

SAVVAS

myView
LITERACY

FOUNDATIONAL RESEARCH

Evidence Base



ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GRADES K-5



Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Program Overview	6
Reader/Writer Workshop	6
Gradual Release	8
Project-Based Inquiry	10
Rigorous Standards	11
Blended Instruction	12
Themes/Essential Questions/Content Area Connections - Interdisciplinary Study	13
Differentiation	17
Small Group Instruction	17
English Learners	18
Striving Learners	19
Accelerated	20
Students with Dyslexia	21
Students with Disabilities	23
Reading	25
Text Selection & Complexity	25
Oral Language Development	27
Foundational Skills	28
Academic Language and Vocabulary	31
Word Study	33
Fluency	34
Comprehension	35
Independent Reading	38
The Reciprocal Relationship Between Reading & Writing	40
Reciprocity and Developing Writers/Readers Who Understand	40
Handwriting	41
Conventions	41
Spelling	42
Writing	44
Writing Workshop	44

Voluminous Writing	45
Mentor Text, Genre, and Writer’s Craft	45
Conferring	46
Speaking & Listening	48
Social Emotional Learning	50
School to Home	52
Assessments	54
Formative	54
Observational	55
Benchmark	56
Summative	57
Technology	59
Technology as an Educational Tool	59
Data Collection and Actionable Insight	60
Teacher Support, Professional Development & Instructional Strategies	63
References	66

The literacy crisis in the U.S. is real. Addressing this crisis requires the systematic application of research-based practices combined with effective teacher preparedness efforts. Low literacy rates affect nearly every important social issue impacting humans living in the 21st century. In the U.S., 36 million adults lack the basic literacy skills needed to sustain employment. Children of parents with low literacy skills can expect a seventy-two percent chance of being at the lowest reading levels themselves (Cascio et al, 2008). Of adults with the lowest literacy levels, forty-three percent live in poverty, and seventy percent of adult welfare recipients have low literacy levels (NIL, 2008). An excess of \$230 billion a year in health care costs is linked to low adult literacy (Baker et al, 2002).

Low literacy rates cost the U.S. approximately \$225 billion each year in non-productivity in the workforce, crime and loss of tax revenue due to unemployment (NCAL, 2015). Every year, one in six adults (more than 1.2 million) drop out of high school (NCES, 2006). Seventy-five percent of state prison inmates did not complete high school or can be classified as low literate and ninety-five percent of those that are incarcerated are reintegrated into our communities. Indeed, research shows that inmates who are educated are forty-three percent less likely to return to prison (Pastore & Maguire, 2001). Currently two-thirds of adult education programs in the U.S. are struggling with long student waiting list and less than ten percent of adults in need are receiving services (ProLiteracy Annual Statistic Report, 2018)

While incomes for literate individuals will likely increase at least two to three times over the course of their working lives, research has shown that the income earning potential for people with poor literacy is more likely to stay the same *at best*. For students that do not complete primary schooling, the future is considerably more bleak. These students are significantly less likely to obtain the types of skills and jobs needed to even stay above the poverty line (Martinez & Fernandez, 2010). Teachers in middle and high school grades can no longer assume that students are able to make full meaning of texts or access classroom resources and digital materials that require literacy skills to expand their current knowledge level (Alber, 2010).

With the evidence showing the correlation between lack of literacy skills and academic, social, and financial challenges, it becomes alarmingly clear that high-quality, impactful reading instruction in the primary grades is essential to creating life-long learners that interact and contribute to society in meaningful ways (Foorman, et al, 2016). The importance of understanding and implementing good reading instruction in the elementary grades cannot be underestimated. More than half a century of research has established a strong correlation between early literacy and later academic and workplace success (Murnane, et al, 2012). Given the diversity of talent and preparation for learning to read that is common in most schools, we must provide reading instruction for diverse groups of students along a continuum of intensity with ample activities, technical exposure, and experiences that inspire confidence and a passion for reading.

Studies have also shown that the greatest likelihood for increased reading skills transpire when explicit, systematic instruction that includes, at a minimum, the following key components is provided: 1) morphology instruction; 2) reading motivation; and 3) interactive writing (Duke, 2017). Morphology instruction supports decoding, spelling, and vocabulary development and

allows students to increase their ability to compose and decompose words of increasing complexity over time (Goodwin & Ahn, 2013). In addition, fostering reading motivation through relevance, choice, collaboration, self-efficacy support and thematic units, is critical to literary advancement and sustained growth (Guthrie, McRae, & Klauda, 2007). No evidence-based literacy program would be complete without ample time for interactive writing with authentic purpose (Craig, 2003; Hall, Toland, Grisham-Brown, & Graham, 2014; Roth & Guinee, 2011). Lastly, the existing body of evidence has shown that intervention for struggling elementary readers is essential if we want these students to achieve the kind of future academic or workplace success that will promote a sustainable life (Blachman et al., 2004; Denton et al., 2006; & Fletcher et al. 2007). Incorporating these best practices for effective literacy instruction has been shown to decrease reading gaps and help struggling students catch up with their on-level peers (Torgesen, 2000).

myView Literacy is a student centered, ELA curriculum for learners in grades K-5, built around standards and with a consistent approach to improving student learning and achievement. From quality instruction and compelling literature, to purposeful digital interactions, *myView Literacy* transforms the classroom of today into a dynamic learning environment for the next generation of learners. The program is a blended, integrated curriculum that promotes student ownership of learning through goal setting, student choice, and reflection. *myView Literacy* encourages social collaboration and links together knowledge, skills and learning behaviors while at the same time utilizing gradual release, project-based inquiry and rigorous standards to support defined learning outcomes with learning activities, instruction, and assessments that address the needs of today's diverse classrooms.

In 2000 the National Reading Panel (NRP) published a report sharing the findings of their longitudinal review of existing empirical evidence regarding the most effective methods for teaching literacy. Twenty years later this existing body of evidence continues to support their findings that the following five elements are the cornerstone of literacy instruction (NRP, 2000):

1. Phonemic awareness
2. Phonics instruction
3. Fluency
4. Vocabulary
5. Text comprehension

The *myView Literacy* ELA solution focuses on providing learning activities that address these needs and more by promoting meaning, inspiring thoughtful conversation and debate, and allowing students to collaborate and share ideas. For teachers, *myView Literacy* offers critical opportunities for modeling, monitoring, and providing feedback that addresses students at an appropriate literacy level and challenges them to greater achievement. The solution was designed to bring teacher expertise together with student potential to develop important life-long skills that increase critical thinking, knowledge building, effective communication, and the strategic use of technology in order to inspire students from all backgrounds in the pursuit of becoming life-long readers and writers.

Reader/Writer Workshop

Developing reading and writing skills is the foundation upon which all meaningful learning takes place. Without reading and writing skills students cannot be expected to attain academic success, or even proficiency, in any subject. This means opportunities for students to engage in reading and writing every day are crucial if we want them to be able to think critically, express and support their ideas, and attain any type of future success academically, professionally and personally. Reader and writer workshops provide a solid framework for developing thoughtful, engaged learners that consistently exhibit academic success. Indeed, research supports that the higher the volume of daily reading the greater the likelihood of attaining higher-order literacy proficiencies

(Allington, 2012; Cipielewski & Stanovich, 1992). Providing students with dedicated reading time each day is essential to measurable literacy growth.

Similarly, if we expect students to succeed as writers, specifically writers with stamina, they must have daily opportunities to write that include extended periods of time to practice. Elementary students benefit when they engage in writing practices that provide a context for both self-directed goal setting and assessment to help them manage the writing strategies they are taught (Graham, McKeown, Kiuahara, and Harris, 2012). Writing instruction that includes these types of processes leads to measurable gains in writing skills (Hertz & Heydenberk, 1997). Indeed, writing strategies and the understanding of how they are applied to the writing process are an essential part of students' growth as writers that can express a variety of thoughts and ideas (Graham, McKeown, Kiuahara, and Harris, 2012). When students are repeatedly allowed to engage in extended periods of writing supported by feedback detailing next steps, they grow as independent writers and thinkers capable of expressing themselves in a variety of genres (Calkins, 1994).

To grow as readers that actively love to read, students must be given a wealth of dedicated reading time with texts they select and can read independently. They must engage in writing opportunities that reflect a combination of quantity and quality in terms of both frequency and duration so that writing becomes a natural second language with which they can share their unique perspectives and gifts. When teachers provide reading and writing workshops that support a student-centered framework of daily, purposeful reading and writing, students' ability to connect and experience the world grows exponentially and with it their futures.

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy ©2020 is framed around a Reading/Writing Workshop model. The instructional model integrates the critical tasks of reading and writing to offer instruction that is worthy of children and their teachers. The solution offers materials that prepare students for authentic tasks—both assigned and self-selected—that occur in and out of school. As students work through the curriculum, they become flexible and resilient learners who read and write for pleasure as well as for academic tasks and real-life purposes.

In the Reading Workshop, students begin lessons with a whole-group activity that focuses their thinking and establishes a purpose for that day's instruction. Minilessons and read aloud-think aloud models introduce essential skills and elements of the unit genre. Emergent readers learn phonemic awareness, phonics, and fluency in a foundational-skills segment that quickly builds competence and confidence. As students progress, further word study allows them to expand and deepen these skills. Students explore vocabulary, both at the unit and weekly level, using a generative approach to maximize their understanding of word meanings across content areas and to create an ongoing curiosity about how language works.

Unique to *myView Literacy* © 2020 is the Reading-Writing Bridge. Situated between the Reading Workshop and the Writing Workshop, the Reading-Writing Bridge allows students to look back to what they have read and then move forward to what they will write

in ways that show the interrelatedness of these skills. The pillars of the Bridge—Read Like a Writer/Write for a Reader—provide integrated support. From the perspective of a writer, students reconsider unit-level academic vocabulary they used as they read. Where they focused on a reader’s view of author’s craft in the Reading Workshop, students now focus on writer’s craft and the process of writing in a mode that relates to the selections they’ve explored as readers. Language and conventions, spelling, and other word-study skills further help students prepare for and complete writing experiences successfully. Students learn effective ways to communicate based on audience and purpose. They learn the power of word choices authors use to create clear and engaging texts.

In the Writing Workshop, students participate in daily writing. Teachers focus on the skills and practices necessary to write effectively. Stacks of mentor texts help students become acquainted with authentic models in the writing mode selected for each unit. As students begin putting their thoughts on the page, teachers also create and share their own writing. These various examples of writing—authentic, teacher, and student—serve as approximations of good writing in all the various stages of the writing process. Teachers select focused minilessons flexibly to tailor their instruction to students’ needs and interests. Collaborative conversations guide students as they work to communicate effectively for specific audiences and purposes. Conferring (both teacher/student and peer-to-peer) is a hallmark of the program and is a recursive practice throughout the workshops.

Throughout both the Reading and Writing Workshops, teachers strategically choose times to bring the class back together to reteach, reinforce, or to refocus students’ attention on critical information, processes, or understandings. These gathering times provide a time for the entire class to reflect and share as well as to celebrate what they have learned.

Gradual Release

The Gradual Release of Responsibility (GRR) model provides educators with an instructional framework that shifts responsibility from teacher directed learning to independent, student directed learning (Pearson & Gallagher 1983). In the GRR method instruction begins with a high level of teacher support that is progressively reallocated to students until they are working independently to apply the skills and concepts they have learned (Anderson, 2000, Calkins, 2003, Harvey & Goudvis, 2007). The GRR model was founded on several key theories including:

- Jean Piaget’s work on cognitive structures and schema (1952)
- Lev Vygotsky’s work on zones of proximal development (1962, 1978)
- Albert Bandura’s work on attention, retention, reproduction, and motivation (1965)
- David Wood, Jerome Bruner, and Gail Ross’s work on scaffolded instruction (1976)

Originally the GRR method followed Gallagher’s three phase implementation model, followed by Fisher and Frey (2008) suggesting an instructional model that added a fourth, collaborative phase in which students work together. More recently, in the 2011 article on comprehension strategies by Duke, Pearson, Strachan & Billman, their chapter in a newer edition of *What Research Has to Say About Reading Instruction* (IRA, 2011) included the addition of a fifth phase to the method.

Following these updates to the GRR instructional framework, phase one provides an explicit description of the literacy strategy and when and how it should be used. This phase is entirely teacher directed.

The first phase typically begins with a focused lesson led by the teacher. During focused lessons the teacher uses expected learning outcomes to establish the purpose of the lesson and models his or her thinking. The second phase of GRR encompasses a teacher and/or student modeling the literacy strategy in action. This phase often utilizes teacher focused questions and timely cues to facilitate student understanding. Phase three sees collaborative use of the literacy strategy in action. Students move into productive group work and team up to produce a deliverable related to the current learning topic. Group work is designed to hold students accountable for their individual contributions and efforts, while utilizing academic language and higher order thinking and problem-solving skills. This phase of GRR should help students to solidify their conceptual understanding of the concept before they reinforce it in a small group setting and then apply it independently (Fisher & Frey, 2013).

In the fourth phase of GRR students have the opportunity for guided practice using the strategy with gradual release of responsibility in a small group setting. During the guided instruction, the teacher focuses on releasing learning responsibility to students, while providing instructional scaffolds to ensure that students are successful. Finally, students apply what they have learned both in and out of class to carry out independent use of the strategy in the fifth and final phase. Oftentimes the independent learning tasks are used as formative assessments that provide the teacher with a snapshot of where students are in terms of their understanding and needs for reteaching, differentiation, or other reinforcement requirements.

Over 35 years later the GRR framework continues to offer an instructional approach focused on developing independent, confident learners that can apply critical thinking to their academic and personal pursuits. While educators have adapted the instructional GRR framework over the years, and additional phases are sometimes added depending on the unique needs of the educator and their learning environment, the intent remains the same. By teaching students the why, how, and when of applying strategies that are used by highly effective readers, Gradual Release of Responsibility offers teachers an effective framework for increasing reading comprehension so that students become strategic active readers for life (Duke & Pearson, 2002).

From Research to Practice

Drawing from the literacy research of educational experts, the architecture of this new solution is based on a gradual release of responsibility model that unfolds in whole-group, small-group, and independent learning environments. Teachers use authentic texts to explicitly model, teach, and reinforce literacy goals as students practice and apply the skillful competencies that characterize lifelong readers, writers, and thinkers.

Direct instruction during shared reading provides a time for guidance that fosters student engagement, participation, and collaboration. Teachers form small groups flexibly to provide instruction based on needs, tasks, and texts. They use Turn, Talk, and Share, Quick Checks, and Reflect & Share to inform instruction as they monitor students' progress

through a variety of ongoing formative assessments. As students engage with a variety of texts, they construct meaning, consider essential questions, and work to master strategic learning goals.

Extensive Small Group options, provided in the Teacher’s Edition, offer a wide range of activities to help meet the diverse needs of students related to their abilities, interests, and learning styles. The Small Group Professional Development Guide also provides professional development support to assist educators in setting up, planning, and delivering small group instruction. Helpful tips from program authors give teachers the support they might need for small group time.

To help striving students, *myFocus Intervention* is referenced within the Small Group pages as a Tier 2 solution. These activities provide teachers with suggested reteaching activities for students in need of more support in skill practice and application. Every lesson includes an intervention activity.

Furthermore, the Student Interactive provides learners with the opportunity to annotate text and complete Reading Workshop activities in meaningful ways as they work as a whole group, in small groups, or independently. Students record understandings and make connections as they close read selections. As they synthesize these understandings about how authors create engaging reads, they are preparing to apply what they learn to the task of authoring their own texts. Book Club completes the gradual-release model, as students explore increasingly complex texts independently.

Project-Based Inquiry

A growing body of research indicates that students learn with greater depth and awareness when they engage in complex, meaningful projects that allow them to apply classroom learning to real-world problems (Hammond, 2008). When students are given the opportunity to develop their own agency and critical thinking skills through project-based inquiry, learning becomes relevant, meaningful, and exciting. Lessons that include these types of learning opportunities provide the framework for students to learn how to be active thinkers rather than passive learners. Projects are complex tasks that address challenging questions or problems and provide an arena where students can flex their creativity, decision making, problem solving and collaborative skills (Jones, Rasmussen, & Moffitt, 1997; Thomas & Mergendoller, 2000).

Rather than presenting a set of rote facts, project-based inquiry leverages student curiosity, questions, and unique interests to drive learning. Research has shown that developing inquisitive minds helps students love learning and is significantly more beneficial to academic success than seeking the “right” answer (Ames, 1992). Indeed, active learning practices positively impact student performance (Anderson, et al, 2005). Students are most successful when they are taught *how* to learn in addition to *what* to learn. Project-based inquiry fosters the process of learning, rather than just the product of learning and enables students to become critical thinkers both in the classroom and out in the larger world (Deignan, 2009).

Research to Practice

Each unit in *myView Literacy* includes a culminating project-based learning activity. At the start of the unit, students begin with a Launch which includes an introduction to the unit’s Essential Question. Students will Turn, Talk, and Share as they think about the Essential Question. Additional weekly essential questions build students’ knowledge and understanding of the theme, allowing for deeper comprehension in preparation for the project. In Week 6, prior to beginning the project, students return to each selection in the unit in a Compare Across Text lesson to collect text evidence. Students are asked to use the text evidence to answer the Essential Question.

These reflections lead to the Project-Based Inquiry (PBI), an opportunity for students to apply their understanding of the unit theme to a collaborative project and to combine inquiry and research skills to create a real-world, authentic product in a specific writing mode. Throughout the project, students are synthesizing information for multiple sources, researching, and applying the knowledge and skills they have learned throughout the unit to solidify understanding and showcase their learning.

Rigorous Standards

The majority of states have now adapted or modified their literacy standards to reflect the literacy needs of their districts and schools, while ensuring they meet federal ESSA guidelines. For standards to meet ESSA guidelines they must be “challenging” and prepare all students, including those with “learning and thinking differences” to succeed in college and professional pursuits (ESSA, 2015). Today’s standards must include rigor beyond the basic understanding of literary content. Rigor resides in the questions that students are being asked versus the answers they produce (Reich, Sevim, & Turner, 2015). Current, more demanding standards require that students understand the crafting and structure of a text, as well as next steps for applying new knowledge. Students need to be able to conceptualize how an author is communicating meaning, why the information is being provided and demonstrate what they can do with that knowledge (Boyles, 2018). When students are provided with instruction that challenges their thinking in fascinating new ways, requires them to approach fundamental ideas with complexity and encourages them to seek answers they do not yet know, they experience academic rigor (Sztabnik, 2015). Rigor in literacy and beyond is the new standard to ensure students have the higher order thinking and reasoning skills required for success in the 21st century.

From Research to Practice

Because *myView Literacy* is a new K-5 ELA solution, a comprehensive efficacy study is pending. However, *Savvas Learning* has ensured that *myView Literacy* aligns with ESSA requirements. Additionally, *Savvas Learning* contracted with independent research group JEM & R to conduct a one-unit formative field test of its *myView Literacy* English Language Arts program. This study was conducted in first and fourth grade classrooms during the 2018-2019 school year. This report summary presents an excerpt of findings from the final

report, including the evaluation design and methods, a description of program usage and implementation, student performance results, and a discussion of the findings.

This study indicates that *myView Literacy* students were clearly learning the content taught in Unit 2. Results by *myView Literacy* subgroups also showed significant learning gains across different types of students including females, males, students receiving free/reduced lunch and those not, low achieving students and high achieving students. *myView Literacy* teachers reported that students learned important English Language Arts skills over the course of the study. Teachers also reported *myView Literacy had a* positive impact on academic skills, including higher-order cognitive skills, grammar, spelling, vocabulary, writing, phonics, fluency and reading comprehension. Students reported they enjoyed using the *myView Literacy* program and preferred it to their previous program.

Additional research will continue over the next two school years. A summative field test will be conducted during the current school year with five to six schools to assess the effectiveness of the program in helping students attain critical English language arts (ELA) skills and to document usage and implementation of the program. Results will be available fall 2020.

Next school year, 2020–2021, a randomized, control trial will be conducted with 12–15 schools. It will employ an experimental research design: teachers within each research school will be randomly assigned to use either *myView Literacy* (treatment condition) or continue using their existing ELA program (control condition). Results will be available fall 2021.

Blended Instruction

21st century classrooms are filled with students, collectively known as “digital natives”, who were born in a digital era and have never known life without technology (Prensky, 2001). These digital natives relate to and navigate the world largely through a direct relationship with technology. They use technological tools on a daily basis to accomplish everything from simple to complicated tasks. They connect to the world and communicate instantaneously with one another as they play complex games, utilize sites like ePals to learn from peers, express their creativity, engage in social relationships, and explore politics and other events. Because digital natives largely express themselves through technology, teaching strategies that leverage these skills have the potential to play an important role in effectively developing the kinds of collaborative skills 21st century learners will need to utilize in the workplace (UNESCO, 2011). As teachers strive to integrate learners from varying socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds, tools that allow the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills will also be paramount (Wells et al., 2016). Blended instruction that includes authentic technology integration will play a key role in helping educators facilitate the kinds of collaborative, student directed learning needed to perpetuate critical thinking and problem-solving skill development across a diverse contingent of 21st century constructs (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy promotes blended learning environments through the utilization of the powerful *Realize* platform. Teachers, students, and administrators are able to access all content, assessments, student data, and management tools using a single sign-on. All print materials are available digitally through our *Realize* platform, which offers students a variety of interactive resources and provides teachers with the data they need to customize content and monitor student progress, so all students demonstrate proficiency in the standards. Teachers have the ability to customize materials, access student work, and streamline planning. On *Realize*, *myView Literacy* students have access to resources that promote critical thinking and problem-solving, such as videos for background knowledge, selection audio, digital games, and annotation tools.

The *Realize* and *Google* Partnership allows for the sharing of content, assessments, and rosters across *Realize* and *Google G Suite for Education*. With the *Realize* and *Google* Partnership, teachers have access to more support, flexibility, and integration capacity.

Teachers can share supported content from *Realize* with classes, allowing students to collaborate on assignments if desired. Teachers can also add links from their *Google Drive* directly into *Realize* lessons and quickly assign those links to students.

Secure Roster Sync allows for teachers to sync *Google Classroom* rosters with *Realize*. Students log in once and can access everything. In addition, Assignment & Score Sharing across both platforms allows for teachers to assign assessments and have content show in the student's *Google Classroom* stream. Completed work and scores are shared and recorded in both *Realize* and *Google Classroom*.

Additionally, *OpenEd*, a K–12 educational resource library that aligns resources to learning objectives, is integrated with *Realize*. Teachers can find and assign thousands of vetted content resources at no additional charge. All program-specific resources, flexible agnostic resources, and assessments are available in one location for lesson planning and presentation. Flexible classroom management tools allow teachers to use a digital, print, or blended format.

Teachers can open and allow students access to resources in *Realize* or *OpenEd*. Teachers can assign thousands of vetted resources, such as videos and games. *OpenEd* analyzes content and delivers resources from the *Smithsonian Institute*, *PBS* television, and *Khan Academy*.

Themes/Essential Questions/Content Area Connections - Interdisciplinary Study

Essential Questions are a critical component of promoting student learning. They help students comprehend that inquiry is an essential part of learning and support extended metacognition. This includes making content area connections and extending inquiry to include interdisciplinary studies. When students engage in these kinds of active inquiry-driven lessons their learning

becomes deeper and more meaningful (Wiggins & McTighe, 2013). If we want students to engage in the work of the subject, we need to provide them with comprehensive, thoughtful questions that form a sense of purpose, direction and commitment to the work they are undertaking. Essential questions require students to delve more deeply into the content, processes, or subject of their learning, inspire them to generate their own questions and find the clarity to communicate the vital parts of the ideas, subjects or disciplines they are exploring (Jacobs, 1997).

Essential questions often serve as the link between content area connections and guide interdisciplinary inquiries. These types of cross topic, content, and discipline related learning experiences provide rich opportunities to address students' individual differences and help develop transferable skills. These types of transferable skills, such as critical thinking, communication and analysis are important aspects of continuous educational development. Educational strategies that encourage students to ask questions and take advantage of interdisciplinary studies help to foster a genuine enthusiasm of learning for all types of students, regardless of background or skill level (Jones, 2010).

From Research to Practice

There are five units in each grade of *myView Literacy*. The overarching themes are Exploration (Geography), Patterns (Life Science), Expressions (Arts and Literature), Connections (History), and Our World (Earth Science). Furthermore, instruction is centered on unit themes and topics that systematically explore concepts, thereby developing the knowledge base of students within and across grade levels. By teaching the same themes across all grades, the program helps students build their knowledge base and prepares them for the following year.

All texts in *myView Literacy* connect to the unit theme. These texts include Weekly Openers, weekly selections in the Student Interactive, Read Alouds in the Teacher's Edition, trade books in Book Club, Decodable Stories in the Grades K and 1 Student Interactive, Songs and Poems Big Book at Grades K and 1, and Leveled Readers.

Each unit has an Essential Question to guide students in exploring big questions, which provides opportunity for the development of expansive knowledge, reflective inquiry, and intertextual understandings. These questions are launching points for further inquiry and are meant to encourage students to be curious and to inquire about the unit topics, which for most units are either social studies/history or science. Weekly Questions are also related to the unit theme. Based on the themes, topics, and content of the weekly selections, Weekly Questions narrow the Essential Question and are introduced in the Weekly Launch spread. The questions are revisited in Lesson 5, where they appear on the Reflect and Share pages in the Student Interactive for further discussion.

In each Unit Introduction, students are exposed to general academic vocabulary words that will spark discussion about the unit theme and help them answer the Essential Question. The academic vocabulary is studied deeply, highlighting science and history/social studies words and concepts learned. In addition, the social studies/history and science standards are placed on the page where appropriate in both the Teacher's Edition and the Student

Interactive. Teachers can instruct about those standards while students are building content knowledge. Throughout the unit, students generate and learn new words to add to their word bank and strengthen their theme-related discussions.

Throughout the selections, there are Cross-Curricular Perspectives notes. These notes are related to either science or social studies standards. These notes support the social studies or science standards in the text being read, but they also add interesting information to engage student interest and build background knowledge.

In Week 6, students are given the opportunity to explore the unit theme and answer the EQ by (a) comparing the texts they have read in the unit and (b) working collaboratively on a Project-Based Inquiry. Students have an opportunity to apply these cross-curricular themes and concepts to an authentic, real-world project. This integrated approach not only increases engagement and collaboration among students, but it also helps build students' academic vocabulary and research skills, and that translates to greater success in all subject areas.



Student populations have changed significantly in the last twenty to thirty years (McCoy and Ketterlin-Geller, 2004). It is increasingly common for 21st century classrooms to be made up of a diverse group of students with very different needs when it comes to literacy instruction. Overarching diversity is the new “normal”, replacing the staid homogeneity of the past. Indeed, many classrooms include students from non-English speaking backgrounds, students with disabilities, students from diverse cultural backgrounds and students on accelerated programs. Diverse classrooms require educators to adjust their teaching and instructional practices by providing differentiation if they want to address the learning needs of their entire student population (Mulroy and Eddinger, 2003). Students learn best when educators accommodate their unique interests, learning profiles and readiness levels (Tomlinson, 2005). By addressing learner variance through the use of differentiated instruction (Subban, 2006) teachers can readily leverage each students’ innate ability to learn (Tomlinson, 2004c & 2005). In short, differentiated instruction creates meaningful learning experiences for every type of learner.

Small Group Instruction

Existing research shows that students who experience small group literacy instruction learn significantly more than students who are not provided with opportunities to engage in small group settings, including students with mild to severe disabilities (Lou et al., 1996). This type of focused instruction beyond the whole class model allows educators to focus on what varied groups of students need to learn next in order to move beyond their current skills (Tyner, 2003). Small group settings also facilitate meaningful sharing and provide situations where students receive feedback amongst their peers. Additionally, small groups typically support maximum efficiency when it comes to the use of teacher and student time, increase instructional time and help improve general literacy skills (Polloway, Cronin, and Patton, 1986).

Students who regularly engage in small-group instruction are more likely to do better on vocabulary assessments and expository retells (Fien, et. al., 2011). They are also more likely to exhibit voluntary participation, more readily ask questions, and request corrective feedback (Vaughn & Linan Thompson, 2003; Vaughn et. al., 2001). Differentiated instruction creates a successful learning environment for students, by encouraging them to collaborate and work together to understand concepts and apply skills and engage in literary discussions, while allowing the teacher to assess current needs and provide targeted responses (Goldenberg, 1993).

From Research to Practice

In *myView Literacy*, shared reading provides a time for guidance that fosters student engagement, participation, and collaboration. Teachers form small groups flexibly to provide instruction based on needs, tasks, and texts. They use Turn, Talk, and Share; Quick Checks; and Reflect and Share to inform instruction as they monitor students’ progress through a variety of ongoing formative assessments. As students engage with a variety of texts, they construct meaning, consider essential questions, and work to master strategic learning goals.

Within the small group portion of the *myView Literacy* lessons (yellow bordered pages), teachers will find multiple small group ideas that are teacher-led or Collaborative/Independent for students, including strategy groups and groups for intervention, fluency, conferring, and leveled reader instruction. Options in Small Group time offer a wide range of activities to help meet the diverse needs of students related to their abilities, interests, and learning styles.

The Small Group Guide also provides professional development support to assist educators in setting up, planning, and delivering small group instruction. Helpful tips from program authors give teachers the support they might need for small group time.

English Learners

In order to build on the linguistic strengths of English learners (ELs), it is important to provide instruction that honors the wisdom and capabilities of their first language, while supporting them as they learn English. Learning to read in a second language requires lessons that support the ability to combine cultural, linguistic and cognitive development (Freeman & Freeman, 2011). Great literacy teachers find opportunities to evaluate and better understand their students and use what they know about literacy to build reading and writing skills tailored to the strengths and weaknesses of each student (Jimenez, 2014). ELs thrive when they are exposed to, and have opportunities, to practice all four language processes, reading, writing, listening and speaking. This includes vocabulary practice and aural supports such as read-alouds and audiobooks, as well as consistent writing opportunities. When it comes to school aged ELs, research has empirically shown that vocabulary aptitude is the single best predictor of their future academic success across all other subjects (Saville-Troike, 1984).

Differentiation that employs a full range of linguistic supports through multiple language processes enables ELs to relish and connect with the various texts and books they are reading (Gibbons, 2009). EL students achieve amazing results when their linguistic diversity is recognized and valued as an asset to continued literacy skill attainment (Borrero & Bird, 2009). Research has consistently shown that one of the most consistent ways to support ELs is through diverse, extensive reading in ways that engage their intellectual abilities and promote both academic and lifelong success (Worthy & Roser, 2010 & Elley, 1991). Teachers who take the time to provide differentiated instruction that creates meaningful communication and extends cognitive abilities (in two or more languages) will engage their EL students in a way that fosters a lifelong love for reading and learning and fosters appreciation for the dual language skills.

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy provides embedded support for English language learners (ELs). EL targeted support is embedded at point-of-use in the Teacher's Edition. Ongoing, frequent, and consistent support for all English Language proficiency levels are provided throughout the teacher support making it possible for teachers to ensure they have the robust, in the moment, instructional tips to help reach all learners. Teachers will find support for all

proficiency levels throughout the Teacher’s Edition at point-of-use in Whole Group and Small Group instruction.

EL strategies support English language acquisition during whole group minilessons or in strategy groups. Ongoing EL targeted support for vocabulary includes cognates, EL targeted support, and EL language transfer.

In addition to the in-text notes for teachers in the Teacher’s Edition, the *Language Awareness Handbook* can be found on *Realize*. The *Language Awareness Handbook* offers all-in-one online resource that supports scaffolded instruction during Reading and Writing Workshop:

- Scaffolded Support Lessons
- Routines and Activities
- Scaffolded Lessons for Writing Types
- Language Learning Resources
- Contrastive Analysis Chart

Striving Learners

For striving learners, a one size fits all approach can be especially detrimental to future reading achievement, as striving readers benefit greatly from the customized approach to learning that differentiation affords them. Instruction that is individualized to their strengths and weaknesses, and is modified as their skills change, may be more effective than high quality instruction that is not differentiated (Connor et al., 2014). Striving learners are not different from their on-level or accelerated peers; they still need instruction that includes regular, built-in, structured, and supported opportunities to develop the skills of competent readers. However, the type and style the differentiated instruction should take will depend on the individual needs of the struggling learner (Tomlinson, 2017). Struggling learners also need to be exposed to literacy activities that boost their confidence, expose them to reading options that are appropriate to their skill level and foster positive learning experiences. To truly provide the kind of differentiated learning opportunities a struggling student needs, teachers must understand what a student knows and does not know, what motivates that student to learn, and how the student learns best (Earl, 2003). There is no magical formula for providing differentiation for striving students, but rather striving students especially benefit from the type of customized, targeted literacy instruction that differentiation delivers.

From Research to Practice

To help striving students, *myFocus Intervention* is referenced within the Small Group pages as a Tier 2 solution. These activities provide teachers with suggested reteaching activities for students in need of more support in skill practice and application. Every lesson includes an intervention activity. *myFocus Intervention* is integrated with *myView Literacy*.

myFocus Intervention focuses on instruction in Foundational Skills (Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Spelling, Vocabulary, and Fluency) and Reading, Writing, and Language (Reading Literature, Reading Informational Text, Writing, Language and

Conventions, and Inquiry and Research). The lessons are skills-based allowing teachers to flexibly select lessons based on the needs of students. The Teacher’s Guide includes integrated student blackline masters and Checkpoint Assessments for ongoing formative assessment.

To accompany the lessons in *myFocus Intervention*, students work from *myFocus Reader* (grades 1-5; in Kindergarten students use decodable readers). On days when instruction includes the *myFocus Reader* or the decodable reader, students are applying and practicing the skills taught during whole group instruction. *myFocus Reader* is an application of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and foundational skills. Teacher support for the *myFocus Reader* is found on *Realize*.

Accelerated

The goal of any dedicated teacher is to make sure that all students are being challenged, building on existing skills, and increasing academic attainment, regardless of their current ability. With a general focus on ensuring that all students meet minimum proficiency levels talented readers often slip through the cracks. Accelerated literacy students often receive little to no instruction tailored to their needs and are inclined to be overlooked when it comes to the encouragement and support needed to engage in challenging reading. Waning interest, apathy and lack of engagement may be exacerbated by the limited differentiation frequently provided for students reading at an advanced level (Reis et al., 2004). Existing evidence suggests that advanced readers tend to read books that are too easy for them and that this negatively impacts opportunities for them to stretch their reading skills and navigate challenging experiences. Programs that lack exposure to challenging texts, do not have provisions for choice when it comes to reading selections, and in turn fail to create ample opportunities for high-level literary discussions that grow the reading skills of accelerated students (Eckert, 2008; Reis et al., 2004).

The issue of accelerated students not receiving the differentiation they need is particularly prevalent in schools struggling to meet state testing standards, as these schools tend to focus on ensuring the maximum number of students meet the minimally accepted standards. Unfortunately, this means students that read at higher levels often miss out on the enriching experiences they need for their own continued literary development (Johnson & Johnson, 2005; Pedulla et al., 2003). It is important then, that remediation for struggling readers is not a barrier to the instructional differentiation needed to ensure that more advanced learners are every bit as successful in terms of growth and new skill attainment as their on-level or lower performing peers (Reis et al., 2004).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy provides enrichment opportunities for K–5 students. In kindergarten, the Kindergarten Acceleration offers students the opportunity to blend words by the third week of school and learn all sounds by Unit 3. In all grade levels, Text Complexity Charts are included for Student Interactive reading selections, which include instructional guidance for advanced students. Options in Small Group time offer a diversity of activities to help meet the diverse needs of students related to their abilities, interests, and learning styles.

Additional enrichment opportunities include:

Book Club

Book Club is a feature of *myView Literacy* in which students are empowered with choice to select authentic texts that appeal to their interests and ability levels. They work cooperatively with their peers during Book Club.

Book Club will give students an in-class opportunity for real-world reading enjoyment. Book Club consists of a set-aside time when students meet in small groups to discuss the trade book for the unit. It is a time for students to talk about what they are reading without having their ideas or insights overly evaluated.

The collaborative/independent work and Book Club options provide an environment where students can develop their social emotional skills and become good learning partners with their peers.

Online Extension Activities

- Record Keeping Templates: Easy-to-use tools for genre reading logs, fiction and nonfiction bookmarks, tips for choosing books, and more.
- *Quest* and *uEngineer It!* extension projects that incorporate science and social studies themes
- Creative Reading (invention, divergent thinking, discovery): Creative response activities for fiction, nonfiction and vocabulary extension.
- Inquiry Reading (conducting research in an area of interest): Develop inquiry questions, plans, documentation, and sharing of ideas.
- Critical Reading (asking questions, making judgments, hypothesizing): Prepare questioning of the author/text, noticing and connecting, analyzing words, and more.

Literacy Centers

With *myView Literacy*, teachers also have access to over 700 leveled (Below, On, Above) center activities to offer additional practice options for students. Resources are downloadable from Realize and can be distributed to stations during small group time based on the needs of students and flexible grouping options.

Students with Dyslexia

Dyslexia is a very specific learning disability that is the result of one or more brain-based language processing challenges in the area of rapid automatized naming (RAN), working memory, and phonological and/or auditory processing. Students with dyslexia typically have difficulties with accurate and/or fluent word recognition, poor spelling and decoding abilities resulting from a deficit in their phonological language abilities (Lyon, 1995). It is not uncommon for dyslexia to

remain unidentified, as it is often masked by the high functioning of other cognitive abilities (Lyon, Shaywitz, & Shaywitz, 2003). However, it is the lack of phonological language abilities, most readily expressed as difficulty reading words, that is the greatest concern when it comes to successful reading comprehension (Torgesen, 2006). Specifically, phonemic awareness, verbal short-term memory, and rapid automatic naming abilities are typically impaired when students have a phonemically based reading difficulty (Snowling, 2000; Torgesen, 1999).

Students with dyslexia require differentiation that includes intensive one-to-one instruction designed to increase accuracy, reading fluency, and text comprehension (Torgesen, 2006). They also need consistent opportunities to receive high quality intervention, focused on their unique processing challenges, that allows them to demonstrate content understanding and access literacy curriculum more readily (Hamman, 2018). While many learners are able to master expressive and receptive language skills from repeated exposure, there is a population of students for whom this is not sufficient (McCardle, Scarborough, & Catts, 2001).

For these students taking a differentiated approach based on Structured Literacy might be a solution, as Structured Literacy makes no assumptions about what students are implicitly capable of learning (Spear-Swerling, L., 2019). Structured Literacy is deeply rooted in the sounds from which our spoken language is composed (phonemes) and systematically introduces the letters or letter combinations (graphemes) that correspond with each phoneme (Cohen, 2016). When dyslexic learners are identified early on and provided with systematic, intense, differentiated instruction, the impacts of their unique learning disability are likely to be less severe (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000 & Torgesen, 2002) However, differentiation must include explicit, concentrated, systematic instruction focused on phonological processing, phonics, and fluency in order to help them make reading gains (Shaywitz et al., 2004).

From Research to Practice

The instructional plan of *myView Literacy* was constructed to ensure the success of learners with Dyslexia. Specific supports include:

- Structured and systematic phonics and reading instruction that provides:
 - repetition and review of skills
 - explicit teaching of decoding skills and sight words
 - focused minilessons that provide carefully sequenced/stepped out instruction
 - Think Alouds that model how skilled readers construct meaning from text
 - additional practice opportunities
 - leveled readers
 - decodable readers
- Spelling instruction that is based on rules and patterns rather than topic- or theme-based words.
- Daily small group instructional opportunities to support strategy groups.
- Practice developing oral language proficiency through Language of the Genre and Academic Vocabulary.
- Multisensory literacy tools in the Foundational Skills Kit: Letter Tiles; Picture, Alphabet, High-Frequency Word, and Sound-Spelling Cards

- Weekly selection texts, decodable text, and decodable readers all have audio and word-by-word highlighting.
- The Student Interactive, a write-in text, provides:
 - students the ability to underline, highlight, and take notes
 - teachers the ability to tear out pages to reduce stimuli and present small, focused amounts of information
 - frequent opportunities to respond orally through Turn and Talk activities
 - frequent opportunities for peer learning through Collaborate activities

Through *Realize*, our online learning management system, students and teachers can navigate between print and digital environments. Students have digital access to the program student interactive, trade books, practice activities, games, and leveled readers. For teachers, the digital path provides support such as intuitive search capabilities, customizable assessments, the ability to upload outside resources, student interactive activities, and a game-based learning environment.

Realize offers several tools to assist students, including highlighting, underlining, and notes. Additionally, programs on *Realize* provide a wide variety of content formats to meet diverse student needs. From Word documents, PDFs, interactive pieces with embedded audio, digital tests, and videos, this variety gives students flexibility to learn in a way that will help them retain information.

Students with Disabilities

During the 2017–18 school year, the number of students ages 3–21 who received special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) was 7.0 million, or fourteen percent of all public-school students. Among students receiving special education services, thirty-four percent had specific learning disabilities (NCES, 2018).

For students with learning disabilities, reading instruction is likely the academic area where they have the greatest need for intervention. As such, for students with learning disabilities it is crucial that differentiation practices promoting the acquisition of reading skills be identified and readily implemented if they are to become proficient readers (Lyon, 1995). The National Research Council conducted research on reading and reading instruction that identified: 1) problems in understanding and using the alphabetic principle to acquire fluent and accurate word reading skills; 2) failure to acquire the verbal knowledge and strategies that are specifically needed for comprehension of written material; and, 3) absence or loss of initial motivation to read, or failure to develop a mature appreciation of the rewards of reading, as the main reasons for students expressing difficulty with reading (Snow, Burns, and Griffin, 1998).

For students with reading disabilities, reading accuracy and comprehension can be significantly improved if carefully administered interventions, that are more intensive than instruction typically provided in special education settings, are implemented with regularity (Torgesen, 2006). Indeed, students with learning disabilities benefit from explicit, intensive, differentiated instruction that increases instructional learning time. When this type of focused instruction is combined with metacognitive or strategy based instruction, basic skills such as handwriting, speed of writing,

speed of reading, and decoding words, show impressive gains even amongst students who have demonstrated a high level of difficulty learning how to read and write (Vaughn, Gersten, and Chard, 2000).

From Research to Practice

Savvas Learning supports and complies with the Individuals with Disabilities Act of 2004 and the terms and conditions of the National Instructional Materials Access Center, NIMAC. In accordance with IDEA 2004, *Savvas Learning* will upload any K-12 textbook or core related student print material published after July 19, 2006, to the NIMAC.

Realize has several tools to assist students, including highlighting, underlining, and notes. Additionally, programs on *Realize* feature a wide variety of content formats to meet diverse student needs. From Word documents and PDFs to interactive audio, digital tests, and videos, this variety gives students flexibility to learn in a way that will best help them retain information.

All items are designed for accessibility, including high-contrast, legible text size and supporting read-aloud audio. Text equivalents for video, audio, art, and images are included. *Savvas Learning* is in compliance with the WCAG 2.0 and Section 508 standards.

The *Realize* platform supports full keyboard navigation, screen reader access, and alternative text, as well as the JAWS, NVDA, and VoiceOver screen readers.

Literacy skills and reading in general are at the root of academic achievement. Without these skills it is nearly impossible to navigate in the 21st century let alone achieve even a basic level of academic proficiency in any subject area. It goes without saying that reading is crucial to the ongoing development of verbal skills, general knowledge, and a host of other cognitive processes that are positively impacted as reading frequency increases (Cunningham, Zibulsky, & Callahan, 2009), making reading one of the most critical skills for success in future academic and personal pursuits. Enthusiastic, independent reading has long been regarded as a predictor of future skill attainment, academic achievement, earning increases, professional advancement, employment opportunities and other attributes of a meaningful life (U.S. Dept. of Education, 2005).

Reading ability is also a predictor of future achievement regardless of socioeconomic status. Students who read often and across a breadth of topics are higher achievers regardless of their family income. Indeed, students from lower income families score higher on standard achievement assessments than do their privileged peers that do not read (Guthrie et. al., 2007; Brozo, et al., 2008). Enthusiastic, habitual reading is the single most predictive habit for indicating whether or not a person has the ability to achieve desirable life outcomes (Bayless, 2010). Given the crucial role literacy plays in almost every aspect of life, it is no surprise that literacy skills are a necessity for a good quality life in the 21st Century.

Text Selection & Complexity

In order to equip students with the skills necessary to propel them into meaningful endeavors beyond high school they must be exposed to relevant literature in a variety of genres, cultures and perspectives, including complex texts (Gallagher & Allington, 2009). Exposure to multicultural literature enhances students' knowledge, stimulates curiosity and fosters a desire to learn more. Multicultural literature also helps students embrace diversity, gain a greater awareness of other cultures, identify commonalities and become more tolerant of perceived differences (Evans, 2010). Students need practice with a wide assortment of strategies if they are to fully acquire and apply what they learn to new reading situations. Literacy programs that provide ample opportunities for students to study and read the work of other writers and explore various types of writing, including longer texts and stories, help them establish the broader knowledge base needed to excel in literacy (Hirsch, 2006).

One of the best ways to help students develop mature language skills and the conceptual knowledge they need for success in school and beyond is to immerse them in texts that convey complex ideas with rare and infrequent vocabulary (Hiebert, 2012) Thoughtful, informed instruction can help students tackle complex text and includes rereading, annotating text with notes in the margin, highlighting key words or passages, circling confusing words or sections, talking about the text with others, and asking text dependent questions (Fisher, Frey, and Lapp, 2012). A complete, extended text offers a depth of embedded meaning-making support that isn't readily accessible in short passages or other incomplete text (Goodman & Bridges, 2014; Bridges, 2013; Serravallo, 2013). Various interpretative and critical reading skills come into play when students learn to read a variety of complex text intently. Teachers must be prepared to challenge all students

with difficult text and be aware of the danger when developing minds are not stretched by longer, challenging works (Gallagher & Allington, 2009).

From Research to Practice

The texts and media students are exposed to in *myView Literacy* offer diverse perspectives so that every student is represented positively:

- Texts represent a wide range of genders, cultures, and ethnicities, with a balance of male and female protagonists.
- Storylines promote tolerance and acceptance of others.
- Nonfiction and fiction texts meet heightened literacy expectations for today's students.

The following guidelines were followed with fidelity when choosing the selections that appear in *myView Literacy*. The literature:

- is high-quality and typically well-recognized, award-winning titles, authors, and illustrators.
- is relevant, engaging, and high-interest.
- aligns with the unit Spotlight Genre and/or the unit theme.
- addresses the Essential Question and Weekly Questions.
- exemplifies the main reading skill/literary element.
- reflects appropriate qualitative and quantitative text complexity requirements, including grade span Lexile measure.
- has developmentally appropriate content.
- meets sensitivity guidelines.
- achieves author/illustrator gender and ethnicity balance.
- achieves subject/main characters gender and ethnicity balance.
- literature meets the requirements of the TEKS, including
- increasingly complex texts in the multiple genres specified at each grade.
- texts that reflect the standards for author's purpose and craft.
- texts that serve as exemplars for the reading comprehension skills.

Both quantitative and qualitative measures of Text Complexity were examined when selecting texts for *myView Literacy*, as well as respecting the teacher's role in reader and task considerations. Teachers have students with a variety of reading levels, interests, and background knowledge. Selecting age and grade-level appropriate text can be challenging in these diverse classrooms. All Student Interactive reading selection have accompanying text complexity charts and have been analyzed using three measures:

- 1) Quantitative: The quantitative measure is typically calculated by computer software. Quantitative measures assess Lexile®, word length, word frequency, sentence length, and text cohesion.
- 2) Qualitative: The qualitative measure is best addressed by an attentive human reader. Qualitative factors include levels of meaning (literary texts) or purpose

(informational texts), text structure, language conventionality and clarity, and knowledge demands.

- 3) Reading & Task: This measure focuses on the individual reader and the task or purpose for reading. By using a student's motivation, knowledge, and experience; the complexity of the task; and the teacher's professional judgment; a teacher is able to determine how appropriate a text may be for that specific student.

Additionally, *myView Literacy* provides a library of over 700 all-new leveled readers, through an exclusive partnership with the award-winning *Rubicon Publishing*. These leveled readers are written to Fountas and Pinnell's Guided Reading levels, which serves as a continuum of progress for all readers. The leveling for each grade is progressive, so that in later units, the lower levels fall away and are replaced with more options at the higher levels. Each reader also includes information on DRA Levels, Lexile Measures, and word count. While each scale is a useful instructional resource, the teacher's personal knowledge of students' abilities, interests, and skills should be an equally important part of matching books to students.

Oral Language Development

Students are better positioned to succeed at reading and writing when they have a solid grasp of oral language starting in early infancy. The early language experiences students are exposed to at home, prior to the start of formal education, influence the development of later language comprehension. By the time children are about three years old, they will have mastered much of the basic system of the language around them (Lust, 2006). Even language skills acquired naturally during the preschool years are relevant to later instruction in reading and writing in the primary grades. According to the latest research, literacy achievement and related language skills are highly correlated and in turn impact future reading and writing skills. Large discrepancies in oral language development and the gap between language-advanced and language-delayed children grows throughout the elementary years (Biemiller, 2001). Indeed, the *Report of the National Early Literacy Panel* (Lonigan & Shanahan, 2008) found that oral language is readily correlated with later literacy achievement.

As they develop children typically learn aspects of the five domains of language: phonology; syntax; semantics; morphology; and pragmatics, as well as endless subtleties of high-level conversation skills. Each language domain plays an important role in later literacy learning (Koutsoftas, 2013):

- Phonemes make up the sounds produced when speaking.
- Syntax refers to the orderly grammar rules a given language requires for the construction of acceptable sentences.
- Concepts have semantic features and meanings.
- Morphemes are the smallest unit of meaning in a language.
- Pragmatics is the system of oral social rules that children learn in order to be considered “nice” or “naughty”.

From the perspective of language development, oral language provides a foundation for the development of all other language skills. Rich oral opportunities are critical for children, not only to expand vocabulary, but also to support the process of learning morphemes needed to modify words they are familiar with. Speech is at the heart of children's ability to structure their cognitive experiences and direct their thoughts (Lyle, 1993). Research pertaining to critical thinking and mental development has consistently indicated that language development for elementary students is directly linked to the development of thinking abilities (Berry, 1985 & Gambell, 1988). Long before reading and writing proficiency is achieved, oral language is the sole means by which to learn, share, and express important thoughts and ideas (Lemke, 1989). Throughout life, oral language skills remain essential for engaging in intellectual dialogue, and more importantly for connecting with others as we share and express our experiences in the world.

Foundational Skills

Long before a child ever steps foot in a classroom the cognitive, social, and biological precursors for reading and writing are put into place. Children who become successful readers later on typically display age appropriate skills (perceptual, cognitive, social, etc.) during the preschool years and have opportunities to interact with and observe other readers and writers engaging in these activities (Sulzby & Teale, 1991). For children learning an alphabetic language such as English, phonological awareness, specifically phonemic awareness, is an important aspect of early literacy skill attainment (National Research Council, 1998). To continue developing literacy skills, students need instruction in both foundational and comprehension reading skills.

Foundational reading skills provide students with the abilities to read words (alphabetic), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read (Foorman et. al., 2016). Phonemic awareness is a critical skill for elementary aged children, as studies indicate that ninety percent of children with significant reading problems have a core deficit in phonological processing (Blachman, 1995; NICHD, 2000). Young students must have a solid phonemic awareness in order to grasp the basic language skills required for reading and writing, including hearing and the identification and manipulation of sounds in spoken words. These foundational phonemic skills also mean students must be able to comprehend the basic symbols comprising the written language and letters of the alphabet that represent the auditory cues for spoken language (Blachman, 2000).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy comprehensively covers- through explicit and systematic instruction- each of the evidence-based skills that students need to read effectively: phonological awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency, as identified by the National Reading Panel.

Phonological Awareness

myView Literacy addresses phonological awareness explicitly and systematically. Phonological awareness instruction occurs three times per week. When a new sound is introduced, the teacher models the sound, explains how the sound is formed with the mouth, and displays picture cards for instructional purposes. On other days, picture cards are used, and kinesthetic activities engage students in practice. A page in the Student Interactive is assigned in Lessons 1 and 3 in Weeks 1–5. In Lesson 5 and in Week 6, instruction for students occurs only in the Teacher’s Edition.

As letter-sound relationships are taught in isolation, students are also taught to blend the sounds to decode words. Each week, the program provides decodable text and writing opportunities that allow students to practice applying the phonics skills they are learning and show them the usefulness of what they are learning.

The instructional support for students in *myView Literacy* is gradually scaffolded and sequenced in a way to verify students progressively develop reading skills (from monitoring comprehension in the shared read to developing higher-level thinking skills through the close read) and applying their contextual understanding through writing (in the Writing Workshop lessons).

For those struggling with phonological awareness skills, teachers can use *myFocus Intervention*, which focuses instruction in foundational skills. *myFocus Intervention* is designed to help teachers target and address students’ intervention needs, whether students require minor or intensive remediation. *myFocus Intervention* can be used as a companion to *myView Literacy* or as a separate, standalone intervention.

Lessons are skills-based, allowing teachers to flexibly select lessons based on the needs of students. Discrete skills are scaffolded into small, manageable minilessons for thorough coverage, focused practice, and built-in progress monitoring. Data-driven assessments after sets of related lessons allow teachers to monitor students’ progress efficiently and effectively.

The Foundational Skills Scope and Sequence for *myView Literacy* is built on evidence that the most effective way to teach Phonological Awareness is to teach it *along with the phonics skill* of that particular lesson. In other words, when the letter *B* is taught in the phonics lesson, it is beneficial for students to learn the sound /b/ ahead of that lesson in the PA lesson, along with segmenting and blending exercises with that sound. This connects Phonological Awareness with Phonics instead of teaching rhyming in isolation, and it better prepares students for reading.

Students begin Unit 1 of Kindergarten learning continuous sound, high-utility consonants and short vowels *a* and *i*. They are taught the concept of initial, medial, and final sounds, and then they begin blending onsets and rimes. Once students can successfully demonstrate these skills, they are ready to both identify and produce

rhyiming sounds. As developmentally appropriate, students begin Unit 2 of Kindergarten working with Rhyming Sorts to recognize patterns and word families. Through Phonological Awareness and Phonics instruction, students identify and produce rhyming words. Because students build on the skills taught in Unit 1, they are able to articulate that rhyming words share an ending sound but have different beginning sounds. Students also have practice decoding rhyming words as they read the assigned decodable text. During Small Group instruction, teachers can provide additional support using lessons from the *myFocus Teacher's Guide* and Additional Practice activities available from the Resource Download Center.

Phonics

myView Literacy teaches phonics explicitly and systematically. As letter-sound relationships are taught in isolation, students are also taught to blend the sounds to decode words. Each week, the program provides decodable text and writing opportunities that give students practice in applying the phonics skills they are learning and show them the usefulness of what they are learning.

Explicit instruction in phonics is fully and clearly developed for the teacher. It is a structured approach to teaching, guiding students through the learning process.

A systematic approach to phonics means that instruction is developmentally sequenced, with phonics elements taught in a carefully sequenced order.

Kindergarten: In Units 1 and 2 and part of Unit 3, two focused phonics skills are taught each week, and the instruction follows a similar plan in Weeks 1–5. In Week 6 of these units, phonics instruction reviews learned sound-spelling patterns through word families. In the second half of Units 3–5, the phonics skills taught in Kindergarten are focused on again during Review and Reinforce instruction.

Grade 1: Throughout Grade 1, there are two focused phonics skills per week. The instruction follows a similar pattern in all units, all weeks.

Grade 2: Throughout Grade 2, there is one focused phonics skill per week. The instruction follows a similar pattern in all units, all weeks.

myView Literacy phonics lessons follow this basic format:

- *Phonemic Awareness* - In Grades K–1, activities in phonemic discrimination, oral blending, and segmentation allow students to become aware of the sounds they will focus on in the day's phonics lesson. This is a warm-up for the phonics instruction.
- *Sound-Spellings* - The teacher introduces the sound-spelling in isolation using key words.

- *Blending* - The lesson provides explicit modeling, teaching, and practice in the blending of already introduced sound-spellings to form words. Blending strategies include sound-by-sound, onset-rime, and whole-word blending.
- *Word Work* - Students read and write words to reinforce sound-spelling patterns.
- *Spelling Connection* - Spelling lists connect to the week's phonics lesson so that students see the connection between reading and writing in Grades 1–2. For Kindergarten, spelling is introduced later in the program and focuses on word patterns that students have already learned, such as VC and CVC words.
- *Decodable Text* - Practice in reading decodable text reinforces the letter-sound patterns being learned, helps students develop fluency, and shows them the utility of what they are learning.

Academic Language and Vocabulary

Academic language, and the associated vocabulary, is an important aspect of literacy learning. Comprehension of academic language allows students to interpret and understand content specific textbooks, academic language used in classrooms, and the language that encompasses assessments required to measure academic success and inform future academic placement. Students need to master academic language in order to succeed in all other content area, including math and science (Marzano, 2010). Every academic content area encompasses discipline specific vocabulary, grammar and punctuation that must be understood by students if they are to succeed in various academic disciplines and in school as a whole. Academic language attainment means students are able to use content-specific vocabulary and specialized, complex grammatical structures to acquire new knowledge and skills, discuss topics with proficiency and share high level information with others (Bailey, 2007).

Undoubtedly academic vocabulary and the associated background knowledge have a profound influence on students' ability to comprehend what they read. Background knowledge is evident in the vocabulary used in oral and written language, and the ability to acquire new vocabulary is linked to background knowledge (Fisher et. al., 2012). For many teachers the push to teach new information can supersede academic language and vocabulary instruction. However, excluding academic vocabulary from lessons is detrimental to student learning, as these skills are important tools for reading comprehension and other core reading skills. Vocabulary and background knowledge are widely recognized as critical factors for both academic learning and learning in general (Fisher & Frey, 2009; Kamil et al., 2008).

Additional research suggests that background knowledge and vocabulary are the strongest predictors of comprehension and that they indirectly influenced whether or not students will apply higher order problem solving skills when they struggle to interpret advanced texts (Cromley & Azevedo, 2007). Vocabulary and the associated background knowledge control the extent to which other reading comprehension behaviors are utilized. Indeed, amongst literacy researchers there is a clear consensus that accelerating vocabulary growth is a vital and often neglected component of a comprehensive reading program (Baumann & Kame'enui, 2004; NICHD Report of the National Reading Panel, 2000). Vocabulary proficiency and reading comprehension have a direct influence

on the other (Stahl & Fairbanks, 1987; Beck et al., 2002; Graves, 2000; Baker et al., 1995), in addition to affecting general reading ability (Stanovich et al., 1998).

From Research to Practice

Within *myView Literacy*, general academic vocabulary acquisition is considered critical for reading comprehension and overall academic success. These academic terms appear in a variety of situations, modes, and text types across all content areas. As a result, they are challenging for students because they are more abstract and vary by context. By focusing on academic vocabulary, *myView Literacy* instruction helps students express themselves, in speaking and in writing, using a more sophisticated language of ideas.

A generative approach to academic vocabulary instruction helps students generate meanings of new words across unit themes and weekly texts. At the beginning of each unit, students are introduced to four or five general academic vocabulary words. These grade-appropriate academic words are chosen because they have:

- a close connection to the unit theme and essential question
- robust morphological and generative qualities
- multiple meanings, collocations, and cognates

Over the course of a unit, *myView Literacy* systematically builds on these academic words by generating, applying, and synthesizing the words within the oral instruction, close read questions, vocabulary practice activities, collaborative conversations, and writing activities. This ensures that students' word knowledge will be incremental, multidimensional, and interrelated.

By the end of the fifth week, students will have built more than 50 academic words per unit, not including how these words are used in a variety of contexts.

On the first day of each week, students will have a word practice activity that explicitly focuses on an aspect of word meaning. On subsequent days of the week, the words are explicitly used in collaborative conversations, close read questions, minilessons, and notes that help teachers make connections between the words and the lesson content. Teachers are encouraged to have students start a Word Wall of academic words and phrases they learn as they progress through the unit.

In addition to the vocabulary support in the core program, the online *Language Awareness Handbook* offers scaffolding support; routines, activities, sentence frames, and games help students explore morphological and semantic links to expand and build academic rigor. Additionally, selection vocabulary from the language of the text is explicitly taught. The words are pulled from the students' Reading Workshop weekly text selection and meet the following criteria: Four to five words are chosen; the words are chosen for their richness and morphological family; the words are taught as a network of ideas rather than as single words; and the words are important for comprehending the text. These groups of words might be Tier 2 words, including instructional words, such as illustrate and preserve. Or

the groups of words might be Tier 3 words—specialized, domain-specific words, such as photosynthesis or empire—since these words represent complex concepts that are new for students.

Word Study

Word study, which covers word structure skills, or skills involving the meaningful parts of words, such as syllables, word endings, and affixes. Understanding the structure of words improves skills in decoding, spelling, and vocabulary.

Decoding As they learn to read, students need to move away from reading letter by letter and begin to recognize chunks of text at a glance. Readers can read more quickly when they have an awareness of syllables and morphemes. At Grade 2 and above, an essential part of decoding is being able to read multisyllabic words. Longer words are nearly impossible to read letter by letter: “Anyone who tried to identify a long word by sounding out its individual letters would run out of memory space long before she or he was done” (Adams 1990, 128). Students who learn to look for patterns in multisyllabic words will be better decoders.

Spelling and Vocabulary English is a language in which many words are related through their morphology. This relationship is preserved through our spelling system. Students who learn to look for patterns in multisyllabic words will be better spellers and expand their vocabularies. If they learn to look further and consider possible meaning relationships, they will increase their vocabulary (Cunningham, 1998). “The rationale that underlies instruction in morphemic analysis is that if students can be taught basic and recurring free and bound morphemes, knowledge of many semantically related words can be acquired” (Baumann and Kame’enui 1991, 622).

Syllabication Teaching students some generalizations about syllables (a unit of pronunciation that has one vowel sound) will help them read long words by helping them see the structure of the word and recognize letter patterns, especially vowel patterns. If they can divide a word into syllables—even if the division isn’t exact—they can use the syllable patterns as a guide to decoding the word.

Morphemic or Structural Analysis Morphemes are the smallest meaningful parts of language. A morpheme can consist of one or more syllables: *cat* and *elephant* are each one morpheme. A morpheme can be one word or a part of a word: *-est* is a morpheme. A word can be made up of one morpheme (*banana*), or it can contain two morphemes (*unhappy*, *outside*), three morphemes (*unfriendly*), or more. Free morphemes are morphemes that can stand alone as words (*peach*, *apple*). Bound morphemes are morphemes that must be attached to other morphemes to make words, such as affixes and word roots (*ly*, *ness*, *bio*).

From Research to Practice

Word Study and Spelling instruction support the connections between foundational skills and meaning-making. While sound-spelling, word structure, and spelling-meaning relationships are taught at all grade levels, the instructional emphasis changes as students move through the grades. In Grades 1–2, the emphasis is on the sound-spelling relationship, and in Grades 1–5, spelling words are explicitly tied to the Phonics/Word Study skill. As students move through the program, the instructional emphasis changes to structure and

meaning. However, students continue to have more challenging examples of sound-spellings.

In *my View Literacy*, Kindergartners learn to count the syllables in a word and blend syllables into a word (orally) as a part of phonological awareness instruction.

In Grades 1 and 2, *myView Literacy* teaches the most common word parts, including inflected endings such as *-s*, *-es*, *-ed*, *-ing*, *-er*, and *-est*; compound words; contractions; the most frequent suffixes and prefixes; spelling changes with inflections; and how to apply this knowledge to unknown words. First and second graders are also taught the basic syllable patterns. In *myView*, word structure lessons are taught as part of the Phonics strand in Grades 1–2.

In Grades 3–5, the solution continues to cover all of the above, introducing more complex spellings and less frequent word parts. More complex syllabication rules are also introduced, and students read longer words, from three to five syllables. Greek and Latin roots are taught in Grades 4–5.

Fluency

Fluency plays a large role in general reading skills, as well as contributes to overall comprehension, helping to develop automatic word recognition and oral reading that sounds like spoken language (Kuhn, 2004). Reading with fluency requires the reader to both comprehend and process text simultaneously so that he or she can focus on understanding the deeper levels of meaning while mastering surface level text processing (Rasinski, 2004). Solid reading fluency requires independent reading done frequently, often, and with exposure to different kinds of texts. Specifically, if students do not read regularly, they are likely to lack fluency (Allington, 2012). While fluency fluctuates for every reader based on the complexity of the text, genre, general familiarity and the purpose for reading (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006); a fluent reader is able to demonstrate text cues, solid comprehension and an awareness for finding the correct flow for what is being read (Newkirk, 2011).

Because many reading comprehension challenges are directly correlated with lack of fluency (Duke, Pressley, & Hilden, 2004), in order to fully support students in their literacy achievements, literacy teachers must grasp the importance of fluency in terms of its effects on other reading skills. Fluency cannot fully develop if there are not frequent and sustained opportunities to practice reading across a wide breath of genres and writing styles (Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn, 2001). If teachers want their students to experience a high degree of reading fluency, they must ensure that students are exposed to an expansive range of reading experiences and that students have access to a classroom library that engages them with diverse and relevant books. Research suggests that certain texts lend themselves to interpretive oral reading more than others. These are the types of texts teachers should ensure end up in their classroom library and are being used in fluency instruction (Rasinski, 2006).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy incorporates fluency instruction that focuses on rate, accuracy, and prosody. In Grades 1–5, instruction occurs in both Whole Group and Small Group settings, but the focus may differ between the two.

At Grade K, fluency is modeled daily by the teacher using the program's texts. Because kindergarteners are just beginning to read, many states do not have fluency standards. Therefore, the expectations for fluent reading at this grade are different; students are exposed to the idea of fluency and are encouraged to read with accuracy when they read chorally or individually. During Small Group instruction, teachers may record observations about rate and accuracy as they listen to students read a Decodable Reader.

At Grade 1, fluency is modeled by the teacher in Lesson 1 using a Read Aloud. At that time, students are invited to practice fluency when they read the weekly text. Fluency is also practiced in Lesson 4 using the Decodable Story. The fluency focus is on the phonics skills in the story. The goal of this practice is to help students achieve automaticity decoding words representative of the newly taught phonics skills. Fluency is also practiced one time per unit using a passage from the Student Interactive text. On other days, fluency can be practiced and/or assessed in Small Group instruction, using a passage from Cold Reads for Fluency and Comprehension.

At Grades 2–5, fluency is modeled and practiced in Lesson 1 using the Read Aloud. It is also practiced one time per unit using a passage from the Student Interactive text. On other days, fluency can be practiced and/or assessed in Small Group instruction, using a passage from Cold Reads for Fluency and Comprehension.

Comprehension

Reading comprehension is the key that unlocks additional learning and skills so that students are able to read increasingly more complicated texts, which in turn increases their capacity for future learning. Or rather the more students read, the more intelligent they are able to become, and this increases their general capacity for understanding (Kintsch, 2004). Reading comprehension is the, “ability to understand the meaning of what is said, or read, as well as its intent” (Cunningham & Zibulsky, 2013). When students are given ample opportunities to practice a system of strategic actions, such as complex processes involving the utilization of a wide range of skills, strategies and conceptual understanding, they are engaging in the complex process of high-level comprehension (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006).

In order to fully demonstrate reading comprehension many different components, relying upon a variety of different kinds of information and yielding complex mental representations, must come

together into a cohesive understanding of what is being read (Kintsch & Rawson, 2005). Teachers must incorporate lesson plans and supports that build a system for processing texts and utilize skills rooted in earlier reading behaviors, so that the process recreates itself and allows students to read increasingly complex texts. Reading is the culmination of literary thinking from all aspects of the text (Fountas & Pinnell, 2006). Reading comprehension encompasses the process of finding meaning in text in order to construct a larger, deeper meaning within which the reader develops a relationship with what is being read (RAND Reading Study Group, 2002).

From Research to Practice

Students practice and apply these skills and metacognitive strategies in the Student Interactive during a Close Read of the texts in the Reading Workshop portion of the week.

The corresponding instruction in the Teacher’s Edition generally follows a minilesson approach with a Focus, Model, Practice, and Apply gradual-release routine with opportunities for students to share what they have learned.

Throughout the Student Interactive, Weeks 1–5 **Reading Workshop**

- *Spotlight on Genre* - The Spotlight on Genre/Genre minilesson introduces the unit genre. Direct instruction on the genre (including a genre anchor chart) allows students to connect to the text in order to better comprehend the content.
- *First Read* - The First Read routine (generally Notice, Generate Questions, Connect, Respond; but it can vary from week to week) guides students to get the “gist” of the text as they read.
- *Shared Read* - Close Read notes guide students to dig deeper by annotating the text based on instruction in the Lesson 3 comprehension skill and Lesson 4 metacognitive strategy apparatus pages that follow each text. Students apply this text evidence to graphic organizers and other activities on the apparatus pages after they complete the Close Reads.
- *Check for Understanding* - Students respond to questions about the text to assess their comprehension of the First Read. Question 1 is a genre question and is always DOK2; question 2 is a “Think Like an Author” question (author’s craft or purpose) and is DOK3; questions 3 and 4 are general, but rigorous, comprehension questions about the text and are DOK3.
- *Close Read Comprehension, Lessons 3 and 4* - Brief instruction is provided for the weekly reading skill in Lesson 3. Students are directed to cite text evidence by annotating the text and then use that evidence to complete a graphic organizer or some other activity. Students then dig deeper into the text by following a similar routine to apply knowledge of a metacognitive strategy to the text in Lesson 4.
- *Reflect and Share* - This page is divided into two sections: an oral activity and a written activity. The purpose of these activities is to have students make connections between texts and other sources to emphasize making comparisons between texts and

genres. Activities have students go back into texts to cite text evidence. Students will always answer the Weekly Question on this page, either through an oral discussion (to hit listening and speaking standards) or a written response (to hit response standards). When the written activity is not about the Weekly Question, it will include the “Write to Sources” run-in head.

Throughout the Student Interactive, Week 6
Reading Workshop

- *Compare Across Texts* - Students use knowledge gained from Weeks 1–5 texts to answer and extend each week’s Weekly Question. Students use this information to answer the unit Essential Question.

Throughout the Teacher’s Edition, Weeks 1–5
Reading Workshop

- *Minilesson* - Instruction generally follows a minilesson routine of Focus, Model, Practice, and Apply.
- *Listening Comprehension* - A teacher read aloud connects the unit genre, theme, and Essential Question through a Read Aloud routine. This allows students to gain exposure to the genre through a listening activity. Teachers first read the passage without stopping. Teachers do a second read using **Think Alouds** to model skills and metacognitive strategies.
- *Genre and Theme* - Instruction guides students in an introduction to the genre. Formative Assessment Options consist of two options for students to apply their knowledge.
- *Introduce the Text (First Read)* - Instruction tailored to the First Read routine in the Student Interactive provides a means to guide students through the text.
- *Text* - First Read and Close Read notes and questions help teachers guide students to cite text evidence by interacting in some way (underlining or highlighting) with the text.
- *Respond and Analyze* - *myView Literacy* allows students time to share their initial responses to the text. Teachers prompt students to complete the Check for Understanding
- *Close Read Skill/Strategy* - Minilessons provide instruction for completing the corresponding Student Interactive pages. Students are directed to return to the text to complete a Close Read focusing on the weekly skill during Lesson 3, and then the weekly metacognitive strategy during Lesson 4.
- *Assess and Differentiate/Small Group* - Scaffolded support and an extension activity for the weekly skill and metacognitive strategy are provided at point of use after the corresponding skill (Lesson 3) and strategy (Lesson 4) pages for leveled instruction

and comprehension acquisition. An opportunity for students to compare texts is provided after Lesson 5.

- *Reflect and Share* - Minilessons assist the teacher in guiding students to complete the SI page. The emphasis of this lesson is for students to discuss and make comparisons across texts and to answer the Weekly Question.

Throughout the Teacher's Edition, Week 6
Reading Workshop

- *Compare Across Texts* - Instruction guides students to complete the Weeks 1–5 Weekly Questions and to compare across texts.

Independent Reading

Based on existing research we have long known that the amount of time spent reading during the elementary school years is the key predictor for future reading achievement growth. An ever-growing body of evidence asserts that high achieving readers read the most and struggling readers read the least, implying that the more time students spend reading, the likelihood their fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension will be positively impacted (National Reading Panel, 2000). Specifically, independent reading is more strongly correlated with reading achievement than either socioeconomic status or other instructional approaches (Krashen, 2004). Providing students with ample time to read text selections of their choosing from a wide collection of reading resources results in greater reading volume, academic achievement and engagement (Allington, 2014; Kelley & McClausen-Grace, 2010). When students have access to a wide collection of both classroom and schoolwide literary materials the likelihood that they actively engage in reading increases and the more students read the better readers they become (Krashen, 2004). Independent reading opportunities also support autonomous learning, which has been shown to increase motivation, engagement and overall reading achievement (Guthrie, Klauda & Ho, 2013).

If reading more means serious gains in reading skills, including comprehension, it's no surprise that increasing opportunities for independent reading helps build literacy skills (Allington, 2014; Reutzel et al., 2012). While research certainly supports the academic pros of independent reading it is important not to overlook the importance of creating lifelong readers, as lifelong readers equal lifelong learners and students are unlikely to become lifelong readers if they never have the chance to read for pleasure (Gardiner, 2005). Offering a wide variety of texts, in different genres and ranges of readability levels allows all students to find engaging material they can tackle independently, while building confidence and reading enjoyment (Atwell, 2007; Guthrie & Humenick, 2004; Pilgreen, 2000; Schunk et al., 2008). In addition, students who enjoy reading are more likely to read over the summer if they have access to reading materials and summer reading helps slow summer learning loss and yield greater academic gains in the following school year (Allington & McGill-Franzen, 2003).

From Research to Practice

Outside of school, children don't read books for the purpose of being tested on them. For this reason, *myView Literacy* offers Book Club, a twice-weekly feature of each unit that gives students an in-class opportunity for real-world reading enjoyment. Book Club consists of a set-aside time when students meet in small groups to discuss the trade book for the unit. It is a time for students to talk about what they are reading without having their ideas or insights overly evaluated.

Book Club is also an opportunity for teachers to encourage students to think about the elements and themes they are studying in connection with the Student Interactive selections. The goal is to keep these elements alive in students' minds without dampening the joy of reading that Book Club is meant to foster.

The Book Club completes the gradual-release model, as students explore increasingly complex texts independently of the teacher. Students read one trade book over the course of the unit. Students are allowed to choose from a list of suggested titles in order to increase student engagement and encourage student ownership.

Reciprocity and Developing Writers/Readers Who Understand

It is nearly impossible to read without writing and to write without reading. Literacy skills are deeply intertwined and as proficiency in one area increases, so too does the other. It's the connections that are made between reading and writing, through teaching and learning, that have the potential for providing a context in which learning about one aspect allows learning about the other (Clay, 1998) By natural extension the reciprocity of reading and writing extends to includes speaking and listening as well. Oral language (listening and speaking), written language, and reading share a fundamental and reciprocal relationship. When young children first begin learning to read, they're dependent on their oral language skills to make the connections needed to become literate (Fitzgerald & Shanahan, 2000; Harste & Short, 1988; Pearson, 1990; Shanahan, 1980; Tierney & Pearson, 1983).

This interconnectedness is easily illustrated as new readers search for graphophonic information to decode words. As the learning progression continues, strides in reading and writing extend back to oral language where vocabulary, fluency, etc. are positively impacted. As older children become more proficient at reading, they use their literacy to increase their learning. For striving readers and writers, it is especially important for teachers to make the connection between the reciprocity of these skills and how this can be leveraged to support learning (Anderson & Briggs, 2011). When educators take full advantage of this reciprocal relationship in the classroom, students are able to progress rapidly (Clay, 2001; DeFord, Lyons, & Pinnell, 1991). As students make these connections, they begin to understand that when they write, they read; when they read, they create meaning and when they create meaning whole new worlds unfold before them (Anderson & Briggs, 2011).

From Research to Practice

Unique to *myView Literacy* is the Reading-Writing Bridge. Situated between the Reading Workshop and the Writing Workshop, the Reading-Writing Bridge allows students to look back to what they have read and then move forward to what they will write in ways that show the interrelatedness of these skills. The pillars of the Bridge—Read Like a Writer/Write for a Reader—provide integrated support. From the perspective of a writer, students reconsider unit-level academic vocabulary they used as they read. Where they focused on a reader's view of author's craft in the Reading Workshop, students now focus on writer's craft and the process of writing in a mode that relates to the selections they've explored as readers. Language and conventions, spelling, and other word-study skills further help students prepare for and complete writing experiences successfully. Students learn effective ways to communicate based on audience and purpose. They learn the power of word choices authors use to create clear and engaging texts.

An additional focus within *myView Literacy* is using text evidence within writing prompts and activities. Students learn this skill through close reading prompts and "Write to Sources" minilessons. At the end of every unit, students have the opportunity to complete a real-world Inquiry-Based Project that includes genre-based writing. Students use

provided research articles and step-by-step support for conducting their own research. All Inquiry-Based Projects also come with three additional primary sources for students to use as text evidence as they strengthen their writing. Lessons on incorporating primary and secondary sources are on *Realize*. Finally, performance-based writing options are included with most units in grades 2-5. These rigorous tasks determine student mastery of various writing genres as they incorporate text evidence from provided sources.

Handwriting

Research on handwriting indicates that visual-motor skills, such as eye-hand coordination, are developed in early childhood and can be predictors of later academic achievement (Lust & Donica, 2011). In addition, children that write quickly and legibly are more likely to demonstrate skills in expressing their thoughts through the written word. Virginia Berninger, a professor at the University of Washington, reported her study of children in grades two, four, and six that revealed they wrote more words, faster, and expressed more ideas when writing essays by hand versus with a keyboard (Berninger & Amtmann, 2003). When children type, write in cursive and print they use different parts of their brain which can be linked to unique cognitive functions Berninger, et al., 2003). Students with better handwriting showed increased overall activity in the areas of the brain responsible for reading and writing networks. Lastly, a 2012 review suggests that cursive writing might be particularly effective for students with dysgraphia (motor controlling difficulties in forming letters) and that cursive writing might be beneficial in terms of preventing the reversal and inversion of letters (Montgomery, 2012).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy teaches handwriting in a progressive format from Kindergarten through Grade 5. Handwriting instruction is embedded in the program because of the precursory implications it has on cognitive development for reading and writing. As a result of the parts of the brain that are activated while handwriting, children are better able to recognize letters, which results in stronger reading skills and higher word counts in writing.

Handwriting, including cursive, is incorporated in *myView Literacy* at every stage of student development because the physical production of letters and words causes the brain to process information in a more advanced manner than visual letter recognition. Handwriting models and handwriting practice opportunities are provided as guides to proper letter formation, size, and spacing between letters and words. In addition, teachers are provided with explicit directions on how to model proper sitting, paper positioning, and pencil gripping techniques to ensure student success.

Conventions

Writing conventions are the technical elements that come together to make writing clear and concise so that the writer can easily convey what she/he intends to the reader. There are five key writing conventions: 1) spelling; 2) punctuation; 3) capitalization; 4) grammar; and 5) sentence

structure, that comprise the generally accepted standards for written English. In the 1970's and 1980's proponents of the writing process movement decided to diminish the use of standard conventions and focus instead on what students wanted to say (Smith, 2000). Unfortunately, problems with basic writing skills have an impact on the quality of a person's writing (Graham, et al., 1997). Handwriting, spelling, and sentence construction are all basic writing skills that students must draw upon to translate their thoughts and ideas into writing (Graham, et al. 2012). Teachers should also explicitly demonstrate how sentence construction and sentence mechanics, such as punctuation and capitalization, interact to form strong sentences, as sophisticated, mature writers see content, form, and conventions as inseparable (Thomas, 2000).

From Research to Practice

In *myView Literacy*, instruction in language and conventions are directly and explicitly taught in the Reading-Writing Bridge, which takes place between the Reading Workshop and the Writing Workshop. The Reading-Writing Bridge provides a conduit that leads students from reading with the eye of a writer to writing effectively for another reader. Students use what they learn about language and conventions in the Bridge as they work through the Writing Workshop.

Grades K–5 follow this plan in the Bridge section of the Reading-Writing Workshop:

- Lesson 1: Teachers begin the week with a spiral review of the previous week's skill. The focus is on reinforcing the previous week's learning. Teachers model and guide practice of the reviewed skill, and students apply the skill on their own or with a partner.
- Lesson 2: Teachers focus, model, and guide practice of oral language. Students apply the skill using the conventions of language as they engage in collaborative conversations.
- Lesson 3: Teachers focus instruction on a new skill, and they model use of the skill. Students engage in guided practice as they complete a short activity.
- Lesson 4: Students apply the language and conventions weekly skill on their own in their Student Interactive. They also are reminded to pay attention to that particular skill as they engage in Writing Workshop activities for that week.
- Lesson 5: Students practice language and conventions by engaging in Standards Practice activities. Teachers use the Online Student Resources to assess student understanding.

Spelling

Most schools and teachers continue to regard spelling as an important part of the educational curriculum. Indeed, the majority of elementary schools nationwide provide spelling instruction and assess their students' spelling abilities (Fresch, 2003; Graham et al, 2008; McNeill & Kirk, 2013). Spelling is an important aspect of both the reading and writing process. If students lack solid spelling skills, their writing may suffer if they choose to limit their use of vocabulary to the words, they are confident they can spell (Graham, 1999). A 2012, Institute of Education Sciences,

Practice Guide, indicates that students should be encouraged to learn words they frequently misspell, as well as words they wish to include in their writing.

The report also advises that teachers should help students acquire the skills they need to generate and check plausible spellings for words (Berninger et al., 2000; Berninger et al., 2002; Graham, Harris, and Fink-Chorzempa, 2002). In addition, the guide notes that when students are working on drafts, it is important for them to learn skills for applying spelling rules to words they wish to include, such as invented spelling or spelling by analogy. In fact, a very small number of words (850) make up 80 percent of the words elementary schools students use in their writing (Graham, et al.,2012). As students increase their grasp of spelling, sounding out and learning more difficult words, both their reading and writing improve.

From Research to Practice

Spelling instruction is based on a developmental continuum. Instruction first focuses on sound-spelling relationships, then on word structure study (word endings, compound words, contractions), and finally on spelling and meaning relationships (such as Greek and Latin roots, homophones, and affixes).

Spelling instruction is built on the following instructional principles:

- Grades 1–2 Sound-Spelling
- Grades 2–4 Word Structure
- Grades 4–5 Spelling and Meaning Relationships

While sound-spelling, word structure, and spelling-meaning relationships are taught at all grade levels, the instructional emphasis changes as students move through the grades. In Grades 1–2, the emphasis is on the sound-spelling relationship, and in Grades 1–5, spelling words are explicitly tied to the Phonics/Word Study skill. As students move through the program, the instructional emphasis changes to structure and meaning. However, students continue to have more challenging examples of sound-spellings.

Writing Workshop

Writing workshops implement a student-centered framework that teaches writing based on the idea that students learn to write best when they write frequently, for extended periods of time, on topics of their own choosing (Calkins, 1994). This includes ample time for mini lessons, writing, conferring, sharing, and informal opportunities for teachers to gauge where students are at in the process of writing and to provide appropriate feedback (Hattie, 2008, Denton, Vaughn & Fletcher, 2003, Bromley, 2011). Students should have opportunities to explore mentor texts and become acquainted with authentic models for various genres and writing styles. When students connect to material that encompasses their reality and is steeped in relevance, they are better able to expand their knowledge of important writing skills and read like writers (Glover & Berry, 2012). Workshop style instruction makes it easy for teachers to provide lessons that are tailored to the unique needs and interests of their students. Workshop style learning also allows for organic conferring to occur which helps readers become better writers (Anderson, 2000). The writing workshop framework provides educators with opportunities to utilize research-based practices that help students become accomplished writers.

From Research to Practice

In the Writing Workshop for *myView Literacy*, teachers focus on the skills and practices necessary to write effectively. Stacks of mentor texts help students become acquainted with authentic models in the writing genre for each unit. Teachers select focused minilessons flexibly to tailor their instruction to students' needs and interests. Mentor stacks serve as the basis for these minilessons in the Writing Workshop.

The Writing Workshop focuses on immersing students in the genre of the writing. As weeks proceed, teachers conduct minilessons with students to develop their writing style. Part of the minilesson bank includes lessons on various steps of the writing process and focusing on the importance of citing text evidence in their writing. The Writing Workshop provides students with a volume of writing to help students hone the craft of writing and integrate the writing process to a completed writing product. The writing process focuses on developing the whole writer by developing elements of the genre and structure, refining the writer's craft, and understanding the process of writing, driving toward a product that teaches the transferable skills students need to communicate effectively in various writing genres and for various audiences.

The central focus of the Writing Workshop is to develop independent writers. To that end, students will progress through the following steps:

- *Modeled/Interactive Writing* - Teachers model the writing and thought processes within a Think Aloud and through the writing minilessons. Teachers use minilessons to immerse students in the genre of writing and help them understand the basic tenets of writing in that genre.

- *Shared Writing* - During Shared Writing, teachers and students collaborate with each other and discuss the topic or text. Workshop minilessons help guide this shared writing activity.
- *Guided Writing* - Explicit instruction in the minilessons or use of the conferring prompts help with the explicit instruction to support guided writing.
- *Independent Writing* - Time is set aside each day for students to write independently. During this time, teachers can conduct one-to-one conferences to review and explore student work and focus on specific writing skills. Conferring prompts and conferring checklists are provided for the teacher.

Voluminous Writing

Students that are encouraged and allowed to write each day experience greater levels of fluency and proficiency when it comes to writing (Newkirk & Kittle, 2013). Daily writing opportunities help students become proficient at drawing on relevant knowledge and apply it to future learning. This increases their ability to absorb mentor texts with ease and produce their own writing with confidence. Voluminous writing opportunities also help increase the type practice learners need to become proficient at consolidating and reviewing ideas and experiences so they can reformulate and extend knowledge when expressing themselves through writing (Langer, 2002). If we expect students to improve as writers, it is essential they are exposed to long stretches of time to practice writing and build stamina. In addition, if we require that students are adept at writing under pressure so they can pass important assessments, score well on entrance exams, get accepted to college, and succeed in finding meaningful employment, we need to give them time to practice the associated skills. When students get to write daily, for extended time periods they acquire the important writing skills they need to communicate effectively and thoughtfully in written form. This is especially true of ELLs and below level learners who need to be encouraged to write as much, if not more, than their on-level peers (Gallagher, 2006).

From Research to Practice

In the Writing Workshop, students have daily opportunities to hone their writing skills. Teachers select focused Minilessons flexibly to tailor their instruction to students' needs and interests. The Minilesson Bank supports standards-driven writing skill development and student progress toward independent writing. Each unit contains thirty-five minilessons which are based on mentor stacks that serve as mental models of writing for students. Minilessons provide instruction in research practices, and students have opportunities to conduct applications of their learning by completing research projects.

Mentor Text, Genre, and Writer's Craft

In order for students to write like writers they need plenty of exposure to a wide range of genres, and appropriate mentor texts that demonstrate the elements of writer's craft in practice (Marchetti & O'Dell, 2015). The process of learning to write is largely driven by function and purpose. Young writers require compelling opportunities to practice writing different genres with context in real

world situations (Duke, et al., 2012). They need to be exposed to a prolific range of mentor texts that model the narrative elements and literary devices unique to each genre, so they have a solid template for producing compelling writing of their own.

Kelly Gallagher, *Savvas Learning* author, long time English teacher and the author of, “*Write Like This: Teaching Real-World Writing Through Modeling and Mentor Texts*” (Stenhouse, 2011) indicates, “If we want our students to write persuasive arguments, interesting explanatory pieces, or captivating narratives, we need to have them read, analyze, and emulate persuasive arguments, interesting explanatory pieces, and captivating narratives. Before our students can write well in a given discourse, they need to see good writing in that discourse.” Exposure to a wide range of mentor texts helps students conceptualize the nuances and use of writer’s craft that are unique to various genres so they can emulate those characteristics successfully in the writing they produce (Gallagher, 2014).

It’s not enough to ask students “what” has been written, but rather to establish true writers that understand the craft we need to ask “how” the selection is written. In addition, exposure to a variety of genres helps ensure that students will become competent, literate members of society, who can express themselves through written word in the contexts the 21st century landscape will require of them (Lattimer, 2003).

From Research to Practice

During the writing workshop, teachers and students focus on the skills and practices necessary for effective writing. Mentor texts help students become acquainted with authentic models in the writing mode selected for each unit. As students begin putting their thoughts on the page, teachers are encouraged to create and share their own writing.

The various examples of writing—authentic, teacher, and student—serve as approximations of good writing in the various stages of the writing process. Teachers select focused minilessons to tailor their instruction to students’ needs and interests. Collaborative conversations (both teacher-student and peer-to-peer) guide students as they work to communicate effectively for specific audiences and purposes.

Throughout the year, students are provided multiple opportunities to learn, practice, and apply different genres, modes, and types of writing. These opportunities occur within all sections of the program, including reading workshop, reading-writing bridge, and writing workshop. Within the writing workshop, students are explicitly instructed on narrative, opinion, informational, and poetry writing.

Additionally, the Writing Club component of the *myView Literacy* program consists of a set-aside time for students to meet with their peers and share their writing. It provides students an opportunity to apply speaking and listening skills while peer conferring about their writing.

Conferring

Conferring is one of the most important parts of the writing workshop. This one-on-one contact between teacher and student creates a space in which the teacher seeks to understand the writer's work and intentions and has the opportunity to provide instructional feedback that supports the next steps in the creative process (Tompkins, 1990). The time spent conferring with students helps guide them towards improved writing skills and gives educators information regarding needed supports and differentiation unique to the student. Carl Anderson, expert on conferring and author of, "*A Teacher's Guide to Writing Conferences*", has indicated, "Conferring is not the icing on the cake; it is the cake."

Conferring with students about their writing makes them better writers and positively influences their attitudes towards learning in general (Bell, 2002; Eickholdt, 2004; Koshik, 2002). By providing a collaborative environment in which the expert mentors the novice writer, conferences also increase students' higher-order and critical thinking skills (Flynn & King, 1993). When teachers take the time to confer with students about their writing, they have the opportunity to model the kinds of important inquiry strategies that help students progress in their writing (Mabrito, 2006). Conferring also embeds hands on activities, utilizing students' texts, into lessons and provides an informal atmosphere in which teachers can genuinely connect with students, helping to build confident, independent, and empowered learners (Martinez, 2001 & Young & Miller, 2004). If we want young writers to take ownership of their creative process and really invest themselves in their writing, it's essential to implement ample opportunities to confer (McIver & Wolf, 1999 & Martinez, 2001).

From Research to Practice

Small group work and conferring provides the teacher opportunities to personalize instruction. Conferring (both teacher-student and peer-to-peer) is a hallmark of the *myView Literacy* solution and is a recursive practice throughout the workshop. Data gathered from conferences can help teachers gain greater understanding of what is going well in the unit and what adjustments or additions to instruction are needed.

There is a fundamental and symbiotic relationship between oral language (listening and speaking), written language and reading. Speaking and listening are the precursory steps to students' later success in decoding and comprehending text and the building blocks of all future literacy skills (Birch, 2011). Without speaking and listening skills, true literacy fluency is nearly unattainable. It is essential for all learners, whether native English speakers or nonnative English speakers, to have the opportunity to increase their speaking and listening skills as they journey to becoming proficient readers (*Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2010). Research has shown the necessity of helping students to develop speaking and listening skills in early childhood if they are to become lifelong learners and readers (Hall 1987; Clay 2013; Kirkland & Patterson 2005).

Listening is often the first step in learning any kind of language, including unlocking the language of the written word. Listening skills play an important role in students' success in reading. Becoming aware of systematic patterns of sounds in spoken language, manipulating sounds in words, recognizing words and breaking them apart into smaller units, learning the relationship between sounds and letters, and building their oral language and vocabulary skills allows them to become natural readers who take delight in literacy (Wolf, et al. 2018). Teachers who want their students to be better readers understand that their students need daily opportunities to practice these skills, to listen to text and reconstruct it, and have opportunities for participating in other literacy related listening activities (Hogan, et al. 2014).

Literary discussions help students take ownership of their learning, promote higher-level thinking, creates space for clarification, encourages confidence in building and sharing knowledge and most importantly allows them the time and space to apply comprehension strategies (Kelly & Clausen, 2007). Students from diverse backgrounds benefit from the inclusiveness of discussion. Research has shown that active opportunities for discussion increases participation, especially for dual language learners, and improves reading satisfaction for all (Carrison & Ernst-Slavit 2005).

From Research to Practice

Students have ample opportunities to practice listening and speaking throughout *myView Literacy*. Shared reading provides a time for guidance that fosters student engagement, participation, and collaboration. Teachers form small groups flexibly to provide instruction based on needs, tasks, and texts. They use Turn, Talk, and Share; Quick Checks; and Reflect and Share to inform instruction as they monitor students' progress through a variety of ongoing formative assessments. As students engage with a variety of texts, they construct meaning, consider essential questions, and work to master strategic learning goals.

In Listening Comprehension (found in the Teacher's Edition), a teacher reads aloud a selection that connects the unit genre, theme, and Essential Question using a Read Aloud routine. This allows students to gain exposure to the genre through a listening activity. Teachers first read the passage without stopping. Teachers do a second read using Think Alouds to model skills and metacognitive strategies.

Within small groups, there are multiple opportunities for students to conduct collaborative conversations with their peers either in collaborative group work or in Guided Reading with the use of Leveled Readers. Tips for conducting collaborative conversations (student and teacher facing) are available on the downloadable resources link in *Realize*. In addition, Book Club also fosters collaborative conversations between peers as they read and discuss their book.

During Writing Workshop, students can work with their peers to work collaboratively on a piece of writing. *myView Literacy* includes conversation prompts to help students have collaborative conversations and provide helpful feedback on student writing. In addition, the Writing Club feature in Writing Workshop is another opportunity for students to discuss and engage with others about their writing.

Within the Project-based Inquiry week of the unit (culminating week), students work collaboratively, calling on their listening and speaking skills to work together on a research project.

Book Clubs help readers process what they are reading in a different way. When readers discuss and share opinions, they hear—and hopefully come to appreciate—that other readers may see things differently. Students can choose books that give them an opportunity to develop opinions, think deeply about a theme, and enjoy talking with others about parts of the book. Book Clubs help support Social Emotional Learning with young students. Teachers may use Book Clubs as an opportunity to reinforce teaching points as you check in with each Book Club.

Beliefs about intelligence can have lasting consequences in terms of how students perceive their learning experience and related challenges. In the past 30 years Carol Dweck and her colleagues have pioneered what we now refer to as, “growth mindset”. After studying the behavior of thousands of children Dweck observed that students' attitudes regarding failure significantly affected their academic achievement and that their underlying beliefs about learning and intelligence could be categorized two ways, as either a fixed mindset or a growth mindset (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). A growth mindset says that when students believe they control their ability to become smarter and that this directly correlates to the effort they put forth, then they are much more likely to put in the time and effort that leads to gains in academic achievement and increases the skills needed to be a lifelong learner (Garcia & Cohen, 2012; Yeager & Walton, 2011). Alternatively, a fixed mindset says that inherent intelligence is a static metric that cannot be changed (i.e. you are either smart or you are not). When students approach learning with an expanded awareness and actionability of their natural abilities they are able to grow prolifically and embrace hurdles as opportunities to deepen the skills they already possess (Yeager & Dweck, 2012). Educators must imbue their teaching with a growth mindset if they want to reinforce the concept that capacity for growth and learning is based on the willingness to put forth effort towards these pursuits. Growth mindset puts the capacity for student achievement just as much in the hands of students as it does with the educators that support them.

Instruction on support skills like resiliency and perseverance, developed through the use of strategies and interventions, provide students with opportunities to explore long-term learning goals that are relevant to them. Programs that include these types of learning experiences foster optimal challenges and motivate students to continue learning (Tough, 2012; Perkins-Gough, 2013; & Pappano, 2013). When students are exposed to and get to practice these skills, they are much more likely to take on the types of challenges they will inevitably experience in future academic, professional and personal pursuits.

Finally, fostering a sense of students' self and belonging within school culture is paramount. When students feel respected, accepted and supported by teachers and peers they experience a sense of self and the belonging that goes with it (Parrett & Budge, 2012). Research has linked a sense of belonging with the amount of attention and effort students exert in class. A sense of belong can also significantly impact dedication, persistence, and follow through when it comes to academic pursuits (Osterman, 2000). Fostering behaviors that enhance sense of self and belonging directly correlates to how good or bad students feel about schoolwork and also the extent to which they value and enjoy it (Trujillo & Tanner, 2014). Students that report a high sense of belonging at school typically expand more effort to achieve and are more likely to exhibit the kind of motivation that leads to future success both in the classroom and out.

From Research to Practice

With the *myView Literacy* solution, competencies of 21st-century thinking and social-emotional learning are taught and practiced using authentic literature, highly engaging trade books, collaborative learning, and project-based inquiry. Teachers can help students

set goals as they practice and apply the skillful competencies that characterize lifelong readers, writers, and thinkers.

Throughout *myView Literacy*, small group opportunities and collaborative discussions help encourage the key aspects of social-emotional learning in the classroom. This kind of learning helps empower students to develop and effectively apply the skills, attitudes, and knowledge needed to help them manage their emotions, set and attain personal goals, develop and maintain positive relationships, make good decisions, and show empathy for others.

During unit introductions, students take a self-evaluation where they reflect on what they already know related and set goals on what they will need to learn as they begin the unit. This self-assessment encourages students to take ownership of their learning. At the end of the unit, students complete a self-reflection by referring to their original goals, considering their growth and challenges, and reflecting on how they have progressed.

Finally, within *myView Literacy*, texts showing characters experiencing social emotional strategies helps students gain perspective and empathy. Students are able to see themselves represented in the reading and are encouraged to share their opinions and explore the perspectives of others through class/group discussions. This experience is critical for creating an inclusive classroom environment.

The ideal environment for fostering educational experiences that support lifelong learners is not the exclusive domain of school time hours. Students do not cease learning beyond the walls of the school and the relationship between home and school is a key ingredient for academic success (Dodd & Konzal, 2002). Research has shown that students do better academically and socially when schools build positive relationships with their families. In fact, negative home-school relationships may be a contributing factor to low student performance (Hughes & Kwok, 2007). If we want home-school relationships to support the kinds of rich academic experiences that improve student learning, it's important to create opportunities that bring parents and schools together. Learning that connects homelife to school life and vice versa increases learning potential (Jacob & Ryan, 2018).

Evidence-based best practices for generating meaningful and lasting connections between school and home requires students, parents, and educators to perceive the experience as beneficial (Cox, 2005). Fostering these types of favorable partnerships promotes effective education that is advantageous to all students. Learners with involved parents, regardless of their socioeconomic status or background, are more likely to have better attendance, receive higher grades, achieve greater levels of social confidence, require less disciplinary action, perform better on tests, and more readily adapt to their educational environment (NCPIE, 2006).

Indeed, the most accurate predictor of student achievement is not family income or social status, but the extent to which a student's family creates a home environment that values learning, has high, but reasonable expectations for academic success, and is actively engaged in their child's educational journey (PTA, 2000). More importantly, when schools foster an environment where parents are frequently involved, academic performance increases *schoolwide*, not just for the students of parents who participate (Henderson & Berla, 1995). As the lines between school and home dissolve and general parent participation increases, so does student academic achievement, especially when the partnership between parents and the school is comprehensive and thoughtfully orchestrated in order to create a lasting school to home connection (El Nokali, Bachman, & Votruba-Drzal, 2010).

From Research to Practice

Included in the *myView Literacy Assessment Guide* are Home-School Connection Letters (in both English and Spanish). These letters give valuable information at the unit level with specific details pertaining to the Reading Workshop, Writing Workshop, and Project-Based Inquiry task. Additionally, the letter offers tips parents can use to support learning at home and questions parents can use to spark conversation about their child's educational experience.

Also in the *Assessment Guide* are Parent Forms on a variety of topics, such as My Child As A Learner and Observing My Child's Reading. These opportunities help form an educational partnership between the parents/guardians and the teacher, encouraging open communication and increasing the teacher's knowledge of specific life circumstances for their students outside of the classroom.

Additionally, instructional materials included in *myView Literacy* are easily accessible at home, both in print (all-in-one Student Interactive) and digitally (on *Realize*). Our partnership with *Google Classroom* facilitates even further the school-to-home connection. With the seamless integration between *Google Classroom* and *Realize*, teachers can communicate with parents seamlessly in multiple languages. Furthermore, for grades K-1, *myView Literacy* provides a weekly removable decodable text in the Student Interactive. Teachers have the option of sending this text home with students, ultimately creating an at-home library for students who may not have access to books outside of school.

Formative

Assessment is a vital part of any learning experience. When learners are provided with informative, responsive, targeted feedback their depth of knowledge and skills for continuing to learn expand. Indeed, providing learners with feedback is a major influencer of student achievement (Hattie, 2008). Formative assessments are designed to accelerate student progress and are embedded into curriculum to support the development of higher-order thinking skills and improve instruction for all types of learners (National Research Council, 2001 & Wood et al., 2007). When formative assessments serve as a precursor to summative assessment, they support the instructional process by providing information for both students and teachers designed to accelerate students' progress (Fuchs & Fuchs, 2002). If we expect students to meet the rigorous academic standards needed by 21st century students, teachers need to monitor student progress in real time and know when and how to intervene with supports that help students meet academic goals.

Ongoing progress monitoring, especially when difficulties are encountered, makes it feasible for teachers to identify exactly what each student needs in order to support them in reaching learning targets (Daro, Mosher, & Corcoran, 2011). One of the greatest strengths of progress monitoring is the ability to highlight immediate actions that need to be taken by either the student or teacher to support immediate next steps for learning. Not only does this keep learning relevant, it also helps students track their own evolution and take ownership of their work, all of which increases student engagement and overall achievement (Chan, et al., 2014). When implemented properly progress monitoring informs more than just students and educators. It also supports families and policymakers by ensuring they have timely and appropriate information that allows them to make decisions that are pertinent to the diverse learners in today's classrooms.

From Research to Practice

The *myView Literacy* assessment suite uses multiple and diverse sources to help teachers understand what students know and comprehend as a result of the teaching and learning process. The results of these assessments provide a view into students' progress, enabling teachers to identify problem areas, modify their instruction, and improve subsequent learning.

myView Literacy provides teachers with daily routines and opportunities to measure student understanding and monitor progress. Teachers can track student learning and inform subsequent instructional pathways through integrated formative assessments. These include Quick Checks; Assess and Differentiate; Assess Prior Knowledge; and Assess Understanding.

These assessment components should be used to help teachers identify those students who may need remediation or intervention. Item Analysis Charts provide correlation to *myFocus* resources for support.

As part of *myView Literacy*'s ongoing support of assessment in the literacy classroom, the program provides tools and resources that help teachers gather and report comprehensive assessment data using digital and print formats. Teachers can find tools such as Conferencing Checklists, Observational Assessments, and Rubrics to help them monitor student performance. Realize reports are also available to help teachers analyze both student and class results.

Teachers can also use Weekly Standards Practice PowerPoint presentations to immediately assess student understanding. These exit tickets feature multiple-choice practice for academic vocabulary, word study, and language and conventions.

Observational

Research suggests daily, formative assessment that includes observation supports student conceptualization of what direction their learning should take, the progress they have made so far, and the specific actions they need to take next in order to progress towards the learning goal (NCTE, 2013). Observation allows educators to focus on what students need to move beyond immediate targets and assist in identifying more challenging pursuits for the future. When teachers use observation to provide students with feedback that helps them learn how to use constructive criticism, set goals, monitor their own progress and select strategies that move their own learning forward, students become active agents in their educational process (Darling-Hammond, 2019). Formative assessment that includes progress monitoring and ample opportunities for observations provides an opportunity for both teachers and students to implement the type of practices that have been shown to be highly effective in raising the student attainment, increasing equity of student outcomes for all students, and improving every learners ability (OECD, 2005).

From Research to Practice

Unique to *myView Literacy* is *Realize Scout*, an observational data gathering tool, which allows teachers to take notes on casual and planned observations. *Realize Scout* helps teachers document “in-the-moment” student learning creating a detailed picture of individual student growth over time. Observations can be easily shared with parents and can be used to inform evaluation and lesson planning. *Realize Scout* includes the following capabilities:

- Checklist and guides for observations
- Progress tracking of student fluency
- Capturing student audio, photos, and videos
- Uploading student artifacts to create portfolios of progress
- Score Weekly Writing Workshop Assessment

Benchmark

When educators use benchmark assessments as part of a comprehensive system for collecting feedback related to student progress, they are powerful tools for long term planning that addresses the needs of a variety of learners. The National Research Council (NRC) indicates a quality assessment system is (a) coherent, (b) comprehensive, and (c) continuous (NRC, 2001). Good benchmark assessments can be an important addition to a comprehensive assessment system. If we expect benchmark assessments to illicit data that fosters instructional planning and guidance, they should be well aligned with curriculum and provide data at the Beginning-of-Year, Middle-of-Year, and End-of-Year (Herman, Osmundson, & Dietel, 2010). Useful benchmark data is used to provide decision makers, including teachers, with the insights they need to positively inform all aspects of instructional planning and policy at the local, district, and state level. Benchmark assessments can be a useful tool for identifying which students require additional instruction on important to content areas that will therefore be covered on state assessments, (Williams, 2009).

In order to effectively use benchmark assessments, current research suggests educators: a) begin with a written plan; b) identify systems for analyzing and reporting data; c) provide related professional development; and d) allocate the appropriate time to administer (Hamilton, et al., 2009). Valuable benchmark assessments should be aligned to the curriculum and instruction teachers are providing and thoughtful instruction should give students ample opportunities to practice taking assessments that mimic the benchmark they will be expected to take (Herman, 2009). Benchmark assessments are critical for monitoring student knowledge and skills in relation to a distinct set of learning goals over the course of the year, specifically at the beginning, middle, and end. They also help provide a common message to students, teachers, and parents regarding the importance of student learning when it comes to specific knowledge and academic skills (McTighe & O'Connor, 2005).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy includes three benchmark assessments per year. These items assess students on grade-level standards and allow teachers to see how learning is progressing:

- 1) The Baseline Assessment is administered at the beginning of the year. This test assesses student competence against items aligned to key standards in the previous year and the upcoming year. The baseline also includes a fluency test. After consulting an interpretation guide, teachers can use test results to place students into reading groups and to plan differentiated instruction. Based on student results, teachers may decide to administer a diagnostic test to further identify any problems that a student may be exhibiting. There is only one baseline per grade, and none has more than 40 items.
- 2) The Middle of Year Assessment measures student progress in the yearly standards, following the same format as the Unit Test. There is one Middle-of-Year Test per grade, and none has more than 45 items.

- 3) An End-of-Year Test measures student progress in the yearly standards, following the same format as the Unit Test. There is one End-of-Year Test per grade, and none has more than 45 items.

Summative

Summative assessments provide educators the opportunity to measure student knowledge and skill attainment at a specific point in time. Unlike assessments that are formative or diagnostic, the purpose of summative assessment is to determine the student's overall achievement in a specific area of learning at a particular time (Harlen, 2005). When properly aligned to required standards, they provide educators with valuable data that illuminates the achievement and progress of students (Chasteen, et al., 2011). Summative assessments are a key component of highlighting the progress of all students, provide insights regarding equitable access to educational opportunities and supports, and narrowing achievement gaps (Celio, 2013). Summative assessments make identifying whether or not students are meeting standards in a specific subject or content area possible and assist with evaluating effectiveness of instructional curriculum, as they are often administered to a specific group of students (Garrison & Ehringhaus, 2007; & Harlen and James, 1997). Many schools, districts, and states administer formal summative assessments at the end of the year, since this is the time to capture whether students have met a given objective. These types of assessments provide both system-wide data student achievement in addition to powerful information on how sub-groups of learners are performing.

From Research to Practice

The *myView Literacy* assessment suite provides comprehensive summative tools for assessing student learning, both on a weekly and unit basis. Intuitive data reports to monitor and track progress are provided; please see the next section for detailed information.

Weekly Assessments

Progress Check-Ups, Grades K–5

Progress Check-Ups can be administered weekly to assess student progress on the standards presented during that week's instruction. High-frequency words (Grades K–2) and vocabulary words (Grades 3–5) from the weekly selection and Phonics/Word Study skills are tested. Each week's reading comprehension skill is assessed as students listen to or read a fresh passage. Prompt-based writing uses the mode of writing from the Writing Workshop for that week. Every item in the Progress Check-Ups is standards aligned, and selected items use the style and format of the state test. There is one Progress Check-Up for each of the 25 weeks of instruction per grade, and none has more than 15 items plus a writing prompt.

Weekly Standards Practice, Grades 2–5

The Weekly Standards Practice provides multiple-choice practice items for Academic Vocabulary, Word Study, and Language and Conventions taught each week. These items are presented on slides, and teachers may project them as exit tickets to assess immediate student understanding.

Cold Reads for Fluency and Comprehension, Grades 1–5

These weekly tests assess student progress in targeted reading comprehension standards. Cold Reads provide teachers with new reading passages and questions. These assessments offer three different levels of passages followed by standards-based questions. Teachers can use these reading passages to measure fluency and words correctly read per minute. Each set of questions includes at least one item in test preparation format.

Unit Assessments

Unit Tests, Grades K–5

Unit Tests assess the standards presented during each unit. The reading comprehension portion of each Unit Test uses one or more fresh passages—often a mixture of literary and informational text. In the primary grades, students are assessed on high-frequency words and Phonics skills from across the unit. In the intermediate grades, Unit Tests assess Word Study skills. All students are tested on their knowledge of the unit’s convention skills.

Students write in response to a prompt using the mode of writing that they have used throughout the unit. Every item in the Unit Test is standards aligned, and selected items use the style and format of the state test. There is one Unit Test for each of the five units of instruction per grade, and none has more than 30 items plus a writing prompt.

Performance-Based Writing Assessments, Grade 2-5

Additionally, grades 2-5 include an optional Performance-Based Writing Assessment. These rigorous tasks determine student mastery of various writing genres. Students are supplied with a prompt and multiple source documents to utilize for text evidence.

Technology as an Educational Tool

Every day in classrooms around the world students and teachers use technology seamlessly as they engage in reading, writing and English language arts instruction. Technology use is prolific in the 21st century, as students produce academic work, connect socially and communicate with peers from around the globe (Jenkins, 2006). Indeed, the way in which students interact with and relate to invisible technologies tells us a great deal about the broader world in which our students live (Garcia, Kelly & Stamatis, 2018). Today’s students have grown up with technology quietly in the background performing a myriad of tasks that support their general orbit through the world. Many of the technologies that were “visible” to previous generations have faded softly into the background for 21st century students, making up the indistinguishable infrastructure of their daily lives. In fact, for many students these invisible technologies are so woven into the fabric of their everyday existence that they aren’t even aware that they’re using these tools on a minute by minute basis (Frاند, 2000). Technology has become the invisible tool that supports learning both in and out of the classroom.

Technology means educators are able to provide multiple means of engagement that stimulates student interest and motivation with a diverse set of interests and passions (Willms, Friesen, & Milton, 2009). When students have access to technology, they are given various options to engage in different learning activities, explore content for particular competencies or skills, and engage in the types of collaborative activities that increase social emotional skills and opportunities for scaffolding (Dunleavy & Milton (2009). Teachers also have the flexibility of having students engage independently, with features like digital storytelling, or ensuring level appropriate content material is accessible to every learner in their class. Digital learning tools offer the flexibility and support that traditional formats do not (Brown, 2000).

Technology integration is successful for digital natives when it’s accessible and relevant to the task at hand and supports students in the development of the kinds of critical thinking used to set and reach academic goals. Student learning becomes engaging when technology implementation is integrated into daily classroom activities in a way that is routine and transparent (Bitter & Legacy, 2008). When technology tools are an effortless part of the learning process and don’t require teachers or students to stop and “think” about how they’re using technology, students are more likely to be engaged in meaningful projects (Darling-Hammond, 2019).

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy promotes blended learning environments through the utilization of the powerful *Realize* platform. Teachers, students, and administrators are able to access all content, assessments, student data, and management tools using a single sign-on. All print materials are available digitally through our *Realize* platform, which offers students a variety of interactive resources and provides teachers with the data they need to customize content and monitor student progress, so all students demonstrate proficiency in the standards. Teachers have the ability to customize materials, access student work, and streamline planning. On *Realize*, *myView Literacy* students have access to resources that

promote critical thinking and problem-solving, such as videos for background knowledge, selection audio, digital games, and annotation tools.

The *myView Literacy* student edition is available offline for students to work at home, even without an internet connection. Downloadable PDFs of the entire student edition are available for offline use, and offline access to the interactive eText is available on an app for Windows 10, iOS, and Chromebook devices. The *Realize Reader* app allows for downloading the entire interactive student edition or single units, and student work is synchronized when students return to online status.

The *Realize* and *Google* Partnership allows for the sharing of content, assessments, and rosters across *Realize* and *Google G Suite for Education*. With the *Realize* and *Google* Partnership, teachers have access to more support, flexibility, and integration capacity.

Teachers can share supported content from *Realize* with classes, allowing students to collaborate on assignments if desired. Teachers can also add links from their *Google Drive* directly into *Realize* lessons and quickly assign those links to students.

Secure Roster Sync allows for teachers to sync *Google Classroom* rosters with *Realize*. Students log in once and can access everything. In addition, Assignment & Score Sharing across both platforms allows for teachers to assign assessments and have content show in the student's *Google Classroom* stream. Completed work and scores are shared and recorded in both *Realize* and *Google Classroom*.

Additionally, *OpenEd*, a K–12 educational resource library that aligns resources to learning objectives, is integrated with *Realize*. Teachers can find and assign thousands of vetted content resources at no additional charge. All program-specific resources, flexible agnostic resources, and assessments are available in one location for lesson planning and presentation. Flexible classroom management tools allow teachers to use a digital, print, or blended format.

Teachers can open and allow students access to resources in *Realize* or *OpenEd*. Teachers can assign thousands of vetted resources, such as videos and games. *OpenEd* analyzes content and delivers resources from the *Smithsonian Institute*, *PBS* television, and *Khan Academy*.

Data Collection and Actionable Insight

Technology has allowed data collection and actionable insight to make great strides forward in the past ten years. The assessment capabilities that allow both students and teachers to demonstrate their current skill level in meaningful ways are astounding (Reeves, 2010). Every learner deserves assessments that accurately reflect the unique knowledge they have acquired and more importantly, the capabilities to capture how they utilize and apply what they have learned. Assessments that use technology to measure achievement far outshine the limitations of paper

assessments (Office of Educational Technology, 2017). Digital technologies allow educators to get a truly comprehensive picture of each students' strengths and weaknesses so they can personalize learning and implement intervention strategies that reinforce, challenge, and inspire learning in ways that speak to the student. When programs have embedded assessments that are easy for educators to use, they are able to monitor the learning process right down to the very details of how their students are constructing thoughts, conjectures, and future goals. This kind of in-depth data collection provides teachers with the information they need to give students individualized feedback so students can take action in the moment (Bloom, Madaus, & Hastings, 1981; Stiggins, 2002).

Digital assessments also excel at keeping parents and caregivers more up to speed with what and how their children spend their time learning during the school day (Olmstead, 2013). The relevancy of digital data supports educators, schools, districts, states, and indeed the nation in longitudinal endeavors to inform continuous improvement plans and other decision-making processes informed by data (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2015). Technology-enabled tools also provide the kinds of support for teachers that make evaluation and professional development useful. Tools such as video capture can record the nuances of teaching in a team and collaborating with colleagues and students (Meyer, 2015). This provides less biased avenues for providing constructive feedback that makes self-reflection effortless. Digital data collection provides a framework for educators at all levels to really evaluate whether they are assessing what is most valuable, or what is easiest.

Assessments are most instructionally beneficial when they provide timely, actionable insights. Technology essentially hands us the tools to vastly improve outdated assessment approaches and data collection modes. Technological engineering in the 21st century means all students should have equitable opportunity to demonstrate their learning process and current levels of skills attainment on statewide assessments (NCES, 2013). As statewide assessments transition to focusing more on real-world skills and rigorous demonstrations of applied learning, it is essential to ensure that students have equitable access to the type of high-quality educational experiences technology supports (Linn, 2003). As a nation, we have a deep responsibility to use the data we collect from assessment administration to impact every single student in a positive way.

From Research to Practice

On *Realize*, teachers can use the data tab to access student and class data that shows standards mastery on assessments, overall progress and the amount of time your students have spent on their work. If students have completed their assignments, choosing the data tab provides a listing of all classes that have data.

The three types of reports in *Realize* are Mastery, Progress, and Usage.

Mastery covers test scores and standard skill mastery for the class and individual students. When the Class Mastery by Assignment screen is opened, the teacher can view class and student mastery of the assignment and see how it aligns to standards. Progress shows which students have completed their assignments, who is In Progress and who has not started yet. Usage data shows how much time each student spent in *Realize* doing specific assignments.

Teachers are also able to view detailed reports, including:

- Standard Analysis: See progress by standard
- Question Analysis: Drill into questions to see where students are struggling
- Student Analysis: Focus on individual performance to determine learning gaps
- Performance Analysis: Teachers set their own acceptable percentages and get recommendations on student grouping and next-step instructional resources

Additionally, teachers have access to digital assessments tools which help create, deliver, score, and report against mastery of the standards:

- *ExamView*- This is a test generator that allows teachers to create assessments by unit, question type, and/or standards. *ExamView* also allows teachers to create multiple forms of the test to ensure test reliability in class.
- *TestNav*- This functionality within *Realize* allows teachers to assign a test to a student. Students take the assessment online and it is automatically scored. Using the data reports in *Realize*, teachers can generate a standards mastery report and monitor student performance over time.
- *EssayScorer* - This is an online writing tool where students type their essays and receive immediate feedback to improve their writing. Writing can also be turned in and scored by the teacher.

Research has long shown that quality instruction delivered by highly effective teachers is a top factor when it comes to positively impacting student achievement (Varlas, 2009). In order to provide quality instruction, teachers need integrated supports that leverage technologies, increase communication skills, make data collection easy, provide opportunities for collaboration, and utilize existing research (Varlas, 2009). In order for integrated supports to be of value to teachers and ultimately impact student outcomes, they must address the following key instructional principles so that teachers can easily manage and coordinate related student learning: 1) activating prior knowledge; 2) making connections; 3) honoring working memory; 4) managing instructional levels; 5) modeling desired responses; 6) providing accurate practice; and 7) developing automaticity (Gravois & Gickling, 2008).

In addition, teachers benefit greatly when they have opportunities to collaborate with peers. Supports that provide access to strategies for creating and participating in personal learning networks (PLNs) expose educators to new concepts and allow them to share and receive feedback about their professional experiences (Ferguson, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). Active collaboration also allows the dissemination of current research and makes sharing effective instructional strategies and resources effortless (Ferguson, 2010; U.S. Department of Education, 2010). If integrated instructional resources are going to support the habits of effective teachers they must also provide a diverse range of tools for planning, make the structuring of engaging learning experiences easy, provide opportunities to formatively monitor student progress, evaluate learning using multiple sources of evidence and adapt interventions accordingly (Varlas, 2009).

The Learning Policy Institute conducted a 2017 review “of 35 methodologically rigorous studies that demonstrated a positive link between teacher professional development, teaching practices, and student outcomes”. As part of this effort they concluded that teachers are best supported when professional development and instructional strategies for educators achieve the following (Hammond, et al., 2017):

- Are content focused
- Incorporates active learning:
- Supports collaboration
- Uses models of effective practice
- Provides coaching and expert support
- Offers feedback and reflection
- Is off sustained duration

The design of professional development (PD) experiences must address how teachers learn, as well as what teachers learn. It is important that researched based theories regarding adult learning and development are used to identify themes that are relevant for designing teacher PD (Trotter, 2006). Regardless of the specific model employed, PD should be well crafted and incorporate the elements outlined above. It should also correlate with teacher identified needs and include feedback from teachers regarding the type of learning they require to best support their students (Curtis, 2010). In addition, teachers should have regular opportunities to evaluate the PD they are

receiving so that a continuous improvement plan can be implemented to ensure teachers are engaging in relevant PD.

If we expect students to develop the knowledge, skills, and competencies they need to excel in the 21st century then Professional development must be a required component of any educational system that wants to promote successful teachers and students (Archibald, et al., 2011). Well-designed and implemented PD ensures that a coherent system that supports teachers across the entire professional continuum is in place. Lastly, if we expect teachers to be effective educators the training, supports and PD they receive needs to connect their experiences in preparation and induction to teaching standards and evaluation (Darling-Hammond, et al., 2009). Ultimately teachers' training and experience should align with leadership opportunities so that the growth and development of teachers, and therefore the educational experience of our students, continues to flourish.

From Research to Practice

myView Literacy integrates professional development at every stage to help teachers make the greatest impact on student achievement. *MyPearsonTraining.com* is a one-stop professional learning website with on-demand training, live webinars, and live chats with educational specialists. It also includes an on-demand library with topics from social-emotional learning to program-specific elements such as book clubs and assessments. This library comes with notes and discussion guides to use within professional learning communities.

Other professional development support includes:

- The Professional Development Center on *Realize* offers a multitude of videos and advice from program authors.
- The Getting Started page on *Realize*, which contains walk-through and teacher guidance for implementation.
- The *Dual Language Implementation Guide* with information to deepen knowledge of teaching strategies in biliteracy classrooms.
- *Language Awareness Handbook* provides exclusive insights from leading experts in the field of language acquisition.
- The *Small Group Professional Development Guide* which provides support to assist educators in setting up, planning, and delivering small group instruction. Helpful tips from program authors give teachers the support they might need for small group time.
- Assessment Guide offers professional development on a variety of assessment topics. This resource helps teachers find specific and practical directions for using data to inform instruction in a literacy classroom. Each chapter includes a discussion about a specific literacy assessment topic, information about where to find resources in the program, Q/A and references for further reading.
- Embedded professional learning tips called “Expert’s View” throughout the Teacher’s Edition.

Flexible Professional Development options improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement. With Program Activation, you get tailored support to meet your needs and equipping you to:

- Learn the flexible instructional model
- Dive into the minilessons
- Explore innovative ways to strengthen your instruction

Additional Service options are available, such as:

- Implementation Essentials - A deeper dive into the features and instructional design, learn to effectively integrate print and digital components, and receive a training plan customized to your needs.
- Enhancing Practice Services - Job-Embedded Services and Literacy Institutes empower you with instructional strategies, classroom practices, and targeted coaching.

References

- Allington, R. L. (2012). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Allington, R. L. (2014). How reading volume affects both reading fluency and reading achievement. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 7(1), 13-26.
- Allington, R. L. and McGill-Franzen, A. (2003). The impact of summer setback on the reading achievement gap. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 68-75.
- American Association of School Administrators, Consortium for School Networking, and National School Boards Association. *Leading the digital leap*. Retrieved from <http://leaddigitalleap.org>
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 261-271.
- Anderson, C. (2018). *A Teacher's Guide to Writing Conferences*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman
- Anderson, C. (2000). *How's it going?: A practical guide to conferring with student writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Anderson, P. L. (2000). Using literature to teach social skills to adolescents with LD. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 35, 271–279.
- Anderson, William & Mitchell, Steve & Osgood, Marcy. (2005). Comparison of student performance in cooperative learning and traditional lecture-based biochemistry classes. *Biochemistry and molecular biology education: a bimonthly publication of the International Union of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*. 33. 387-93. 10.1002/bmb.2005.49403306387.
- Archibald, S., Coggshall, J. G., Croft, A., & Goe, L. (2011). *High-quality professional development for all teachers: Effectively allocating resources*. Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Armbruster, B.B., Lehr, F., & Osborn, J.M. (Eds). (2001). *Put Reading First: The Research Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read*. Washington, DC: The National Institute for Literacy.
- Atwell, N. (2007). *The Reading Zone: How to Help Kids Become Skilled, Passionate, Habitual, Critical Readers*. New York, NY: Scholastic, Inc.

- Baker DW, Gazmararian JA, Williams MV, Scott T, Parker RM, Green D, Ren J, Peel J. 2002. Functional health literacy and the risk of hospital admission among Medicare managed care enrollees. *American Journal of Public Health*. 92(8): 1278-1283.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of model's reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 589-595.
- Bayless, C. (2010). "Growing a Reading Culture: Just for Parents." Retrieved from <http://www.slideshare.net/ThroughtheMagicDoor/growing-a-reading-culture-1647123>.
- Beethan, Helen; Sharpe, Rhona. (2007). *Rethinking Pedagogy for a Digital Age*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Bell, J. H. (2002). Research report: Better writers: Writing center tutoring and the revision of rough drafts. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 33 (1), 5-20.
- Berninger, V., Vaughan, K., Abbott, R., Brooks, A., Begay, K., Curtin, G., Graham, S. (2000). Language-based spelling instruction: Teaching children to make multiple connections between spoken and written words. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 23(2), 117–135.
- Berninger, V., Vaughan, K., Abbot, R., Begay, K., Coleman, K. B., Curtin, G., Graham, S. (2002). Teaching spelling and composition alone and together: Implications for the simple view of writing. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(2), 291–304.
- Berninger V. W., Abbott R. D., Jones J., Wolf B. J., Gould L., Anderson-Youngstrom M., et al. (2006). Early development of language by hand: composing, reading, listening, and speaking connections; three letter-writing modes; and fast mapping in spelling. *Dev. Neuropsychol.* 29 61–92. 10.1207/s15326942dn2901_5
- Berninger, V. W., & Amtmann, D. (2003). In Swanson, H. L., Harris, K. R., & Graham, S. (Eds.). *Handbook of learning disabilities*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2015). *Teachers know best: Making data work for teachers and students*. Retrieved from <https://s3.amazonaws.com/edtech-production/reports/Gates-TeachersKnowBest-MakingDataWork.pdf>.
- Birch, J.R. (ed) (2011). *Multisensory teaching of basic language skills (Third Edition)*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes Publishing.
- Bitter, G. G., & Legacy, J. M. (2008). *Using technology in the classroom (7th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Blachman, B. A. (1995). Identifying the core linguistic deficits and the critical conditions for early intervention with children with reading disabilities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Learning Disabilities Association, Orlando, FL, March 1995.
- Blachman, B. A. (2000). Phonological awareness. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Rosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Volume III* (pp. 483–502). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bloom, B. S., Madaus, G. F., & Hastings, J. T. (1981). *Evaluation to improve learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Borrero, N. & Bird, S. (2009). *Closing the Achievement Gap: How to Pinpoint Student Strengths to Differentiate Instruction and Help Your Striving Readers Succeed*. New York, NY: Scholastic.
- Boyles, N. (2018) *Reading, Writing, and Rigor: Helping Students Achieve Greater Depth of Knowledge in Literacy*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Brinkerhoff, E.H., & Roehrig, A.D. (2014). *No more sharpening pencils during work time and other time wasters*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Bromley, K. (2011). Best practices in teaching writing. In L.M. Morrow & L.B. Gambrell (Eds.), *Best practices in literacy instruction* (4th ed., pp. 295–318). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Brown, J. S. (2000). Growing up digital: How the Web changes work, education, and the ways people learn. *Change*, March/April, 10–20. Also accessible at USDLA Journal, 6 (2) February 2002. http://www.usdla.org/html/journal/FEB02_Issue/article01.html
- Brozo, W. Shiel, G. & Topping, K. (2008). “Engagement in Reading: Lessons Learned from Three PISA Countries.” *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 51 (4), 304-315.
- Calkins, L. (1994). *The Art of Teaching Writing*, 2nd ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Calkins, L. (2003). *Writing for Readers: Teaching Skills and Strategies*. FirstHand.
- Carrison, C., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2005). From Silence to a Whisper to Active Participation: Using Literature Circles with ELL Students. *Reading Horizons: A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 46 (2). Retrieved from https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/reading_horizons/vol46/iss2/4
- Cascio, E., Clark, D. & Gordon, N., (2008). Education and the Age Profile of Literacy into Adulthood. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, American Economic Association*, 22(3), pages 47-70.

- Celio, M. B. (2013). Seeking the magic metric: Using evidence to identify and track school system quality. In *Performance Feedback: Using Data to Improve Educator Performance* (Vol. 3, pp. 97–118). Oakland, CA: The Wing Institute.
- Chan, P. E., Graham-Day, K. J., Ressa, V. A., Peters, M. T., Konrad, M. (2014). Beyond involvement promoting student ownership of learning in classrooms. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 50, 105-113. doi:[10.1177/1053451214536039](https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451214536039)
- Chasteen, S.V., Perkins, K.K., Beale, P.D., Pollock, S.J., & Wieman, C.E. (2011). A thoughtful approach to instruction: Course transformation for the rest of us. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 40(4), 70-76.
- Cipielewski, J., & Stanovich, K.E. (1992). Predicting growth in reading ability from children's exposure to print. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 54, 74-89.
- Clay, M. M. (2013). *An observation survey of early literacy achievement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Clay, M. M. (1998). *By different paths to common outcomes*. York, Maine: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Clay, M.M. (2001). *Change over time in children's literacy development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Connor, C.M., Alberto, P.A., Compton, D.L., O'Connor, R.E. (2014). *Improving Reading Outcomes for Students with or at Risk for Reading Disabilities: A Synthesis of the Contributions from the Institute of Education Sciences Research Centers (NCSER 2014-3000)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Special Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Connor, C. M., Morrison, F. J. (2016). Individualizing student instruction in reading: Implications for policy and practice. *Policy Insights From the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3, 54-61.
- Cook-Harvey, C.M., Darling-Hammond, L., Lam, L., Mercer, C., & Roc, M. (2016). *Equity and ESSA: Leveraging Educational Opportunity Through the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute
- Cowen, C. D. (2016). *What is structured literacy?* Baltimore, MD: International Dyslexia Association. Retrieved from <https://dyslexiaida.org/what-is-structured-literacy/>
- Cox, Diane. (2005). Evidence-based interventions using home-school collaboration. *School Psychology Quarterly*. 20. 473-497. 10.1521/scpq.2005.20.4.473. Cunningham, A.E.,

- Zibulsky, J. & Callahan, M.D. *Read Writ* (2009) 22: 487. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-009-9164-z>
- Craig, S.A. (2003). The effects of an adapted interactive writing intervention on kindergarten children's phonological awareness, spelling, and early reading development. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38, 438-440.
- Culp, K. M., Honey, M., & Mandinach, E. (2005). A retrospective on twenty years of education technology policy. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 32(3), 279-307.
- Curtis, R.E. (2010). Weaving the Pieces Together: A Framework for Managing Human Capital in Schools, in R. E. Curtis and J. Wurtzel, eds., *Teaching Talent: A Visionary Framework for Human Capital in Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press: 171–196.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2008). *Powerful Learning: What We Know About Teaching for Understanding*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Cook-Harvey, C. M. (2018). *Educating the whole child: Improving school climate to support student success*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/educating-whole-child>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B. & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, DOI: [10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791](https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791)
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective Teacher Professional Development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. This report can be found online at <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-prof-dev>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Wei, R. C., Andree, A., Richardson, N. and Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional Learning in the Learning Profession: A Status Report on Teacher Development in the United States and Abroad* (Washington, DC: National Staff Development Council, 2009); Yoon, T. Duncan, S. W.-Y. Lee, B. Scarloss, and K. Shapley, *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2007).
- Daro, P., Mosher, F., & Corcoran, T. (2011). *Learning Trajectories in Mathematics: A Foundation for Standards, Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction*. Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

- Davis, V. (2014, January 9). True grit: The best measure of success and how to teach it. *Edutopia*. Retrieved from <http://www.edutopia.org/blog/true-grit-measureteach-success-vicki-davis>
- DeFord, D.E., Lyons, C.A., & Pinnell, G.S. (1991). *Bridges to literacy: Learning from Reading Recovery*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Deignan, Tim (2009) Enquiry-Based Learning: perspectives on practice, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14:1, 13-28, DOI: 10.1080/13562510802602467
- Denton, C. A., Vaughn, S., & Fletcher, J. M. (2003). Bringing Research-Based Practice in Reading Intervention to Scale. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 18, 201-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-5826.00075>
- Donnelly, Whitney & Roe, Christopher. (2010). Using Sentence Frames to Develop Academic Vocabulary for English Learners. *The Reading Teacher*. 64. 131-136.
- Dubinsky, J. M., Roehrig, G., & Varma, S. (2013). Infusing Neuroscience Into Teacher Professional Development. *Educational Researcher*, 42(6), 317–329 <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X13499403>
- Duckworth, A.L., Kirby, T.A., Tsukayama, E., Berstein, H., Ericsson, K.A. (2011). Deliberate practice spells success: Why grittier competitors triumph at the National Spelling Bee. *Soc Psychol Personal Sci* 2:174–181.
- Duckworth, A.L., Peterson, C., Matthews, M.D., Kelly, D.R. (2007). Grit: Perseverance and passion for long-term goals. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 92:1087–1101.
- Duckworth, A.L., Quinn, P.D. (2009). Development and validation of the short grit scale (grit-s). *J Pers Assess* 91:166–174.
- Duckworth, A.L. (2013). Grit: The power and passion of perseverance [video recording]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/angela_lee_duckworth_grit_the_power_of_passion_and_perseverance. Accessed November 10, 2019.
- Duke, N., Caughlan, S., Juzwik, M., Martin, N. (2012). *Reading and Writing Genre with Purpose in a K-8 Classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Duke, N. K., Pearson, P. D., Strachan, S. L., and Billman, A. K. (2011). Essential elements of fostering and teaching reading comprehension. In Samuels, S. J. & Farstrup, A. E. (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (4th Ed.). International Reading Association.

- Duke, N. K., Pressley, M., & Hilden, K. (2004). Difficulties with Reading Comprehension. In C. A. Stone, E. R. Silliman, B. J. Ehren, & K. Apel K. (Eds.), *Handbook of language and literacy development and disorders* (pp. 501–520). New York: Guilford.
- Duke, N.K., & Pearson, P.D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A.E. Farstrup & S.J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 205–242). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Dunleavy, J. & Milton, P. (2009). What did you do in school today? Exploring the concept of Student Engagement and its implications for Teaching and Learning in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Education Association (CEA), 1-22
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256–273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256>
- Earl, L. (2003). *Assessment as learning: Using classroom assessment to maximize student learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Eckert, L. S. (2008). Bridging the pedagogical gap: Intersections between literary and reading theories in secondary and postsecondary literacy instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52, 110-118. doi:10.1598/JAAL.52.2.2
- Edutopia (2017). *How to integrate technology*. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/technology-integration-guide-implementation>.
- Eickholdt, L. A. (2004). *Scaffolding in the writing workshop*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Georgia State University.
- El Nokali, Nermeen & Bachman, Heather & Votruba-Drzal, Elizabeth. (2010). Parent Involvement and Children’s Academic and Social Development in Elementary School. *Child development*. 81, 988-1005.
- Elley, W. B. (1991). Acquiring Literacy in a Second Language: The Effect of Book-based Programs. *Language Learning*, 41(3).
- Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 42(3), 255-284.
- Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. *Computers & Education*, 59(2), 423–435.

- ESSA (2015). Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-95 § 114 Stat. 1177 (2015-2016).
- Eunice Kennedy Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NIH, DHHS. (2010). *Developing Early Literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel (NA)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Ferguson, H. (2010, June/July). Join the flock. *Learning & Leading with Technology*, 37 (8), 12-15.
- Fien, Hank & Santoro, Lana & Baker, Scott & Park, Yonghan & Chard, David & Williams, Susanna & Haria, Priti. (2011). Enhancing Teacher Read Alouds With Small-Group Vocabulary Instruction for Students With Low Vocabulary in First-Grade Classrooms. *School Psychology Review*, 40, 307-318.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Homework and the gradual release of responsibility: Making student 'responsibility' possible. *English Journal*, 98(2), 40-45.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Releasing responsibility. *Educational Leadership*, 66(3), 32-37.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). Student and teacher perspectives on the usefulness of content literacy strategies. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47, 246-263.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2013). Collaborative conversations. *Principal Leadership*, 13(8), 57-61.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2013). Show me the proof: Requiring evidence in student responses. *Principal Leadership*, 13(7), 57-61.
- Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2012). *Text complexity: Raising rigor in reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Fishman, B., & Dede, C. (2016). Teaching and technology: New tools for new times. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 1269-1334). Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.
- Fitzgerald, J., & Shanahan, T. (2000). Reading and writing relations and their development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35(1), 39–50. doi:10.1207/S15326985EP3501_5
- Flynn, T., & King, M. (1993). *Dynamics of the writing conference: Social and cognitive interaction*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Foorman, B., Beyler, N., Borradaile, K., Coyne, M., Denton, C. A., Dimino, J., Furgeson, J., Hayes, L., Henke, J., Justice, L., Keating, B., Lewis, W., Sattar, S., Streke, A., Wagner, R., & Wissel, S. (2016). *Foundational skills to support reading for understanding in*

- kindergarten through 3rd grade (NCEE 2016-4008). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance (NCEE), Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from the NCEE website: <http://whatworks.ed.gov>.
- Fountas, I.C., and Pinnell, G.S. (2007). *The continuum of literacy learning, grades K-8: Behaviors and understandings to notice, teach, and support* Portsmouth, NH : Heinemann,
- Frand, J.L. (2000). *The Information-Age Mindset: Changes in Students and Implications for Higher Education*.
- Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2011). *Between Words: Access to Second Language Acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fresch, M.J. (2003). A national survey of spelling instruction: Investigating teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 35, 819-848
- Frey, N. and Fisher, D. (2007). "Gradual Release of Responsibility Instructional Framework." The Formative Assessment Action Plan. Alexandria, VA.
- Frey, N., & Fisher, D. (2013). *Rigorous reading: 5 access points for comprehending complex texts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Literacy.
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2002). *What is scientifically-based research on progress monitoring?* (Technical report). Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University.
- Gallagher, K. (2014). Making the most of mentor texts. *Educational Leadership*, 71(7), 28–33.
- Gallagher, K. (2006). *Teaching Adolescent Writers*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Gallagher, K. (2011). *Write Like This: Teaching Real-World Writing Through Modeling and Mentor Texts*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Garcia, A., Kelly, M., & Stamatis, K. (2018). Invisible potential: The social contexts of technology in three 9th-grade ELA classrooms. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 52(4), 404-426.
- Garcia, J., & Cohen, G. L. (2012). A social psychological perspective on educational intervention. In E. Shafir (Ed.), *Behavioral foundations of policy* (pp. 329–350). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gardiner, S. (2005). *Building Student Literacy Through Sustained Silent Reading*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Garrison, C., & Ehringhaus, M. (2007). *Formative and summative assessments in the classroom*. Westerville, OH: Association for Middle Level Education. https://www.amle.org/portals/0/pdf/articles/Formative_Assessment_Article_Aug2013.pdf
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*, Third Edition. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gibbons, P. (2009). *English Learners, Academic Literacy and Thinking: Learning in the Challenge Zone*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Glover, M. & Berry, M. (2012). *Project Possibilities for Writers, The How, What and Why of Designing Units of Study, K-5*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Goldenberg, C. (1993). Instructional conversations: Promoting comprehension through discussion. *The Reading Teacher*, 46(4), 316-326.
- Goodwin, A., Lipsky, M., & Ahn, S. (2012). Word detectives: Using units of meaning to support literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 65, 461-470.
- Goodwin, A.P., & Ahn, S. (2013). A meta-analysis of morphological interventions in English: Effects on literacy outcomes for school-age children. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, 17, 257-285.
- Graham, S. (1999). Handwriting and spelling instruction for students with learning disabilities: A review. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 22(2), 78–98.
- Graham, S., Berninger, V., Abbott, R., Abbott, S., & Whittaker, D. (1997). The role of mechanics in the composing of elementary school students: A new methodological approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(1), 170–182
- Graham, S., Bollinger, A., Booth Olson, C., D’Aoust, C., MacArthur, C., McCutchen, D., & Olinghouse, N. (2012). *Teaching elementary school students to be effective writers: A practice guide (NCEE 2012- 4058)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and
- Graham, S., Harris, K., & Fink-Chorzempa, B. (2002). Contribution of spelling instruction to the spelling, writing, and reading of poor spellers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(4), 669–686.
- Graham, S., Morphy, P., Harris, K. R., FinkChorzempa, B., Saddler, B., Moran, S., & Mason, L. (2008). Teaching spelling in the primary grades: A national survey of instructional practices and adaptations. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45, 796–825.

- Graham, S., Mckeown, D., Kiuahara, S. & Harris, K. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of Writing Instruction for Students in the Elementary Grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104 (4).
- Gravois, T. & Gickling, E. (2008). Best practices in instructional assessment. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (pp. 505-508). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Greenhill, V., & Petroff, S. (2010). 21st century knowledge and skills in educator preparation. *Education* (p. 30). Retrieved from <http://www.p21.org>
- Guthrie, J.T. and Humenick, N. M. (2004). Motivating students to read: Evidence for classroom practices that increase reading motivation and achievement. In P. McCardle & V. Charbra (Eds.) *The Voice of Evidence in Reading Research*. Baltimore, MD: Brookes, Inc.
- Guthrie, J.T., Klauda, S. L. and Ho, A.N. (2013). Modeling the relationships among reading instruction, motivation, engagement, and achievement for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 48(1) 9-26.
- Guthrie, J.T., McRae, A., & Klauda, S.L. (2007). Contributions of Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction to knowledge about interventions for motivations in reading. *Educational Psychologist*, 42, 237-250.
- Guthrie, J.T., Hoa, L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M. and Littles, E. 2007. Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32, 282–313.
- Hall, A.H., Toland, M.D., Grisham-Brown, J., & Graham, S. (2014). Exploring interactive writing as an effective practice for increasing Head Start students’ alphabet knowledge skills. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 42, 423-430.
- Hall, N. (1987). *The emergence of literacy*, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>.
- Harlen, W. (2005). Teachers’ summative practices and assessment for learning—tensions and synergies. *The Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 207–223.

- Harlen, W., & James, M. (1997). Assessment and learning: Differences and relationships between formative and summative assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 4(3), 365–379.
- Harste, J.C., & Short, K.G. (1988). *Creating classrooms for authors: The reading–writing connection*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Harvey, S. and Goudvis, A. (2007) *Strategies That Work* 2nd ED. Portland ME: Stenhouse
- Hattie, J. (2008). *Visible Learning*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Henderson, A.T., and Berla, N. (1995). *A New Generation of Evidence: The Family Is Critical to Student Achievement*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education, 14–16.
- Herman, J. L., Osmundson, E., & Dietel, R. (2010). Benchmark assessments for improved learning (AACC Policy Brief). Los Angeles, CA: University of California.
- Hertz, M., & Heydenberk, W. (1997). A kindergarten writing workshop: How kindergarten students grow as writers. *Reading Horizons*, 37(3), 3.
- Hogan, T. P., Adlof, S. M., & Alonzo, C. N. (2014). On the importance of listening comprehension. *International journal of speech-language pathology*, 16(3), 199–207.
- Hughes, J., & Kwok, O. (2007). Influence of student-teacher and parent-teacher relationships on lower achieving readers' engagement and achievement in the primary grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(1), 39-51.
- Jacob, B. A. and Ryan, J. (2018). *How Life Outside of a School Affects Student Performance in School* Brookings Institution. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/research/how-life-outside-of-a-school-affects-student-performance-in-school/>
- Jenkins, H. (2006, October 19). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century* [White paper]. Retrieved from the MacArthur Foundation website: www.macfound.org
- Jennings, Patricia & Greenberg, Mark. (2009). *The Prosocial Classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to child and classroom outcomes..* Review of Educational Research. 491.
- Jiménez, R. (2014). *Teaching English Language Learners*. Los Angeles, CA.: Annenberg Learner. Retrieved from: <http://learner.org/workshops/teachreading35/session6/resources.html>
- Johnson, D. D., & Johnson, B. (2005). *High stakes: Poverty, testing, and failure in American Schools* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Johnston, P.H. (2004). *Choice words: How our language affects children's learning*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Jones, B. F., Rasmussen, C. M., & Moffitt, M. C. (1997). *Real-life problem solving: A collaborative approach to interdisciplinary learning*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association
- Jones, C. (2010) "Interdisciplinary Approach - Advantages, Disadvantages, and the Future Benefits of Interdisciplinary Studies," *ESSAI*: Vol. 7, Article 26.
- Kelley, M. and Clausen-Grace, N. (2006). R5: The sustained silent reading makeover that transformed readers. *The Reading Teacher*, 60(2), 148-156.
- Kelley, M., & Clausen-Grace, N. (2007). *Comprehension shouldn't be silent: From strategy instruction to student independence*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Kenziora, K., & Yoder, N. (2016). When Districts Support and Integrate Social and Emotional Learning (SEL): Findings from an Ongoing Evaluation of Districtwide Implementation of SEL.
- Kinsella, K. (2005, October). Preparing for effective vocabulary instruction. Aiming high [Aspirando a lo major] resource, 1–8. Retrieved June 9, 2010, from www.scoe.org/docs/ah/AH_kinsella1.pdf
- Kirkland, Lynn & Patterson, Janice. (2005). Developing Oral Language in Primary Classrooms. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32, 391-395.
- Koshik, I. (2002). Designedly incomplete utterances: A pedagogical practice for eliciting knowledge displays in error correction sequences. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 35 (3), 277-309.
- Koutsoftas, A.D. (2013). School-Age Language Development: Application of the Five Domains of Language across Four Modalities.
- Krashen, S. (2004). *The Power of Reading: Insights from the Research* (2nd Ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Kuhn, Melanie. (2004). Helping Students Become Accurate, Expressive Readers: Fluency Instruction for Small Groups. *Reading Teacher - READ TEACH*. 58. 338-344. 10.1598/RT.58.4.3.
- Langer, J. (2002). *Effective Literacy Instruction: Building Successful Reading and Writing Programs*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Lattimer, H. (2003). *Thinking Through Genre: Units of Study in Reading and Writing Workshops* 4–12. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers.
- Lee Rainie and Janna Anderson. “The Future of Jobs and Jobs Training.” Pew Research Center, May 2017. Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2017/05/03/the-future-of-jobs-and-jobs-training/>
- Lou, Y., Abrami, P. C., Spence, J. C., Poulsen, C., Chambers, B., & d'Appolonia, S. (1996). Within-class grouping: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), 423–458.
- Lucas, G.M., Gratch, J., Cheng, L., Marsella, S. (2015). When the going gets tough: Grit predicts costly perseverance. *J Res Pers* 59:15–22.
- Lust C. A., & Donica D. K. (2011). Effectiveness of a handwriting readiness program in Head Start: A two-group controlled trial. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 65, 560–568. <https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2011.000612>
- Lyon, G.R. (1995). Towards a definition of dyslexia. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 45, 3-27.
- Lyon, G.R., Shaywitz, S.E., & Shaywitz, B.A. (2003). Defining dyslexia, comorbidity, teachers' knowledge of language and reading. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 53, 1-14.
- Mabrito, M. (2006). A study of synchronous versus asynchronous collaboration in an online business writing class. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 20(2). 93-107.
- Marcia Linn (2003) Technology and science education: Starting points, research programs, and trends, *International Journal of Science Education*, 25:6, 727-758, DOI: 10.1080/095006903051
- Marchetti, A. & O'Dell, R. (2015) *Writing with Mentors: How to Reach Every Writer in the Room Using Current, Engaging Mentor Texts*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman
- Martinez, D. (2001). The experience and impact of writing conferences on selected English learners in a Puerto Rican University. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- Marzano, R. J. (2010). *Teaching basic and advanced vocabulary: A framework for direct instruction*. Boston, MA: Heinle.
- McConnaughey, J. W., Sloan, T., & Nila, C. A. (1995). Falling through the net: A survey of the “have nots” in rural and urban America. National Telecommunications and Information Administration, Department of Commerce.

- McCoy, J. D., and Ketterlin-Geller, L. R. (2004). Rethinking instructional delivery for diverse student populations. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 40(2), 88-95.
- McIver, M. C., & Wolf, S. A. (1999). The power of the conference is the power of suggestion. *Language Arts*, 77 (1), 54-61.
- McNeill, B., & Kirk, C. (2013). Theoretical beliefs and instructional practices used for teaching spelling in elementary classrooms. *Reading and Writing*, 27, 535- 554.
- McTighe, J., O'Connor, K. (2005). Seven practices for effective learning. *Educational Leadership*, 63, 10–17.
- Meyer, L. (2015). Report: Teacher-Controlled Video Observations Improve Teacher Assessment Process. *The Journal*. Retrieved from <https://thejournal.com/articles/2015/10/07/report-teacher-controlled-video-observations-improve-teacher-assessment-process.aspx>
- Montgomery, D. (2012). The Contribution of Handwriting and Spelling Remediation to Overcoming Dyslexia, *Dyslexia - A Comprehensive and International Approach*, Taeko N. Wydell and Liory Fern-Pollak, IntechOpen, DOI: 10.5772/30994. Available from: <https://www.intechopen.com/books/dyslexia-a-comprehensive-and-international-approach/the-contribution-of-handwriting-and-spelling-remediation-to-overcoming-dyslexia>
- Mulroy, H., and Eddinger, K. (2003). Differentiation and literacy. Paper presented at the Institute on Inclusive Education, Rochester.
- Murnane, Richard & Sawhill, Isabel & Snow, Catherine. (2012). Literacy Challenges for the Twenty-First Century: Introducing the Issue. *The Future of children / Center for the Future of Children, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation*. 22. 3-15. 10.2307/23317408.
- Murray, M. C., & Pérez, J. (2015). Informing and performing: A study comparing adaptive learning to traditional learning. *Informing Science: the International Journal of an Emerging Transdiscipline*, 18, 111-125. Retrieved from <http://www.inform.nu/Articles/Vol18/ISJv18p111-125Murray1572.pdf>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *The Health Literacy of America's Adults: Results from the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2013). *Formative Assessment That Truly Informs Instruction*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2018). National Elementary and Secondary Enrollment Projection Model, 1972 through 2028. See *Digest of Education Statistics 2018*
- National Coalition for Parent Involvement in education. (2006). *Research Review and Resources*. Retrieved September 16, 2011, from www.ncpie.org/WhatsHappening/researchJanuary2006.cfm.
- National Council for Adult Learning. "Adult Education Facts That Demand Priority Attention." Fact sheet. NCLA America. New York, NY. 12/5/15. Web.
- National Early Literacy Panel. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel: Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction: Reports of the subgroups (NIH publication No. 00-4754). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel--Teaching Children to Read: An Evidence-Based Assessment of the Scientific Research Literature on Reading and Its Implications for Reading Instruction*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- National Research Council. (1998). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/6023>
- National Research Council. (2001). *Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/10019>.
- NCTE Executive Committee (2013). Formative assessment that truly informs instruction. Retrieved November 23, 2019, from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Positions/formative-asse...>
- Newkirk, T. (2011). *The Art of Slow Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Newkirk, T., & Kittle, P. (Eds.). (2013). *Children Want to Write: Donald Graves and the Revolution in Children's Writing*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Nystrand, M. (2006). Research on the Role of Classroom Discourse as It Affects Reading Comprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(4), 392-412. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/40171709
- OECD (2012). Equity and Quality in Education: Supporting Disadvantaged Students and Schools, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264130852-en>
- OECD/CERI. (2005). *Formative assessment: Improving learning in secondary classrooms*. Paris: CERI/OECD.
- Olmstead, C. (2013). Using Technology to Increase Parent Involvement in Schools. *TechTrends*, 57(6), 28-37.
- Osterman, K. (2000). Students' Need for Belonging in the School Community. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(3), 323-367. Retrieved January 29, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/1170786
- Pappano, L. (2013). Grit and the New Character Education. *Harvard Education Letter*, 29, 1-3.
- Parrett, W. & Budge, K. (2012). Turning high-poverty schools into high-performing schools. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Passey D. (2001). Developing home-school links: Implications for learners, learning, and learning support. In: Taylor H, Hogenbirk P. (eds) Information and communication technologies in education: the school of the future. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers;
- Pastore, A. L., and Maguire, K., Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, 2001, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ 196438, 2002
- Pearson, P.D. (1990). Foreword. In T. Shanahan (Ed.), Reading and writing together: New perspectives for the classroom (pp. v–vi). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Pearson, P. D. and Gallagher, M. C. (1983). “The Instruction of Reading Comprehension,” *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8, pp. 317-344.
- Pedulla, J. J., Abrams, L. M., Madaus, G. F., Russell, M. K., Ramos, M. A., & Miao, J. (2003). Perceived effects of state-mandated testing programs on teaching and learning: Findings from a national survey of teachers. Chestnut Hill, MA: National Board on Educational Testing and Public Policy.
- Perkins-Gough, D. (2013). The significance of grit: A conversation with Angela Lee Duckworth. *Educational Leadership*, 71(1), 14-20.

- Piaget, J., & Cook, M. T. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. New York, NY: International University Press.
- Pilgreen, J. L. (2000). *The SSR Handbook: How to Organize and Manage a Sustained Silent Reading Program*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.
- Podolsky, A., Kini, T., Bishop, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2016). *Solving the Teacher Shortage: How to Attract and Retain Excellent Educators*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/solving-teachershortage>
- Polloway, E. A., Cronin, M. E., & Patton, J. R. (1986). The efficacy of group versus one-to-one instruction: A review. *Remedial and Special Education*, 7(1), 22-30.
- Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants (web article). Retrieved from: <http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf>
- PTA. (2000). *Building Successful Partnerships: A Guide for Developing Parent and Family Involvement Programs*. Bloomington, Indiana: National Education Service, 11–12.
- Rasinski, T. (2004). Creating Fluent Readers. *Educational Leadership*, 61(6), 46-51.
- Rasinski, T. (2006). Reading Fluency Instruction: Moving Beyond Accuracy, Automaticity, and Prosody. *Reading Teacher - READ TEACH*. 59. 704-706. 10.1598/RT.59.7.10.
- Reeves, D. (2007). *Ahead of the curve: The power of assessment to transform teaching and learning*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications_reviews.aspx#pubsearch.
- Reich, G. A., Sevim, V., & Turner, A. B. (2015). Academic rigor for all: A research report. *Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium*. Retrieved from <http://www.merc.soe.vcu.edu/academic-rigor-for-all-a-research-report/>.
- Reis, S. M., Gubbins, E. J., Briggs, C., Schreiber, F. R., Richards, S., Jacobs, J., Renzulli, J. S. (2004). Reading instruction for talented readers: Case studies documenting few opportunities for continuous progress. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48, 309-338. doi:10.1177/001698620404800406
- Reutzel, D. R., Petscher, Y., and Spichtig, A. (2012). Exploring the valued added of a guided, silent reading intervention: effects on struggling third-grade readers' achievement. *The Journal of Education Research*, 105, 404-415.

- Rose, T. (2016). *The End of Average: How We Succeed in a World That Values Sameness*. San Francisco, CA: HarperOne.
- Roth, K., & Guinee, K. (2011). Ten minutes a day: The impact of interactive writing instruction on first graders' independent writing. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 11*, 331-361.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *TESOL Quarterly, 18* (2): 199–219.
- Schechtman, N., DeBarger, A. H., Dornsife, C., Rosier, S., Yarnall, L. (2013). Promoting grit, tenacity, and perseverance: Critical factors for success in the 21st century. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Education Technology. Retrieved from <http://pgbovine.net/OET-Draft-Grit-Report-2-17-13.pdf>
- Schunk, D. H., Pintrich, P.R. & Meece, J.L. (2008). *Motivation in Education: Theory, Research, and Applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Shanahan, T. (1980). The impact of writing instruction on learning to read. *Reading World, 19*(4), 357–368.
- Shaywitz, B.A., Shaywitz, S.E., Blachman, B.A., Pugh, K.R., Fulbright, R.K., Skudlarski, P., et al. (2004). Development of left occipitotemporal systems for skilled reading in children after a phonologically-based intervention. *Biological Psychiatry, 55*, 926-933.
- Smith, C. B. (2000). Writing instruction: Changing views over the years. *ERIC Digest, 155*. Retrieved September 11, 2019, from the ERIC database.
- Snow, C.E., Burns, M.S. & Griffin, P. (1998). Preventing reading difficulties in young children. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Snowling, M. J. (2000). *Dyslexia, 2nd Ed.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Snowling, M.J., Stackhouse, J. & Rack, J. (1986). Phonological dyslexia and dysgraphia: A developmental analysis. *Cognitive Neuropsychology, 3*, 309-39.
- Sonoma County Office of Education. (2006, January). Providing language instruction. Aiming high [Aspirando a lo major] resource, 1–8. Retrieved October 15, 2009, from www.scoe.org/docs/ah/AH_dutro.pdf
- Spear-Swerling, L. (2019). Structured literacy and typical literacy practices: Understanding differences to create instructional opportunities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 51*, 201–211. doi:10.1177/0040059917750160

- Sulzby, E., & Teale, W. (1991). Emergent literacy. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 727-757). New York: Longman.
- Sztabnik, B. (May, 2015). *A New Definition of Rigor*. Retrieved from: <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/a-new-definition-of-rigor-brian-sztabnik>
- Thomas, J. W. & Mergendoller, J. R. (2000). Managing project-based learning: Principles from the field. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Thomas, P. L. (2000). The struggle itself: Teaching writing as we know we should. *English Journal*, 90, 1, 39-45. Retrieved September 11, 2019, from the ProQuest database.
- Tierney, R.J., & Pearson, P.D. (1983). Toward a composing model of reading. *Language Arts*, 60(5), 568–580.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2004c). Sharing responsibility for differentiating instruction. *Roeper Review*, 26(4), 188-200.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2005). Grading and differentiation: Paradox or good practice? *Theory into Practice*, 44(3), 262-269.
- Tomlinson, C.A. (2017). *How to Differentiate Instruction in Academically Diverse Classrooms*, 3rd Edition. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Tompkins, G. E. (1990). *Teaching writing: Balancing process and product*. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Torgesen, J.K. (1999). Phonologically based reading disabilities: Toward a coherent theory of one kind of learning disability. In R.J. Sternberg & L. Spear-Swerling (Eds.), *Perspectives on Learning Disabilities*. (pp. 231-262). New Haven: Westview Press.
- Torgesen, J.K. (2002). The prevention of reading difficulties. *Journal of School Psychology*, 40, 7-26.
- Torgesen, J.K. (2006). Recent Discoveries from Research on Remedial Interventions for Children with Dyslexia. In M. Snowling and C. Hulme (Eds.). *The Science of Reading: A Handbook*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

- Torgesen, J.K., Rashotte, C.A., & Alexander, A. (2001). Principles of fluency instruction in reading: Relationships with established empirical outcomes. In M. Wolf (Ed.), *Dyslexia, fluency, and the brain*. Timonium, MD: York.
- Tough, P. (2012). *How children succeed: Grit, curiosity, and the hidden power of character*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Trotter, Y. D. (2006). Adult learning theories: Impacting professional development programs. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 72(2), 8.
- Trujillo, G., Tanner, K.D. (2014). Considering the role of affect in learning: monitoring students' self-efficacy, sense of belonging, and science identity. *CBE Life Sci Educ* 13: 6 –15. doi:10.1187/cbe.13-12-0241.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2018, December 11). *Classrooms More Racially and Ethnically Diverse* (Report No. CB18-192). Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2018/school-enrollment.html>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Career-long learning networks*. *National Education Technology Plan*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/technology/netp-2010/career-long-learning-networks>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2013). *For Each and Every Child—A Strategy for Education Equity and Excellence*, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Common Core of Data (CCD) (2018). *Local Education Agency Universe Survey, 2016–17. Digest of Education Statistics*.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *The Condition of Education 2005* (NCES 2005–094). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2017). *Reimagining the Role of Technology in Education: 2017 National Education Technology Plan Update*. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <https://tech.ed.gov/files/2017/01/NETP17.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *Reimagining the role of technology in education: 2017 National Education Technology Plan update*. Retrieved from <https://tech.ed.gov/teacherprep/>

- UNESCO. (2011). *Policy Brief Digital natives: How do they Learn? How to Teach Them?* IITE VA:ASCD. Retrieved from https://pdo.ascd.org/lmscourses/pd13oc005/media/formativeassessmentandccswithelaliteracymod_3-reading3.pdf
- Valadez, J. R., & Durán, R. P. (2007). Redefining the digital divide: Beyond access to computers and the Internet. *The High School Journal*, 90(3), 31-44.
- Van Roekel, N. P. D. (2008). *Technology in schools: The ongoing challenge of access, adequacy and equity*. National Education Association, Washington DC. Retrieved from http://www-infocris.isea.org/assets/docs/PB19_Technology08.pdf
- Varlas, L. (2009). Highly effective teachers: Defining, rewarding, supporting, and expanding their roles. *ASCD InfoBrief*, 15(3).
- Vaughn, S., & Linan-Thompson, S. (2003). Group sizes and time allotted to intervention: Effects for students with reading difficulties. In B. Foorman (Ed.), *Preventing and remediating reading difficulties: Bringing science to scale*. Baltimore, MD: York Press.
- Vaughn, S., Gersten, R., & Chard, D. J. (2000). The underlying message in LD intervention research: Findings from research syntheses. *Exceptional Children*, 67, 99–114.
- Vaughn, S., Hughes, M. T., Moody, S. W., & Elbaum, B. (2001). Instructional grouping for reading for students with LD: Implications for practice. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 36(3), 131–137.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Warschauer, M. (2012). The digital divide and social inclusion. *Americas Quarterly*, 6(2), 131.
- Wells, A., Fox, L. & Diana Cordova-Cobo, D. (2016). How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students. *The Education Digest*, 82.1: 17
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a sociocultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, L. L. (2009). *Benchmark testing and success on the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills: A correlational analysis* (Doctorate dissertation, Publication No. AAT 3353754). Phoenix, AZ: University of Phoenix. Retrieved from: <http://gradworks.umi.com/33/53/3353754.html>

- Willms, J. D., Friesen, S. & Milton, P. (2009). What did you do in school today? Transforming classrooms through social, academic and intellectual engagement. (First National Report) Toronto: Canadian Education Association.
- Wolf, Merel & Muijselaar, Marloes & Boonstra, A. & Bree, Elise. (2018). The relationship between reading and listening comprehension: shared and modality-specific components. *Reading and Writing, 32*. 1747–1767. 10.1007/s11145-018-9924-8.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J.S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*.
- Wood, G. H., Darling-Hammond, L., Neil, M., & Roschewski, P. (2007). Refocusing Accountability: Using Local Performance Assessments to Enhance Teaching and Learning for Higher Order Skills. Amesville, Ohio: Forum for Education and Democracy.
- Worthy, J., & Roser, N. (2010). “Productive Sustained Reading in a Bilingual Class.” In Hiebert, E., & Reutzel, R., (Eds.). *Revisiting Silent Reading: New Directions for Teachers and Researchers*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Xu, Min & David, Jeanne & Kim, Suk. (2018). The Fourth Industrial Revolution: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Financial Research, 9*. 90. 10.5430/ijfr.v9n2p90.
- Yeager, D. S., & Dweck, C. S. (2012). Mindsets that promote resilience: When students believe that personal characteristics can be developed. *Educational Psychologist, 47*(4), 302-314.
- Yeager, D. S., & Walton, G. M. (2011). Social-psychological interventions in education: They’re not magic. *Review of Educational Research, 81*, 267–301.
- Young, R. F., & Miller, E. R. (2004). Learning as changing participation: Discourse roles in ESL writing conference. *The Modern Language Journal, 88* (4), 519-535.
-



Get a Better View

To learn more about *myView Literacy*, please visit
[Savvas.com/myViewLiteracy](https://www.savvas.com/myViewLiteracy)

SAVVAS
LEARNING COMPANY


[Savvas.com](https://www.savvas.com)
800-848-9500

Copyright © 2020 Savvas Learning Company LLC All Rights Reserved.
Savvas™ and Savvas Learning Company™ are the exclusive trademarks
of Savvas Learning Company LLC in the US and in other countries.

Join the Conversation
@SavvasLearning



Get Fresh Ideas for Teaching

 [Blog.Savvas.com](https://www.blog.savvas.com)