reading instruction in alternative high schools: A statewide survey of educator

reported practices and barriers. *The High School Journal, 99*(2), 166–178.

https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2016.0000

Yazzie-Mintz, E., & McCormick, K. (2012). Finding the humanity in the data:

Understanding, measuring, and strengthening student engagement. In S.L.

Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student

engagement* (pp.743-761). New York, NY: Springer.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage Publicati

Appendix A

RESEARCH QUESTION	DATA SOURCE #1	DATA SOURCE #2	DATA SOURCE #3
What feelings and perceptions do high school students have regarding the selection process that identifies them as needing supplemental instruction?	Observations	Focus Groups	Artifacts
In what ways has being a part of supplemental instruction shaped these students as learners?	Observations	Focus Groups	Artifacts
What motivations or barriers exist for high school students within supplemental instruction?	Observations	Focus Groups	Artifacts
In what ways does supplemental instruction impact students in regards to their student identity, competency, and autonomy?	Observations	Focus Groups	Artifacts

Appendix B

Focus Group Protocol

Time	Date	Location	Interviewer	Focus Group
TBD	TBD	Quality High School	Andy Miehe	Reading Workshop
TBD	TBD	Quality High School	Andy Miehe	Reading Workshop

I will be interviewing a focus group of students who have been or are currently participating in supplemental instruction for reading which is intended to close perceived skill gaps.

Topic Domain: Student understanding of supplemental instruction

Lead Questions: What can you tell me about supplemental instruction? Tell me about your experiences Reading Workshop. What can you tell me about the purpose of these classes?

Covert Categories: student understanding, skill gaps, support, student achievement, academic interventions, student perspective, obstacles/frustrations

Follow-up Questions:

1. How often or when are you involved in this coursework?

2. In what other ways have you been involved in working to increase your skills in reading or math?

3. What motivates you to be successful in your supplemental instruction setting (math lab, Reading Workshop, seminar)?

4. To you, what are some indicators of success?

5. What types of barriers have you encountered along the way?

6. How has this work impacted you as a student?

7. What do you think your parents know about your involvement in supplemental instruction?

Identity, Autonomy, Competence

Topic Domain: Identification of students in need of supplemental instruction

<u>Lead Question</u>: Can you tell me how you were selected for Reading Workshop? How did you find out you were selected?

<u>Covert Categories</u>: identification process, scheduling, power dynamics, trust, relationships, guardian involvement

<u>Follow-up Questions</u>:

1. How was your identification for supplemental instruction communicated to your guardians? To you?

2. What measures, information, or data were used for the identification process?

3. How have your supplemental instruction teachers worked to build relationships with you as a student?

4. What input have you been able to give regarding your identification for supplemental instruction?

5. Is there anything else you would like me to know about your identification for supplemental instruction?

Identity, Autonomy, Competence

Topic Domain: Motivation for success and potential negative consequences

<u>Lead Question</u>: What motivates you to be successful in Reading Workshop?

<u>Covert Categories</u>: skill gaps, schedule freedom, schedule restrictions, motivation for success, relationships with instructors,

<u>Follow-up Questions</u>:

1. How was your teacher communicated success or success criteria for your supplemental course?

2. What happens if you are successful in your supplemental coursework?

3. What happens if you are not successful in your supplemental coursework?

4. Can you see any negative impacts of your enrollment in supplemental coursework?

5. What negative impacts might your enrollment in supplemental coursework have on your schedule?

6. Has your involvement in supplemental coursework limited your ability to take other elective courses?

Identity, Autonomy, Competence

Appendix C

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

HUMAN PARTICIPANTS REVIEW
INFORMED CONSENT

Understanding Student Perceptions of Supplemental Instruction: Student perceptions of supplemental instruction implemented in order to overcome perceived skill deficits
Research conducted by Andy Miehe

Invitation to Participate: Your student is invited to participate in a research project conducted through the University of Northern Iowa. The following information is provided to help you make an informed decision about whether or not to allow your student to participate.

Nature and Purpose: This study is designed to discover student perspectives on supplemental instruction. Through the use of observation and focus group sessions student perspectives will be analyzed.

Explanation of Procedures: Classroom observations at West High will take place twice a week for approximately three weeks in order to familiarize students with the researcher and to allow for data collection regarding student perceptions of supplemental instruction. These observations will be recorded using typed notes from the researcher.

Focus group interviews with a group of students (10-15 students) will take place once at the beginning of the study and again at the conclusion of the study. The focus group interviews will serve as data collection sessions allowing the researcher to gather information from participants regarding their perceptions of supplemental instruction. These focus group interviews will be conducted during the regular class meeting times and will be recorded using typed notes from the researcher and audio recordings to assist in capturing all details for analysis.

All data collected will be used for research purposes only and will not be used for any other reason. At the conclusion of the project and once all data has been collected it will be used for member checking purposes.

This study is associated with supplemental instruction and your student will continue in their coursework as normal. I am hereby asking to be allowed to work with your student to inquire about their perceptions of this supplemental instruction.

Privacy and Confidentiality: Your student's identity will be known to the researcher throughout this project. Your student's confidentiality will be maintained through coding of data collection and identifying information will be destroyed as soon as data is coded. The use of focus groups does mean confidentiality by group members cannot be guaranteed. Information obtained during this study which could identify you will be kept

confidential. The summarized findings with no identifying information may be published in an academic journal or presented at a scholarly conference.

Your student's participation in this study will be observable by others in the class.

Discomforts, Risks, and Costs: Risks to participation are similar to those experienced in day-to-day life.

Benefits and Compensation: Students who participate in this study may directly benefit through an increased understanding of themselves as learners and an increased awareness of their academic surroundings.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw: Your student's participation is completely voluntary. Your student is free to withdraw from participation at any time or to choose not to participate at all, and by doing so, they will not be penalized or lose benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

Questions: If you have questions regarding your student's participation in this study or about the study generally, please contact Andy Miehe at 319-215-2461 or am408664@uni.edu. For answers to questions about the rights of research participants and the research review process at UNI, you may contact the office of the IRB Administrator at 319-273-6148.

Agreement: Include a statement similar to this:

> I am fully aware of the nature and extent of my student's participation in this project as stated above and the possible risks arising from it. I hereby agree to their participation in this project. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent statement. I am 18 years of age or older and the participant's legal guardian. .

Signature Lines:

_____ _____
(Signature of participant)   (Date)

_____
(Printed name of participant)

_____ _____
(Signature of guardian)   (Date)

_____
(Printed name of guardian)

_____ _____
(Signature of investigator)   (Date)

Appendix D

This is the description of Reading Workshop taken from the Quality School District's

Program of Studies Course Catalog:

Reading Workshop A/B　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　RDG100/101
01-066-B-050-10 (A)
01-066-B-050-20 (B)
Open to 9-10-11　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　2 credits
Reading Workshop is designed to improve a student's reading comprehension, increase reading fluency (words read per minute) and develop knowledge, usage and mastery of vocabulary. One reading lesson per month focuses on a specific career from each of the academies. This course may be repeated for elective credit. The credit for this class does NOT fulfill one of the eight required English credits.

Appendix E

Email Correspondence from "instructor A" for Reading Workshop regarding student

selection and course description:

On Tue, Apr 4, 2023 at 10:39 AM Andy Miehe <miehea@waterlooschools.org> wrote:

Good morning,

I know it is a little nuts with testing this week and I am not in a rush but when you have

time could you reply to this email and let me know how students are selected for

Reading Workshop? The program of studies is descriptive but does not discuss how

students are either selected or assigned to the program. Any insight you have would be

greatly appreciated -

--

Andy Miehe

Principal

Waterloo West High School

319-433-2700

West High Website

Twitter @Wahawkboss

Response:

From: **Traci Hahn** <hahnt@waterlooschools.org>

Date: Tue, Apr 4, 2023 at 11:22 AM

Subject: Re: RW ?

To: Andy Miehe <miehea@waterlooschools.org>

I know that many students are placed in Reading Workshop because they have an IEP with a reading goal. I'm not positive what specifically is in the reading goal that has them in Mrs. Quang's class as opposed to mine. I know that Sheila Houston also puts quite a few ELL students in my classroom too. Other than that, this is one of the big mysteries and I long ago decided it was not my place to question it. I accept every kiddo and do my best to get them further along than where they are when they cross the threshold.

Hope this is helpful.

T

Appendix F

Email Correspondence from "instructor B" for Reading Workshop regarding student

selection and course description:

On Tue, Apr 4, 2023 at 10:39 AM Andy Miehe <miehea@waterlooschools.org> wrote:

Good morning,

I know it is a little nuts with testing this week and I am not in a rush but when you have

time could you reply to this email and let me know how students are selected for

Reading Workshop? The program of studies is descriptive but does not discuss how

students are either selected or assigned to the program. Any insight you have would be

greatly appreciated -

--

Andy Miehe

Principal

Waterloo West High School

319-433-2700

West High Website

Twitter @Wahawkboss

Response:

From: **William Dawson** <dawsonw@waterlooschools.org>

Date: Tue, Apr 4, 2023 at 11:35 AM

Subject: Re: RW ?

To: Andy Miehe <miehea@waterlooschools.org>

Good morning Mr. Miehe! I hope the day and the week are going well. I will work to respond to any question you have around Reading Workshop (course title for the WCS, as the training for the course was provided by Central Rivers (AEAs), Second Chance Reading.

1. In the 1st Period Reading Workshop, thirteen students are enrolled in the course

2. In the 8th Period Reading Workshop, ten students are enrolled in the course.

The purpose of Reading Workshop (Second Chance Reading) is the remediation of reading deficits for secondary students. As a result, these secondary stuAt one time, and in our brief discussions, these were the manners in which students were identified for Reading Workshop enrollment.

1. The Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test was given to all 9th grade students to determine reading proficiency. SDRT administered at the beginning and end of each school year.

2. The ITBS reading comprehension scores were used to determine reading proficiency.

3. Students identified with special needs with a reading goal were enrolled in the Reading Workshop.

4. Middle school literacy teachers recommended students for enrollment.

5. ELL students were recommended for enrollment.

Students would struggle with the literacy demands of the general education curriculum. Reading Workshop focuses on having struggling readers engage on high order comprehension tasks in both fiction and non-fiction texts. The course is designed specifically for middle and high school students who are reading below grade level.

The program incorporates several strands:

1. Extensive independent reading at students' recreational level;

2. Vocabulary development at both age-appropriate and recreational reading levels;

3. Comprehension instruction for both lower- and higher-order comprehension tasks in fiction and non-fiction materials;

4. Fluency instruction and monitoring; and

 5. Writing as an assist to comprehension

.

High order comprehension tasks taught in Reading Workshop:

1. Cooperative Comprehension (recently we have been updating these assessments to reflect DOK 2, 3, and 4).

2. Dictated Writing: writing as a resource to comprehension.

3. Inductive Thinking

4. Critical Persuasive Writing Analysis

Please submit any questions you have, Mr. Miehe. It is great for me to review the purpose and description of the course.

Appendix G

Graduation requirements from Quality School District for Standard Diploma

Standard Diploma Requirements		
	Credits	
English	8 (must include English 9, 10, Am. Lit./Comp)	
Mathematics	6 (must include Algebra I or equivalency)	
Science		
Earth & Space Science	2	
Biology	2	
*And **One** of the Following Combinations:*		
Physical Science A & B	2	
Physical Science A & Chemistry A/B	3	
Physical Science B & Physics A/B	3	
Chemistry A/B & Physics A/B	4	
Social Sciences		
U.S. History	2	
World History	2 (or satisfied by taking IB World History)	
U.S. Government	1	
Geography	1 (can be satisfied by taking AP or IB History)	
Economics	1 (Econ, JA Econ, Personal Finance/WCC Personal Finance, IB Econ, IB World History)	
C^3 Foundations	1 (can be earned in 8th gr. or taking ELP, IB DP, JROTC, or Strategies)	
Health	1	
Physical Education	4 (or equivalent exemptions)	
Electives	9-11+	

Credits for Graduation with a Standard Diploma   44+

Dr. Andrew Miehe
School Administrator

237 Lovejoy Ave. Waterloo, IA 50701 319-961-2051 <u>AM408664@UNI.EDU</u>

SKILLS

Experienced in educational leadership, Multiple Tiered Systems of Support, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports, Professional Learning Communities, recruiting and hiring staff, and specializing in staff development

EXPERIENCE

West High School / Building Principal

July 2015 - PRESENT, Waterloo, IA

Create and oversee implementation of organizational transformation plan

Successfully recruited and hired over 45 certified staff over the course of seven school years

Designed and launched Comprehensive School Improvement Plan

Designed, implemented, and monitored multiple action plans tied to SIP

Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports School-Wide Implementation

Create, deliver, and monitor building-wide Professional Development

Bunger Middle School / Building Principal

July 2008 - July 2015, Evansdale, IA

Successfully led transformation plan which included the implementation of MTSS as well as school wide PBIS

Bunger Middle School / Assistant Principal

July 2006 - July 208, Evansdale, IA

Successfully managed athletic department, teacher teams, professional development plans, and parent organization

EDUCATION

University of Northern Iowa / Ed.D. Educational Leadership

August 2020 - December 2023, Cedar Falls, IA

Authored qualitative dissertation focused on student perspectives regarding supplemental instruction

John J Kamerick Fellowship recipient 2022

University of Northern Iowa / A.S.C.

January 2013 - October 2015, Cedar Falls, IA

Completed Superintendent program

University of Northern Iowa / M.A.E.

August 2003 - May 2005, Cedar Falls, IA

Completed Masters of Arts Education Program

University of Northern Iowa / B.A.

August 1998 - May 2000, Cedar Falls, IA

Bachelor of Arts History Teaching Major