MaxScholar programs are the solution for struggling readers. We use cutting-edge software to improve word recognition skills and reading comprehension.

The programs are for students reading below grade-level, including those with dyslexia, ADHD, auditory processing and learning disabilities, as well as English Language Learners.

Our interactive, multi-sensory Orton-Gillingham program is structured, organized, and easy for students to use. Our interactive electronic Highlighting Program teaches students to highlight properly, improving reading comprehension, oral and written language, and vocabulary.

Why MaxScholar?

The lack of reading skills is a serious problem facing the United States today. According the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) 37% of 4th graders and up to 70% in some low-income urban areas cannot read at the basic level. 79% of the 8th graders in the Chicago Public Schools are not grade-level proficient in reading, according to the U.S. Department of Education. Careers of 30 to 40% of American children are imperiled because they do not read well enough, quickly enough, and easily enough. As students advance, the learning gap between the readers and non-readers widens, and nearly 35% of students of non-readers drop out of school, a rate more than twice their classmates. Far too few children, no matter their socioeconomic background, can read well enough to function in an economy in which literacy is more-important than ever. Boys are especially hit hard, often trailing their female peers in reading and falling far behind in other academic studies by the time they reach middle school. Over $2 Billion is spent each year on students who are retained a grade because they cannot read.

The current approach to reading failure is remedial, not preventative, forcing students to evidence failure before receiving help. In some states and school districts, the process to get the students the help they need is slow and tedious, further delaying their ever learning how to read. In addition, some of the best methods to work with non-readers are difficult for teachers, tutors, or parents to learn, depriving some students the opportunity to benefits of these research-based methods.

Electronic learning, as we present it, has the ability to transform learning to read through technology.

Our Orton-Gillingham based method allows teachers to use a method that has been effective for over 60 years, but is often not offered in schools because of the lack of the knowledge of how to use the method
by the teachers or the resource staff. Sometimes teachers who do try to use this method will skip steps, will not provide enough drill and practice, and do not have the time to individualize the amount of time spent on any individual letter, sound, or skill for an individual student. Our electronic method addresses all of these concerns. It allows a teacher, a reading coach, a tutor, or even a concerned parent to present a method to a student which is very easy to learn, involves cutting-edge technology, engages the student, allows the student to proceed at his or her own pace, and is actually fun to use.

Reading comprehension problems affect 75% of all struggling readers. Our interactive, electronic version teaches a student how to highlight, a research-based strategy that is very effective in learning how visualize what is read. Most students do not know how to highlight, and, when given a highlighter, will often color the entire paragraph or passage. Our program was created to allow only the proper words and phrases to be highlighted while the student is using the electronic highlighting tools we created. Our insistence of summarizing, or retelling what has just been read, is a strategy that also helps comprehension, as the student who can visualize what is read will understand the passage and be able to answer questions about what has just been read. Our passages are written to be interesting to the students.

Our programs engage the student through multi-media, interactive, and multi-sensory instructional content. Our methods are very easy to master, and, most-importantly, are cost-effective.

We have the solution that gets results.
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1. **Overview**

MaxScholar programs are the solution for struggling readers, using cutting-edge software to improve word recognition skills and reading comprehension. The programs are for students reading below grade-level, including those with dyslexia, ADHD, auditory processing and learning disabilities, as well as English Language Learners.

Our interactive, multi-sensory Orton-Gillingham program is structured, organized, and easy for students to use. Our interactive electronic Highlighting Program teaches students to highlight properly, improving reading comprehension, oral and written language, and vocabulary.
2. MaxScholar Orton-Gillingham Multi-sensory Phonics Program

MaxScholar Orton-Gillingham Multi-sensory Phonics Program starts by teaching the student the letters and sounds they make. It then provides drills in the auditory, visual, and kinesthetic areas to reinforce learning. The program provides everything that it needed to learn to read. There is no need to go to different sources to gather materials to be used, which is often time consuming and confusing. It is easy to use for teachers, tutors, and parents.

This program introduces the structure of the English language to beginning readers, whether they are in Kindergarten, First Grade, Second Grade, English Language Learners, or are struggling readers in any other grade. It is based on over 60 years of clinical experience, supported by a multitude of research studies, and is considered one of the best ways to teach children how to read words, sight words, and stories. This program is the first of its kind to be so extensive, thorough, and easy to use in an electronic format.
3. **MaxScholar Highlighting Program**

MaxScholar Highlighting Reading Comprehension Program is based on the educational strategy of highlighting. Research has shown that the highlighting strategy using a specific sequence of directions (topic in blue; main idea in green; and only the important details in yellow) causes the student to focus better, to learn to summarize what is read, and to have better recall of the text. This program has provided outstanding results for struggling readers (including dyslexia, ADHD, auditory processing and learning disabilities), ESE, and ELL students. This is the first electronic version of a reading comprehension program that allows a student to utilize the highlighting strategy in a way that improves reading comprehension. There are books in the series that allow the student to start at his or her level and progress upwards towards grade level reading or better.
4. MaxMusic

Along with learning to read, students need a knowledge base, cultural literacy, and critical thinking skills. Today’s children need a knowledge base which they do not have. In this section students have the opportunity to develop such a knowledge base on famous musicians. Here the student will find passages about the lives of famous musicians which are read to them by the computer. This is designed to develop auditory processing and listening skills.
5. MaxPlaces

Howard Gardner’s linguistic area of multiple intelligence is an area that involves sensitivity to spoken and written language. MaxPlaces allow students to understand the world and to learn some facts about geography. This section includes the method of the computer reading a short passage to the student who then has to answer questions. This is designed to develop auditory processing and listening skills.
6. MaxTimeline

This section helps students develop sequencing skills.
A short-term study of an Orton-Gillingham curriculum implemented with first, second, third and fourth graders in a reading remediation program demonstrates age equivalent gains of up to 3 years and 6 months. Overall, the study shows significant gains in both Passage Comprehension and Word Attack skills tested using the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test Revised Form G.

Kingston, NY (PRWEB) November 6, 2010

"Similar findings can be expected of any properly implemented Orton-Gillingham curriculum," said Luria. "All students will benefit from teachers who are well-trained in Language Enrichment, Developing Metacognitive Skills, Multisensory Grammar and Writing. Students with reading difficulties will reap the greatest rewards."

"This study shows that an Orton-Gillingham curriculum can help struggling readers improve their skills. Schools interested in implementing proven methods of early reading instruction should consider Orton-Gillingham based training for their teachers." said Susanne Warren of High Meadow School in Stone Ridge, NY. Language Enrichment certificate recipient Kristin Schroder, stated, "As a teacher with over 20 years experience, I am excited to be teaching the comprehensive Language Enrichment program in the Kindergarten classroom. It addresses my students’ needs and I am now confident in their success as they progress through the program."
Abstract
The purpose of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of the Institute for Multi-Sensory Education’s supplementary Orton-Gillingham based reading program across three schools in a single school district. Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessments were used to measure the reading skills of 224 treatment and 476 comparison group first-grade students, with control group students receiving traditional reading instruction for 90 minutes per day in a core reading program and treatment group students receiving instruction using the supplementary reading program for 30 additional minutes per day. Classroom observations by reading professionals revealed satisfactory program implementation. Collected teacher surveys demonstrated high teacher satisfaction with the program. Alphabetic principle and phonemic awareness skills in the treatment group made significant improvement relative to the comparison group. Treatment group female Hispanics made the greatest gains in alphabetic principle skills.
Program for First-Grade Students

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of an Orton-Gillingham (OG) based multi-sensory reading program as a supplement to regular first-grade classroom instruction in three elementary schools in a high-needs school district. Both comparison and treatment groups were taught using the district’s core reading program during a 90-minute reading block, and the treatment group’s reading instruction was supplemented with an Institute of Multi-Sensory Education (IMSE) reading program for 30 minutes per day. First-grade students in the three treatment schools made the most dramatic improvement in acquiring alphabetic principle skills. There was also substantial evidence that phonemic awareness skills improved more for students in the treatment group than in the comparison group. Hispanic female students demonstrated the greatest improvement in alphabetic principle skills after receiving IMSE’s reading program.

The IMSE supplemental reading program is designed to be incorporated into existing reading curricula to provide a multisensory, phonetic, and structured instructional tool. The program is based on the Orton-Gillingham method of reading instruction originally developed by neurologist Dr. Samuel T. Orton and educator Anna Gillingham. The IMSE reading program involves a daily, five-part 30-minute intervention. The reading program offers a method of organized, direct instruction in phonemic awareness and application of phonetic rules and word attack strategies. The reading program relies on directly teaching the fundamental structure of language, beginning with simple sound-symbol relationships and progressing logically to phonetic rules and word-attack strategies using multisensory methods. The first part of the program is called the three-part drill. The three-part drill is a review of all phonetic concepts known or taught including practicing phonetically regular words using all learning pathways: visual, auditory, and kinesthetic (VAK). The second part of the program involves teaching a new phoneme-rule using multisensory techniques for encoding and decoding words and writing/reading sentences. Vocabulary and syllable division are taught using a multisensory method in the third part of the program. Vocabulary words are taken from all components of the program, whereas syllable division of multi-syllabic words is based upon phonetic components which are learned. The fourth aspect of the lesson is devoted to reviewing and teaching non-phonetic and high-frequency words or both. The fifth portion of the program incorporates reciprocal reading strategies during oral reading. Reciprocal teaching, as developed by Palincsar and Brown (1984, 1986), is used to foster comprehension of orally read text by asking students to summarize, question, clarify, and predict from text (Liuzzo, 2003).

The IMSE reading program in this study is aligned with the U.S. Department of Education and the National Institute for Literacy’s (2001) guide Reading: Know What Works which is based directly on the reports of the National Reading Panel (2000) and the National Research Council (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998) and delivers guidelines for reading teachers in Title 1 schools. In order to get meaning from print, students must understand the alphabetic principle, have phonemic awareness, and be supported by direct teaching of sound-symbol relationships.

The guide indicates that phonics is an important reading skill and that building phonics skills such as decoding is most effectively done through explicit, systematic instruction. Among the skills needed for building comprehension are summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting, all of which are embedded in IMSE’s reciprocal teaching. A study in an inner city school provided empirical evidence that multisensory methodology guided by Orton-Gillingham is effective in improving reading (Joshi, Dahlgren, & Boulware-Goeden, 2002). This was a timely study because, as the authors indicated, almost all prior studies were in clinical settings with special populations or small-group settings, and empirical support for the added benefit of multisensory techniques had not been demonstrated. Jones (2001) reported that Multisensory Structured Language Education (MSLE) has been practiced by teachers and clinicians since the earliest teaching guides (e.g., Montessori in 1912) and that current findings such as those studying the relationship between brain function and learning have brought us closer to understanding why generations of teachers have been committed to MSLE.
The purpose of this investigation was not to separate and examine individual components of the IMSE supplemental reading program; the purpose was to study the effectiveness of this program in a real-world setting in which the teachers in the treatment group implemented this program and the comparison group teachers did not. Specifically, after instruction in the first grade, did treatment group children perform significantly better than comparison group children in basic reading fluency skills as measured by Phoneme Segmentation Fluency, Nonsense Word Fluency, and Oral Reading Fluency subtests on the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills?

Method

The current intervention study was based on the revised IMSE program (2000) and reciprocal teaching. Because the reading program instruction and materials combined auditory, visual, and kinesthetic learning styles, it is called multisensory. Each lesson is designed to use two or more multisensory modalities. This investigation was planned, coordinated, and carried out by three individuals who contracted with the IMSE to conduct the study. The lead member of this research group was the liaison between the IMSE and the district. A contract between the district and the IMSE was signed, with a clause that the trained teachers would use the IMSE program in their classrooms a minimum of 30 minutes a day, five days a week for the school year and that they would put forth a good faith effort in implementing the methodology, the required assessment procedures, and the protocol required. District administrators distributed information about the study to school principals. Dissemination of information about the project to the teachers was the responsibility of the district school and principals; it was not under direct control of the research team. The three schools volunteering to be a part of the treatment group were required to have the full commitment of principals and all their first-grade teachers.

Classroom teachers, lead teachers, and literacy coaches from these three schools participated in 30 hours of training in a one-week summer session. During the 30-hour training, teachers learned the theory and practice of the IMSE method of language instruction including the five parts that comprise the IMSE reading intervention program. Materials distributed to teachers to implement the IMSE method included syllable division cards, red word screens, and teacher card packs as well as other classroom materials (e.g., sand trays, sand, blending boards, red word screens, and controlled readers). The training content included student assessment of the above skills and guidelines for weekly lesson plans to achieve student learning objectives. Upon completion of the training, teachers had the tools to implement this program into their current curriculum.

One of these three treatment schools chose to drop out of the study when school began in the fall, indicating that they would continue to use the supplementary reading program and materials, but would not be part of the study. The research team agreed that this school would not be part of the comparison or treatment group. The study’s liaison identified a replacement school for the treatment group to replace the school that was initially part of the study. Teachers in this newly participating school received training in the program using video tapes of the 30-hour summer training session with supplementary on-site training from the IMSE trainer. Training was completed in November, and full implementation of the supplemental reading program in this school began in December.

In addition to the 30 hours of training, the Institute for Multi-Sensory Education’s trainer made three teacher-directed visits to the classroom of teachers participating in the study in October, February, and May. To guide this process, teachers completed a request form before each visit to specify the kind of consultation that would be most beneficial to the teachers, such as demonstration lessons, reviewing assessment data, or addressing the needs of individual students.

The study applied multiple measures to assess the effectiveness of the training and quality of program implementation. Three of the summer training sessions were observed and evaluated by the research team using a professional development observation protocol (Shaw, 2003). An implementation checklist, developed by the research team in collaboration with the trainer, was used during each of the three classroom visits (Drake, 2006). The checklist included sections on assessment, the three-part drill, teaching a new concept, organization, red words (phonetically irregular words), decoding of multi-syllabic words, and reading comprehension. Teachers
completed opinion surveys during the summer training and at the end of the school year to assess their satisfaction with the IMSE program.

Student progress was measured, using the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy (DIBELS) reading assessment (Good & Kaminski, 2003), which was designed to assess the five major skill areas in early reading identified by the National Reading Panel (NICHHD, 2000) and the National Research Panel (Snow et al., 1998) including phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. In first grade, DIBELS primarily assesses three skill areas: phonemic awareness, alphabetic principle, and fluency with connected text. These skills are measured using the DIBELS subtests termed Phoneme Segmentation Fluency (PSF), Nonsense Word Fluency (NWF), and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF), respectively. In first grade, PSF and NWF are administered during fall, winter, and spring benchmark assessment periods, while ORF is administered during the winter and spring benchmark assessment periods.

DIBELS benchmark target scores represent minimum acceptable scores that predict future reading success for a child (Good, Simmons, Kame‘enui, Kaminski, & Wallin, 2002). Based on the predictive validity associated with individual DIBELS measures, children should be proficient in phonemic awareness skills by the end of kindergarten, alphabetic principle skills by the middle of first grade and appropriate fluency and comprehension skills through later grades (Good et al., 2002). Preventing reading failure in later grades involves identifying skill deficits as early as possible in kindergarten and first grade, and providing targeted instruction based on these deficiencies. Additionally, DIBELS assessments separate student scores into risk categories from lowest to highest (i.e., low risk, some risk, at risk) based on the probability that a student will attain desired future reading outcomes based on current skills. Students identified as low risk have approximately an 80% chance, those in the some risk category have approximately a 50% chance, and children in the at risk category have a 20% or lower chance of meeting the next DIBELS benchmark target score. In-depth descriptions and information on the reliability and validity of the PSF, NWF, and ORF DIBELS assessments are provided by Good and Kaminski (2003).

Schools included in this study had used DIBELS to assess student achievement since the 2001-02 school year. DIBELS data used in this investigation were collected by test administrators trained in appropriate DIBELS protocol (Good & Kaminski, 2003) during the fall, winter, and spring benchmark assessment periods of the 2005-06 school year.

Participants

Treatment group participants came from three elementary schools in a school district with approximately 18,000 students in a suburban school district in the state of Colorado. In the district, 50% of the students are Hispanic; 47%, White; 1%, African American; 1%, Native American; and 1%, Asian. Two of the treatment schools were low, and one was average in overall academic performance as measured by the statewide assessment measure, Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP). For the nine comparison group schools, four were low and five were average in overall academic performance. The average school enrollment stability was 97% and 96% for the treatment group and comparison groups, respectively. The treatment group included 227 students (51% male and 49% female) who were primarily Hispanic (56%) or White (41%). The comparison group included 535 students (52% male and 48% female) who were also primarily Hispanic (59%) or White (39%). Two of the three treatment group schools and five of the nine comparison groups were Title 1 schools. Only students with complete data for fall, winter, and spring benchmark assessments were used in analyses (i.e., casewise deletion). As a result, 224 children from the treatment group and 476 children from the comparison group remained in the study throughout the school year.

Results

Implementation Results

Two members of the research team recorded capsule ratings equal to “4” (4: accomplished, effective professional development) for the three observed training sessions on a scale of 1 to 5 (5: high). Ten teachers completed a survey at the end of the first day of training in which they rated from 1 to 5 (5: excellent; 4: good; 3: satisfactory; 2: fair; and 1: poor) the day’s training and their enthusiasm for being part of the study. Mean ratings
were 4.5 for trainer’s ability to hold participants’ attention, trainer’s effectiveness in answering questions, written information, the three-part drill, and interest in learning more tomorrow. The mean ratings for overall training organization and respondents’ enthusiasm for being part of the study were 4.4 and 4.1, respectively. At the end of the second day the mean rating for enthusiasm for being part of the study had increased to 4.4, and the mean overall training rating was 4.7. In addition to conducting surveys, discussions with the participants were led by the research team at the end of the third, fourth and fifth days. The research team and trainer emphasized the importance of consistency of implementation with regular instruction supplemented with 30 minutes of reading instruction each day using the IMSE program. Teachers were asked to track the number of days each student received the additional 30 minutes of reading instruction using the IMSE program. During the school year, none of the teachers tracked the number of days students received the additional 30 minutes of training.

The teachers from the school that received their initial training by video and an on-site session rated their initial training retrospectively at the end of the school year using the same rating scale (1 to 5, with 5: high). The ratings recorded by these three teachers were 5, 4, and 4.

In all three schools, the IMSE program was implemented in small groups (e.g., students with similar lettersound abilities were kept together) for 30 minutes daily. Two of the schools implemented the IMSE program for nine months, while one school began the project in December and, thus, implemented it for six months. The supplemental program’s progress monitoring assessment objectives were met.

Nine teachers from the three treatment schools completed an evaluation form at the end of the school year on which they rated their implementation of the IMSE program from 1 to 5 (5: excellent; 4: good; 3: satisfactory; 2: fair; and 1: poor). The mean overall implementation rating was 3.9 across all nine teachers at three schools. Research team classroom observers rated implementation of the supplementary program satisfactory for the treatment group as a whole. All nine teachers indicated they would recommend the IMSE supplemental reading program to other first-grade teachers in their school and in the school district. Eight of the nine teachers indicated that they would implement this reading program in their classrooms the following year if they taught first grade.

Discussion

As discussed previously, it is important for early literacy programs to prevent reading difficulties before they occur and to rectify them as efficiently as possible once skill deficits are detected. Overall, this study provided evidence that the IMSE supplemental reading program helped students at treatment schools acquire phonemic awareness (PSF) and alphabetic principle (NWF) skills more effectively than students at comparison schools. Since phonemic awareness is a skill that should be established in kindergarten, first graders who lack proficiency in this area need to have this deficit addressed as quickly in the year as possible. Phonemic awareness skills were improved during the school year most effectively for students in the treatment group as evidenced by changes in statistical measures of dispersion and the percentage of students who scored at or above the DIBELS benchmark target score during the winter and spring benchmark assessment periods (Figure 1). Treatment schools had a smaller range of scores on PSF during the winter and spring assessments than did comparison schools, indicating that student scores became more homogeneous at treatment schools during the year (Figure 1). This result is important because student scores became more homogeneous concurrent with an increase in the percentage of students who attained the DIBELS benchmark target score. As such, the results represent an increase in the rate of improvement for the lowest-performing students (i.e., those at the greatest risk for reading failure). Students whose scores were at the 25th percentile in the distribution of PSF scores from the winter benchmark assessment exceeded the DIBELS PSF benchmark target score at treatment schools but were below the benchmark target score at comparison schools (Figure 1). Students whose scores were at the 5th percentile in the distribution of PSF scores from the spring benchmark assessment exceeded the DIBELS PSF benchmark target score at treatment schools but were below the benchmark target at comparison schools (Figure 1). The treatment group transitioned 25% of students from some risk to the low risk on PSF between fall and winter compared with 20% of students who made the same transition in comparison schools (Table 1). In the spring, 95.5% of treatment group and 92.6% of comparison group students were in the low risk PSF category, and as significantly, only 0.9% of students in the treatment group remained in the high risk category (Table 1). Exceeding the DIBELS benchmark
target score, or moving to a lower risk level, means that the probability of future success is increased for these students. In other words, demonstrated proficiency in this foundational reading skill helps unlock the potential for progress in higher order skills (e.g., reading connected text, comprehension).

Students at both treatment and comparison schools made similar progress in the alphabetic principle as measured by NWF, during the first half of the year, but the rate of progress at treatment schools was greater than comparison schools over the last half of the year (Table 2). Liberman, Shankweiler, and Liberman (1989) identified that mastery of the alphabetic principle is dependent upon one’s strength in phonological awareness. It is possible that the improved phonemic awareness skills developed by treatment students during the first half of the year translated into accelerated gains on the alphabetic principle during the last half of the year. If this presumption is accurate, it would lend support to the importance of remediating skill deficits as quickly as possible in early grades. No substantial differences in the ability to read connected text as measured by ORF, were observed between treatment and comparison students (Table 4).

This result is not surprising since phonological awareness has long been identified as a precursor to skilled reading (Liberman, 1971, 1973) and that the development of word recognition is constrained by poor phonological decoding (Rack, Snowling, & Olson, 1992). Lower-performing students at treatment schools who made substantial progress in phonemic awareness and the alphabetic principle would not be expected to show significant gains on reading connected text until after becoming proficient on precursor skills. While data for this study were only collected during first grade, it would be informative to analyze longitudinal data for treatment students to determine if foundational skill improvements in first grade lead to significant progress in reading connected text in second grade.

Conclusion

This study provides strong evidence to support the conclusion that the Institute of Multi-Sensory Education’s supplemental reading program led to accelerated acquisition of, and increased student proficiency in, phonemic awareness and alphabetic principle skills for first-grade students when compared with students who did not receive the program. These results are similar to those identified by Joshi et al. (2002) who determined that children who received systematic IMSE-based phonics instruction performed better on tests of phonological awareness and decoding than students who did not receive the additional instruction.

Previous research indicates that the better a young child is at segmenting words into their individual sounds, the more likely they are to read and the faster the reading process develops (Blachman, 1991; Catts, 1991; Fox & Routh, 1983; Griffith & Olson, 1992; Juel, 1988; Perfetti, Beck, Bell, & Hughes, 1987). Several studies have also shown that children having difficulty developing good decoding skills during early grade levels will likely develop reading problems during later grades (Stanovich, 1986; Walberg & Tsai, 1983). It is, therefore, highly probable that skill improvements documented for students who received the supplemental reading program in this study will translate into improved reading outcomes in later grades for these students. Another particularly interesting result of this study was the increase in alphabetic principle proficiency demonstrated by Hispanic females.
Oswego Community School District 308, Oswego, IL
Institute for Multi-Sensory Education Professional Development
School Year 2008-2009

Oswego, Illinois is a southwest suburb of Chicago with a total enrollment of just over 14,000 students. The racial/ethnic backgrounds of these students are: 64.8% white, 8.1% black, 17.2% Hispanic, 5.2% Asian/Pacific Islander, .2% Native American and 4.3% Multi-racial/Ethnic. The low-income rate is 10.9 and the limited English-proficient rate is 3.8. The mobility rate is below the state average at 8.3.

Oswego is a fast growing district, growing from four elementary schools to thirteen in less than ten years. This has led to many exciting opportunities and some challenges. This fast growth enabled our district to hire many additional staff. Ensuring that this newly hired staff all had the same professional development opportunities as their peers was one of our challenges.

Our Reading Department expanded as well from less than ten members to currently over thirty. Professional development and fidelity to implementation were critical to the continuity and effectiveness of our services to our most struggling readers. With this in mind, our district contracted with the Institute for Multi-Sensory Education for 30 hours of comprehensive training for our Reading Professionals that serviced our primary at-risk students. This professional development provided the essential training they needed to be as successful as possible, as well as a framework for a unified delivery of this powerful intervention. Reading Professionals were given a survey after participating in this initial training. Over 97% of them found this training to be valuable and would recommend it to fellow teachers. Our results from this training were consistent and effective in enabling 76% of the 225 indentified first grade at-risk students to reach target comprehension and word decoding scores on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test.

During May of the 2008-2009 school year, these targeted at-risk students were administered four diversified assessments to document their reading achievement. Here are the assessment results of the 225 at-risk first graders after participating in this reading intervention for thirty minutes a day, five days a week in small groups of approximately four students. These small groups were serviced in a pullout setting by a Reading Teacher or a Reading Specialist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessments Administered in Spring 2009</th>
<th>Reading Skills Assessed</th>
<th>Target Score</th>
<th>Average Score of the 225 identified at-risk first graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test *Administered in small groups by Reading Professionals</td>
<td>Word Decoding and Comprehension</td>
<td>40th percentile or higher</td>
<td>59th percentile rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMSweb R-CBM Benchmarking Probes *Administered</td>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>59 words read correctly in one minute is at the national 50th percentile</td>
<td>63 words read correctly in one minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Survey: Text Reading *Administered individually by Reading Professionals</td>
<td>Determine the appropriate level of text difficulty</td>
<td>*Text Level 20 is the random sample average according to section</td>
<td>**Text Level 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darrell-Morris Developmental Spelling Test *Administered whole class by classroom</td>
<td>Spelling Stages</td>
<td>The transitional/correct stage range of 67-90</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The average would have been higher, but due to the time consuming task of administering this assessment, the Reading Professional stopped at text level 20.

The Reading Professionals, classroom teachers, and Reading Coordinator compiled all data with the utmost integrity. Oswego CUSD 308, Reading Professionals, classroom teachers and Reading Coordinator are not responsible for unintentional human errors.
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Highlighting

Brain research has shown that the kinesthetic act of highlighting activates the brain and improves retrieval memory and recall of the informational text. The act of highlighting the important facts enables the student to be able to recall and summarize the passage more easily. Research indicates that summarizing a passage is an excellent way to remember what has been read. When the student puts into their own words what they have read, he or she has improved comprehension and recall.
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The lack of effective reading strategies is often what prevents struggling readers from excelling with reading. Fortunately, you can teach reading strategies to struggling readers to help them improve their reading comprehension. Often, educators call these reading strategies “scaffolding” techniques because they help struggling readers build their way up to reading comprehension, much as a scaffold helps a construction worker to build upward from the ground.

One such scaffolding skill that you can teach to struggling readers is the annotation of text. This means, quite simply, that the reader “marks up” sections of text, either with a highlighter or underlining, and makes notes in the margin in his/her own words, to ensure understanding.

Annotation helps build three key reading skills. When annotating a text, the reader:

1. Formulates questions in response to what he is reading
2. Analyzes and interprets elements of poetry or prose
3. Draws conclusions and makes inferences based on explicit and implicit meaning

In order for this to be effective, it is essential that you show your struggling readers how to highlight and annotate a text. Otherwise, the student will probably lapse into highlighting every word, which doesn’t help him to identify key concepts.

As you use these teaching strategies, you should discuss with the students the purpose of highlighting. Each student will have different purpose for highlighting depending on their own skill set and reading struggles.

For example:

Students that struggle with understanding what they read (reading comprehension), benefit from highlighting because it helps them focus on identifying the main ideas of a text.

Showing struggling readers active strategies like annotating gives them concrete tools to be able to interact with text and find small, immediate successes. The more students practice effective reading strategies, the more natural they will become, and the closer to absorbing text they will get.
Selective Underlining

What Is Selective Underlining?
Well, there's underlining, and there's underlining selectively. [By the way, even though I'm using the word "underlining," you can feel free to know that that also means highlighting.] The way to make underlining useful as a tool for comprehension is for it to be strategic, selective, and purposeful. The underlining must be undertaken toward particular ends.

Do you remember how wonderful it was to discover the highlighter, perhaps when you were in college? I know that for me, I was more likely NOT to read the stuff I was highlighting. For some reason, that's the effect that a highlighter had on me. Or maybe I'd look back at the selection and find I'd pretty much colored the whole darn thing yellow. With selective underlining (and highlighting!), the idea is to underline ONLY the key words, phrases, vocabulary, and ideas that are central to understanding the piece. Students should be taught this strategy explicitly, given time and means to practice, and reinforced for successful performance.

How Can I Teach My Students to Selectively Underline?
There are several ways to go about it. You may be saying, "Selective underlining is all well and good, but have you eggheads up in the university forgotten that we use textbooks, and that our kids only get to use them for the year, but we have to use them at least five years??" That's a fair question, so how can you teach this strategy anyway?

1. First of all, let's realize that not every single bit of text you have students read is in a textbook and untouchable.
2. Second, consider seeking out appropriate content sources, such as newspapers, that students can indeed learn this strategy with while still pursuing meaningful social studies goals.
3. Third, think about how you can get around the problem of textbooks that can't be marked in. For instance, in order to teach the strategy, you might photocopy a page or two out of the text that students use and distribute it to them. Make an overhead of that selection for yourself. Model for them and guide them in practicing the strategy on the photocopies. Alternatively, if you have enough of the materials available to you, give each student a sheet of transparency film, some paperclips, and some overhead pens. Let them practice directly on their texts by using the transparencies.

Think about how this strategy would work when combined with power thinking. Students might put a box around Power 1 ideas; an oval around Power 2 ideas; and an underline under Power 3 ideas.

Students might also use different colors in their underlining. Power 1s could be blue, Power 2s could be red, and Power 3s could be green.

Practice selective underlining for different purposes: underline key vocabulary and its definitions or explanations, and use this as an opportunity to focus on how authors reveal the meaning of new terms within the context. Or have students underline cause and effect. Or ask them to underline the facts and concepts that support a particular viewpoint, as might be useful with a strategy such as Opinion-Proof. Remember, you're limited only by your own imagination with teaching and applying selective underlining.
Teaching Children How to Highlight as They Read

The question about highlighter skills is not whether to teach them, but when to teach them. Highlighter skills are useful towards helping students improve reading comprehension and learn good study habits. Think carefully about what text to have the students read and what highlighting skills to teach them.

Highlighter Skills to Improve Reading Comprehension

Highlighting will help to promote better reading comprehension. Students who highlight as they read are learning to identify the important points, and are paying close attention to what they are reading so that they highlight the appropriate text. Focusing on the text in this way enables greater learning and deeper comprehension.

Highlighting also helps both visual and tactile students remember what they are reading and will aid in studying the text independently. For visual learners, the highlighted portions of text will stick in their heads better as a visual reminder of the important facts in the text. For tactile learners, the physical act of highlighting helps them to remember the important facts.

Picking a Text to Highlight

When choosing a text to teach highlighter skills, think carefully about the students' reading level. The text should be at an independent reading level for all students, so that the act of reading is not the focus of the activity. It may be prudent to choose a text that is written a grade level below where your students are currently reading, and that includes more than one paragraph.

Teaching Highlighting Skills

When deciding what to teach students to highlight, think through the things you would highlight when studying a college text book. Students need to look for the main idea, key points, and any other important information. Ask students to think about what information might end up on a test, and highlight that.

Teach students to not highlight an entire paragraph. Look for and highlight new information. They need not highlight even an entire sentence if only part of the information is important.

When going back to study a highlighted text for a test, teach students to read the highlighted parts and not the entire text again. The point of highlighting is to remember where the most important pieces of information are found within the body of the text.

Students as young as second grade can learn how to use a highlighter when reading an informative text. Proactively teach highlighting skills, and do not expect a child to understand what is important to highlight, even if he is able to articulate the key facts in the story.
Selective Underlining/Highlighting Strategy

What is it?
We have all had the experience of suggesting that students highlight the text that they are reading, only to watch them indiscriminately highlight nearly every word on the page. It is clear that learning how to highlight a text as a part of a reading strategy requires some instruction, including some modeling and guided practice. If done well, highlighting can become a very effective reading tool; if done poorly, it is most likely a waste of a student’s time, energy and ink. Selective underlining/ highlighting is most effective when combined with marginal annotations that help to explain the highlighted words and phrases.
The following lists provide a simple set of goals and guidelines that students could use to increase the effectiveness of their selective underlining/highlighting and, as a result, improve their comprehension and understanding of a text.

Purposes/Goals of Selective Underlining/Highlighting
Capture main ideas / key concepts / details of a reading
Target, reduce and distill the needed information from a text
Strengthen reading comprehension

What does it look like?
1. Choose a focus or framework for your highlighting. Ask yourself: What is the purpose or intended goal of this particular reading? (e.g. Main ideas only? Supportive details for an interpretive claim you are making? Definitions and examples of key vocabulary?) After you determine the focus, highlight only the targeted information.

2. If possible, do not highlight on a first reading of a text. Rather, divide a page into manageable chunks and read a section once. Then skim the section again and highlight on the second reading. If you try to highlight on the first reading, you may not have a clear sense of the key ideas/concepts or important/relevant details.

3. Eliminate every single unnecessary word in a sentence as you underline or highlight. This method should still allow you to make sense of a sentence or section when you reread it. Do not underline/highlight entire sentences unless it is absolutely necessary.

4. You may want to use multiple colors in your highlighting process. For instance, choose one color for main ideas and another color for supportive detail that may help in sorting the information when you study the material or collect information for a paper, exhibition or project. You may want to use a color to indicate facts or concepts on which you would like clarification or pose as questions.

5. Remind students that they should never highlight or underline more than 25% of a passage. To teach students to limit their highlighting, begin by asking them to pick only one “most important word” from each sentence.
Most teachers enjoy challenging their students and extending students’ critical thinking skills. Few joys compare with seeing a student grasp the big picture, connect and relate previous learning to something new, and discover the satisfaction of an “Ah-ha” moment. However, with larger classes and more material to cover in less time, it’s not always possible to engage in Socratic methods with empirical or inductive dialogue to bring students up to their potential as high level thinkers. But brain-based research and colored marker pens can help teachers provide the necessary scaffolding and guide their students with to develop their powers of interpretation, analysis, and abstraction.

Many students are limited in their prior experience in higher cognitive analysis of complex written text. They have either been taught to the standardized test or are products of the digital-audio-visual era with its emphasis on immediate gratification without encouraging critical feedback. Sheridan Blau teaches in the departments of English and education at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where he also directs the South Coast Writing Project. His believes that, “Over-instruction or giving predigested interpretations to students results in a limited conception of what competent readers go through to produce meanings from what they read. Most student readers function largely as welfare recipients in the economy of literary and other academic interpretation and instruction. We want to give students the experience of successfully interpreting difficult text, and liberate students from interpretive welfare. The goal is to build in students a greater tolerance for difficulty or failure. Confusion represents a high state of understanding. The act of interpretation doesn’t occur in reading unless you feel something is wrong – something makes you uncomfortable. From there you seek and reach a new perspective and the richest parts of the understanding and connection with the material.”

As part of the South Coast Writing Project, Blau demonstrated a teaching technique to the fellows in the writing project that I have subsequently applied to help students connect with and critically interpret not only literature, but also information in philosophy, psychology, and history texts. Blau’s comprehension of text strategy reflect the way competent readers move haltingly and recursively toward the satisfactory interpretation of difficult text without “interpretive welfare.” To demonstrate the strategy, Blau gave the member of the workshop copies of a challenging, obscure poem that not a single member claimed to fully interpret after a single reading. He next directed participants to use three different transparent colored markers, read the poem three more times, and each time underline any text we didn’t understand. In his instructions, he noted that strong readers pay more attention to what they don’t know because they think that what they notice, but don’t quite understand, is worth pondering.
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Not surprisingly, the participants discovered that they understood more of the poem each time they read it. The process of underlining focused attention on the phrases they would have skipped as “too hard.” They persevered because they were obliged in color to return to these lines. They found themselves enjoying the “feel” of the markers, the positive reinforcement of each insight, and the discovery that solving one piece of the puzzle helped them when they returned to earlier points of confusion. The exercise went beyond simple reading and rereading, because there was the active, visually enhanced process of increased time spent with the complex lines by virtue of slowing down to highlight them. In addition, looking at the decreasing amount of text underlined with each color was encouraging and built confidence.

That experience provided a set of self-management skills — concentration, persistence, and courage — in the face of intellectual difficulties. By extrapolation I have used the colored pen technique to light the way for students to reach higher levels of thinking, abstraction, and conceptualization regarding the material they read in other subjects where interpretation is important. As one would expect, the scaffolding afforded by the colored markers eventually becomes unnecessary, because as students become adept at the process, they are simultaneously developing their higher levels of thinking, abstraction, and conceptualization. They discover that they can achieve the same degree of understanding by focused rereading. The end result is that they learn the material they need, but not because it is processed through superficial rote memory from notes or lectures that predigest the material, but rather through their own relational and conceptual thinking utilizing their higher-level executive function skills.

**What's Happening in the Brain That Moves the Hand That Controls The Marker?**

Perhaps what may sound like a “gimmick” may garner the appropriate respect and attention from skeptical readers when they understand the science behind how this technique is promoting learning. Behind the colored markers, the technique works like this: Executive functions, centered in the orbitofrontal portion of the frontal lobes, include higher reasoning, abstraction, synthesizing, critical analysis, comparison/contrast, and judgment. As brain research has found, this processing results in the learned material becoming part of long-term memory available for retrieval and subsequent critical thinking connections far beyond the classroom.

The brain is divided into lobes, each with many functions, each interconnecting to the other lobes through nerve pathways or circuits. Areas in the frontal and temporal lobes are integral in executive attention – alerting the rest of the brain to pay attention or respond to stimuli. In learning, the stimuli are the bits of sensory information students see (through their eyes or by internal visualization after reading text), hear, feel, smell, touch, or experience through movement. There are even more specialized brain regions that have been revealed through neuro-imaging and brain mapping while subjects are in the process of moving information from sensory data to these centers of executive function. When new information is actively learned and stored, the first areas activated (lit up by increased metabolism seen on PET or fMRI scans) are the somatosensory cortex areas, one in each brain lobe, where input from each individual sense (hearing, touch, taste, vision, smell) is received and then classified or identified by matching it with previously stored similar data.
Next in the sequence of memory storage is the limbic system, comprised of parts of the temporal lobe, hippocampus, amygdala, and prefrontal cortex (front part of the frontal lobe). Studies of the electrical activity (EEG or brain waves) and metabolic activity (from specialized brain scans) show the synchronization of brain activity as information passes from the somatosensory cortex sensory processing areas to the limbic system. For example, bursts of brain activity from the somatosensory cortex are followed milliseconds later by bursts of electrical activity in the hippocampus and then other parts of the limbic system before being passed along to the executive function centers. This is the one of the most exciting areas of brain-based memory research because it offers educators a view of the brain while it is processing new information. This provides empirical evidence with which to evaluate the techniques and strategies that stimulate and those that impede communication between the parts of the brain when information is processed and stored.

Engaging in the process of learning actually increases one’s capacity to learn. Each time a student participates in an academic endeavor, a certain number of neurons are activated. When the action is repeated, such with a new color marker during each rereading, these same neurons respond again. The more times one repeats an action the more connections are made from the new memories to previous related knowledge. If previously stored, related memories can be activated, or brought back on line, they travel back to the hippocampus and nearby regions of the temporal lobe where they are connected to the new information. The brain then makes the conscious connection between these stored memories and the new information.

When students process information through multiple sensory intake centers in their brains (visual reading, auditory reading out loud or with a partner, color stimulation of the highlighting, and the positive emotional connections to past “coloring” activities when coloring meant childhood fun, the information to be learned is connected to multiple senses and positive emotions. This excites more of the brain, increasing stimulation of executive function centers. Part of this process is due to the brain’s plasticity. When new information is input using several sensory systems, the brain’s plasticity builds additional dendrites to form more networks of information communication. For example, offering the information visually will set up a dendrite/neuron connection with the occipital lobes, the posterior lobes of the brain that processes visual input. Subsequently or simultaneously presenting the same material by sound will build an auditory dendritic circuit with the temporal lobes. The temporal lobes process sound and play an important role in the regulation of emotion and memory processing because they are part of the limbic system. This duplication of pathways results in greater opportunity for future cues to prompt the brain to recall related stored information and make connections and higher-level interpretations.

A “Colored” Brain
As the highlighting lesson progresses, students feel more capable of doing higher order thinking independently. When students have the opportunity to actively think for themselves, they become self-learners, not just Blau’s welfare information recipients. The person who does the work (thinks) is the one who learns. When students are ready to respond in class discussion, open-ended questions with multiple possible responses encourage more students to be the thinkers. When some students do begin
to respond with what they believe are factual answers or correct assumptions, asking them to explain their thinking and give evidence for their ideas allows others to actively listen and clarify their own interpretations.

A student must care enough about new information or consider it important, for it to go through the limbic system, form new synaptic connections, and be processed in executive function centers of the frontal lobe. Having students relate new information in the engaging process of highlighting personalizes it and increases its importance to them. This process has the built-in positive emotional experience of the “play” of coloring and the success that results from feelings of accomplishment, pleasant social interactions with classmates or teacher, or specific acknowledgement and praise. This emotional connection is particularly applicable during early college years when the influences of emotions and hormones are greatest, making this a particularly significant time for teachers to use strategies that make the most of the heightened emotional state of students.

**Color Me Dopamine**
The chemical neurotransmitter that appears to most impact the activity state of the limbic, attention, and executive function systems is dopamine. Dopamine has long been associated with attention and attention disorders in the frontal lobes. Dopamine carries information across synapses in the networks and circuits involved in decision-making and executive control. In the frontal lobes and the amygdala, there is an optimal stimulation state where brain stimulation and activity is enhanced with some types of reward-dependent learning. This is reflected in neuroimaging that measures dopamine levels in these brain regions.

Research evidence indicates that when reward or positive reinforcement is part of a lesson, dopamine activity increases in these brain regions to the point that there is an opening of the gates and passages through the limbic system to the executive function control centers. Dopamine responsive brain cells in the amygdala and elsewhere in the limbic system may be where the brain “makes predictions” about possible rewards by releasing the dopamine in response to cues that rewards are possible. The dopamine then activates the neural pathways to prompt the behavior to achieve the rewards it predicts. This research, and an even newer area of brain research related to mirror neurons (which play a part in learning language and linguistic interpretation) suggest that the pleasure and achievement-based rewards of this highlighting color process can change the way students will relate to challenging text in the future.

**Metacognition**
Metacognition, knowledge about one’s own thoughts and the facts that influence one’s thinking and learning can optimize future learning. With all the information neuroimaging and brain mapping has yielded about the acquisition of information, some of the best strategies are still those that students recognize themselves. Research has demonstrated that optimal learners knowingly practice distinct learning behaviors that they have acknowledged as successful for them. After a lesson with the colored highlighters, it is beneficial for students to recognize a breakthrough success in the learning processing that they experienced that day, and consider what they did right.
The Future

When executive function brain research is applied to the classroom it not only drives the learning process, but also allows instructors and professors to energize and enliven the minds of more students. As the research continues to build, it will challenge educators to develop and utilize new strategies that bring the insights gleaned from brain-based research to their interactions with students, their pedagogical practice. That will be a fascinating and exciting challenge to meet.

I have seen the work students have produced after they leave my highlighting class and am confident that a set of markers helped them brighten the executive thinking portions of their brains. Demonstrating this technique with students has helped them sharpen their critical thinking and capacity for abstraction so these skills. It sounds almost naïve to assert that a few colored markers can help prevent important learning skills from being extinguished by frustration and negative experiences with a challenging text, but I’ve found that they have. I urge you to try this approach to surmounting difficult texts with your students.
8. Documented test improvement results

Results obtained using the Highlighting Strategy for SES students in Miami-Dade County Public Schools who were provided at least 20 hours of SES tutoring. The following scores were obtained:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>% completing program</th>
<th>% making learning gains</th>
<th>Average % gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2009</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>82%&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 – 2010</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>92%&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 – 2011</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>91%&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 – 2012</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>80%&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> District Administered Interim Tests
<sup>2</sup> Comprehensive Assessment of Reading Strategies (CARS)
<sup>3</sup> SAT-10, administered by District
9. Testimonials

Isaac and Ariel showed more interest and enthusiasm with learning and reading than I have previously witnessed. MaxScholar has given both of them an opportunity to refine their skills and have a great time simultaneously. The highlighting task was a joy to watch as they both worked hard with smiles on their faces.

Michael Lekness, Educational Specialist, Broward County, Florida

My son went from the 1st grade 4th month reading level to the 4th grade 3rd month level in three month’s time in working with MaxScholar phonics and MaxScholar Highlighting. The reading coach at his school who did the standardized test was amazed at the progress achieved by using the MaxScholar programs. The graphics, the multisensory, and the kinesthetic interaction holds anyone’s attention and makes them want to keep trying. This is the best educational software I have ever encountered.

Mrs. O parent

Just want to give 2 thumbs up for the MaxScholar software. Parents have told me how pleased they have been with the improvement in the reading and grades of their children. They say their children can’t wait to go home and work on the software programs.

Michael D. teacher

The Highlighting software and reading strategies on the MaxScholar highlighting led to an awesome success of our son. He is now passionately engaged and involved with reading. The MaxScholar software is innovative and remarkable. The passages are engaging and interesting. The graphics are something Steve Jobs would have developed. Most of all, my son, who had difficulty with school, and was diagnosed with ADHD, is now an outstanding student. Thanks to the MaxScholar reading comprehension Highlighting software! The highlighting strategy gave my son remarkable and amazing results. He, for the first time, enjoys reading, and is now an A student.

Linda Flores

My child went from the 27th percentile in reading on the state assessment to the 89th percentile on the state assessment. Thank you MaxScholar

parent
10. Teacher support

Teacher Support

We offer free unlimited support to anyone using the MaxScholar Programs.

If you already have a password, click here.

If you need a password, click here.

You can also call us at 305-496-7208 and ask a question, or send us an email at maxscholarsoftware@gmail.com
11. School Partnerships

School Partnerships

MaxScholar has extensive experience in improving students’ ability to read words and comprehend what they read. The programs are now available in electronic formats which can lead to successful school partnerships.

- Improved student achievement in reading comprehension improves performance on state testing.
- Improved student achievement in reading supports the National Common Core Standards learning.

MaxScholar is appropriate for all K-2 students who are just beginning to read.

- A strong foundation for Kindergarten students will make them stronger readers.
- Closing the gap for struggling 1st and 2nd grade students by teaching them how to read with multi-sensory language instruction will allow them to read at grade level by the time they enter 3rd grade.

MaxScholar is appropriate for students who are or who have

- Dyslexia
- ADHD
- Auditory Processing Disabilities
- Learning Disabilities
- English Language Learners

MaxScholar is appropriate

- For schools for K-2 students as part of a program to teach reading, as part of an early intervention program or prevention.
- For after-school tutoring at school sites
- For use in schools, as part of supplemental and enrichment programs for at-risk students
- As part of an RTI program, Levels I, II, and III
12. Demonstrations

To be provided
13. Target population

Our MaxScholar Multi-sensory Phonics Program is targeted to the following groups of students:

• Students who are in Kindergarten, 1st grade, and 2nd grade. These students need a strong foundation in reading to ensure that by 3rd grade they are reading on grade level.
• Students who are in higher grades who are not reading on grade level and need more intervention methods than might be provided in a school classroom setting. These struggling readers are the ones who get further behind as they get older, and are at risk of dropping out of school. Included in this group are those students who have
  - Dyslexia
  - ADHD
  - Auditory Processing Disabilities
  - Learning Disabilities
  - Not diagnosed disabilities which require intensive remediation
• Students who are on an RTI program, Level 1, II, or III.
• Students who are English Language Learners, especially those whose parents or grandparents do not speak English as their primary language at home.
• Students who need drill and practice to improve their level of fluency, or speed at reading the words.

Our MaxScholar Highlighting Program is targeted to students who have issues with Reading Comprehension or understanding what is read. This method is divided into two broad areas.

• Students in grades 3 to 5 who are not reading at grade level, although they do know how to read words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs. They need help in their fluency, as well as needing help in learning how to visualize what they read. The Program is designed to start at Level 1 to start creating success for these students, allowing them to scaffold, or build, on what they know.
• Students in grades 6 to 9 who have similar needs but require more difficult passages, with longer words and sentences.

In evaluating each student, often a student will need to use both programs.

Potential uses for the programs include the following:

• Schools (public, charter, parochial, private) as a primary program to teach reading
• After school tutoring programs in schools for children who are not reading at grade level
• Private tutoring for those students who are falling further behind
• Parents who want to provide a supplementation to the materials used at school or a reinforcement or drill and practice for their children
14. Price and ordering

To be provided