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The National Behaviour Support Service (NBSS) was established by the Department of Education & Skills in 2006 in response to the recommendation in *School Matters: The Report of the Task Force on Student Behaviour in Second Level Schools* (Martin, 2006).

The role of the NBSS is to assist partner schools in addressing behavioural concerns on three levels:

- **Level 1: School-wide Support**
- **Level 2: Targeted Intervention Support**
- **Level 3: Intensive, Individualised Support**

The NBSS model of support draws extensively from Positive Behavioural Interventions and Supports (Sugai & Horner, 2002), Response to Intervention (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2006) and the Comprehensive, Integrated, Three-Tiered Model of Prevention (Lane, Kalberg, & Menzies, 2009) frameworks. The integration of these frameworks offers opportunities to address the behavioural needs as well as the social, emotional and academic needs of students effectively, with interventions at different levels of intensity and support. This problem-solving model is founded on international best practice (Bohanon et al., 2006; Carr et al., 2002; Duffy & Scala, 2012; Ehren, Deshler, & Graner, 2010; Hawken & Horner, 2002; Lewis & Sugai, 1999; McPeak, Trygg, Minadakis, & Diana, 2007).

In NBSS partner schools this three-tiered approach is applied to behaviour interventions as well as interventions that address the social, emotional and academic literacy and learning needs of students. All three levels of support to NBSS partner schools are customised to the specific characteristics, needs and requirements of each partner school on an on-going basis as change occurs. NBSS interventions and support emphasise using evidence-based practices for promoting behaviour change.
Research highlights how behavioural and academic problems exert reciprocal influences on one another. The reciprocal nature of this association is evident with behavioural difficulties affecting children and young people’s academic achievement (less time on task, absenteeism, peer and adult rejection) and similarly academic failure leading to low self-esteem, alienation from the school community, negative behaviours and in some cases early school leaving (McEvoy & Welker, 2000; McIntosh, Flannery, Sugai, Braun, & Cochrane, 2008). The research points to the importance of recognising the links between academic and behaviour difficulties and coordinating systems for prevention and intervention in both areas (Bulotsky-Shearer & Fantuzzo, 2011; Byrne & Smyth, 2010; Miles & Stipek, 2006; Trzeniewski, Moffitt, Casp, Taylor, & Maughan, 2006; Valiente, Lemery-Chalfant, & Swanson, 2010).

To support students to develop the academic literacy, learning and study skills needed to succeed at post-primary, the NBSS looks to the research, nationally and internationally, on Adolescent Literacy and to the most effective practices and strategies for addressing the literacy needs of all adolescent learners (National Behaviour Support Service, 2009). NBSS Level 1 academic literacy support for example, involves the explicit teaching of comprehension, thinking and learning skills and strategies (Biancarosa & Snow, 2006; Blachowicz & Ogle, 2001; Duke & Pearson, 2002; Keene & Zimmerman, 1997; Kosanovich, Reed, & Miller, 2010; Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001; National Reading Panel, 2000; Pearson, Roehler, Dole, & Duffy, 1992; Pressley, Johnson, Symons, McGoldrick, & Kurita, 1989; RAND Reading Study Group, 2002) as well as building and strengthening writing skills. The latter not only improves writing ability but also enhances students’ ability to read a text accurately, fluently and comprehensively (Graham & Herbert, 2010; Graham & Perin, 2007).

The NBSS supports teachers to integrate effective strategies across subject areas that can enable students to read and write a wide range of texts, help them to become strategic thinkers and problem solvers and provide them with opportunities to apply comprehension, writing and learning strategies in many different contexts.
Catch Up Literacy: A NBSS Level 3 Intervention to Support Struggling Readers

NBSS Level 2 and 3 academic literacy and learning support is provided to students for whom Level 1 provision is not sufficient. Level 2 support is about targeting, planning and monitoring short-term, focused interventions for small groups of students. Such an intervention might for example address two or more of the five main components of reading – comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness - or focus on writing, spelling or study skills development. For some students, a tightly focused group intervention will be sufficient to allow them to develop their learning and literacy skills and build their confidence to engage more actively in the learning process.

NBSS Level 3 support is concerned with developing interventions necessary for students with multiple and specific challenges to their learning and behaviour. If these students have poor reading skills, one focus of change includes improving reading achievement by teaching students how to read as reading is a skill that gives access to learning. At post-primary students must be able to decipher increasingly complex passages, understand vocabulary that is more specialised and synthesise information at a higher level across a variety of subject disciplines. One way to support learners who experience difficulty with literacy learning is by implementing interventions to teach skills that will enable them to read and access the curriculum more easily (Brooks, 2007; Kamil et al., 2008).

Supporting Reading Development

Developing students’ literacy skills through small group or individual interventions, using research validated approaches, has been a specific focus of the work of the NBSS in the last number of years. Research carried out by the NBSS (Henefer, 2010) has pointed to the association between poor literacy and behaviour difficulties (adolescents with poor literacy skills will sometimes go to great lengths to hide their literacy difficulties, including, for example, ‘acting out’ and employing other distracting behaviours that divert attention from their struggle with reading). An exploration of the reading ages of students (N=2,187) receiving NBSS Level 3 behavioural support from the Spring Term 2009 to the Spring Term 2012 revealed that 66.3% (N=1,450) of students were reading three or more years below their chronological ages. The following table presents the analysis of this data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 years below</td>
<td>24.1% (N=350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years below</td>
<td>23.2% (N=337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years below</td>
<td>22.1% (N=320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more years below</td>
<td>30.6% (N=443)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0% (N=1,450)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the analysis revealed that 4.3% (N=96) of the students receiving NBSS Level 3 support had reading ages of 7 years or less. Many of these students must overcome the obvious disparity between their reading skill level and the reading skills needed to access the curriculum and learn from complex subject area texts at post primary.

‘...66.3% (N=1,450) of students were reading three or more years below their chronological ages...4.3% (N=96) of the students receiving NBSS Level 3 Support had reading ages of 7 years or less.’

Unfortunately, for many learners the gap between their skill level and that of their peers continues to grow over time. Stanovich (1986) describes this as the ‘Matthew Effect’ – how, in reading, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer - students who experience difficulty with reading are exposed to much less text than their more skilled peers. Students who are more skilled experience a ‘bootstrapping of further vocabulary, knowledge, and cognitive structures’ creating an even bigger gap between the skilled and the less skilled reader (p.360). In addition, many students who have difficulty with reading suffer emotional and psychological consequences, including low motivation, anxiety and lack of self-efficacy (Wigfield & Eccles, 1994).

**BEST APPROACHES**

Best approaches to supporting reading development have been extensively researched (Brooks, 2007; Chard, Vaughn, & Tyler, 2002; National Reading Panel, 2000; Rose, 2009; Rowe, 2005; Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; Taylor & Ysseldyke, 2007). Systematic phonics, word recognition, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary, oral language skills and working memory have all been identified as key to the acquisition of reading skills, as has a holistic approach to high quality reading instruction.

Developing these key reading skills by providing targeted and intensive interventions has also been identified as crucial (Eurydice Network, 2011; Scammacca et al., 2007). Kamil et al. (2008) point out ‘helping students learn specific reading strategies, and providing intensive and individualised instruction appear to be especially promising methods for improving the outcomes of struggling readers’ (p.31). Greg Brooks in his review of ‘What works for pupils with literacy difficulties’, noted that ‘although good classroom teaching is the bedrock of effective practice, most research suggests that children falling behind their peers need more help than the classroom normally provides. This help requires coordinated effort and training’ (Brooks, 2007 p. 31). Additionally, individual or small group targeted interventions and programmes that are highly structured, systematic and implemented with fidelity have been found to be the more effective (National Reading Panel, 2000; Singleton, 2009).

Since 2008, as part of NBSS Level 2 support (targeted group interventions) and NBSS Level 3 support (intensive, individualised support) partner schools have implemented research validated strategies, approaches and programmes to develop key reading and literacy skills. Research validated or evidence-based means that a particular programme or collection of practices has a record of success and that
there is reliable and valid evidence to suggest that when used with a particular group of students, the students can be expected to make adequate gains in literacy achievement. For example, teachers have explicitly taught comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, writing and study skills or implemented specific literacy and reading programmes such as Corrective Reading, Toe by Toe, Acceleread Accelewrite, Rapid Plus, ARROW, Spell Write Right, Wordsworth, SNIP Literacy, Comprehension Strategy Instruction and the Vocabulary Enrichment Programme. However, it is important to note that research also highlights that regardless of the programme or strategy it is the teacher and learning situation that make the difference (Bond & Dykstra, 1997).

**Catch Up Literacy – Key Elements**

The diversity of student needs, learning styles, teaching styles and classroom conditions that exist in any school means no one ‘right’ strategy or programme can teach each student the skills they need to read and succeed in school. No one programme, strategy or approach holds the answer to addressing literacy difficulties in schools (Dowker, Holmes, & Reid, 2012; Kamil et al., 2008). However, using research-validated reading intervention programmes as one element of targeted support for learners with low levels of literacy achievement can play an important role in a school’s repertoire of prevention or intervention supports to students.

Cognisant of the fact that using a research-validated programme is only one element in the design of targeted support, the NBSS in 2010 introduced Catch Up Literacy as an intervention programme that partner schools should consider when planning support for learners in receipt of NBSS Level 3 support, who also had difficulties in reading.

Catch Up Literacy is a one-to-one structured literacy intervention developed in 1998 at Oxford Brookes University in partnership with Caxton Trust (Clipson-Boyles, 2000). It has been identified by the UK Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) as an evidence-based Wave 3 intervention (Brooks, 2007), i.e. interventions that have been shown to provide effective one-to-one support for struggling readers. Catch UP Literacy is implemented in over 4,000 schools in the UK and employed with clusters of schools by 60 UK Local Authorities. In 2009 the intervention was also piloted successfully at schools in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania, in Australia.

The intervention is appropriate for learners between the ages of 6 and 14 approximately, though schools do use it with older students whose reading age is significantly below their chronological age. It is a book-based intervention where learners are given one-to-one support to read a book that is at an appropriate level of difficulty. The intervention begins with diagnostic/formative assessments that enable the teacher to set literacy targets, establish individual strengths and identify the appropriate starting point for support. Following the assessments the intervention is comprised of two 15-minute...
sessions per week, per student that teach a range of skills, strategies and concepts, including phonological knowledge (visual and aural), sight recognition of high frequency words, cueing strategies and the links between reading and writing. Each session begins with the Prepared Reading Approach that focuses on reading for meaning, followed by the student reading independently while the teacher uses the Pause, Prompt, Praise method and observes and records any miscues. A linked writing activity is completed in the final part of the session. These methods are grounded in research from Clay (1991), Stanovich (1980), Goswami (1994), Glynn, Mc Naughton & Robinson (1987) among others. The structure of the Catch Up sessions mirror those in Marie Clay’s Reading Recovery programme and incorporates the Pause, Prompt Praise strategy devised by Stuart McNaughton, Ted Glynn and Vivviane Robinson- the benefits of both these approaches ‘have been extensively evaluated’ (Wearmouth, Solar, & Reid, 2002 p.2) and the model of reading instruction used is based on the interactive approach that Stanovich (1980) and Blachowicz, Barr, and Sadow (1985), among others argue is necessary for effective reading instruction (Dowker, Holmes, & Reid, 2012).

Though selecting an effective reading programme that is grounded in research is essential, a crucial element in the successful implementation of any literacy intervention is teacher knowledge and expertise. Slavin, Lake, Davis, and Madden (2011) in their research review of what works in closing the gap in educational achievement for young people living in poverty, in relation to improving reading, argue that ‘professional development in specific proven approaches, using well-specified materials, is more likely to produce positive outcomes’. While Cynthia Shanahan (2005) in her review of adolescent literacy intervention programmes points out that ‘if teachers do not have the appropriate pedagogical content knowledge, they will be less likely to be able to use materials sensitively, to make adjustments when necessary, or support student learning’ (p.8). As professional development and support is such a crucial component of literacy instruction the NBSS introduced the Catch Up intervention to partner schools as it incorporates comprehensive and integrated training for teachers by accredited trainers.

‘Professional development and support is a crucial component of literacy instruction...’

Between 2010-2012, 150 teachers had access to a range of professional learning and support opportunities. For example, to support the successful implementation of the intervention, teachers attended three half days of training where they were taken through the key elements and theory of the programme by Dee Reid, consultant and co-creator of Catch Up Literacy. A gap between training days allowed the teachers to implement elements of the intervention and any queries or clarifications were addressed on the following training day. A further half day training session was provided for the member of staff who would manage and oversee the implementation of Catch Up Literacy in their schools. In addition to these days, a further training session for all teachers was held approximately six months later. This day involved reviewing the delivery of the intervention and also provided further advice and guidance. Ongoing support and
advice were provided throughout the year from the school’s NBSS Regional Development Officer, Assistant National Coordinator, Literacy Development Officer as well as through the UK Catch Up via online access, phone or email. The Catch Up Literacy training is accredited by the UK Open College Network (OCN) which provides accreditation services for adult learning and is a recognised UK national qualification awarding body. This accreditation was open to the teachers in NBSS partner schools who trained during 2010-2012.

EVALUATING CATCH UP LITERACY

The adoption of a programme described as ‘research-validated or evidence-based’ does not guarantee reading success for learners. Teachers and school management (and support services) must also evaluate strategies, approaches and programmes through the lens of their particular school and setting. They need to consider if the programme meets the needs of their students in their setting, with the resources they have available for implementation.

To assist schools in this process, the NBSS asked the teachers who had trained in the intervention to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention, by administering the following research instruments:

- The Salford Reading Test (pre and post intervention);
- NBSS Student Attitudes to Reading Survey (pre and post intervention);
- NBSS Teacher Questionnaire (post intervention);
- NBSS Student Learning Behaviour Checklist (pre and post intervention).

The following section presents the findings from the Catch Up Literacy intervention in NBSS partner schools 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. Data was obtained for 333 students who received the Catch Up Literacy intervention in 58 post-primary schools.
**Reading Progress**

Table 1 presents the findings from pre- and post-intervention Salford Sentence Reading Tests (McCarty, C. and Lallaway, M. 2002, 2012) that the teachers were asked to conduct in addition to the assessment of sight word knowledge, phonics knowledge and spelling knowledge that is inherent in the Catch Up intervention. The analysis, once outliers were excluded (N=325), demonstrates not only the mean pre and post intervention Reading Ages but also the average duration of the delivery of the intervention as well as the ratio gain (calculated by division of the mean gain by the mean duration). As the intervention was being used with struggling readers in receipt of NBSS Level 3 intensive, individualised support rather than as the focus of a research study, there was no control group.

### Table 1: Reading Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Female Students</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>At Start of Intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Chronological Age</td>
<td>13.9 years (167.19 mths) (N=306)</td>
<td>13.8 years (166.12 mths) (N=98)</td>
<td>14.0 years (167.69 mths) (N=208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Pre intervention Reading Age</td>
<td>8.6 years (102.95 mths) (N=325)</td>
<td>8.7 years (104.03 mths) (N=108)</td>
<td>8.5 years (102.41 mths) (N=217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At End of Intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Post intervention Reading Age</td>
<td>9.4 years (112.83 mths) (N=325)</td>
<td>9.5 years (113.65 mths) (N=108)</td>
<td>9.4 years (112.42 mths) (N=217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Gain Reading Age</td>
<td>9.88 mths</td>
<td>9.62 mths</td>
<td>10.01 mths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Duration of Intervention</td>
<td>4.33 mths</td>
<td>4.26 mths</td>
<td>4.37 mths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Ratio Gain</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the 325 students identified as ‘struggling readers’ who received support in 2010-2012, the mean Chronological Age at the start of the intervention was 13.9 years with the average reading age being 8.6 years. The mean gain in Reading Age after 4.33 months of delivering the programme was 9.88 months, with a ratio gain of 2.28. A ratio gain is the amount of progress a student makes in reading...
age, divided by the time spent between pre and post intervention. Calculating ratio gains therefore involves using a test that gives age equivalent scores. Brooks (2007) suggests that teachers should aim for students to make ratio gains of 2. In effect, Brooks argues, ‘Good impact - sufficient to at least double the standard rate of progress - can be achieved and it is reasonable to expect it’ (p32). This would imply that struggling readers should make two years’ progress in reading in one year. At the end of the intervention period, 29.8% (N=97) of the participating students achieved the ceiling test score (10 years 7 months) - i.e. they may be said to be functionally literate. It should be noted however that this degree of accelerated progress still leaves many of these students behind their peers in terms of reading skill.

**ATTITUDES, EXPERIENCES AND READING BEHAVIOURS**

During the two years of the NBSS Catch Up Literacy programme, participating students were asked to complete pre and post intervention questionnaires. In 2010/2011, an instrument developed and used in previous NBSS literacy research was administered. This aimed to gain a picture of students’ attitudes and experiences of reading. The following year (2011/2012) a different student questionnaire was introduced in order to capture additional aspects of the students’ perspectives (Appendix A). Because separate instruments were used, the findings will be presented below as distinct sections according to the year in which the data was collected. Additionally, teachers (N=37) delivering the Catch Up Literacy programme completed a questionnaire evaluating the programme (Appendix B) at the end of the project.

**STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE 2010/2011**

At the conclusion of the first year of the intervention, student questionnaires from 77 students (77 pre and 76 post intervention questionnaires) were received and analysed. In terms of the first two variables presented (“Do you enjoy reading?” and “I think I am good at reading”) the instrument offered students a 5 point Likert Scale.

![Figure 1: Do you enjoy reading?](image-url)
Figure 2: Do you think you are good at reading?

The percentage of students who reported that they enjoyed reading at the conclusion of the intervention had increased by 16.9%. Additionally, those who indicated that reading was difficult or impossible for them had decreased by 13.0%. The next section of the questionnaire further investigated the students’ attitudes towards reading by offering examples of motivations for reading as well as disincentives. The cohort was asked to select any of the examples that they felt were applicable to themselves.

Table 2: Motivations and Disincentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Pre (N=77)</th>
<th>Post (N=76)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would read because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is fun</td>
<td>9.1% (N=7)</td>
<td>13.0% (N=10)</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is interesting</td>
<td>29.9% (N=23)</td>
<td>33.8% (N=26)</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To learn new things</td>
<td>63.6% (N=49)</td>
<td>62.3% (N=47)</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I like to read</td>
<td>7.8% (N=6)</td>
<td>11.7% (N=9)</td>
<td>+3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t read because:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Books are boring</td>
<td>35.1% (N=27)</td>
<td>22.1% (N=17)</td>
<td>-13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Books are difficult</td>
<td>36.4% (N=28)</td>
<td>26.0% (N=20)</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TV is better</td>
<td>33.8% (N=26)</td>
<td>36.4% (N=28)</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My friends don’t read</td>
<td>18.2% (N=14)</td>
<td>9.1% (N=7)</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have to read too much at school</td>
<td>18.2% (N=14)</td>
<td>28.6% (N=22)</td>
<td>+10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between pre and post responses to motivation examples are slight (with the majority of students citing reading to learn new things as the main reason why they would read). There is more evidence of change in the category of disincentives with fewer students reporting books as boring and/or difficult after the Catch Up intervention.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE 2011/2012

In 2011 a new student questionnaire was developed and administered to students participating in the Catch Up Literacy intervention. While also exploring students’ attitudes and enjoyment of reading, the new instrument (Appendix A) aimed to measure their experiences of reading, particularly in school.
Additionally, the questionnaire concluded with a scaling exercise in which students were asked to rate how easy they found reading. Pre and post questionnaires were completed by 212 students.

**Figure 3: Do you like reading?**

As in the previous year, the percentage of students who reported enjoying reading had increased. Pre intervention 22.6% (N=48) of the students selected these responses while post intervention the percentage rose to 39.6% (N=84), i.e. an increase of 17.0%. Similarly, the number of students who prior to the intervention reported that they disliked or hated reading (28.8%, N=61), at post intervention had fallen by 12.8% (16.0%, N=34).

- I don’t like reading so when I was asked I didn’t want to do it but now I like reading more.
- When I start reading a book at all I don’t stop.
- I’m thinking, instead of watching telly I’d like to read more.
- I get books from the library. I would never have even picked up a book before starting Catch Up.

Many teachers concurred that their students’ enjoyment of reading seemed to have increased over the course of the intervention.

- One student who would never read wanted to take the book home in order to see what happened next.
- Yes, in general they enjoyed it – felt they could achieve. For one student she read more books in 4 months than she had for the previous 14 years!
- One student said they had never read a “proper” book before. All students reported positive feelings about reading.

‘...the number of students who prior to the intervention reported that they disliked or hated reading (28.8%, N=61), at post intervention had fallen by 12.8% (16.0%, N=34).’

- They liked it. One student now borrows books regularly from the library and reads with his mother.
- One student said she enjoyed the Catch Up because she had never finished any book before.
- They said they were proud to finish reading a book. Said they like doing the reading. They felt more confident reading.
There was little change in the number of students who found reading in school very or quite easy. However, post intervention the percentage of students who had reported that reading in school was hard or very hard had fallen by 16.9%. Some students made the following comments:

- *I feel I can read now, better.*
- *Words fly past me now and I can understand them.*
- *When I start reading a book I just want to keep reading until I get to the end.*
- *I couldn’t really read at the start of the year and it’s coming along now...understanding it better, it’s getting better. It (Catch Up) helped me read more books.*
- *I’m not getting stuck on words so much anymore.*

Post intervention the percentage of students who reported that they found reading on their own very or quite easy had increased by 9.8%. Additionally, there was a 12.7% reduction in the number of students indicating that it was hard or very hard to do so.

**Figure 6: How do you feel if someone asks you to read out loud?**
In both the pre and post findings, the majority (63.2% and 50.9% respectively) of students reported disliking or hating having to read out loud (“It (Catch Up) helped – I hate reading in class”). While after the intervention there were some changes in what could be categorised as the more positive responses to being asked to read out loud (for example, a 11.9% in reports of “It’s ok” post intervention), there was a decrease of 12.3% of students responding that they either dislike it or hate it. When asked whether the intervention had helped with schoolwork, one student said “It helps with reading out loud in class, it helps my confidence”.

Several teachers wrote that the intervention helped their students in mainstream classes in terms of self-esteem, confidence and willingness to read aloud.

- He now volunteers to read in class which he would not do at the beginning of the year.
- It boosted the confidence of the students. There was a marked improvement in their reading.
- Her mam said her daughter had gained a lot of confidence and was less nervous about reading out loud in class.
- Volunteering to read in class. Contributing to discussion.
- He shows more confidence reading in class. He volunteers more answers.
- Other students noticed their withdrawal and asked why they weren’t getting help. Within classes other teachers commented on confidence gained to read aloud with improved sentence structure to written work.
- He ran away the first day refusing to read. After I explained the Catch Up concept with time, etc. he really engaged. He looked forward to it. He chose his books and grew in confidence.

Figure 7: How easy do you find reading (out of 10: 1=not easy, 10=very easy)

While changes across each individual scaling measure do not seem high (selection of number 7 showing the most substantial increase, 7.5%), amalgamating and comparing responses of 7-10 (i.e. finding reading easy) pre and post intervention shows a change. In the pre-intervention questionnaires 32.6% (N=69) of the students chose 7, 8, 9 or 10. Post intervention, the percentage had risen by 18.8% (51.4%, N=109).
BEHAVIOUR FOR LEARNING SKILLS

Catch Up Literacy teachers were asked to provide a NBSS Learning Behaviour Checklist for each of their students to be completed by a relevant member of staff (for example, the student’s English teacher, tutor, etc.) at the start and at the end of the intervention. The checklist (Appendix C) presents a list of positive behaviours for learning with a Likert Scale of “1” being equal to the student always demonstrating the behaviour to “5” being equal to the student never demonstrating the behaviour. From the checklists that were submitted to the NBSS, a frequency analysis was conducted identifying the percentages of students who had pre and post intervention scores of “always” or “most of the time” demonstrating the positive learning behaviours. Once percentages were obtained, the difference between pre intervention and post intervention scores were calculated as reflected in Table 3. In the view of the NBSS, while improvements in positive learning behaviours for the cohort who participated in Catch Up Literacy are to be commended, the service is aware that the schools were providing these students with a range of additional interventions and supports which no doubt, along with Catch Up Literacy, contributed to the students’ progress.

Table 3: Positive Learning Behaviours: “Always/Most of the Time”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviours</th>
<th>Pre (N=373)</th>
<th>Post (N=323)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arrives on time for my class</td>
<td>75.3% (N=281)</td>
<td>80.5% (N=260)</td>
<td>+5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Can enter the classroom appropriately</td>
<td>67.3% (N=251)</td>
<td>74.9% (N=242)</td>
<td>+7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is organised with his/her books, pencils, equipment, etc.</td>
<td>48.2% (N=180)</td>
<td>59.1% (N=191)</td>
<td>+10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Makes an effort with homework</td>
<td>40.7% (N=152)</td>
<td>51.4% (N=166)</td>
<td>+10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Settles down at the beginning of my class</td>
<td>57.1% (N=213)</td>
<td>65.3% (N=211)</td>
<td>+8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Follows verbal instructions</td>
<td>51.2% (N=191)</td>
<td>64.1% (N=207)</td>
<td>+12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Begins a task at the same time as other students</td>
<td>44.8% (N=167)</td>
<td>53.6% (N=173)</td>
<td>+8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stays on task</td>
<td>39.4% (N=147)</td>
<td>56.6% (N=183)</td>
<td>+17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Can complete a task</td>
<td>36.2% (N=135)</td>
<td>57.3% (N=185)</td>
<td>+21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Makes an effort with his/her classwork</td>
<td>50.2% (N=187)</td>
<td>61.9% (N=200)</td>
<td>+11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Presents written work well</td>
<td>37.8% (N=141)</td>
<td>50.1% (N=162)</td>
<td>+12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Works well in a group</td>
<td>33.0% (N=123)</td>
<td>42.7% (N=138)</td>
<td>+9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Participates well in class discussions</td>
<td>31.4% (N=117)</td>
<td>46.2% (N=149)</td>
<td>+14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Can work without direct supervision</td>
<td>26.8% (N=100)</td>
<td>41.2% (N=130)</td>
<td>+14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Requests help appropriately</td>
<td>43.9% (N=164)</td>
<td>57.9% (N=187)</td>
<td>+14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Can work without constant reassurance/attention</td>
<td>33.3% (N=124)</td>
<td>47.1% (N=152)</td>
<td>+13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Is able to follow school rules</td>
<td>53.9% (N=201)</td>
<td>62.0% (N=200)</td>
<td>+8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘…teachers had noticed improved attitudes towards reading, including students’ enjoyment, motivation and willingness to read…’
The most improved areas of positive behaviour for the cohort were task completion (increase of 21.1%); staying on task (increase of 17.2%); participation in class discussion (increase of 14.8%); working without direct supervision (increase of 14.4%) and requesting help appropriately (increase of 14.0%). Additionally, based on the data that was submitted by participant schools, the NBSS was able to conduct a qualitative collation and analysis of comments that some subject teachers had made on the post Learning Behaviour Checklists. Again, it should be stressed that the NBSS does not suggest that improvements in positive learning behaviours are solely connected to the Catch Up Literacy intervention, but no doubt are equally a reflection of the range of programmes, interventions and supports that partner schools are providing to their students. Teachers’ comments on the Learning Behaviour Checklists included:

- She has made a significant improvement in the last few months in terms of behaviour and making an effort with school work.
- He seems a lot more focused in comparison to the start of the year. His concentration and work ethic has really improved. He can now work better on his own and complete a task without constant instruction and intervention.
- He is more confident in himself. He reads fluently and takes a more active part in lessons!
- He has improved greatly in class. He is more confident and asks to read in class which would not have happened before Catch Up intervention.
- He has made good progress in his reading. He reads with more confidence in lessons. He has improved in his efforts at taking work down from the board.
- He will now write and ask for help with spellings instead of not attempting the work and pushing it away.
- I have seen great changes in this student’s classwork and attention span. He is more interested in his work and becoming more confident and mature in attitude.
- Parents and teachers have commented on the fact that her confidence level has increased.
- He has been making a big effort of late to behave and makes huge efforts with his classwork.

**Teachers’ Perspectives**

As highlighted throughout the previous sections, the teachers who delivered Catch Up Literacy found that the intervention had benefitted their students in a variety of ways. In addition to developing and strengthening their literacy skills, the teachers had noticed improved attitudes towards reading, including students’ enjoyment, motivation and willingness to read, as well as in many cases their students seeming to gain confidence over the course of the intervention.

- Both students that I worked with made progress in their reading but also in gaining confidence – we built up a good rapport. It gave them an opportunity to practice staying on task. The fact that the books were selected to suit the “level” or “ability” implied that they would be successful and that the challenged were manageable. The students looked forward to the classes possibly because it was a positive experience.
• Students were “ready” to learn. Really tried. Fantastic for confidence, social skills and enjoyment of reading…Constantly asking when they were coming again.

• I am happy with the progress made by the student in question. It was a good confidence builder for him. He confided in me in relation to other matters. Lots of benefits.

• Both students enjoyed it and expressed interest and enthusiasm in relation to it. After missing a session I heard one student say to a teacher that he needed to Catch Up on his Catch Up!

• Great response from the students which makes it worthwhile and our job easier as great willingness to learn shown by the students. Students keen. “Can you take me now, I’m free”.

• One of the students was very interested in the programme and commented that it motivated him to come in if he knew he was doing it.

• Students commented on improvement, felt more confident to read out loud in class, like the idea of short books and on occasion asked could they be taken when free...Great response from the students which makes it worthwhile and our job easier.

The teachers were asked to identify any aspect or components of the programme that they would define as “strengths” from a teaching and learning perspective. Frequently, their responses referred to the structure, routine, consistency or predictability of the programme. Many teachers wrote of the advantages offered by the one-to-one support that allowed them to both identify and address the specific, individual literacy needs of each student. The one to one format of the intervention, in their view, also enabled students to feel more focused, comfortable and less self-conscious when reading.

• The students got a choice in the books they read, they were able to take ownership instead of being teacher led.

• Clear, precise programme. Students get familiar with the format, they know what’s expected of them and work towards that.

• All four first year students commented that they enjoyed the sessions. They became very familiar with the structure of it and didn’t like missing a session.

• Provided students with structured lessons which hugely improved their reading and comprehension skills.

• It targeted their weak spots and allowed time for working on these. The routine of 15 minutes meant that they knew what to expect. The target sheets motivated them.

• It is structured and meets the needs of individual students. It highlights particular areas of difficulty. The 15 minute session is ideal time-wise for a struggling reader.

• Specific teaching tailored to their exact needs. Intimate setting where teacher gets to know a lot about the student.

• It facilitated a more microscopic view of issues with literacy and allowed work to be done on more than just fluency.

• A fresh, structured, innovative approach to teaching basic literacy skills. Students responded with interest and enthusiasm. I would consider it’s greatest benefit – students’ retention of spelling over extended periods of time. Based on quality of learning rather than quantity.

• One to one structured reading – teacher got to see exactly where mistakes were being made. Could pinpoint problem areas and it developed relationships and self confidence in students.

Building trusting relationships was seen by some teachers as a benefit of the intervention. The individualised, consistent, one-to-one format of the programme fostered a climate of security and understanding in which some students felt they could share their thoughts, concerns and experiences in a way that they were not able to do elsewhere. Developing trust and ease with a
teacher was perceived as a valuable outcome of the programme in that it enabled conversations to take place not only to do with students’ feelings in regard to their reading but also about other issues in their lives.

- One of the students felt comfortable enough with me as a result of the sessions to confide a serious emotional issue. This may have gone unnoticed only for Catch Up.
- It improved their confidence and allowed for some one to one time with these students so problems could be addressed.
- The one to one tuition built up their self confidence. They enjoyed the one to one experience. Developed a better rapport with the student.

Crucially, the majority of teachers (83.8%) reported that other members of staff had reported positive changes in the students who had taken part in the Catch Up Literacy intervention. Some teachers stated that their colleagues had commented on students’ improved literacy skills in their classes, specifically their comprehension and de-encoding skills as well as positive changes in students’ homework. A few teachers focused specifically on behaviour and reported that students were more settled and participative in their mainstream classes.

- It is a great intervention, it certainly improves reading, spelling and comprehension. From the Behaviour Support Classroom perspective we found it a very useful tool for literacy skills and students enjoyed it. It created a concrete and steady structure to their time in the BSC and in some ways helped calm students down. They enjoyed reading and feeling a sense of achievement and it helped build their confidence and self-esteem and they were able to apply these skills in the mainstream class.
- Before the intervention she believed she was not good at anything academic and would have to leave school…Many of her dockets for being uncooperative and aggressive in class were due to her conduct and repeated refusals to read out loud in class. Now she is eager to read in class – even puts her hand up. Her self-esteem is still low however, she now firmly believes she can read well and with confidence.
- Some teachers commented on improved behaviour – greater willingness to read in class.
- He has improved greatly in class. He engages extremely well with reading exercises and activities. Loves to participate in class discussions and understands the rules of turn-taking.
- More settled in class. More confident in reading aloud in class.
- She hated reading at the start of the intervention but grew in confidence with the one to one help. She has settled down much better in her mainstream classes recently and is now willing to attempt work and ask questions if she doesn’t understand something. She doesn’t like to admit that she enjoys reading though – it’s not cool!

Many of the students’ subject teachers had noticed that the students seemed to have gained confidence in their lessons, made a better effort with the work and were more willing to participate and read in class. One Catch Up teacher wrote:

- Teachers noticed that they both had grown in huge confidence with regard to reading and participation in the class. One student especially has really developed as a student academically and emotionally. She recently put herself forward to act in front of a visitor to the school and all her year group by reading from a script. Both students love reading and don’t want our time together to end.

The teachers were also asked to describe any challenges they encountered in running the Catch Up intervention. Apart from a few comments regarding the need for more gender balanced materials
(“More selection of books needed for girls”) and the perceived extensiveness of the required preliminary testing, challenges seemed to be concentrated on issues related to time to deliver the programme with fidelity. The majority of teachers (75.7%) described “time” as a challenge, with most describing a discontinuity in implementation because of timetabling restraints or conflicts as well as student absenteeism. The former tended to be a result either of teachers trying to withdraw students twice a week from an established school timetable (in one case a teacher stated that it was necessary to conduct a session in their own time) as well as sessions being cancelled because of school events (for example, sports events, school holidays, inspections etc.). Continuity was similarly disturbed by student absenteeism from school. Contributing to, and perhaps related to, the challenges of time and attendance, some teachers found the format they used for delivering the programme i.e. two students withdrawn from class for one to one work, could be problematic. For instance one teacher wrote:

- Absenteeism – one student missed a huge number of sessions due to being suspended or being out. Trying to do two students in one session proved difficult due to the short time and also having enough work for them. If you set work for the waiting student then they often started asking questions about it in the middle of your session with the other student. You need to establish a pattern with students and choose work that, whilst it is helpful, won’t have the students interrupting your session by asking questions.

These challenges, albeit predominantly of an organisational, logistic nature, undoubtedly proved frustrating to the teachers delivering the intervention particularly as a bedrock of the programme is its consistent routine and intensive, methodical format of delivery. Optimal progress is dependent on adherence to the stipulated procedures and methods, including delivering the intervention consistently over a set period of time. Many teachers felt that it would have been more effective if they had additional time to implement the programme (for example, to have the intervention timetabled from the beginning of the academic year).

Despite these challenges, overall the teachers were very positive about the programme. They felt that most students shared their view and for those students who required this level of support, the intervention was effective.

- I found it to be an excellent programme. Both students that I worked with made progress in their reading but also in gaining confidence – we built up a good rapport. It gave them an opportunity to practice staying on task. The fact that the books were selected to suit the “level” or “ability” implied that they would be successful and that the challenges were manageable. The students looked forward to the classes possibly because it was a positive experience. What I found particularly effective was their experience of “fluency” in reading therefore they engaged with the text. Both students made very good progress in reading with expression and using the punctuation effectively…An excellent project.

- Both students said that they enjoyed Catch Up and would like to have more time to spend reading with a teacher one to one. Both said that they feel more confident reading at home. One of the students felt that it had improved her spelling for English class.

- Great response from the students which makes it worthwhile and our job easier as great willingness to learn shown by the students. Students keen “Can you take me now, I’m free”.

- The students really enjoyed Catch Up. They felt the 15 minutes was too short. They enjoyed the one to one time. They have both become members of the local library. The two students have requested that we continue reading together right up until the end of the year.
While some teachers thought that they themselves would benefit from additional practice implementing the programme, others said that they enjoyed delivering the intervention, with one teacher stating: “Enjoyed training and using the intervention. Learned the skill of teaching reading”. Another teacher viewed their own professional development as a benefit of the programme stating that they “Got to learn more about the difficulties and anxieties students face when they have to read”. Bearing in mind the critical level of student need the programme sets out to address, one teacher at the end of the intervention concluded:

- Despite improvements the students are still a long way from being able to access core curriculum material. However, they are on the road and if continued they may find success.

Across the range of teachers’ responses to the programme there is an appreciation that on-going planning and further work is needed to redress the critical gap in students’ reading skills. The teachers’ comments also indicate that in their view, Catch Up Literacy is both an appropriate and effective intervention for these students.
In their meta-analysis of literacy programmes for adolescents, Scammacca et al., (2007) provide a list of those elements research shows are essential for students in order to meaningfully access the curricula from the latter years of primary school and throughout their subsequent time in post primary school. These include:

Fluency of text reading; vocabulary, or the breadth and depth of knowledge about the meaning of words; active and flexible use of reading strategies to enhance comprehension; background, or prior knowledge related to the content of the text being read; higher level reasoning and thinking skills; and motivation and engagement for understanding and learning from text (p.5).

In terms of motivation and engagement, there are a wealth of studies identifying the correlation between these elements and the development of young people’s reading abilities (Guthrie & Wigfield, 2005; Lau, K., 2009; Logan & Johnston, 2009: Lovett, Lacarena, DePalma, & Frijters, 2012; Schunk & Zimmerman, 1997; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997). Research has explored motivation and engagement in terms of the individual’s perception of themself as a reader. The concept of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) as a determinant not only of the extent to which a student will pursue and engage with an activity or task but as well in their attitude towards the same has likewise been documented in the literature (Logan & Johnston, 2009; Mullis, Martin, Kennedy, & Foy, 2007; Schunk, 1991; Solheim, 2011; Wigfield et al., 1997). In considering the motivation, engagement and self-concept of struggling adolescent readers, there have been a number of investigations that have explored, in general, the manner in which these elements decrease over the course of a student’s school experience from primary to post primary (Gottfried, Fleming & Gottfried, 2001; Hogsten & Peregoy, 1999; Jacobs, Lanza, Osgood, Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002; Lau, 2009; Melekoglu, 2011; Petscher, 2010). Additionally, a recent study conducted by the National Literacy Trust (Clark, 2011) found from its on-line survey of 8 to 17 year olds that enjoyment of reading declines with age as well as the frequency of reading for enjoyment.

In their study of an intervention programme for students in the post primary sector, Lovett et al., (2012) argue that basic skills can still be effectively attended to with adolescent struggling readers. The authors state that:

Working on basic reading skills is an unappealing task for struggling readers of any age, but particularly for adolescents. Student engagement will depend on many factors—positive
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instructional group dynamics, affiliation with the teacher, the inclusion of enjoyable texts and activities, and, critically, the students’ perceptions of their own improvement (p. 164).

The qualitative data offered by both teachers and students during these two years that the NBSS has provided partner schools with the Catch Up Literacy intervention indicate that the nature of the programme, the structure of the intervention and the reading materials used all contributed to students being able to engage in the process, experience success and recognise their own progress. Students’ improved confidence and self-esteem emerge throughout many of the teachers’ comments as outcomes of the intervention.

‘...the nature of the programme, the structure of the intervention and the reading materials used, all contributed to students being able to engage in the process, experience success and recognise their own progress...’

In respect of reading improvement, as measured by the pre and post Salford Sentence Reading Test, it is clear that the majority of students who participated in Catch Up Literacy did develop their reading skills. The mean ratio gain over the two year period was 2.28 (average duration of intervention 4.33 months). However, it should be noted that it can be easier to achieve such ratio gains over a short period of time than it is to achieve similar ratio gains over a longer phase (for example a ratio gain of 2 over a year is two years progress in one year). Due to the length of the school year, the period of time needed for the training of teachers in the Catch Up intervention and the time needed to identify those students who would benefit most from this support, it was not possible to implement Catch Up in a single academic year for longer than a few months. However, many teachers have continued the intervention with their students into the following year and further research is needed to follow up on the impact of Catch Up over this extended period of time. Additionally, it must be acknowledged that the degree of accelerated progress made by the students over the course of the intervention still leaves many of them substantially behind their peers in terms of reading skills.

Because the NBSS focuses on students’ Positive Behaviours for Learning, the NBSS Catch Up Literacy Project utilised the Learning Behaviour Checklist for completion by individual subject teachers of students who had participated in the intervention. It is evident from the data collected that for students who participated in the project positive learning behaviours had increased. However, it is essential to state that in the partner schools there are a range of supportive interventions being implemented with students to address their learning behaviours. Therefore, this report does not attribute improvements shown in the quantitative or qualitative findings with regard to behaviours for learning to the Catch Up Literacy intervention alone. It is suggested that the Catch Up Literacy intervention contributed to the increase in students’ positive learning behaviours as recorded by their teachers.
Rassool (2009) points out that literacy and literacy learning are not culturally, socially or politically neutral. The school culture and/or philosophy that underpins the overall curriculum, pedagogy and in this case the policy, structures and systems to support and promote literacy education for all students are critical. Wearmouth, Solar, and Reid (2002) argue that the success of any programme is strengthened by certain broader key elements and that:

*successful implementation of any new initiative in education depends not only on ‘proven’ efficacy but also the structure and context within which it is delivered. Particularly pertinent are issues of resources, ownership and control* (p. 12).

Teachers in this study identified issues that became challenges in their implementation of this intervention programme. Primarily these were hurdles that were not intrinsic to Catch Up Literacy itself but were to do with insufficient time, student absenteeism or suspension from school and timetabling constraints, most commonly in terms of the logistics of withdrawing students from their scheduled subject classes.

The negative effects of difficulties with reading are well documented (Bynner & Parsons, 2007; McCoy & Banks, 2012) — and impact on learners’ lives through post-primary school and into adulthood. For example, literacy difficulties can lead to poor academic achievement and educational attainment, early school leaving, behavioural problems, low self-esteem, reduced employability and ultimately marginalisation and social exclusion. The effects are wide reaching and detrimental for society but more importantly for the person concerned. Over the course of the two years, these NBSS research findings support international studies that confirm the effectiveness of Catch Up Literacy in helping adolescents who struggle with reading (Brooks, 2007; Clipson-Boyles, 2000; Clipson-Boyles, 2001; Holmes, 2009). The findings in general concur with the view that reading interventions at post-primary with students with literacy difficulties can lead to significant improvement and impact positively on students’ self-confidence and efficacy.

Further research is needed to compare Catch Up Literacy with other literacy interventions and to investigate factors that may influence its effectiveness. These would include the duration of the intervention; the number of sessions received; whether the degree of discrepancy between students’ chronological ages and reading scores at the start of the work has a causal effect on progress; and do socio-economic factors or specific learning difficulties have an impact on student outcomes. It would also be beneficial to extend the provision of the intervention, for instance as a long-term, follow-up initiative into the senior cycle. This would in a sense correspond with Catch Up Literacy UK’s recommendation that the programme needs to be provided over the course of the entire academic year.
Considering the limited amount of time that teachers have had to implement the programme for the purposes of this research project, the results across both years of the intervention have been promising. The experience of delivering the Catch Up Literacy programme corroborates Linda Diamond’s (2006) view that effective and sustainable reading programmes need the collective commitment of all parties in addition to the individual teacher and student. Diamond includes in this commitment the provision of on-going professional development and support for the teachers, the availability of requisite tools and resources as well as “…support systems initiated by the local leadership to ensure smooth implementation and enduring effects” (p.13). Effort must be invested in addressing the logistic and organisational issues that have impeded programme delivery in some of the schools participating in this research. Additionally, methods should be devised and enacted to develop sustainability of the programme’s positive outcomes. At a minimum, students in this project who have responded positively to the programme should be encouraged and enabled to carry on with Catch Up Literacy if their teachers think it would be of value to them. The NBSS would hope that because of the evidenced-based merits of this programme (nationally and internationally) that provision will be made in partner schools for more students to have access to the intervention.
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Appendix A: Student Questionnaire

Your Views on Reading

1. Do you like reading?
   - Hate it
   - Dislike it
   - It’s Ok
   - Like it
   - Love it

2. When you read in school do you find it
   - Very hard
   - Hard
   - OK
   - Quite easy
   - Very easy

3. When you read on your own do you find it
   - Very hard
   - Hard
   - OK
   - Quite Easy
   - Very easy

4. How do you feel if someone asks you to read out loud in class?
   - Hate it
   - Dislike it
   - It’s Ok
   - Like it
   - Love it

5. How easy do you find reading?
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6
   - 7
   - 8
   - 9
   - 10

Thank You
Appendix B: Catch Up Literacy Teacher Review

Catch Up Literacy Intervention Research Project

1. What were the benefits of running the Catch Up Literacy Intervention with students?

2. Were there any challenges to running the intervention?

3. Did other people notice or comment on any improvement (if any) with the students?

4. Did the student doing Catch Up make any comments about the intervention? If so, please outline.

5. Would you use the Catch Up Literacy Intervention again next year?

6. Other Comments
Appendix C: Learning Behaviour Checklist

* To be completed by class tutor or English teacher

Confidential

Catch Up Literacy
Learning Behaviour Checklist

Name of Student ______________________ Date: ____________

Name of Teacher: _____________________ Subject: __________

Please use the ratings 1 to 5 and comment further if needed: 1=Always 2=Most of the time 3=Sometimes 4=Infrequently 5=Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments:

Signed:
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National Behaviour Support Service (NBSS)
Navan Education Centre
Athlumney
Navan
Co. Meath

Telephone: +353 46 909 3355
Fax: +353 46 909 3354
Email: nbss@ecnovan.ie
Website: www.nbss.ie