Two Failed Workarounds
1 - The Search for Foundation Grants
2 - The International Dyslexia Association

First Failed Workaround - A Lesson Learned
In 2016, the MacArthur Foundation announced a competition for a $100,000,000.00 grant to fund a single proposal that promised real and measurable progress in solving a critical problem of our time. This competition was called 100&Change. The Center saw this competition as its potential fourth workaround. The submission deadline was October 3, 2016. On June 3rd, we registered for the competition.

The application was an interesting one. Twenty-one different pieces of information required written descriptions. Each description had a word-count limit imposed. The form itself was completed online and automatically rejected answers that exceeded its word count. There were also documents to upload and a ninety-second video to create and add via a YouTube link. The Center application's Executive Summary is included below.

Executive Summary (150 words)
Provide a brief summary of the problem and the solution you are proposing. A single paragraph, delivering a compelling overview so that the Evaluation Panel will want to read more. The paragraph should not require any other context to explain clearly the problem and the proposed solution.

The Problem: Illiteracy in America. According to a study conducted in 2014 by the U.S. Department of Education, 32 million adults in the United States cannot read. That is nearly 15% of our population. One in four children in America grows up without learning how to read. According to the Department of Justice, "The link between academic failure and delinquency, violence, and crime is welded to reading failure." Nearly 85% of the juveniles who face trial in the juvenile court system are functionally illiterate. **Our Proposed Solution:** Provide at no cost to every kindergarten and first-grade classroom in America a reading and writing program with a 30-year proven track record of teaching every child in every classroom to read and to write. Every child means EVERY child, including educationally disadvantaged, ESL, autistic, dyslexic, and special needs students. We propose to end illiteracy in America. (146 words)

Acceptance
We received the notice that our application was accepted on October 3rd. Thank you for your submission; it will now move into the Administrative

Review process. If your application is considered invalid, you will receive a message by the end of November letting you know.

All valid submissions will be reviewed by our evaluation panel judges, and after the review process is completed, you will receive your comments and scores. We expect to announce the Semi-Finalists in mid-December.

View the Judges (with a link provided to the list).

And Rejection
Our application was rejected on December 6th before even one judge had been allowed to see it. The stated reason: You have not provided rigorous evidence that your solution will address the problem that you've identified. We expected to see one or more of the following types of evidence cited in your application: data or findings from external evaluation of a pilot project or experimental study, citations to peer-reviewed research indicating a strong scientific consensus, a strong logic model, and documentation of a detailed pathway from the proposed actions to specific outcomes.

My Response
Cecilia,

I appreciate your providing me with more detailed information on why the Center's application was rejected before even one judge was allowed to review it. I am responding to your message, not to appeal your decision, since no appeals are allowed, but to suggest to you and the MacArthur Foundation that, among other things, your concept of "rigorous evidence" is too narrow.

Rigorous Evidence:

In 1976, the Center published through Addison-Wesley a non-textbook curriculum for the teaching of mathematics to primary grade children in a book titled "Mathematics Their Way". By "non-textbook," I mean that the curriculum presented used neither student textbooks nor student workbooks. The only persons making use of any books at all were the teachers themselves, using the curriculum outlined in the Math Their Way book.

Even though Addison-Wesley was a textbook publisher, the company published our anti-textbook for two reasons. First reason: Our first book "Workjobs" had sold 100,000 copies in a teacher market where Addison-Wesley said the sale of 15,000 copies constituted a best seller. The sales of this first 100,000 took place before Addison-Wesley had even

advertised the book's existence. Second reason: Even though our book had the potential of moving teachers away from textbooks and Addison-Wesley was a textbook publisher, our publisher said, "You would have to bomb teachers to get them to stop using textbooks."

Our goal was, obviously, to replace textbooks and workbooks with a child-centered curriculum based on teaching for understanding. To do this, we would have to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach as compared to that of the textbook publishers.

Our research on the effectiveness of our approach would be based on the teacher as the researcher and the classroom students as the research subjects. Since every state and many districts within each state have their own separate standards for what is to be taught, we would let each teacher-researcher set his or her own standard for determining the success of our curriculum.

Teachers using our program would communicate directly with us - a prepaid postcard was included in each copy of Mathematics Their Way. Teachers would also communicate with one another on the successes or failures of our curriculum. While our research may not fit the traditional mold of what constitutes "rigorous research," our opinion is that the very best judge of the effectiveness of a curriculum is the classroom teacher.

We knew from personal experience that, while the book presented a curriculum, not all teachers would feel comfortable discontinuing use of their textbooks with only a single book as a guide. So, to support teachers who wished assistance in implementing our curriculum, we offered weeklong workshops with the option of follow-up classes. We currently have a database of over 300,000 teachers who have asked for our assistance in either workshop sessions or in obtaining manipulative materials for use in their classrooms.

Our "research" may not seem acceptable to the MacArthur Foundation, but it was acceptable to the teaching nation as a whole. When touring nationally to promote the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) 1989 Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics (Standards), an NCTM board member said to each of his audiences, "If you want to see how best to implement the Standards in a primary classroom, look at Math Their Way. For the NCTM our "research" was deemed quite good enough.

In the 1980's, the State of California adopted Mathematics Their Way for use statewide as a primary grade textbook, making Mathematics Their Way the first non-textbook ever accepted for State adoption. So, our "research" was good enough for the State of California.

The magazine of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) printed an article by a teacher-professor who had traveled the world looking for the best elementary school math curriculum. (A nice way to write off the expenses of world travel.) She reported finding it in Australia, which she said was odd because it was from California. It was our Math Their Way curriculum. Nice recognition for a curriculum the MacArthur Foundation would not have considered due to the absence of "rigorous research".

The book is known and used worldwide, with teachers in Chile even translating it into Spanish (with Center permission) for use throughout Latin America. Yet, again, the MacArthur Foundation definition of rigorous research would not have allowed this curriculum any consideration.

Pilot Program

You say we offered no date or findings from the external evaluation of a pilot program. This is true only under the confines of your very narrow definition of what constitutes "rigorous evidence." Our pilot program of 2,048 kits in 2,048 classrooms used the same teacher as researcher, classroom students as research subjects model as we used for Mathematics Their Way. The same standard for determining the success or failure of the program was used here as well.

2,048 kits distributed over ten years equals 2,048 teacher-researchers. Assuming an average class size of 25, that is 308,700 test subjects over that ten-year period. Over the thirty-year life of the kits, several thousand teachers have taught an additional several hundred thousand students. Every one of the original 2,048 teachers and many of the teachers who inherited their kits communicated with the Center about their successes in using the kit. I would say they communicated their failures, as well, but of all the thousands of teachers using the program, with all the hundreds of thousands of students, there were absolutely no failures.

What is your definition of "data or findings from external evaluation of a pilot program"? None of these 2,048 teacher-researchers were employed by the Center. All were allowed to determine their own measures of the program's successes and failures. We received literally thousands of external evaluations, samples of which were included as part of our application. Why does your definition exclude this data?

Our program is more widely and thoroughly tested over a greater length of time than perhaps any other program submitted to the MacArthur Foundation. Our research methods for the Reading Program are the

same ones we employed for the Mathematics Their Way curriculum. The NCTM, the State of California, and schools and school districts all over the country and all over the world have found our research methods quite acceptable. As I said at the start, this email is not an appeal for the MacArthur Foundation to change its decision. It is a request that the Foundation broaden its too narrow definition of what constitutes acceptable proof of a problem's solution.

The Judging

We never expected to win the $100,000,000.00 grant, because the MacArthur Board will make the final decision, and no standards for the basis of that decision were ever or will ever be posted. So, in essence, it does not make any difference how well we presented our case, because the decision will be whatever the Board decides it wants, regardless.

We did, however, expect to be judged by a panel of five, on the criteria included as part of the application. We did not expect that MacArthur Foundation staff would decide on its own whether we met the judging criteria without even letting a single judge see our application.

You discarded our application because we did not meet your narrow definition of "rigorous evidence," yet the evidence we offered was equivalent to what was accepted by the NCTM, the State of California, and countless school districts across the country. Do you think every judge shares your same narrow view of evidence? I think not. But we will never know, because you assumed the role of judge.

You discarded our application because we did not meet your narrow definition of "findings from external evaluation of a pilot project". You did this despite the fact that our pilot project involved thousands of teachers as researchers and hundreds of thousands of classroom students and research subjects, and all of our evaluations were conducted by our teacher peers. Do you think every judge shares your same narrow view? I think not. But we will never know, because you assumed the role of judge.

The MacArthur Foundation discarded our application for reasons that I had thought would be left up to the judges themselves to decide. Obviously, that is not the case. So, in essence, in order to reduce the number of applications for which you must assign judges, you have thrown the proverbial baby out with the bath water.

You say, "We plan to include the executive summary of your proposal in materials that we anticipate sharing with other funders, in the hope that you may find support for your work in the future." Realistically, though, who is going to look through more than 1,800 executive summaries from

the 1,800 different applications received by 100&Change for funding ideas? Our hope was to reach the judging level, for it is only that group of applications that will form the basis for another funding group's potential interest.

There will be another round of 100&Change in three years. Regardless of how much we would like to have used the 100&Change process to help us find funding for ending illiteracy in America, there would never be a way for us to reapply as long as your standards for denying access to the judging process denigrates the viability of teachers as researchers and students as the group researched.

The Lesson Learned
For the next 100&Change competition, the rules for who could submit an application had been changed, and the Center found that it was no longer even eligible to apply.

I had learned why no textbook publishers were interested in ending illiteracy in America. This failed try at a workaround gave me reason to believe that seeking funding from any other foundation would produce the same result as we had experienced with the MacArthur Foundation. The three workarounds we already had in place were the best we could do for now.

2 - The International Dyslexia Association

Second Failed Workaround – A Lesson Learned?
The lengthy message below was sent in its entirety to The International Dyslexia Association and 39 of its branches. Forty emails and zero replies. You can judge for yourself if there is anything more we should have said that might have produced a response of any kind.

From: reading @center.edu
To: email address of IDA or Affiliate
Subject line: **A Reading Program for Dyslexic Children**

We have developed a reading program designed specifically to teach dyslexic children in regular classroom settings alongside their peers, with no special assessments or customized learning plans needed. Our program has undergone ten years of testing in 2,048 different classrooms across America. The number of students involved in our study was in excess of 300,000. Results: Every single child learned to read and read well, including every single dyslexic child. 100%, not 99.99%.

On June 1st of this year, we wrote the UCSF Dyslexic Center to share our findings with them. The Dyslexic Center's reply, "We will get back to

you as soon as we can. It is now October, and we have heard nothing. On July 2nd of this year, we wrote the Northern California Branch of the International Dyslexia Association to see if they were interested in learning about our approach to teaching dyslexic children. No response of any kind to our email.

I know there are schools that specialize in teaching dyslexic students that charge $50,000.00 or more per student. Our program teaches these same students in a regular classroom setting, thus making obsolete the need for special schools that cost $50,000 per child. Is it possible that there are Dyslexic Centers and Associations that exist for the money and not for the child? I would like to believe that this is not the reason we have received no responses from the first two dyslexic organizations we contacted.

Our purpose now is to send word of our program's success to as many dyslexia organizations as we can, in the hope that we will find an organization or organizations interested in learning how it is possible to teach dyslexic children alongside every other child in a regular classroom, using the same teaching method for all children.

If you are interested in what we have to say, please keep reading.

The Hardest Thing You Ever Had To Learn

When I am explaining the philosophy behind our Reading Program to parents and teachers, I first ask them, "What was the hardest thing you ever had to learn?" I tell them that whatever they say will most likely be the wrong answer. Chemistry in high school? An advanced math class? Or something not so academic, like how to drive a tractor? The guesses go on and on, and, as I told them they would be, they are all wrong.

The hardest thing we ever had to learn was the language we now speak. Newborn babies know how to eat, sleep, poop, and cry. They are born knowing little else. They don't even know what language is. Yet these little learning machines will hear the sounds around them, figure out that some of the sounds they hear are sounds they themselves can make, and that these sounds have meanings that they themselves can understand. They go from knowing nothing to figuring out what language is and learning it themselves.

There is no need for parents to assess their baby in advance to determine which way might be the best way for their baby to learn. They simply surround their baby with words and respond with great pleasure to any words the infant says, no matter how far from the actual word the infant's first words might be.

Learners
My mother's sister gave birth to a daughter three months after I was born. My cousin Jean and I spent a lot of baby time together. She crawled before I did, walked before I did, and talked before I did. She was so much faster at learning than I was that my parents were convinced that I was retarded. My father was even planning to take me to work with him each day so he could watch over me, rather than enrolling me in kindergarten when the time came.

There are fast learners and slow learners, but there are no non-learners. Fortunately, since I was just a baby, I did not pick up on my parents' concern. I simply learned to crawl, walk, and talk at my own pace, just like every other child does. However, when children's student lives begin, school strips their natural ability to learn at their own pace away from them. And if, like when I was compared to my cousin Jean, a child learns at a slower rate than the school demands, that child will be graded accordingly and made to feel that he or she is slow or dumb.

Natural Ability
The way children are taught to read in school is one of many examples of schools taking away a child's natural ability to learn at their own pace. In the case of reading, though, not only is a child's natural pace taken away, the way the child learned language so effectively as an infant is taken away, as well.

As I said earlier, there is no need for parents to assess their babies in advance to determine how they will learn to talk. If children were allowed to learn to read in school the same natural way they learned to talk, there would be no need for their teachers to assess them in advance to determine if there are any special needs to take into consideration when teaching them.

Now replace the IF with when. When children are allowed to learn to read the same natural way they learned to talk, there is no need for their teachers to assess them in advance to determine how they should learn to read. They will all, and I mean ALL, learn to read as naturally as they all learned to talk.

Credibility
The Reading Program we developed does just that. It allows all children to learn to read as naturally as they learned the language they speak. Actually, their learning to read is even easier for them than it was for them as they learned to talk. As they learned language, they had to figure everything out on their own. Now, in a classroom setting, they are surrounded by other children with whom they can share their learning experience.

Before I explain how our Reading Program makes learning to read so easy for ALL children, I will offer proof of its effectiveness. As I alluded to earlier, the Center conducted a ten-year study of the effectiveness of its Reading Program by placing Reading Program kits in 2,048 classrooms across the country.

	Kits	Students (Assuming a 25 per student average class size)										
	Placed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Year - 1	280	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	70,000
Year - 2	220		5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	5,500	49,500
Year - 3	293			7,325	7,325	7,325	7,325	7,325	7,325	7,325	7,325	58,600
Year - 4	207				5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175	36,225
Year - 5	2					50	50	50	50	50	50	300
Year - 6	349						8,725	8,725	8,725	8,725	8,725	43,625
Year - 7	194							4,850	4,850	4,850	4,850	19,400
Year - 8	236								5,900	5,900	5,900	17,700
Year - 9	267									6,675	6,675	13,350
	2,048											308,700

The chart above estimates the number of students across the USA who participated in our study. For estimation purposes, we assumed an average of twenty-five students in each class each year. The estimated number of students participating in our study through its tenth year was over 300,000. Whether the number 300,000 is a reasonable approximation or not, what is clear now and was clear at the time is that there were thousands of students using our Reading Program during those ten years.

Every Child Learned - No Child Left Behind

Every year of the ten-year study, we asked teachers who were using kits that year to send us written reports of their successes and/or failures with the Program. The teachers using the kits could use any method of evaluation they, or their school, or their district, chose to use. During that entire time frame and continuing to this day, there has never been a report of any child failing to learn to read or to write using the Center's Reading Program, regardless of any child's supposed reading readiness. EVERY child learned. NO child was ever left behind.

A certain percentage of the 300,000 children in our study were, of course, dyslexic. However, the actual percentage is irrelevant because, regardless of any supposed learning difficulties, our Program was designed to teach every single child. There was no need to assess any child in advance for differences in learning capabilities or learning style, just as there is no need to assess in advance any baby's capability to

learn language. All healthy babies who can hear and can babble will learn language. Our Program allows all children who can hear and speak to become proficient readers and writers, as well.

Current Reading Credibility
Included below is a single paragraph from a recent email exchange between me and a retiring teacher wishing to find a new home for the Reading Program kit she has been using since 1989.

From: Donna J.
Subject: Baratta-Lorton Reading Program
Date: April 15, 2023
To: reading@center.edu

I thought I had a home for the program. One of my former students looked me up. She told me that later in life she was diagnosed with a rare kind of dyslexia. She was asked by the people who diagnosed her how she was able to learn to read. She told them about the program her first-grade teacher used. They told her that she was lucky, because she would have struggled her whole life otherwise. She was going to use it with preschool kids, but ended up getting a different job with our school district.

Donna's former first-grade student had dyslexia, and neither she nor Donna even knew it, because the Reading Program was designed to teach dyslexic students alongside every other student, with or without any learning disability, in a regular classroom setting with no need to diagnose in advance any supposed learning difficulties.

Learning to Read as Natural as Learning Language Was

As was pointed out earlier, the little learning machines hear the sounds around them, figure out that some of the sounds they hear are sounds they themselves can make, and that these sounds have meanings that they themselves can understand. The first words they recite are not words like hippopotamus or fire engine. They are words like Ma or Wawa, as approximations for the words Mommy and Water.

Children used the sounds around them to learn language. The Reading Program mirrors the child's learning of language by having children learn to read with sounds as well. Traditional letters are only introduced once the child has learned to read with sounds. Our alphabet uses 26 letters to spell every word. English uses 44 sounds to make every word we speak. Before a child begins the process of learning to read using letters, the child must learn all 26 letters. When a child was learning to speak, two sounds were all it took for an infant to say "Ma".

When the Reading Program begins, the teacher introduces children to the 44 sounds slowly over several days by reading them a story written in rhyme. The story explains why each unique picture represents the sound it does. The story is in rhyme because the best way to hear the sound a letter makes is to hear that sound at the end of a word. The first sound-picture in the illustration below represents the sound at the end of the word fu**ss**. The second sound-picture below represents the sound at the end of the word tr**ee**.

see sea C sí

As you can see, the word the two sound-pictures represent can be spelled at least four different ways with letters. Learning with sounds before letters are introduced allows children to learn to read words in the same way they learned language as infants, by putting sounds together to form words.

Using the sound-pictures is the starting point that makes everything else so easy for each child. Children don't have to know all 44 sounds before learning to read. The first word to be read is introduced after the first two sounds are known. Students begin their learning activities when just eight sounds are known. For most activities, children work in groups of twos and threes. There is no grouping by ability. All children are allowed to work at their own rate. Children who learn faster, like my cousin Jean, work side by side with children like me who learn at a slower rate. The 44 sounds are in sets of stamp trays. Once all 44 sounds have been introduced, all children begin stamping out any word or words they wish to write. The sounds are also available as a computer font that a teacher or parent can use. Fonts can be any size a teacher or parent wants.

The 26 letters of the alphabet are introduced early in the program, but only for the purpose of learning their names and how to write them. Letters are not matched with sounds until the child is already a proficient reader and writer. When the child is a proficient reader and writer, a decoding chart is introduced that teaches the child the various

spellings of each sound. Letters are then used to record the words the child already knows how to read and write.

The Program's Philosophy
None of us is as smart as all of us. With 30 children in a class, each child has 30 teachers - the classroom teacher and 29 other children. The Program was specifically designed to meet the needs of dyslexic children under the assumption that what works for them will work for everyone else, as well. Dyslexic children learn to read alongside their peers without needing any special consideration because, as I said, the Program was specifically designed to meet their needs.

All babies are little learning machines. All children are still little learning machines if given the chance to learn at their own rate and not the arbitrary rate most school learning sets for them. The Reading Program allows every child to learn to read and write as seamlessly as they learned their spoken language.

There is much more to the Program than is included here. For now, though, you should have a feel for why it taught every child in our ten-year study to read and write so well. 100% not 99.99%.

You Might Wonder
You might wonder why no more kits were made after that first 2,048. Wouldn't any publisher want to make a reading program that teaches every child available to everyone? Each Summer since its founding, our Center conducted math workshops for elementary school teachers. In the Summer following the end of our Reading Program's ten-year study, we conducted more than 700 week-long K-6 math curriculum workshops for more than 21,000 teachers in all 50 states. By then, our math curriculum books had sold more than 1,400,000 copies to teachers across the world. That is one book per teacher, not 30 books for children in a class.

Just before that year, the State of California adopted one of our math curriculum books for use by all of its primary grade teachers. Following that adoption and the corresponding increasing nationwide drop in textbook sales, textbook publishers began actively working to make it difficult, if not impossible, for teachers in the USA to use our math curriculum in their classrooms.

The No Child Left Behind Act
When President Bush took office, Congress passed his No Child Left Behind Act. While I don't think President Bush knew the full implications of his actions, his No Child Left Behind initiative had as its purpose curtailing the use of our math curriculum. No Child Left Behind

required all public schools to be measured by end-of-year standardized tests, written by the textbook publishers, to measure not how well children understood mathematics, but how well they remembered their textbook lessons. If performance did not reach certain levels, the entire school would be subject to successive punishments. The consequences did not just apply if an entire school was falling behind. They also applied if a subgroup of students didn't make progress, such as students with disabilities, students from low-income families, students learning English, or students from a particular racial group.

Tens of thousands of schools faced No Child Left Behind's sanctions. By 2012, more than 6,000 schools were being restructured, meaning they had suffered all the way through the penalties without improvement. Thousands more schools had been required to take some of the less drastic steps. The focus on high-stakes testing and the pressure on schools to raise test scores led to teachers "teaching to the test" as opposed to providing a well-rounded education. President Bush's No Child Left Behind Act left thousands of children far behind. The textbook publishers' dream came true. No Child Left Behind required teachers to teach the textbook, not the child.

Rejection and Two Workarounds

At the conclusion of our ten-year study, the Center began the process of seeking out a publisher for our Reading Program. Despite the Program's nationwide success, every publisher of educational materials to which the Center submitted our Program for publication rejected it. Their rejection was not based on our Program's effectiveness. Its effectiveness was never disputed by any publisher.

There were several reasons for the rejection. The publishers did not want to give credibility to a reading program from a company they were already trying to put out of business. Unlike workbooks, no components of the Reading Program's kit needed to be replenished the following year. A non-consumable kit was a loser in the publisher's eyes. Also, the Reading Program did not tie the school using it into any publisher's K-6 curriculum. Children who used it could use any other publisher's textbook series the following year. As was true for math, publishers were more concerned about their profits than the learning of the child.

Regardless of the reasons, I did not feel I could do much about it. What I could do, though, was make our Reading Program available to every teacher or parent who wanted to use it as a free download from the Center's website. When the Apple iPad was first introduced, I saw that it, too, could be used to make our Reading Program available for free to anyone who wanted it. I taught myself app programming and turned the

Center's Reading Program into 14 apps. Apple App Store search term: Baratta Lorton. No hyphen needed.

Is Anybody Still Using Our Program?
Since our Reading Program download was free with no strings attached, we had not thought to include any way to know either who was doing the downloading or how many downloads were taking place. None of the 2,048 teachers in our ten-year study had ever asked the Center questions about how to facilitate the kits' use in their classrooms. The video on the Center's website, which explains its use to a group of Center instructors, along with the Program's teacher's manual, had served to answer every teacher's questions. Therefore, the absence of questions from people downloading it did not provide any indication of download numbers.

Not knowing who was doing the downloading ended in 2022 when the software program used for the downloading malfunctioned, and the downloading stopped working. The malfunction caused so many people to contact the Center asking for the Program to be made available again that we became aware of how many teachers and parents were then and still are downloading our Program. The software was fixed, and the downloading continues.

However, seeing how popular the Reading Program still was, without any promotion at all from the Center, it occurred to me that there was actually a way to bypass the publishers who had rejected our Program. A book, if it were as well-received as our earlier books had been, could be that bypass power. In December of 2022, I began my writing. In December of 2024, I completed my manuscript. The book's title: The Curriculum Book - Teaching EVERY Child and Ending Illiteracy in America. I am now in the process of finding a publisher for my manuscript.

Dyslexia - Two Things I Learned
In the Current Reading Credibility section above, I said that a teacher had recently returned a kit to me that she had been using since 1989. In the paragraph that I included, the teacher told me of her former first-grade student who had learned later in life that she had dyslexia. When I related this story to one of my brothers, he told me that there was a special school in his town that was dedicated to teaching children with dyslexia. He suggested that I contact that school and see if it would like the kit to use with its students.

When I Googled the school, I learned two things. First, the school would definitely not want to use our Reading Program kit. Tuition for each student in the school exceeded $50,000.00. There was no way a school

like that would want to use a program with their students that would show that there was no need for their school to exist. Second, my search had shown me something of which I had been completely unaware. There were organizations and associations dedicated to improving the learning lives of dyslexic children. The school in my brother's hometown would not be interested in what I had to share, but I was sure that the organizations and associations would be.

First Effort's Failures

The Curriculum Book goes into very specific detail as to how the Reading Program meets the needs of dyslexic children in a regular classroom setting. It was as I was nearing the end of writing my manuscript that I learned of the existence of organizations whose purpose was to serve the needs of dyslexic children. I knew then that one of the questions my eventual readers would surely ask me would be what dyslexic organizations thought of my approach to teaching dyslexic children. I would need an answer to that question. That is when I decided it was important for me to share my approach to teaching dyslexic children with the organizations that shared my desire to help children with dyslexia and get their feedback. However, the very beginning of this message indicates that my first two efforts were failures.

An Unintended Implication

The Curriculum Book conveys the message that textbook publishers deliberately set out to make it difficult for teachers to use our anti-textbook curriculum in their classrooms because our curriculum was directly responsible for a substantial drop-off in textbook and workbook sales. The message is that many publishers of educational materials care more about profits than about educating children. The unintended implication now is that the reason my first two efforts were failures is because those two organizations were not interested in a Reading Program that could eliminate the $50,000.00 per child revenue for the schools with which they were associated.

My Purpose Now

Now that I know of the existence of organizations established to meet the needs of dyslexic children, I want to share with them the Reading Program we created. A program that lets every dyslexic child learn to read and write in a typical classroom setting alongside every other child. When readers of my book ask me what dyslexic organizations think of our Reading Program, I want to provide them with the opinions of as many groups as possible.

The kit's free download doesn't need a publisher. The 14 free apps don't need a publisher, either. What the kit and the apps do need is the dyslexic community's knowing of their existence. For any dyslexic

organization that wishes to share it with its followers, the kit is freely available from our website. All 14 apps are also just an Apple App Store Search term away. This is where (the IDA and 39 of its affiliated branches were each named separately here, and each sent a copy of this message) your organization comes in. What more would you need to know about our Reading Program to consider recommending its use to your followers? And, if you think our Program is worthwhile, what other dyslexic organizations would you suggest we share it with?

Bob Baratta-Lorton
reading@center.edu
www.center.edu

The Failure
We still have not received a reply of any kind from any of the 40 IDA organizations to which we sent our message. You may draw your own conclusions, or you can contact any of the 40 and ask why not one of them was interested in learning more about a method that teaches every dyslexic child for way less than a $50,000.00 per child yearly tuition.