Literacy in the Content Areas Parts I and II

Secondary Content Areas (7-12), Content and Special Education (PreK-12)

Table of Contents

Introduction

Teaching Reading in the Content Areas: Part I and Part II course content guidelines were adopted for use in July 1999. Although the reading courses required for early childhood and elementary certification were revised in conjunction with the 2003 U.S. Department of Education Reading First grant award to the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE), the courses required for individuals seeking initial certification or certification renewal in the secondary or PreK-12 areas of teaching have not been reviewed or revised since 1999.

In February 2014, after soliciting recommended participants from two and four-year colleges and universities, local school systems, and alternative preparation programs, the MSDE, Division of Educator Effectiveness (DEE), convened a work group of experts in the field of secondary content literacy to revise these courses to align with the current PreK-12 content standards as well as to assure currency of the research guiding them. The members of the work group are listed on the next page. The work group was co-facilitated by the Program Approval and Assessment and Certification Branches of DEE.

MSDE takes this opportunity to wholeheartedly thank the members of this group of experts for the two years of diligent work to complete this revision. They traveled often great distances, put in long hours in meetings, and continued to contribute professional expertise and experience throughout the process. The outcomes serve as witness to the deep collaboration between MSDE and its education partners in Maryland.

The Reading Work Group made the following recommendations which were approved by the Maryland State Superintendent in Spring 2016:

1. That the first of two revised courses, the first being entitled *Literacy in the Content Area Part I,* be required by authority of the *Institutional Performance Criteria Based on the Redesign of Teacher Education* at the point of program completion leading to certification for secondary content areas, special education, or PreK-12 content areas;
2. That six hours of reading instruction, those six hours defined as *Literacy in the Content Area Part I* and *Literacy in the Content Area Part II,* be required at the point of the first certificate renewal as currently in place by authority of COMAR 13A.12.01.11 (if a Maryland Approved Program or a Maryland Approved Alternative Preparation Program completer were to earn initial certification, *Literacy in the Content Area Part I* will have already been completed);
3. That the frameworks of *Literacy in the Content Area Part I* and *Literacy in the Content Area Part II* and their associated rubrics be adopted as required for use in course development for any courses designed to fulfill the requirements of COMAR 13A.12.01.11;
4. That entities developing the courses *Literacy in the Content Area Part I* and *Literacy in the Content Area Part II* could begin to submit those courses to the Maryland State Department of Education, Division of Educator Effectiveness, beginning January 1, 2017;
5. That *Reading in the Content Area Parts I and II* will cease to fulfill the requirements of COMAR 13A.12.01.11 as of July 1, 2020;
6. That relevant regulation(s) other than COMAR 13A.12.01.11, including those pertaining to reading and/or literacy coursework presented to the State by those seeking certification through transcript analysis or interstate reciprocity or through any other means, be examined for alignment to significant and unique components of *Literacy in the Content Area Part I* and *Literacy in the Content Area Part II.*

Reading Work Group
February 2014 - April 2016

Peter Afflerbach, Ph.D. Professor Teaching, Learning, and Professional Leadership University of Maryland	**Sheila Allen, Ph.D.** Professor of Reading and Teacher Education Harford Community College
Katryna Andrusik, Ph.D. Urban Teachers Baltimore, Maryland	**Teri Floyd-Brumm, M.Ed.** Department of English Chesapeake College
Audra H. Butler TEACH Institute Anne Arundel Community College	**Sharon A. Craig, Ph.D.** Professor Department of Education McDaniel College
Linda M. Forrest, M.Ed. Reading Specialist Charles County Public Schools	**Cynthia Ghent, Ph.D.** Assistant Professor Department of Biological Sciences Towson University
Simone Gibson, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Teacher Education and Professional Development Morgan State University	**Gayle Glick** President State of Maryland International Reading Association Council (SoMIRAC)
Evelyn R. Jones Lecturer, Special Education University of Maryland Eastern Shore	**Katherine Lauritzen** Instructor Goucher College
Mark A. Lewis, Ph.D. Assistant Professor of Literacy Education School of Education Loyola University Maryland	**Maggie Madden, Ph.D.** Program Approval Specialist Program Approval and Assessment Branch Division of Educator Effectiveness Maryland State Department of Education
Barbara A. Marinak, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Reading Department Chair Mount St. Mary's University	**David M. Maylish** Assistant Professor of Education The Community College of Baltimore County
Montana McCormick, Ph.D. Associate Professor, Department of Secondary Education Towson University	**Donna Michel** Master Adjunct Professor Department of Education Howard Community College
Debra A. Miller, Ph.D. Professor of Education Coordinator of Reading Specialist Program McDaniel College	**Emily Milleson, Ed.D.** Assistant Professor Department of Educational Professions Frostburg State University
Stephanie Fisher Mills Professor of Education Carroll Community College	**Zeleana Sarah Morris** Howard County Public School System

Jody Nichols, Ed.D.	Virginia Pilato, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor Educational Professions Department Frostburg State University	Vice Dean, Department of Education University of Maryland University College
Alan Reese Professor, English Department Towson University	Amber H. Rust, Ph.D. Associate Professor Mathematics Department Anne Arundel Community College
Zeporia Smith, M.A. Coordinator, Education Department Montgomery College	Sandy Spitzer, Ph.D. Department of Mathematics Towson University
Deanna Reinard Stock, Ed.D. Professor, Teacher Education Chesapeake College	Diane Switlick Professor, School of Education Montgomery College
Jade Wexler, Ph.D. Assistant Professor Department of Counseling, Higher Education, And Special Education University of Maryland	Allan Wigfield, Ph.D. Professor Developmental Science Program & Educational Psychology Specialization University of Maryland College Park

MSDE WORK GROUP FACILITATORS:

Literacy in the Content Areas Parts I and II

Framework   The following framework is to be used by course developers in rewriting *Reading in the Content Areas Parts I* and *II* to meet the newly-designed Standards for the now-titled courses *Literacy in the Content Areas Parts I* and *II*.

Focused Design/Flexible Implementation   Course developers will see that the standards are written to be consistently applied across the two courses, with the content of Part I heavily concentrated on theory and Part II on the implementation of that theory in practice. **There is no expectation that all elements in each standard must be evident in the course design.** The Reading Work Group and MSDE agree that there should be a reasonable level of flexibility on the part of course developers in the work of meeting the standards, and that the exercise of professional judgement informed by widely-accepted research and proven best practice should guide that development.   It should be noted, however, that a central theme of the revision is assuring that **all secondary teachers acquire the skills and dispositions necessary to teach all students in all classes,** with particular attention to all elements of diversity in the student population. Reviewers of course submissions will look for deep and concentrated instruction related to literacy proficiency for the non-native English speaker as well as for students with exceptionalities at both ends of the educational spectrum. Developers must also note the emphasis on global and digital literacy and their prominence in a well-written course.

Design for Multiple Needs
The framework considers that some providers will continue to offer both literacy courses as part of an educator preparation program, while others will develop courses designed to be delivered as stand-alone offerings.   Consequently, the Reading Work Group did not assume that all who complete *Literacy in the Content Area Part II* will be practicing teachers. With that in mind, developers will need to design activities that simulate actual classroom implementation of theory as faithfully as possible where actual classroom settings are unavailable to the student.

Course Structure   Begin the submission with the following chart explaining the organizational structure of courses, the delivery method (online, face-to-face, hybrid), the number of credit hours, the placement of the course(s), including the sequence of the course within the program or department, if this is a program offering. Add rows as needed.

Name of Institution of Higher Education, Local School System, or Other Entity submitting the course				
Course	Delivery method(s)	Credit hours	Placement in program or sequence	Other contextual factors

Content in Context Course content should be based on currently accepted best-practice research, unless a particular work, not necessarily contemporary, is considered by the reading/literacy community to be seminal content work. Courses should reflect the descriptors that are presented in the frameworks through submissions with multiple measures that can be addressed by reviewers as holistic representations of descriptors, and thus, the standards. Multiple experiences must include application of the course material with diverse student populations such as, but not limited to, practice with classroom students, case studies, data analyses, field experiences, peer teaching, video analyses, small group work, unit and lesson planning, and multi-genre/multimodal lesson development and implementation. Courses should be specifically and intentionally aligned with current state PreK-12 student standards. Although it is not necessary to include the rubric in the development of courses, the rubric might be a guide in aligning syllabi, course materials, outcomes, assessments, etc.

Rubric   **Literacy in the Content Areas: Part I and II**
Rubric of Overall Findings

Standards	Organizing Principle	Findings		Comments
		Met	Unmet	Identifies the strengths and/or areas for required revisions.
I. The Learner and Learning	Learner Development			
	Learning Differences			
	Learning Environments			

Standard I Met _____
- Evidence suggests that content is clearly in place.
- Evidence suggests that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- Evidence suggests that material is assessed using multiple measures.
-

Standard I Not Met _____
- There is no or very little evidence that content in place.
- There is no or very little evidence that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- There is no or very little evidence that multiple measures are being used to assess student learning.

Standards	Organizing Principle	Findings		Comments
		Met	Unmet	Identifies the strengths and/or areas for required revisions.
II. Content Knowledge	**Content Knowledge**			
	Application of Content			

Standard II Met _____
- Evidence suggests that content is clearly in place.
- Evidence suggests that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- Evidence suggests that material is assessed using multiple measures.

Standard II Not Met _____
- There is no or very little evidence that content in place.
- There is no or very little evidence that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- There is no or very little evidence that multiple measures are being used to assess student learning.

Standards	Organizing Principle	Findings		Comments
		Met	Unmet	Identifies the strengths and/or areas for required revisions.
III. Assessment-Instruction	Assessment			
	Short and Long Term Planning			
	Evidence Based Multimodal Instructional Practices			

Standard III Met ____
- Evidence suggests that content is clearly in place.
- Evidence suggests that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- Evidence suggests that material is assessed using multiple measures.

Standard III Not Met _____
- There is no or very little evidence that content in place.
- There is no or very little evidence that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- There is no or very little evidence that multiple measures are being used to assess student learning.

Standards	Organizing Principle	Findings		Comments
		Met	Unmet	Identifies the strengths and/or areas for required revisions.
IV. Professional Responsibility	Professional Learning and Ethical Practices			

Leadership and Collaboration			

Standard IV Met ____
- Evidence suggests that content is clearly in place.
- Evidence suggests that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- Evidence suggests that material is assessed using multiple measures.

Standard IV Not Met _____
- There is no or very little evidence that content in place.
- There is no or very little evidence that learners have multiple experiences with the material.
- There is no or very little evidence that multiple measures are being used to assess student learning.

MSDE, through the Program Approval and Assessment Branch of the Division of Educator Effectiveness, will empanel a number of peer-experts in the field to facilitate a process of blind peer review of all courses offered to fulfill the certification requirements of any area requiring these two courses. Revised coursework may be submitted at any point after January 1, 2017. All courses fulfilling this regulatory reading requirement must be revised, submitted, and approved by September 15, 2020. The currently-approved Reading in the Content Areas Parts I and II will not be accepted for certification purposes after that date. Approved courses will be listed in a revised data base available on the MSDE website, Division of Educator Effectiveness, Maryland Approved Programs.

Questions should be directed to Sarah Spross, Assistant State Superintendent, 410-767-0385 or Michelle Dunkle, 410-767-0399 or michelle.dunkle@maryland.gov.

Literacy in the Content Areas Coursework

Standard I The Learner and Learning	Content Literacy I	Content Literacy II
Learner Development		
Developmental Characteristics of Adolescent Learners Developmental aspects of literacy • Physical • Cognitive • Social • Affective/Emotional	-Define and describe the developmental characteristics of adolescent literacy learners.	
Active Independent Readers • Metacognitive theory and practice • Self-regulation • Strategic reading behaviors	-Describe and explain the characteristics of active, independent readers using appropriate theoretical orientations and practical frameworks.	- Analyze the characteristics of active, independent readers in relationship to specific content areas.
Processes of Meaning Making • Reader, text, context, task factors • Meaning construction • Critical analysis and synthesis • Transformation of Information	-Analyze the processes of constructing meaning in relationship to reader, text, contextual, and task factors.	-Interpret the processes of making meaning to critically analyze, synthesize, or transform information to specific content areas.
Motivation and Engagement • Literacy identity, self-efficacy, and agency • Motivation, interest, and choice • Collaboration and interaction patterns	-Define and distinguish motivation and engagement and identify factors impacting each in the context of literacy development.	-Identify instructional techniques to support motivation and engagement when planning content area literacy instruction.

Learning Differences		
Diverse Languages and Learners • Language as social practice • Diversity as a strength • Cultural views of literacy • Funds of knowledge • Styles and processes of communication	-Define and distinguish features of diversity that impact literacy development and learning.	-Examine and apply relevant factors of diversity to ensure inclusive content area literacy environments.
Linguistic and Cultural Differences Among Adolescent Learners • Second language/dialect • Gifted/talented • Striving/reluctant learners • Gender • Ethnicity • Socioeconomic status, conditions, influences	-Interpret linguistic and cultural differences among adolescent learners and demonstrate understanding of their effects on learning.	-Examine diverse student needs to create inclusive content area literacy environments.
Equitable Access for Learning and Achievement • Culturally responsive interaction and instruction • Inclusive learning • Closing achievement gaps		-Evaluate learner differences to plan inclusive content area literacy instruction that ensures equity and learning opportunities to close achievement gaps.
Learning Environments		
Instructional Context & Optimal Learning Environments • Characteristics of culturally relevant pedagogy • Physical and social environment of learning contexts • Curricula	-Define and describe the characteristics of a high quality learning environment.	-Construct high quality learning environments that support individual and collaborative interaction and engagement.

	Standard II Content Knowledge	Content Literacy I	Content Literacy II
	• Teacher dispositions • Grouping practices • Instructional routines • Materials and resources • Student motivation and engagement • Professional collaboration/support		
	Content Knowledge		
	Reading, Writing, and Communication Within and Across Disciplines • Curricular connections to content literacy • Literacy opportunities • Reading to learn • Writing to learn	-Describe purposes and opportunities for reading, writing, and communicating within and across content areas.	
	New Literacies • Multimodal learning and communication • Disciplinary discourse communities • Socially mediated contexts • Inquiry-based learning	-Analyze types of new literacies and their uses for acquiring content knowledge and student understandings.	-Employ new literacies for acquiring and developing content knowledge and student understandings.
	Application of Content		
	Discipline-Specific Processes of Inquiry • Authentic personal, local, and global issues • Diverse perspectives • Collaborative problem solving • Multimodal information sources for inquiry-based problem solving • Critical evaluation of multimodal sources • Selection and use of multimodal sources	-Identify and select appropriate multimodal sources and resources for inquiry.	-Evaluate and employ discipline specific processes of inquiry to engage in collaborative problem-solving and critical thinking.

Standard III Assessment-Instruction	Content Literacy I	Content Literacy II
Assessment		
Guiding Principles and Practices • Multiple methods with varied designs and response formats • Dynamic and continuous • Authentic • Reflective • Standards-based • Intentional and manageable	-Describe guiding principles and practices for content literacy assessment.	
Assessment Types and Purposes • Pre-assessment for instructional planning • Formative • Summative • Formal, high-stakes assessment tools	-Examine assessment types, tools, and purposes for content literacy assessment.	
Assessment Tools and Methods • Content benchmarks • Observation, inventories, surveys, interviews • Portfolios • Performance tasks • Student self-assessment • Descriptive rubrics and scoring tools		-Select and/or develop content-specific assessment tools -Evaluate student performance and the effectiveness of assessment tools for content-specific assessment.
Assessment of Materials and Context • Quantitative • Qualitative • Reader/text/task match	-Examine factors of text complexity in relationship to instructional materials and context.	

Data Analysis and Interpretation • Data triangulation • Interpretation and reflection • Evidence-based goals for instructional planning	-Analyze student data to inform and evaluate instructional practice.	-Synthesize multiple data points to evaluate and to refine content area instructional practice.
Short- and Long-Term Planning for Instruction		
Standards-Based Outcomes and Objectives • National professional standards • Maryland State Curriculum • Local curriculum • Evidence-based objectives • Rationale (objective-outcome alignment) **Lesson/Unit Development** • Materials/multimodal resources • Engagement/motivation • Procedures • Closure • Debriefing **Differentiation & Inclusive Instruction (e.g., UDL)** • Accommodations: ELL, special education, gifted/talented • Content • Process • Context • Product • Assessment	-Identify professional and literacy standards and curricula for lesson development. - Plan and evaluate engaging instruction that supports all learners in meeting goals and intended outcomes.	-Employ professional and literacy standards and curricula to plan, implement, and evaluate lessons and instructional units of study within content areas. -Critique effectiveness of instruction and design next steps for students and teachers.

Lesson/Unit Evaluation and Future Goals • Student growth/achievement • Teacher reflection and evaluation • Next steps for teacher and students		
Evidence-Based Multimodal Instructional Practices		

Comprehension
• Principles
• Cognitive theories
• Social constructivist theories
• Critical literacy theories
• Strategic reading/viewing/observing
• Online comprehension
• Motivation/engagement theories
• Genre-strategy match across purposes, text types and modes
• Activating prior knowledge (e.g., anticipation guides, knowledge ratings)
• Identifying text features and organizational patterns
• Predicting
• Setting purpose
• Determining importance
• Questioning
• Inferring
• Visualizing
• Summarizing
• Monitoring
• Synthesizing
• Practices
    Question/Answer Relationship
    Reciprocal teaching/Internet reciprocal teaching
    Questioning the author
	- Examine research and theoretical frameworks for comprehension.
	-Investigate evidence-based multi-modal instructional practices to develop comprehension.
		-Employ evidence-based multi-modal instructional practices to develop and evaluate comprehension within content areas.

	Think alouds
	Study Guides
	Close reading
	Annotation & Note-taking
	Formats
	Discussion
	Generating Interactions between
	Schemata and Test
	(GIST)/paraphrasing
	Mapping (e.g., concept, semantic,
	graphic representations)
	• Pedagogy
	   Gradual release
	   Guided inquiry
	   Discovery
	   Guided reading procedures (e.g.,
	   DRTA)
	• Reader Response (e.g., discussion,
	writing, student
	reflection, process drama, idea circles,
	etc.)		

	General Academic and Content-Specific Vocabulary
	• Principles
	   Word consciousness
	   Integration (into prior knowledge and
	   between concepts)
	   Levels of word knowledge
	   Multiple exposures and
	   uses across contexts
	   Word relationships
	   Digital vocabulary tools
	• Practices
	   Concept of definition mapping
	   Sematic feature analysis
		- Examine research and theoretical frameworks for vocabulary acquisition and development.
		-Investigate evidence-based multi-modal instructional practices to develop general academic and content specific vocabulary.
			-Employ evidence-based multi-modal instructional practices to develop and evaluate general academic and content specific vocabulary use.

Vocabulary self-selection Word sorts Linear array Connect-Two Visual associations Others • Pedagogy Vocabulary-comprehension relationship Multiple exposures Wide reading/viewing/observing Close reading Contextual analysis Morphemic analysis		
Writing In Content Areas • Principles Reading-writing-thinking connection Types of writing (i.e., argument, informational-explanatory, narrative) Writing process Strategic writing/multimodal representations Multimodal digital communication • Practices Writing to learn Writing to source Response journals Learning logs Double-entry journals Unsent letters Point-of-view guides Microthemes Admit/exit slips Sketch books Quick writes	- Examine theoretical frameworks and purposes for writing within specific contexts. -Investigate evidence-based multi-modal instructional practices to develop contextual writers.	-Employ evidence-based multi-modal instructional practices to develop and evaluate writing within content areas.

		Content Literacy I	Content Literacy II
	Others Digital composing (Google chat, blogs ,threaded discussions, Podcasts, multimodal online authoring tools, others) Authentic writing/representation in the discipline Research-based disciplinary discourse formats Analytic writing/representation Collaborative processes and product development • Pedagogy Disciplinary models of inquiry/research Evaluation of processes and products		
	**Standard IV** **Professional Responsibility**	**Content Literacy I**	**Content Literacy II**
**Professional Learning and Ethical Practices**
	Opportunities, Trends, and Constraints • New curriculum • Teacher/principal evaluation system • High-stakes assessment • Access to technological resources • Equity/social justice issues • Others		-Examine current trends, initiatives, and educational reform efforts as relative to content literacy.
	Professional Inquiry and Continuous Development • Professional development plan • Professional learning communities • Critical reflection and continuous self-evaluation • Professional organizations (e.g., Code of Ethics, Professional Standards)	**-**Explore professional dispositions and ethical decision-making for contemporary educators.	-Engage in critical self-reflection in order to construct a professional development plan as a content area literacy teacher.

Leadership and Collaboration		
School/Community Connections and Collaboration • Engagement in school-wide goals and policies • Effective communication with stakeholders • Family and community literacy outreach		-Investigate opportunities for collaboration with families/school/communities.
Professional Relationships Within A School Community • Mentoring relationships • Cross-curricular connections • Department, school, and system meetings • School-based personnel/resources (administrator, reading specialist, special educator, speech and language pathologist, etc.)	-Identify organizational structures and school-based resources for specific needs.	-Develop leadership capacities through actively participating in school-based opportunities for growth and development.

Resources for Course Development for Literacy in the Content Area Parts I and II

Processes
Adolf, S.M., Perfetti, C. A. & Catts, H.W. (2011). *Developmental changes in reading comprehension: Implications for assessment and instruction.* In Samuels, S.J. & Farstrup, A.E. *What research has to say about reading instruction.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
Alverman, D., Hinchman, K., Moore, D., Phelps, & Waff, D. (2006). Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives
Alvermann, D.E., Unrau, N.J., & Ruddell, R.B. (Eds). (2013). *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (Vol.978, No. 0-87712). International Reading Assoc..
Beck, I., McKeown, M., and Kucan, L. (2013). *Bringing words to life: Robust vocabulary instruction, (2nd ed.)* New York: Guilford Press.
Beers, K. (2002). When kids can't read; what teachers can do. Heinemann.
Bromley, K. (2007). Nine things every teacher should know about words and vocabulary instruction. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 50 (7), 528-537.*
Ehri, L.C. (1991). Development of the ability to read words. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds)., *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 383-417). New York: Longman
Fisher, D. & Frey, N. (2016). *Improving adolescent literacy: Content area strategies at work.* New York: Pearson.
Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York, Continuum.
Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hyams, N. (2003*). An Introduction to Language.* Boston, MA: Wadsworth
Gambrell et al. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher, 49,* 518-533. For elementary school students.
Gambrell, L., Marinak, B., Brooker, H., & McCrea-Andrews, H. J. (2011). The importance of independent reading. In Samuels, S.J. & Farstrup, A.E. *What research has to say about reading instruction.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
Gee, J. P. (2000). The new literacy studies: from 'socially situated' to the work. *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*, 180.
Giroux, H. (October 27, 2010) "Lessons From Paulo Freire", *Chronicle of Higher Education*
Graves, M.F. & Watts-Taffe, S. M. (2002). The place of word-consciousness in a research-based vocabulary program. In A.E. Farstrup & S.J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed.), pp. 140-165. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
Guthrie, J. T. (2011). Best practices in motivating students to read. In L.M. Morrow & L. Gambrell (Eds). *Best practices in literacy instruction* (4th ed., pp. 177-198). New York: Guilford Press.
Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., & Perencevich, K. C. (2005). From spark to fire: Can situational reading interest lead to long-term reading motivation?. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 45(2), 91-117.
Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & You, W. (2012). Instructional contexts for engagement and achievement in reading. In S. Christensen, A. Reschly, & C. Wylie (Eds.), Handbook *of research on student engagement.* New York: Springer Science.

Henk, W. A., Marinak, B. A., & Melnick, S. A. (2012). Measuring the reader self-perceptions of adolescents: Introducing the RSPS2. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *56*(4), 311-320.

Holmberg and Allen. 2011. Processes and Acquisition of Reading (6th edition). Pearson. This is a custom published book for Processes and Acquisition of Reading. It covers cognitive theories, a bit of socio-cultural theory, motivation, language and reading acquisition, and diverse learners, including ESL.

http://www.edutopia.org/blog/film-festival-digital-citizenship "Five-Minute Film Festival: Teaching Digital Citizenship"

Invernizzi, M. & Hayes, L. (2004). Developmental spelling research: A systematic imperative. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39 (2),* 2-6-228.

Johnson, D. (2014). *Reading, writing, and literacy 2.0: Teaching with online texts, tools, and resources, K-8.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Karchmer, R. A., Mallette, M. H., Kara-Soteriou, J., & Leu Jr, D. J. (2005). *Innovative approaches to literacy education: Using the internet to support new literacies*. Newark: International Reading Association.

Leu, D.J., Coiro, J., Castek, J., Hartman, D.K., Henry, L.A., & Reinking, D. (2008). Research on instruction and assessment in the new literacies of online reading comprehension. In C.C. Block, S. Parris, & P. Afflerbach (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices.* New York: Guilford Press.

Leu, D., O'Byrne, W., Zawilinski, L., McVerry, J., & Everett-Cacopardo, H. (2009). Expanding the new literacies conversation. *Educational Researcher. 38 (4), 264-269.*

McRae, A., & Guthrie, J.T. (2009). Promoting reasons for reading: Teacher practices that impact motivation. In E.H. Hiebert (Ed.), *Reading more, reading better* (pp. 55-76). New York: Guilford Press.

Pitcher, S. M., Albright, L. K., DeLaney, C. J., Walker, N. T., Seunarinesingh, K., Mogge, S., ... & Dunston, P. J. (2007). Assessing adolescents' motivation to read. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *50*(5), 378-396.

Pressley, M. (1990). *Cognitive strategy instruction that really improves children's academic performance*. Brookline Books.

Tatum, A. (2011). Diversity and literacy*.* In Samuels, S.J. & Farstrup, A.E. *What research has to say about reading instruction.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Tovani , C. (2000). I read it, but I don't get it: Comprehension strategies for adolescent readers: Stenhouse.

Tovani, C. (2004). Do I really have to teach reading?

Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models, 2nd ed.* New York: Guilford Press.

Vacca, R.T., Vacca, J.A. , & Mraz, M. (2014). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum.* Boston: Pearson.

Vygotsky, L.S (1978) Mind in Society: the development of higher psychological processes.
Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). Thought and Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published in 1934).

Wentzel, K.R.,Wigfield, A. (Eds.) (2009). *Handbook of motivation at school.* New York: Taylor-Francis.

Wigfield, A. (2004). *Motivating reading comprehension: Concept-oriented reading instruction*. Routledge.

Wigfield, A., Cambria, J., & Ho (2012). Motivation for reading information texts. In J. Guthrie, A. Wigfield & S. L. Klauda (Eds.),

	Adolescents' engagement in academic literacy. University of Maryland Questionnaire for middle school students.
	Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (2000). Engagement and motivation in reading. *Handbook of reading research*, *3*, 403-422.
	Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*, 420-432. (Reading motivation questionnaire for middle school students
	Wigfield, A., Guthrie, J. T., Perencevich, K., Taboada, A., Klauda, S. L., McRae, S., & Barbosa, P. (2008). The role of reading engagement in mediating the effects of instruction on reading outcomes. *Psychology in the Schools, 45*, 432-445. (Eight item measure for teachers to use to rate student engagement in reading).
	Willis, J.W. (2008). Teaching the brain to read: Strategies for improving fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. ASCD.
Foundations	
	Alvermann, D. E. (2009). Sociocultural constructions of adolescence and young people's literacies. In L. Christenbury, R. Bomer, & P. Smagorinsky, (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent literacy research* (pp. 14-28). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
	Archer, A. L. & Hughes, C.A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. New York: The Guilford Press
	Boardman, A.G., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Murray, C. S., Kosanovich, M. (2008). *Effective instruction for adolescent struggling read practice brief*. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Corporation, Center on Instruction. http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/Practice%20Brief-Struggling%20Readers1.pdf
	Brozo, W.G., & Simpson, M.L. (2007). *Content literacy for today's adolescents: Honoring diversity and building competence* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson. Buehl, D. (2011). Developing readers
	Fisher, D. (2001). Cross age tutoring: Alternatives to the reading resource room for struggling adolescent readers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 28(4), 234–240.
	Gee, J. P. (2000). The new literacy studies: from 'socially situated' to the work. *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context*, 180.
	Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools – A report Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. http://all4ed.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/10/WritingNext.pdf
	Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & Perencevich, K. (Eds.) (2004). *Motivating reading comprehension: Concept Oriented Reading Instruction.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
	Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & Klauda, S. L. (Eds.) (2012). *Adolescents' engagement in academic literacy.* University of Maryland. Can be retrieved at www.cori.umd.edu
	Heller, R., & Greenleaf, C.L. (2007). Literacy instruction in the content areas: Getting to the core of middle and high school improvement. • 14 • Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from www.all4ed.org/files/LitCon.pdf
	Hidi, S., & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four phase model of interest development. *Educational Psychologist, 41*,11-27.
	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Y00Oe-cODw Vocabulary Instruction in secondary content
	https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FPM9torQTFU Teaching Close Reading

Kamil, M. L., Borman, G. D., Dole, J., Kral, C. C., Salinger, T., and Torgesen, J. (2008). *Improving adolescent literacy: Effective classroom and intervention practices: A Practice Guide* (NCEE #2008-4027). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/adlit_pg_082608.pdf

Klingner, J.K., Vaughn. S., Boardman, A. (2007). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Margolis, H. & McCabe, P. P. (2004). Resolving struggling readers' homework difficulties: A social cognitive perspective. *Reading Psychology*, 25, 225-260.

Media Material https://vimeo.com/53536848
CLC: A Model for Whole School Secondary Literacy Instruction
Don Deschel, Kansas University

Middle School Matters http://www.bushcenter.org/education-reform/middle-school-matters

Moje, E.B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 52(2), 96–107. doi:10.1598/JAAL.52.2.1

Nystrand, M., & Duffy, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Towards a rhetoric of everyday life: New directions in research on writing, text, and discourse.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press

Orellana, M. F., Martínez, D. C., Lee, C. H., & Montaño, E. (2012). Language as a tool in diverse forms of learning. *Linguistics and Education, 23*, 373-387.

Orellana, M. F., & Reynolds, J. F. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*, 48-65.

Santa Ana, O. (2004). *Tongue-Tied: The lives of multilingual children in public education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Snider, V. E., (1989). Reading comprehension performance of adolescents with learning disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 11, 87-96.

Solis, M., Ciullo, S., Vaughn, S., Pyle, N., Hassaram, B., & Leroux, A. (2012). Reading comprehension interventions for middle school students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of 30 years of research. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 45, 327–340. doi:10.1177/0022219411402691

Tatum, A. (2011). Diversity and literacy*.* In Samuels, S.J. & Farstrup, A.E. *What research has to say about reading instruction.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

The International Reading Association*.* (2012) *Adolescent Literacy: A Position Statement of the International Reading Association*, Newark, DE: Developed by the Adolescent Literacy Committee and the Adolescent Literacy Task Force, Revised, 2012, Retrieved at http://www.reading.org/Libraries/resources/ps1079_adolescentliteracy_rev2012.pdf

Tracey, D. H. & Morrow, L. M. (2012). *Lenses on reading: An introduction to theories and models, 2nd ed.* New York: Guilford Press.

Vaughn, S., Wanzek, J., Murray, C. S., & Roberts, G. (2012). Intensive interventions for students struggling in reading and mathematics: A practice guide. Portsmouth, NH: RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.

	http://www.centeroninstruction.org/files/Intensive%20Interventions%20for%20Students%20Struggling%20in%20Reading%20%26 ath.pdf
	Wanzek, J., Vaughn, S., Scammacca, N., Metz, K., Murray, C., Roberts, G., & Danielson, L. (2013). Extensive reading interventions for older struggling readers: Implications from research. Review of Educational Research, 83, 163–195. doi:10.3102/0034654313477212
	Wilhelm, J. D., Smith, M. (2002). *Reading Don't Fix No Chevys: Literacy in the Lives of Young Men*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
Pedagogy and Assessment	
	Alvermann, D., Hinchman, K., Moore, D., Phelps, & Waff, D. (2006). Reconceptualizing the literacies in adolescents' lives Delpit, L., & Dowdy, J. K. (2002). *The skin that we speak: Thoughts on language and culture in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
	Chall, J. S. (1996). Varying approaches to readability measurement. *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, *25*(1), 23-40.
	http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/reciprocal-revision-making-peer-403.html Annotations, Cornell Notes, Reciprocal Revision
	http://www.instructionalsolutions.com/blog/bid/61880/How-To-Enable-Readability-Measures-in-Microsoft-Word-2007
	Fisher, D., Frey, N., Lapp, D., (2012)*Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association
	Gee, J.P., & Levine, M.H. (2009). Welcome to our virtual worlds. *Educational Leadership*, 66(6), 48–52. Retrieved from www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el200903_gee.pdf
	Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high schools—*A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education. Retrieved from www.all4ed.org/files/WritingNext.pdf Heller, R., & Greenleaf, C.L. (2007).
	Harvard Educational Review, 78(1), 40–59. Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C.
	http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/internalization-vocabulary-through-word-307.html
	Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2005). Toward critical media literacy: Core concepts, debates, organizations, and policy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26,* 369-386.
	Lapp, D., & Moss, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Exemplary instruction in the middle grades: Teaching that supports engagement and rigorous learning*. New York: Guilford.
	Orellana, M. F., Martínez, D. C., Lee, C. H., & Montaño, E. (2012). Language as a tool in diverse forms of learning. *Linguistics and Education, 23*, 373-387.
	Orellana, M. F., & Reynolds, J. F. (2008). Cultural modeling: Leveraging bilingual skills for school paraphrasing tasks. *Reading Research Quarterly, 43*, 48-65.
	Purdue Online Writing Lab https://owl.english.purdue.edu/ Santa Ana, O. (2004). *Tongue-Tied: The lives of multilingual children in public education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
	Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy.
	Summarizing Peer Editing http://www.readwritethink.org/classroom-resources/lesson-plans/peer-edit-with-perfection-786.html