DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 480 088 CS 512 377

AUTHOR Righeimer, Jennie M.; Voss, Cathy

TITLE Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations (1st, Naperville, Illinois, November 15, 2001).

INSTITUTION North Central Regional Educational Lab., Oak Brook, IL.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 2001-11-15

NOTE 61p.

AVAILABLE FROM North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Editorial Offices: NCREL, 1120 E. Diehl Rd., #200, Naperville, IL 60563. Tel: 800-356-2735 (Toll Free). For full text: http://www.ncrel.org/ litweb/meet2001/index.html.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Cultural Background; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; *Government School Relationship; *Literacy; Poverty; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; Special Needs Students; Teacher Education

IDENTIFIERS North Central Regional Educational Laboratory

ABSTRACT

The Center for Literacy (part of the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory) established the Regional and National Network of Research and Professional Organizations, which examines current trends in literacy research on a national level. The first meeting of the Research Network was held in 2001, and featured a panel of expert researchers whose discussion centered around topics such as early literacy, middle and high school literacy, culturally and linguistically diverse populations, special-needs learners, assessment, pre-service training for improving classroom instruction, closing the achievement gap, and high-poverty, high-performing schools. Keynote speakers discussed the current status of education issues in Washington and how to move a high-poverty, low-performing school in an urban area into a high-performing school using research-based best practices. There also were cross-states collaboration sessions centered on linking research into practice. This document presents transcripts of panel discussions, the text of a luncheon address, and the results of an afternoon session involving the framework for cross-states study teams. Appendixes contain biographies of speakers and panelists; a cross-state collaboration study team research-to-practice form; and a research to practice guiding questions form. (Contains 42 references.) (RS)

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

November 15, 2001

Table of Contents

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Introduction

About NCREL

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) is one of ten regional educational laboratories funded by the U.S. Department of Education. It is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to helping schools—and the students they serve—reach their full potential.

Since 1984, NCREL has been providing research-based resources and assistance to educators, policymakers, and communities in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Its Midwest region is home to more than 20 percent of the nation's schools, teachers, and students. The ultimate goal of NCREL is to help its clients apply proven practices to create productive schools where all students can develop their skills and abilities. NCREL draws on the latest research and best practices to strengthen and support schools and communities to achieve this goal.

Center for Literacy

The primary purpose of NCREL's Center for Literacy is to improve the reading achievement of all students by providing assistance to state education agencies, intermediate state educational units, and local school districts in defining and implementing research-based best practices in literacy. NCREL's literacy staff identifies resources, develops materials, and helps schools in improving the reading achievement of all students, and when appropriate, uses technology to support its efforts.

The Center for Literacy's scope of work proposes activities that include research, policy, and practice. These activities are designed to improve literacy and literacy instruction throughout NCREL's seven-state region. In connection with these activities, the Center for Literacy established a Regional Literacy Network to support its efforts in addressing the literacy needs and critical issues across NCREL's region. In addition, the Center for Literacy sought to broaden its scope of work by establishing the Regional and National Network of Research and Professional Organizations.

The Regional and National Network of Research and Professional Organizations

NCREL's literacy agenda includes providing leadership through collaboration with regional and national organizations in an effort to discuss the national literacy agenda and to establish a shared knowledge base. This knowledge includes research, best practices, tools, and resources for the improvement of students'

reading achievement, particularly for at-risk and special-needs students.

To implement this agenda, the Center for Literacy established the Regional and National Network of Research and Professional Organizations—referred to as the Literacy Research Network—to examine current trends in literacy research on a national level. Members of the Literacy Research Network include national and regional literacy researchers, members of NCREL's Regional Literacy Network, and the following collaborators and partners:

- International Reading Association (IRA)
- Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA)
- National Staff Development Council (NSDC)
- Great Lakes Area Regional Resource Center (GLARRC)

The Literacy Research Network has the following goals:

- Analyze and communicate current literacy research areas of concern.
- Develop strategic plans for implementing research into practice.
- Expand its capacity by incorporating the cross-states study teams of NCREL's Regional Literacy Network.

The first meeting of the Reasearch Network was held on November 15, 2001, at NCREL's facility in Naperville, Illinois. The meeting featured a panel of expert literacy researchers whose discussion centered around topics such as early literacy, middle and high school literacy, culturally and linguistically diverse populations, special-needs learners, assessment, preservice training for improving classroom instruction, closing the achievement gap, and high-poverty, high-performing schools. Keynote speakers discussed the current status of education issues in Washington and how to move a high-poverty, low-performing school in an urban area into a high-performing school using research-based best practices. There also were cross-states collaboration sessions centered on linking research into practice.

Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Morning Session

Welcome
Gina Burkhardt, NCREL's executive director, welcomed meeting participants and thanked them for partnering with NCREL to further the goal of linking literacy research to best practices in the classroom. She shared the reading experiences of her fourth-grade daughter and expressed hope that through good literacy education for all children, the gap between achievement and opportunity will narrow for the younger generations of today and tomorrow.

Dr. Edyth Young, director of research for NCREL's Center for Literacy, also welcomed the group and extended special thanks to the research panelists for "bringing their expertise to the table" and for their dedication to the field of reading and research. She emphasized that the mission and major focus of the Literacy Research Network is to take what is known about the reading research and apply it to practice.

Introduction of Panel
Danielle Carnahan, NCREL Program Associate, served as moderator for the panel. A position statement was read to introduce each topic prior to questions being presented to the panelists. The panelists were:

- Dr. Peggy Grant, program associate, NCREL's Center for Literacy
- Dr. Terry Greene, consultant for the National Staff Development Council and president of Literacy Initiatives
- Dr. Mary McNabb, research scientist, University of Denver
- Dr. Donna Ogle, president, International Reading Association
- Dr. Scott Paris, professor, University of Michigan, and researcher at the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement
- Dr. Timothy Shanahan, professor, University of Illinois, and director of reading for the Chicago Public Schools
- Dr. Edyth Young, director of research, NCREL's Center for Literacy

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Early Literacy

Statement
Researchers and classroom teachers know that children enter formal schooling with a wide range of literacy backgrounds and experiences. Literacy experiences in the home and community have a major impact on students' literacy achievement. Many initiatives and programs have targeted children from birth to 8 years of age. Some of these programs also have targeted parents to strengthen home-school relationships in literacy development. The type and degree of literacy instruction of children before they enter first grade continues to be a topic of heated debate. Literacy instruction for Grades 1-3 also is an area of major concern.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Young.

In our region, the state of Indiana requires all teachers in grades K-6, who receive their first teaching license after July 2001, to demonstrate knowledge and skills in reading by passing the Reading Specialist Test. In view of this, how should teacher preparation programs address early literacy in their coursework?

Dr. Edyth Young: First of all, I would like to address the Reading Specialist Test and give you some background on that. It was originally designed for reading specialists with advanced degrees and for those who have advanced or supervisory preparation in the field of reading. These particular reading specialists have to have background knowledge developmentally of where children are from Grades K-12. Let's look at some of the critical components starting with the frequency distribution of the breakdown of the items on this particular test. Fifteen percent of the test deals with linguistics and the cognitive basis of the reading process, 20 percent with comprehension, 15 percent with word identification, 10 percent with vocabulary development, 20 percent with methodologies, and 20 percent with diagnosis and program improvement.

So, as you can see, this test is particularly designed for reading specialists. However, in Indiana, the policy that was adopted was that *all* teachers from K-6 teacher education programs graduating after July 2001 had to pass this particular test. Since this test is designed for reading specialists who have advanced degrees, it raises the question of how this will impact other teachers, such as elementary school teachers. Although Indiana adjusts the score accordingly, it is not certain whether the information needed is available. Considering the type of test and the significance of it, I would like you to think about whether teachers are prepared for this, what we need to do in reading instruction, and the type of classes that we should offer these teachers. A teacher taking the test could have six hours of reading instruction but be held accountable for knowing linguistics, the cognitive basis of reading, and diagnosis. This would mean they would have to take special classes in

diagnosis.

One of the things that we could do to try and incorporate immediately is ensure that a set of course standards is covered in classes. These course standards could include helping the teachers understand the psychology of reading development, which looks at how students learn to read and the cognitive characteristics of what the good readers and poor readers do. The environmental and cognitive factors of reading development, along with the whole arena of language and its structure, should be considered in the design of reading methods courses. Those are heavy courses, but they would provide ways of strategically ensuring that we are covering the pieces for which these teachers are held accountable at the end of the day. They need to have some type of knowledge and skills set where they can ascertain effective ways of integrating instructional practices in the classroom concerning decoding, spelling, fluency, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and writing. We should also ensure that this type of reading instruction provides the students with a beginning in diagnostic training. How do we assess students? How do we assess our limited-English-proficiency students, our special-needs students, and our students most at-risk? Basically, we're looking at authentic and alternative types of assessment, giving them—these teachers—the ability to do informal reading inventories. These are just some brief suggestions that we could do on the interim to help the teachers know the information for which they are being held accountable.

Responses From Other Panelists

Dr. Timothy Shanahan: I didn't know anything about the Indiana standards before you described them. It does strike me, in a lot of ways, as the wrong knowledge for the particular audience, and I think that's something we do pretty poorly in professional education. We have a lot of trouble deciding who needs to know what, and we usually proceed with the notion that everybody needs to know everything and it's the only way that we can succeed. It's sort of the approach of teaching 16-year-olds automotive physics rather than drivers' education. It just doesn't make great sense to me. If you're going to be a reading specialist and you're going to get involved in pull-out kinds of situations—dealing with referrals to special education and all the kinds of things that reading specialists end up involved in—you definitely need to know how to sit down and do a diagnosis. But regular teachers rarely do that, and it's not because they're bad and it's not because there's some fault in the system. It doesn't make sense. If you've got 34 kids sitting in there, to sit down and try to do an individual diagnosis—a teacher in that role, a beginning early reading teacher, needs to know how to find out about kids' literacy on the fly. How do you observe sight vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension strategies? How do you see it on the hoof, *not* how do you stop and test for a little while. Testing is just a recognition that the situation is different.

The kinds of things that teachers need to know about curriculum are very different—that is, the things that teachers need to know about continuity and where their teaching fits into the whole system. If you're a new second-grade teacher, then what is the first-grade teacher doing? What's following in third grade? There are certain things that you really need to know developmentally that may not be quite as essential for the reading specialist or [that are] more background kinds of things—how to choose a lesson out of the wide array of programs that are usually available to teachers. How do you adapt lessons to meet [students' needs]? How do you communicate with parents, including grading and things like that because that's

part of the communication system? I just think there's a whole range of things that practical knowledge—and knowledge that often has really interesting psychological and cognitive and linguistic basis as well as cultural basis—that frankly would be much more tailored to the needs of those teachers who are going to have classroom responsibilities. The reading specialists need to know very different things, it seems to me, in terms of working with staff, professional development, and a whole range of developing school programs, evaluating school programs, and so on that are really quite different. While they overlap, I think Indiana has made a mistake. They feel like they have raised standards, and they won't see the outcome, is what I guess I'd be afraid of.

Dr. Donna Ogle: I haven't seen the Indiana assessment goal so I don't know what's included in it, but I think the question is the deep question of what is the knowledge that teachers need to have in the classroom. I think in Illinois, with only one course in reading language arts, teachers are underprepared for the major role of a primary teacher, which is to develop literacy and reading and writing. If the primary teacher can't do that, the kids lack the foundation for the rest of their schooling. Maryland has instituted 15 hours of preservice reading coursework as a way of saying that all primary teachers have to really basically be reading teachers. California has instituted the RICA [Reading Instruction Competence Assessment] test [see National Evaluation Systems, 2001], which is their test for all teachers at the preservice level before they become certified. I think we're grappling with the same question that Indiana and Tim [Shanahan] are raising, and that we all can say "What is the essential knowledge for primary teachers if they are going to be successful?" I think we haven't taken seriously enough that foundational knowledge, and that one course in reading is never enough for all of the kinds of work that preservice teachers need to be prepared. I think, for me, the question is we have a lot of knowledge that we should be insisting that teachers should have before they go in the field. We have a lot of practical considerations they ought to be prepared with, and I don't think that given the raising of the bar for what goes on in primary classrooms that we've given the teachers a foundation to feel secure in being there. I think a lot of work needs to be done comparing what we're doing here, what Maryland is trying to do, what California is trying to do, to just see what impact that does have on the student learning.

Dr. Terry Greene: I think it's really important too, though, to bring those fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade teachers along as well, because depending on your student population and your community, it's going to be really important that they not only know, but that they be able to take students from where they are when they walk in their classroom as readers and writers and move them forward. And to do that, they've got to be able to come back with that developmental continuum and know that even though that may not be a fourth-grade skill, they need to be able to go back and pick up kids wherever they are and move them along. So I think in preparation programs, it is really important also to be able to have that continuum available, to have teachers know the practical application, and also for teachers to be able to use the data that they get from the day-to-day kid watching and the things that they're doing to be able to say, "Now how does this translate into instruction? And what do I need to do for one child that maybe I don't need to do for another?" I think that's really an important part of preparation programs as well.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Middle and High School Literacy

Statement
Recent reading initiatives, particularly President Bush's *No Child Left Behind* [see No Child Left Behind Act of 2001], target early literacy achievement. Yet, the reading ability of adolescents in this country is not keeping pace with the literacy demands of the 21st century. This situation is especially true in urban and rural areas where linguistically and culturally diverse middle and high school students are lagging behind their suburban peers in achievement.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Ogle.

The research on implementation of content-area reading strategies in middle and high school classes continues to be dismal. What gaps in the research in this area do you see that could improve reading instruction in secondary classrooms?

Dr. Donna Ogle: I like the question. I don't know what research it implies because I think, more basically, we just don't get instruction that's going on. So you don't do much research if there's no instruction going on. So to me, the first step is to say what we're seeing is lack of instruction from fifth grade on, and if teachers don't take the responsibility for continuing the development of strategies and awareness of the differentiation reading process across different kinds of settings, different kinds of text, then more research to show that we aren't helping kids, I don't think is the answer particularly. I think what we need to start with is some surveys of what teacher preparation is going on at the upper levels, what continued professional development is going on, what commitment the schools have to provide instruction to students. I mean what's interesting is that we have assessments now that go all the way through high school that mark reading progress, and yet we haven't scaffolded it around the programs that will allow the kids to have the instruction that they need to become better readers. And so, to me, there's a whole awareness level.

We're still at that stage within our schools—saying it's important to continue instruction. When we look at technology needs for the 21st century in critical thinking, the programs that fill the schools with that kind of literacy just are not there. We have to start with programs and the recognition that we haven't done well in providing instruction. I think there is a basic-level kind of survey work that needs to be done and program implementation that needs to be there and even design of adequate programs across the curriculum for students at these levels. I think there's a great deal ahead to be done. Also, I think standards could work very well in our behalf just as we've got the assessments now. We also have standards that say what students should be able to do. What we need is superintendents, principals, and cadres of teachers across the curriculum to say that this is the way we're going to

develop students who can do these things in our schools. I've worked at middle schools in Illinois who look at the Illinois standards that kids should be able to create a graphic display of text that they've read and they've never read the standard in the first place. They don't know the standard exists, and the schools have not taken seriously the responsibility to ensure the kids can do this, so I think that level needs to be the first.

Responses From Other Panelists

Dr. Peggy Grant: I think what we've found, and what my experience in working with both preservice and inservice content-area teachers has shown me, is that, generally speaking, future teachers who plan to go into secondary content areas are not really opposed to including literacy instruction in what they do. They understand that the reading and the writing are important. But when we get into the classroom, many of those teachers have more literacy perspective, but the culture of being a high school content-area teacher is very different. A lot of the programs that we see that are meant to help high school teachers include literacy instruction tend to be: This is how we know how to do it, so now all we have to do is train you to do it, and everything will be fine. And there are all kinds of issues that have to do with how those high school teachers, secondary teachers, view their content area. Content-area literacy instruction comes with the implication that the students will read to learn, which is purely obvious to all of us.

For many teachers in the content areas, the reading is mainly one way to get the learning to the students, but not necessarily the most important one that they see. If their point in teaching is to get certain concepts across to their students, many of them feel they can do that without a lot of literacy in the classroom. And so it's not just a matter of knowing what the methods are. I think we have to start looking at what is going on inside these content-area teachers' heads. It's a professional development issue because there are scads of programs to teach these teachers. I'm working on a project right now where we're trying to understand how they are interpreting these content literacy strategies and what they're doing with them in their classrooms. And it really has a lot to do with [purpose]. Is the purpose of the literacy, especially the reading in their teaching, for students to construct their own knowledge? Or is it just to remember certain kinds of content?—in which case it's much easier for the teacher to tell them. And so it's a pedagogical issue as much as it is a professional development and a literacy issue.

Dr. Timothy Shanahan: First of all, I'd like to emphasize what Donna [Ogle] said. Yes, we need more research, but we really need to grow, and I guess I'd like to add a little bit to my introduction. I am still on the faculty of University of Illinois. But in the last couple of months, I've actually taken a new job. I'm the director of reading for the Chicago Public Schools—meaning that I'm responsible for the reading education at 73 high schools not too far from here. What Donna said is absolutely true. We make almost no effort at all in the Chicago Public Schools when it comes to high school literacy. That's going to change, but that takes a commitment, and it takes a movement of dollars. In Illinois, you can get an endorsement on your certificate in reading if you take 18 hours of reading. The Chicago Public Schools has 73 high schools, and we have 15 teachers who have reading endorsements—just to give you a little bit of context on that.

Another little statistic that might interest folks comes from the NALS [National

Adult Literacy Survey] data [see National Center for Education Statistics, 2000]. Kids go through more literacy development from the ages of 18 to 23 [see Kirsch & Jungeblut, 1986] in the United States than the ages 13 to18, which is really pretty startling. They're learning more when they get out of school about how to read and write than they're learning while they're in school during those years. I think for exactly the reasons that Peggy [Grant] is talking about. Our teachers in English and history and science and social studies—despite the national standards in their areas because the national standards in their areas are actually quite demanding of literacy—don't do much with it. This fall, the National Science Foundation had a meeting where they brought together literacy experts, science education experts, and working scientists. Not surprisingly, the literacy people pushed really heavily for including text in the teaching of science. Big surprise. The science educators pushed really heavily for hands-on science: "Just do lab science." The working scientists said, "Are you crazy? You've got to have text in this." These kids would never be able to work in the scientific field unless they could read science. We can teach them the lab stuff. You have got to get these kids reading science and writing science. I think we really need to pay attention to our national standards in each area. They are really pretty demanding in terms of literacy. Our high schools and junior highs don't know anything about that, and that's something that needs to change.

Dr. Mary McNabb: I just wanted to add that this issue keeps coming up about the lack of reading practice in our public school classrooms. Terrence Paul [see Paul, 1996] conducted an extensive national study of K-12 students during the 1994-95 school year. When he analyzed reading performance data, looking at NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] data and some other data, he got a startling finding. He said when ranked according to the amount of time that students spend in reading, students in the top 5 percent in performance read 144 times more than the students in the bottom 5 percent. I think that says a lot about the importance of having reading practices in our schools. The report also talks about the fact that after fifth grade, reading practice time during the school day declines significantly.

Dr. Edyth Young: I just have one thing to piggyback on Mary [McNabb]'s comments. Anderson and others [see Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkenson, 1986] did a research study about the amount of time that children read. I know in [Naperville] District 203, right here in our neighborhood, they present information to the parents to get the children to read more. It is a very active reading district. The study talks about if you just spend 60 minutes a day reading, the standardized test scores are going to be really high, like 80 to 90 percent if this is consistent, but if you're reading like zero minutes, those are the students who will be in the low percentile. And so, just taking that, the district, how do they implement this into practice? They have all these wide reading programs within the district, starting from kindergarten. Their students have bags of books. They're reading all kind of things; they're celebrating reading. I even have the District 203 report card here, the one that you get back from ISAT [Illinois Standards Achievement Test]. I have the report card for one school, and on the average, the whole district is exceeding state standards on the ISAT. The district is basically doing naturalistic reading, but you have to have it across wide-reading sources, both in narrative and expository. I found it very interesting that within this one district looking at their report card, the third graders in one school—basically all the students—exceeded state standards.

Dr. Donna Ogle: I have one more point. When we talk about upper-level reading, I'm working in too many situations where a definition of reading is still novels/fiction, and that's just not going to do it. Tim [Shanahan] talked about reading science. I get distressed when I go into classrooms and see wonderful libraries of books, and there's no nonfiction. And what you're talking about is that balance, about reading about the world, and reading stories. I think we've got to elaborate on our concept of what reading is, and for the secondary teachers who think reading is phonics, we better change that because that's all they see: beginning reading. But until the upper-level teachers recognize that reading comes in all sorts of different types of materials, and that our curriculum is bound by novels, I think we will continue to do a disservice until we broaden that.

Dr. Edyth Young: Because when we look at the test used for measuring those students, they're measured on informational and narrative.

Dr. Donna Ogle: The reading test measures informational and narrative reading. We need language in every field; we need reading in every discipline—science, social studies, and mathematics.

Dr. Terry Greene: For the last four years, I've worked with secondary teachers in reading, well, with all secondary teachers, and that's the biggest change that I saw over those four years, where teachers who really wanted to know more about reading and to know more about writing as their students began to come into their classrooms who couldn't read and write. And those were the teachers who again began that paradigm shift pretty early on because they said, "You've got to tell me what to do. I'm trying to give this novel, we're trying to talk about it, but I saw all these kids who can't read it." And I thought that was great because that was my first audience. Now coming to schools where test scores are still remaining high, those teachers are not beginning that shift because they don't see the purpose of it yet. We still keep talking and we still keep trying to bring that out, but the secondary teachers who I know are just really crying for those strategies and that knowledge about where do I start, how do I go back and take this child, and how do I become a reading teacher. I've talked always from the point of view that every teacher is a reading teacher. And I still believe that to my core.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Populations

Statement
As the population of the United States grows more diverse, teachers face greater challenges as they try to adapt literacy instruction to meet all students' needs. Furthermore, they face these challenges in the midst of political debates that have a great impact on how they do their daily work.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Shanahan.

There continue to be reading achievement gaps within and between different ethnic groups. What do we know about the reasons for these different gaps?

Dr. Timothy Shanahan: A few minutes ago, Edyth [Young] was describing a district nearby that has outstanding reading achievement and where kids read a lot. One of the things I know about that district is that it is a high-income district. Parents not only make good incomes; they're rarely unemployed and when they are unemployed, it's for very brief amounts of time. Parents have really high levels of education; in fact, I think the average parent education in that district in higher than a college education. I think a few of those "little" things have a lot to do with the kinds of reading achievement. It isn't just all these kids are reading. They're going to read well. There's a whole lot of teaching going on in communities like that. I know even in my own district—thinking of my own children—after school they were off to Girl scouts, where they did academic stuff; they were off to the library program where they did academic stuff; they were involved in all kinds of stuff at the park district where most of that was quite academic. Our kids were not given five or six hours of school a day. They were getting 10 and 12 and 14 hours a day, and not just during the week, and not just 185 days a year. Clearly, poverty, racism, lack of parental education, and language differences all militate against some kids doing well, and that's part of the gap.

But I would like to turn our attention away from all those inequities and differences in the community—not because they're not important, not because they don't need to be addressed—but because as educators, primarily, they're not what we do. We don't get to redistribute income typically. That's not on our plate. And so, what else is going on, and when you look a more closely, you say, well, someone like Susan Neuman [Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education] has done some wonderful work, but the communities are very different. There's no question about it. Kids have very different books availabilities, no question about it. But go into the schools, and look there. We do have responsibility, direct responsibility there, and authority there. The book availability is pretty different between the schools too. It's not just in the general

community. It's not just that we have bookstores in a place like Naperville, and we might not have them in certain neighborhoods in places like Chicago or Peoria or East St. Louis or Detroit, it's not quite the same thing. Our kids in inner-city classrooms get less instruction than they do in most suburban districts. That's a big part of the inequity. You look at the meta-analyses of productive factors in education, and the No. 1 factor that always comes up, no matter how you slice the data, is the amount of instruction. Our districts that serve poor kids, our districts that serve language-different kids, our districts that serve kids whose parents have little or no education tend to give the least amount of education.

A couple of months ago, there was a series of articles in the *Chicago Sun-Times* by Rosalind Rossi and some of her colleagues [see Rossi et. al., 2001], a series that I hope is going to win a Pulitzer prize. It is showing in Illinois, and especially in my district of Chicago, that we get the least prepared teachers in the poorest districts. Teachers [who are] less likely to be able to pass things like basis skills tests that eighth graders in the state can pass. There's less monitoring of what goes on in the classrooms by parents, and less monitoring of what goes on in the classroom by principals.

I came back from Los Angeles not too long ago. The average school in Los Angeles, an inner-city Los Angeles elementary school, had more than 1,200 children in it. And they don't have assistant principals. There's a principal. Yes, the fact is that our kids, in the poorest neighborhoods, instead of getting more teaching, instead of longer school years and longer school days, and the best prepared teachers, and especially prepared teachers to work in those situations, we actually get what's left when districts like 203 [in Naperville] are done taking what they get. Yes, there are big gaps, and those gaps aren't likely to go away. I'm less concerned about closing the gap, because I know that good instruction tends to spread the gap out, and widen gaps rather than lower them. What we have to do is make sure that the parts of our population that are the most challenged—it's not necessarily that they can catch up with everybody else—can have at least a level of a skill that allows them to participate fully.

The Supreme Court, in the1960s, has said that there shall be no literacy bar to voting. Last year, we saw in the election all the information about the hanging chads and the pregnant chads and all that fun stuff. I was asked to analyze the paper ballots in Florida because they weren't on machine ballots. They lost more paper ballots than machine ballots. That's something that most people don't know. And those ballots were lost primarily because of the low education, the low reading ability, the inability to deal with the difficulties that the ballot presented for our older population, a lot of them minority populations. Here in Cook County, we lost 6 percent of the vote last year, primarily because people can't read the instructions on the machines and so on. So I guess I'm less worried about closing the gap and more concerned about raising the level of success so that people can fully participate. Maybe they're not going to do quite as well as their neighbor who has a ton more advantages, but they should be able to get a job. They should be able to keep a job. They should be able to make a good enough income to support a family. They should be able to vote. They should certainly be able to engage in some of the social things going on in this society now that we are so literacy-oriented—things like e-mail and the World Wide Web and so on. Bill Clinton was just giving a speech and said when he became president, there were 50 World Wide Web sites. Now they're like 100 million of them or something. I actually think that was the

number he used. To participate, you obviously have to have literacy, and these kids aren't getting a level that allows them to participate. We have to change that.

Responses From Other Panelists

Dr. Scott Paris: I'd like to follow up on that. There were some good ideas you had there, Tim. I'd like to actually make one proposal to come out of today's meeting, and that is we elevate the discussion of what the achievement gap is, and that we disallow politicians from using racial, linguistic, comparative bases for the gap. This is, I think, really misinformed policy making. The black/white achievement gap should not be part of rhetoric among educators. For a lot of the reasons that Tim [Shanahan] said, the only significant gap that we need to face as educators is the gap between what children are doing and what we want them to be able to do—their potential. And so the gap is to help every child achieve more and achieve their potential. And I think that what we have now is invidious comparisons based on racial, socioeconomic educational levels that don't make sense. Nobody talks about the Irish and Italian gap. They don't talk about the Korean and Chinese gap. They talk about white/black gaps, and I think it's an injustice to treat all blacks the same, to treat all whites the same, and to say that the aspiration is that somehow we're all to be equal. What we aspire to is for all children to be the best that they can be, and that gap is an individual achievement gap.

So I think that we allow the politicians to have inflammatory rhetoric that's driven by what I think are inappropriate educational goals, what seem to be racial generalizations, which seem to be based on many of the factors that Tim [Shanahan] said, which are social inequities, learning opportunities that are not equal among children in the schools, resources that are not equal. What we talk about in terms of the gap is really the social circumstances, the economic resources, and the school resources that are available to children. That's the gap that has to be addressed, and we shouldn't hold teachers and students accountable for the social environments that they find themselves in. So I think actually we could do a great service to elevating the discussion of what the gap is and to avoid what I think are small-minded and erroneous discussions of the gap and how it can be narrowed because it deflects all the attention away from teaching and away from children to something that's based on test scores and disaggregated data.

Dr. Mary McNabb: I heard a keynote address this past summer in which a meta-analysis was referred to, a research study that really backs up what you're saying. Kati Haycock [see Haycock, 2001] found through her meta-analysis on student achievement that socioeconomic status is not the cause of the gap. Her analysis showed that among kids who performed very well were some from disadvantaged backgrounds, regardless of the type of test used. What she did find is that what does matter most is teacher quality, which then influences what the instruction looks like and, as Tim [Shanahan] pointed out, that is something that we *can* do something about. On top of that, that's where we *should* do something.

Dr. Ogle: I think this is where research can help us. Also, I don't know if any of you saw the story two weeks ago in *Education Week* [see Viadero, 2001] about the Department of Defense schools and how we don't have the gap, racially or economically, or by jobs, in the military schools because our system has highly qualified teachers, and you have a system there that is a single system. It works for the children, and no matter what the race or the economic level at which the

military families are working, the kids are performing well above the average in our culture. So that is again a meta-analysis, and the experience of different racial groups within our military show that this is something that goes within schools.

I just also want to add to what Tim was saying. I think we have to take seriously the amount of money that we put into schools. When I work abroad in Europe or in Latin America, they're appalled that we don't ensure the same funding for kids no matter where they are, and that we allow kids in some districts and downstate rural areas to receive only minimal per-pupil expenditures as contrasted to other districts that receive much larger per-pupil expenditures. We say we are providing equality of educational opportunity [and] that we're going to test kids on the same assessment measures, and yet we're willing to [allow] uncertified teachers and unstaffed buildings. When I was working in Europe, you couldn't even have someone come in and disinfect your house who doesn't have a certification—that is, a licensed professional to do [extermination]. You have to be certified to be able to come into a house and clean it. Yet, we're allowing our children—our most precious commodity—to be taught by uncertified teachers all over cities and rural areas in this country. It's a crime that's just beyond understanding.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Special-Needs Learners

Statement
Research shows that without early identification and intervention, children who read poorly in the first grade will continue to read poorly in middle school, high school, and adulthood. Research also provides evidence that children identified as learning disabled, and those who are poor early readers, rarely catch up to the reading levels of their peers, even by the age of 18.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Paris.

What has the research taught the education community concerning the psychology of reading as it relates to the cognitive and metacognitive processes of good readers and poor readers? How can we apply this knowledge in building effective intervention programs for special-needs students?

Dr. Scott Paris: A concise answer to that question is that we know the children who have difficulty reading oftentimes don't use effective strategies, and they seem less aware of the kinds of strategies and plans to use. So the kinds of remedial or instruction or interventions that these children need aren't different in kind; they're probably different in intensity. So that they need more practice, more explicit instruction, more help in guided reading and guided comprehension to understand how to construct the meaning from the text and how to use the strategies that are available. Almost all the research on special-needs children shows that they need that extra time and attention and, with that, they can use those strategies effectively. I call your attention to two kinds of research findings that I think are important for thinking of the developmental trajectories of these special-needs children. One is Keith Stanovich's finding [see Stanovich,1986] that summarizes the "Matthew effect" and that is, simply, that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. That finding was based on the developmental trajectory over time, that children who have the skills by Grade 3 continue to excel; the children who don't are at a lower level of achievement. That's very difficult to remedy at fourth grade, or sixth grade, or eighth grade, and so that's part of the philosophy for earlier intervention. And I think that there is a strong research base that says we need to intervene early for special-needs children.

The second thing is related to summer school, and this comes from the Baltimore project [see Beginning School Study Team, 2001] and Karl Alexander and Doris Entwisle's project [see Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 2001] that shows the classic summer loss in reading. We discovered this in Michigan and other places that have looked at summer school programs. That is, children who are at high risk for not having good literacy achievement often don't have literacy opportunities in the summer. So their achievement from the end of the year to the beginning of the next

shows either no improvement or that it declined—the classic summer-loss pattern. So the children—and these are high-and low-achievement children—fall further behind their peers. Even if they make equivalent gains during the school year, they are likely to lose ground each summer over the first two and three and four years of elementary school, and thus, they actually fall further behind because of the cumulative effect of summer loss, which I think shows the value of summer programs. Michigan was a leader in good summer school programs the last two years when we had the funding to help to prevent this kind of summer reading loss. I know Chicago Public Schools and other urban centers oftentimes have important summer programs, but I think we should all take note that children with special needs often need these extended learning opportunities throughout the summer.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Assessment

Statement

There is a great deal of controversy regarding how large-scale assessments should be put into place for early childhood, special-needs learners, and limited-English-proficiency learners. How and what should be assessed in literacy for all students is an area that needs careful analysis and strategic planning. There is also a need to carefully analyze the use and impact of yearly testing of every child for Grades 3-8.

Question

The question was addressed to Dr. Young.

Should we use alternative classroom-based assessments for these learners to obtain diagnostic information that could be used for instruction? How would this look?

Dr. Edyth Young: Just recently, this past summer, I was at the Chief State School Officers' last big conference that they held on assessment—large-scale assessment. One of the major themes and focus at this particular conference was on assessment for limited-English-proficiency (LEP) students and special-needs students. They have another conference coming up, I believe, sometime in the spring and Peggy [Grant] and I submitted a proposal for that. It's also a large-scale assessment, and I wonder why they keep doing large-scale assessment. One of the major themes that came out of the conference with the Chief State School Officers was: How do we do this? How are we going to test? How are we going to have this equilibrium with these students with limited English proficiency and special education? Some of these students have to take these tests only as the students who have been identified to take the alternative assessment test, and that's a very small amount.

I'm looking at the report card—once again I go back to District 203, the Naperville district—which is a suburb. Tim [Shanahan] probably can add information from an urban perspective; I live in Naperville. There are 205 special-ed students in the elementary grades in Naperville, and only 9 at one particular grade level were identified to take the Illinois alternative assessment. That means that all of these other students, special-ed students, were taking the ISAT [Illinois Standards Achievement Test]. So how do we then strike some type of balance because we know that this assessment is coming down the pike? So how do we have a balance for these particular students? We proposed looking at alternative assessments and helping teachers do this, but you get a better window, a better index, like informal reading inventories, and various other types of measurements, especially with early childhood. You find out much more when you use alternative types of assessments to see where these children are. With LEP students, doing some type of informal assessment—away from the large-scale paper and pencil assessment—allows you to have an opportunity to see, first of all, if these students are proficient in their own language. In some cases, they are not, and then they have to learn English, so

they're lost in the middle with nowhere to go. These types of alternative assessments—which we can give and help teachers naturalistically in their instruction—can actually help us link assessment to instruction so we can start modifying and improving instruction.

Responses From Other Panelists

Dr. Scott Paris: Okay, I want to throw out a couple of proposals because large-scale assessment for some of the purposes is a political agenda. It's not a teacher's agenda. And I want to speak on behalf of the teachers who see this as evil incarnate. I think that we need to contest it. I don't think we need to accept it, particularly when we talk about annual testing for every student in America. This, I think, has no educational foundation and ought to be considered more creatively. Let me give you a couple of options. One is, in my opinion, there should be no norm-referenced, wide-scale assessments given. It's not relevant to instruction. It's not an educational agenda, and parents ought to pay for that if they want to. Every ITBS [Iowa Test of Basic Skills], Stanford 9 [Stanford Achievement Test Series, Ninth Edition], every norm-referenced test should be taken out of the school's agenda. Let people take it on Saturday and pay for it like the SAT [Scholastic Aptitude Test]. It would save schools a tremendous amount of money because the tests are only used for number crunching and political agendas. When they're used for these purposes, we ought to acknowledge the limitations.

You don't need to give them to every student to get a reliable estimate of benchmarks. You can give them to a sample; a National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP] sample would give you the same information. Now, the problem, and it occurred in today's paper, if you read the *Chicago Tribune*, it says three-quarters of Chicago's schools are failing [see Banchero, Olszewski, & Dougherty, 2001]. If we allow wide-scale, large-scale assessment to be used to evaluate the quality of schools and the quality of teaching, we are committing an unethical practice. The American Psychological Association [see American Psychological Association, 2001], the American Educational Research Association [see American Educational Research Association, 2000], and the International Reading Association [see International Reading Association, 1999] have guidelines to say that these are inappropriate uses of testing. Yet, we see them conducted by politicians and policymakers on a routine basis. I think that we as educators know better and cannot let this happen. So we should say that some kinds of tests have no place in education. They should be marketplace-driven, norm-referenced tests. We should protest annual testing because the kids' abilities don't change annually. We should move to census testing so that they're only tested on a limited basis, and we should make sure that tests are diagnostically used if that's their purported purpose.

Dr. Mary McNabb: I kind of want to represent the flipside for a moment. It's not that I think that the measures that are used for large-scale assessment are necessarily the best ones. However, there has been extensive legislation that's trying to create an equity factor so that all kids are measured to see how they're progressing. And if they're not progressing well enough, there can be some interventions targeted toward that. Recently, I've heard at conferences and in talking with people about this issue that until the 1960s, some minority people in the South never received any testing all the way through K-12. They were never tested on anything. So the impression is nobody cared how they were doing, and we can't let that happen. There's a need for some sort of equitable testing practices for every child in the

system, but the problem is we haven't figured how to do that very well.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Preservice Education

Statement
Today, teacher preparation programs are undergoing great scrutiny, as policymakers demand more accountability for the quality of teachers that higher education programs produce. As these programs face demands for more comprehensive coursework and field experiences, the nation also must address the impending teacher shortage.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Grant.

Every organization interested in teacher education is demanding that future teachers spend more time in schools and classrooms working with children. What do we know about the components of effective literacy field experiences and their influence on the practice of teachers once they enter their own classrooms?

Dr. Peggy Grant: This idea of preservice teachers spending more time in schools with kids is an extremely popular one, and it's becoming mandated by many organizations. NCATE [see National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education, 2001] requires field components that are quite extensive, and it makes a lot of common sense. We hear these horror stories of students who go into the classroom to student-teach and have never seen a teenager, never seen a third grader before, and they're just lost. I'm sure that is still going on in many places around the country today. So I'm sympathetic to the idea that students need to spend some time with kids. However, I think we know an awful lot about how preservice teachers think, and we know a lot about how they view their education courses and what happens with the knowledge they get in their teacher preparation programs. Some studies have said that the entire body of knowledge that they get in teacher preparation is washed out once they walk into a classroom and spend some time with real teachers and that the ideas that preservice teachers have about their own education completely overwhelm what they are being taught in teacher preparation.

For that reason, I think we need to look much more carefully at what happens in field experiences because these are questions that I had and that we need to be asking about these field experiences. How much time in the field is important for preservice teachers to get the most out of it? Preservice teachers love to spend time in the field, and they think it's the most valuable thing that they do. However, I haven't seen a lot of research telling us what exactly is the impact on teacher teaching and on student achievement from all of these field experiences. And I think that's something that, as researchers, we really need to look at. What is happening with the preservice teachers while they are in these field experiences? We need to look at beyond their satisfaction with the program. I read a lot about these different programs, professional development schools, different kinds of

partnerships, and in almost all of them, all they say is everyone thought it was a great experience. And so, then it was a good experience. I think we need to start being a lot more rigorous in our examination of what's going on in these field experiences. We need to answer the questions first: How much time is necessary? What are the different roles of the classroom teachers and university supervisors? How does this play out with the students? These are groups that have very distinct agendas sometimes, which don't overlap, and working together can be really a challenge. I think we need to know that this kind of field experience is becoming very prominent. In some schools, every single course has to have a field component of some kind. We need to start looking at the impact of these field experiences on eventual student achievement. What we have to do to make sure that these experiences in the school don't just reinforce the naïve ideas the preservice teachers have that sometimes teacher educators are trying to help them change instead of just having them keep those same ideas once they get into the school.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Professional Development

Statement
Research indicates that the single most important factor in a child's learning is the quality of the teacher. For this reason, several organizations have made recommendations describing the components of effective professional development. As reading moves to the forefront of education policy, more funds are being made available to increase the expertise of classroom teachers. With the emphasis on research-based practice, the role of the research community has become significant in converting research into practice.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Greene.

There continues to be a gap between what we know about professional development for teachers and the kinds of activities in which teachers participate in their school districts. What do you think research can contribute to close this gap?

Dr. Terry Greene: The National Staff Development Council [see National Staff Development Council, 1995], as you all know, has come out with standards and has gone back and reorganized those standards as well—talking about what quality staff development looks like, what professional development looks like. One of the things that I see as I travel and talk to teachers and administrators is first, it's the time, which seems to be the No. 1 thing. It's the funding. What are the models we're going to use? There are lots of models that are out there. There are lots of different components that need to be there. What I'd like to see from a research perspective are programs being offered to teachers by the districts that have a really strong evaluation component in them. I do staff development myself, and sometimes there's an evaluation and sometimes there's not. I always want to know, well, how do you know this worked, and how do you know what I said had any impact on instruction in classrooms? That's really what it's about—taking it back to kids and taking it back to instruction. I think that's one thing we need to take a look at and reexamine in school districts—is there an evaluation component? Is that evaluation component directly linked to classroom instruction? Are we looking at what's being taught, what we're talking about, and how it's implemented?

When I started working in the last district I was in, we had lots of sessions offered in the summer. I went into one of the sessions and sat down. No one knew me. A teacher came in and sat down at the table, and several more joined her. One of them looked at me and said, "I hope you brought something to do. You know this session is just deadly boring." That was great for me. She was a little embarrassed when she found out who I was. That was okay. For me, it was wonderful because the session *was* deadly boring. There wasn't anything in it that I thought that teachers ought to be talking about. I just think we have to go back and look at it from a very

evaluative point of view, and sometimes an evaluation doesn't need to come from people in our district. It can come from people outside the district. For example, you come in and talk to teachers; you do the interviews; and you go back and look at classroom implementation and classroom practice. This needs to be something that we're really about.

Responses From Other Panelists

Dr. Peggy Grant: I'd like to just expand a little bit on what Terry [Greene] said about this. I've been looking a lot at professional development, especially in the area of reading instruction lately. We've all had the experience—either as teachers or as professional developers—of filling out a form at the end that said, how was it, was the food good, that sort of thing. I'm convinced that a lot of professional development is evaluated in that way. I agree absolutely 100 percent with Terry that the key to improved professional development is evaluation because if these programs that everybody loves so much don't result in learning, then what good was the good evaluation? We need to start looking at evaluation in professional development from several different perspectives.

I think the idea of having people come in to examine [is important], but of course teacher satisfaction is important because if they aren't open to the idea then it doesn't matter how good your idea is, they won't do it. That's important, but we need to be looking at an evaluation of what in the environment is supporting the kind of growth that professional development is calling for. Teachers do not go to professional development to think that someone is going to tell them that they are not doing things right. A lot of times that is what professional development is. So what in the environment and the administration and the culture of the school is supporting that? We also need to look at—as she said—how it transfers into teaching practice, and also what are the consequences for student achievement-measured in any way would be better than it is now. We talk about how professional development for teachers is especially important in areas where teachers are underprepared and underqualified like in Chicago. We have all these teachers who don't have the basic skills that they need. We have to rely on professional development because we are not going to find highly qualified teachers to take these positions. We have to improve the quality of the ones we have. It has to be done through a more rigorous way of looking at professional development. Those of us who do professional development have to buy into that as well.

Dr. Donna Ogle: I just want to challenge her definition of professional development. It is always from the outside in. To me, professional development is a school that is a learning community. That's what we have to insist on—what is changing our whole paradigm. WestEd [see WestEd, 2000] has a nice piece that is an evaluation of the most successful forms of professional development. They find it is in schools where teachers are in control, and there is no outsider coming in particularly, except on request, and where the teachers have an ongoing regular culture, where they inquire with each other about what they should be doing for the kids in their school, and where they continue to learn and bring information in for each other. In this model of these outside resources that I know were sometimes essential—I do it too—there are times when groups of teachers ask us to come in, but we come into a context that is a learning environment where the teachers are in charge. Evaluation is important, but it is what we are evaluating. Do we have a culture in a school that is a learning culture where teachers want to be there, to get

better and to do it together? I think those are the schools—and we have data on them—that are the "break the mold" schools, the "make a difference" schools.

Dr. Edyth Young: I would like to add something to the comments of Donna [Ogle] and Peggy [Grant]. Just for an information base, and so our audience would know this, we do have an evaluation toolkit called the *Literacy Program Evaluation Tool*. It is an easy read, a friendly toolkit to go through. What we try to do in the literacy team as we deal with schools is go out and use these schools as intensive sites. We do longitudinal action research with them. One of the major things that we look at doing is just what Donna said-how do we build capacity in the schools? So we are setting up the literacy leadership teams within the schools with the people who are on the front line. The evaluation toolkit is very simplistic. It has a lot of little links. Teachers like that. You can link and find different places. But we really want to build this type of expertise and capacity and not be just one more guru flying in to tell you this is what you need to do. You have to create that learning community in the schools. Also, on our literacy Web site, we have been developing a prototype to upgrade this. Members of our Regional Literacy Network reviewed this and gave us some insights on the types of things that we should have on it. One of the categories that will be on our Web site—look for it across the course of this year—is professional learning. In that link, you will find areas on preservice research and professional development research, which includes everything that we can find and how to increase that particular arena.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Panel Discussion on Closing the Achievement Gap

Statement
There is an abundance of research describing the achievement gap and a plethora of programs aimed at reducing it. These programs range from highly prescriptive to holistic and flexible. Yet many of them do not reflect research-based comprehensive literacy practice.

Question
The question was addressed to Dr. Paris.

Accountability has taken the role of high-stakes testing in many states and districts, particularly in school districts that continually fall below state standards for reading and writing. What can the research community offer and address in this growing problem?

Dr. Scott Paris: I wrote an article called "The Trojan Horse" [see Paris, 2000], and I think that is the way that I view high-stakes testing. It is designed by some well-meaning people who would like to help education. They think that high-stakes testing and accountability will help achieve that purpose, and it may for some of the people some of the time. The question is whether or not the collateral damage is too great. The research base says that it is. The research on students, on teachers, and on parents is fairly clear. I think it would apply to today's report again, to make it relevant. If we ask parents to interpret the news media reports about the ISAT [Illinois Standards Achievement Test], which is the Illinois testing program, I think most parents would endorse the program, because they see it as a means of accountability. Yet their understanding is pretty modest, and if we ask more detailed questions about what the testing actually does, what we find is that the public doesn't usually know. They endorse accountability and standards because they want the best for their children and their teachers, and they think that having these high-stakes tests actually ensures better learning. That's the link that is always missing. Having the tests does not always ensure that you have the collaborative communities of learners in the schools. It doesn't necessarily ensure that the teachers are teaching better, because their feet are held to the fire, as superintendents like to say. It doesn't necessarily increase the learning opportunities provided to children by simply having the tests. So the linkages of making the test not simply media reports where parents can move their children to schools that have higher test averages, but actually improving the constructional climate and practices of the school, is the trick.

If you look at the data from the teachers, it is clear that high-stakes testing is perceived in a negative way by most teachers. In Texas, for example, most teachers find the Texas assessment system [Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS); see Texas Education Agency, 2002] to be a negative influence on their own

teaching. Lorrie Shepard [see Shepard, 2000] and Walt Haney [see Haney, 2000] and many other people such as Jim Hoffman [see Hoffman, Assaf, & Paris, 2001] have written about the narrowing of the curriculum, about teachers leaving the profession, about teachers feeling not appreciated or their professional judgments under question, because of the kinds of assessment they collect having low stakes, as opposed to the single day of high-stakes testing.

We find that teachers think that the tests don't reflect the curriculum. Ninety percent of the teachers in an Arizona survey [see Haladyna, Nolen, & Haas, 1991; Nolen, Haladyna, & Haas, 1989] and in a Michigan survey [see Paris & Urdan, 2000] said that the tests were unfair to children who did not speak English as a first language and to minority children. When teachers feel these tests are not valid measures of accountability, that they're not valid measures of the learning of the children in their classrooms, then we ought to question them. So even though politicians appreciate them and even though politicians and parents think they are getting something for those tests that they want—better learning—I think that the teachers and the students know, and the research shows, that those positive benefits don't always accrue. In fact, the negative benefits may outweight the positive benefits.

I am not anti-testing. What I would like people to have is a more reasonable approach, that high-stakes testing for accountability does not necessarily improve the instructional climate practices of the classroom. And that's where we need to put our energies. These wonderful schools, from whatever neighborhoods they come that are successful, have the characteristics that they want to emulate. David Pearson and Barbara Taylor's CIERA School Change Study [see Taylor & Pearson, 2001] identified it. The *Chicago Tribune* has examples of it. Donna [Ogle] has described it. I am sure that Tim [Shanahan] and everyone up here knows these schools. They can talk about effective educational leaders, a teamwork of parents and teachers who work together, students with high expectations for themselves and good work habits, effective resources, and on and on, where there is a community built within the school, in the neighborhood that supports the development of the children. To the extent that testing helps that, testing can be good, but many facets of high-stakes testing do not necessarily promote those positive features.

Responses From Other Panelists

Dr. Young: To add to that, I have another information piece that I would like for everyone to have on the achievement gap. One of NCREL's primary missions and that of the Center for Literacy is to determine how we can help the underserved population, both in urban and rural areas. A particular study that fascinates me is *No Excuses: Lessons From 21 High Performing, High Poverty Schools* by Samuel Casey Carter [see Carter, 2000]. Also, at NCREL about two years ago, we did a statewide evaluation study in Indiana, titled *A Study of the Differences Between Higher- and Lower-Performing Indiana Schools in Reading and Mathematics* [see North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, 2000]. I was one of the evaluators on that. One thought that will always stick with me was going into one of the high-performing schools that had three crack [drug] houses surrounding it. Yet it was a high-performing school. Some of the same things that Scott [Paris] was saying were going on in this school. If you are interested, I have it here. We found some very interesting things, and the *No Excuses* study is also very provocative.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Audience Questions and Panelists' Responses

Question From Rosilyn Carroll, Center for Excellence in Urban Teaching, Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota: My questions have to do with the achievement gap. The discussion earlier by Dr. Paris about the "politicalness" of the disaggregate information and race and linguistics and economic status, sort of the ploy of the political entities out there—my question has to deal with [this]. We know that there is a disproportionality with students who are put into special education based on gender and race. We also know that there is a disproportionality when we look particularly in urban areas, but [it's] not limited to urban centers. When we look at the achievement of those who are of certain minority groups and those who are from European-American backgrounds—my question is—if we are to *not* look at those things, then how are we going to close the gap? What we have found particularly in Minnesota is that teachers view children differently and that difference is not based on that they cannot read and they can't do this or that. It is based on things such as race, economic status, and the fact that they speak a different language. It is not that they *are* ignorant because of that, but that they are *perceived* to be ignorant because of that. I think when you make the statements that you make like that, it really gives people a way of not addressing the underlying problems with how the disproportionality got there. So I think I would like to hear you speak to that, and I also would like some of the other panelists speak to that.

Panelist Response

Dr. Scott Paris: I am glad you brought it up. I think that you are correct. There are people—teachers among them—who treat people differently by virtue of race, gender, and language, and racism and attitudes persists among people. Teachers are not exempt from that. I think that is something that we need to address. What I am worried about is that the high-stakes testing and accountability testing that identifies—disaggregates data by gender, by race, by poverty and other things—calls attention to those differences. And the superficial explanations that are offered to describe those reinforce the stereotypes of racism and gender bias that we are trying to avoid. So when you disaggregate, and you say blacks score lower than whites on achievement tests, that invites a racial comparison, and it invites racial explanation. In my personal point of view, I think that there are so many additional variables beyond race that need to be considered. For example, in today's *Chicago Tribune* [see Banchero et al., 2001], if you read the story, it says that 90 percent of the low-achieving schools were identified as having the highest poverty. What we know is that poverty often accompanies minority status and racial lines, particularly in Illinois. So that the black/white achievement gap is oftentimes traced—not always—to differences in SES [socioeconomic status] and poverty. But, in fact, the research shows when you factor out the poverty, the differences diminish. What I am concerned about is not failing to address stereotypes. What I am worried about is reinforcing the notions of stereotypes when you disaggregate data, and you focus

resources on the wrong problem.

Panelist Response

Dr. Donna Ogle: If we are going to be an environment of assessment and accountability, what we need to do is have broader data sets and broader indices in correlations. We wrote a letter saying that the new *Put Reading First* [see Armbruster, Lehr, & Osborn, 2001] ought to hold people accountable with disaggregated data so that Title I doesn't continue to have the problem that it has in terms of not really producing gains in the districts where it is most needed. I think politically we have to look at the data and have to have an honest assessment of it. That means not limiting ourselves by just looking at race and socioeconomic data but looking at the other factors that produce achievement. I think that is the problem that Scott [Paris] is speaking of. If you only put in the *Chicago Tribune* the socioeconomic status and minority student population, then we're indicating that we think those are the factors that are most important, instead of putting in there the amount of time the schools [spend on instruction] and the percentage of teachers who are certified, the stability of the teaching faculty, or the stability of the student population. We know that these are also factors. I did an informal analysis of the time that the kids spend in school in Chicago. The kids get an hour a day less in instructional time than they do in the suburban schools right next door. An hour a day of instruction, five hours a week. That is a day a week—the difference in instruction—which accumulates to a very significant amount of time in schools. It is collecting more data and looking at those variables that we know are important so that we do have a realistic picture of what is happening.

Rosilyn Carroll: We have to address that achievement gap. Why is it that there even is such a gap, and that gap ends up with that disproportionality based on race and based on language? Even if we do it where we send kids to schools where there are good schools, senior teachers, and they do a marvelous job with children who look like them, something happens when there are children who do not look like them. And all of our data sets say in the year 2025 that we are going to have lots of people that do not look these teachers who are teaching. I think that we have to address this. It is not that these kids are inherently less smart than the other children.

Moderator Danielle Carnahan: Thank you for your comments. This is something we can discuss further in the breakout sessions. In the interest of all audience participants, I would like to open up the floor. Does anyone else have a question?

Question From Anne Stephens, Executive Director, Office of Reform and Federal Student Programs, Ohio Department of Education: I am with the Ohio Department of Education. I was a former superintendent of schools prior to coming to the department. I employed a lot of teachers out of the university who really didn't have a clue of what they were coming into. Someone said, the other day at a panel discussion I was attending, that they [new teachers] used up everything they ever learned in college with the first 10 minutes of the classroom. I am wondering what you feel about a K-16 connection. How many states have gone to this type of organization where everything is connected as to what is really going on in the schools and what teachers receive prior to going into the classroom? And do you think it is a good idea?

[Note: Dr. Young asked if Anne Stephens would describe a K-16 model before panelists responded.]

Anne Stephens: What we are talking about is a state department of education that has a K-16 obligation where the K-16 program is really is connected from one level to the next. The standards and everything that is important up to the 12th grade are instilled in the teacher education people as they move on into teaching. [They are] learning about cultures, learning about addressing the things that they are going to address when they come into the classrooms—[things] that educators who have been there for a while are really familiar with and can pass on to the young teachers. [If] they don't get that until a preservice time, it can really be a disaster for their career. Like you said, many of them are leaving because of that.

Panelist Response

Tim Shanahan: In terms of the specifics of the content of that, I will leave that alone because obviously I don't know that system. It does strike me there is much more diversity in teacher education than there is in K-12 education. We talk about the differences that exist, the differences Scott [Paris] referred to earlier, that they are more differences of intensity than they are qualitative differences. That isn't true in teacher education. States have, for example, adopted standards. I bet you if you went to any of your states and went through the teacher education programs, you would find wide differences in what percentages of students have ever even seen those standards, or have any kinds of instruction framed around them, so that you know how to teach to those things. I think you would find that in most institutions, while there would be a fairly large amount of preservice time in real classrooms with real teachers as someone stated earlier, [there would be] wide discrepancies in what is expected from that, and what kinds of situations they are put into, what kinds of support they receive, whether there is any kind of learning that comes out of it, or whether they are being thrown to the wolves a little earlier than they are going to be.

I think we have been really loath in the education community and higher education to be really be reigned in and do what our colleagues in law and medicine do. There are some real things that people have to know, and we are going to teach it, even if it is not the most interesting parts of what we get to do. I guarantee you that on anybody on this panel's research agenda, they are working on something more interesting than some of the basics of what our students need to learn. It is so easy for the researcher, for example, who is teaching those courses to say, "Let me tell you about my work," rather than "Let me tell you about why you teach a phonic element or what you do with a comprehension strategy. Here is how you work with fluency with a group of fourth graders when your class is split like this." We just don't want to go into to those because they are not the most fascinating issues. They are essential issues, and instead of saying, "Yes, but our students have to know it, so the next two weeks I have to do that," we have not done those kinds of things. I think in your question you are calling for a tighter coupling. I would fully support a tighter coupling, and I think that it is going to mean is that we need to discipline ourselves a bit, and really make some more social determinations of what it is that we really believe our teachers need to know and then to state those social agreements. I don't think we really do that right now.

Panelist Response

Dr. Mary McNabb: I would like to address the issues of a tighter coupling. NCATE [see National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2002] has changed some of their guidelines for accreditation. One thing that they are mandating is that colleges of education be responsible for the performance of their graduates in the first year of teaching. Some programs have addressed that by not trying to get NCATE accreditation. I have become familiar with the grant programs that are trying to meet the new NCATE requirements through my full-time job over the past year working with the PT3 program, which is Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology [see U.S. Department of Education, 2001]. They are redesigning their curriculum and their practices in preservice, so that they have a strong K-16 connection and a lot of flow between the different school systems through strong partnerships, and by creating communities of practices among inservice and preservice teachers. They are looking at how to use technology to help support and facilitate that through information and communication systems and things like that. So, I see a big national movement for those who want to keep NCATE accreditation to find ways to strengthen those bonds between inservice and preservice for the reason that you brought up.

Panelist Response

Dr. Donna Ogle: I think more articulation of our standards of what it means to be a teacher is very important. I'm not sure that it's just within a state because there is so much transfer of teachers from teacher preparation programs to other states. I know in Maryland I was on a panel where they were talking about preparation of teachers at the Maryland state universities, but two-thirds of those teachers who they prepared went out-of-state to teach. So what they also have to have is some way of communicating what the standards are when teachers from other states come into their state and become part of that system. I think articulated standards can be very helpful, and those standards so often are knowledge [that is] cognitively based. The practice of what happens in the classrooms is so much more complex that we need to have some sort of continuation process. Right now, the IRA [International Reading Association] is doing a study of teacher preparation programs in literacy. We are trying to follow those teachers both during their preparation programs and in the next two years. What we find is an incredibly complex shifting from the learner's stance to being an independent teacher to even becoming a part of the culture of the school and meeting the expectations within that environment. How you evaluate that connection is also very complex. We have a big study underway right now with eight teacher preparation institutions following those teachers into practice. I think having an articulated set of standards—having a set of expectations of what it looks like in the classroom—is something that we are all striving for, and it counters the culture of the university. It is a shifting role.

Moderator Danielle Carnahan: I would like to take the third question, please.

Question From Linda Wold, Purdue University–Calumet: I just wanted to let you know that we [Purdue University–Calumet] passed NCATE [accreditation] yesterday. Cynthia [Etsler] and I can speak from the heart about that, and it draws to mind a lot of issues that you have all addressed. I would like to say from my heart that I appreciate your participating in the panel today, because I think it is so critical that we hear more about the expertise from literacy researchers in the field, and that we really continue trying to translate that into practice. As a person who took some English cognate in my graduate work, I always go back to searching for the gaps in

our discussions. One of the important areas that I feel we have not really talked about—it parallels with all the field-work conversations that we've had today—is family literacy. We think we can do it all. We are sadly mistaken because our role as literacy professors and literacy educators is really to extend that school day in ways that are monumentally important to children and their learning-how they begin to monitor and learn independently from us and from our teaching. I think that it is a critical area that we need to think about-how we are going to support [family literacy] in our future teachers and also in the literacy faculty who are trying to do some of this powerful professional development in our schools.

I go from scaring myself about the weight and the burden of some of things that we have to do as literacy professionals to how I will get any sleep and plan for the next day and do a quality job of grading students' work and giving them feedback, and do all of the important things that I think are absolutely essential for future teachers. So that is something that I don't know if you can address. I think that as a profession, we have to figure out some ways to either provide release time or to honor the commitment of these professional development and field-work experiences. I find that in my own teaching, I take twice as much time in any professional developmental experience as I would in teaching a course. So the personal commitment is quite phenomenal. The other area that I think is really critical is—and we don't talk about this as much—but I think there is a cultural change happening. It is thinking about the teacher as teacher professional, researcher, and scholar in an ongoing way.

I remember hearing a literacy professional talk, maybe five years ago, about how they did not discuss research-based practice with students who were teacher candidates because they felt this was a problem. Teachers don't want to hear about the research, and practicing teachers don't want to hear about it in the field. I think we have to figure out a way culturally to raise the status of teachers and to help them understand that their scholarship and research-based practice is critical. NCATE [see National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2002] helps us to do that. It is only the floor; we are not at the ceiling. We are at the floor here when we are talking about helping teachers to become reflective scholar-practitioners. It has helped us to make our students realize that that is one of our standards that they have to be able to use research as a basis for best practice. So there were many other things that you talked about.

Thirdly, what I think is also critical is related to when Tim [Shanahan] was talking about his kids doing all of these various kinds of academic school activities. If you read the recent article by Shirley Bryce Heath [see Heath, 2000] about the arts, you realize that we forget about alternative ways to think about extending the school day and enhancing learning. We forget about the arts. The National Council of Teachers of English [see National Council of Teachers of English, 1996] has talked about the spoken and written and visual arts. We need to put that into practice, and the IRA [see International Reading Association, 1998] does the same. I don't know if these are comments or questions. You can address it all. I think that they are all critical issues about our teacher candidates and our practicing teachers.

Panelist Response

Dr. Mary McNabb: I think some of your issues relate to [the fact] that [literacy in the real world]—as far as family literacy and the kind of literacy that the kids are

learning out there in society—is not the kind of literacy practice that is going on in school, which is primarily print-based. Like you said, the standards from IRA and the National Council of Teachers of English [see National Council of Teachers of English & International Reading Association, 1996], which came out in 1996, redefined what *text* means. Text is not only print on a page. It's dynamic; it's interactive; it's electronic; it's multimodal; it's nonlinear. That's what kids are learning outside of school. Don Tapscott recently wrote a book, *Growing Up Digital* [see Tapscott, 1998] that documents how kids are using the new media. Kids spend an enormous amount of time online doing chats, creating Web pages, interacting with people around the world, and that's the kind of literacy they are developing. Then they come into the schools, and they are not exposed to that. It's foreign to them in a lot of ways.

I was in Indiana the last two days, and we were discussing problems with the writing tests in Indiana having to do with technology. In the English language arts curriculum, one of the big movements has been process writing and word processing. With kids, these are becoming their native writing tools—word processing and multimedia. But then we take the technology away from the kids in order to prepare them for a paper and pencil test, and we don't let them use the tools that they have learned to write with. There is research coming out showing that it is not fair. Kids don't always perform the same on paper and pencil tests as they would if they were given their native writing tools. I think this is a big issue that compounds all the other issues that were brought up. The problem with literacy instruction is that technology—and there is a lot of research out there showing that technology is really changing the nature of literacy—and our curriculums are not moving toward aligning with that. So there is a gap between what we are testing kids for and the kind of literacy that they are learning in the family and out in society. There are a lot of kids who don't perform well on the standardized test and may perform very well out in society doing other types of literacy. Then there is also that need for some of the basics so they can excel when they get out in the workplace. It is really a compounded problem. There is such a big difference between the kind of literacy out in society and that which we teach in schools.

Moderator Danielle Carnahan: Thank you. We have time for just one last question.

Question From Elizabeth Goldsmith-Conley, Illinois State Board of Education: First of all, my experience has been that there aren't enough good cooperating teachers. When I went for my credentials a long time ago in Berkley, we went immediately into the field. We had lots of hours in the field but very few hours in the classroom. But my two cooperating teachers were really not good teachers. I did not have very good mentoring experience myself. Then, as an assistant professor at a university with students who then went out into the field, what we found is that we couldn't get enough teachers. We were just dying for any teacher to take our students. We had too many students and nobody good to place them with. As a supervisor of student teachers, I found the same thing. Here I am talking in my class and seminar about motivating students, not just throwing text at them, and when I see my student teacher in the field, he just hands the kids the text. I talked this over with the cooperating teacher, and she said, "Oh, this motivation, this prior knowledge—I am tired of hearing all about this."

So I think that this is a problem that I see, and I start wondering if we aren't

graduating *too many* teachers, despite what we hear about the teacher shortage. Between 1994 and 1999, I went to back to New York City because I was dying to teach in inner-city schools. The first few years, I was unable to get a regular position. I went around subbing and observing. Finally, I got my form from the union, and it said that I could be a regular teacher. I went to the district that the board sent us to, and there were hundreds of teachers waving their tickets with certificates. There were only three positions there. Meanwhile, I went home, and in *The New York Times* it was saying that we don't have certified teachers, and we have thousands of positions going without teachers. We are going to have to hire teacher in alternative ways. Nonsense, it was because they didn't want to pay the salaries for certified teachers. I eventually did get a grade position. But I am wondering: Are we graduating too many teachers really, despite what we read about shortages?

Panelist Response

Dr. Timothy Shanahan: Are we educating too many teachers? In the city of Chicago in the next four years, we are going to hire a little over 10,000 new teachers. That's just for that one system. This year we hired just over 2,000 teachers. We are having to go all over the country to find them. No, we are not producing too many teachers.

Elizabeth Goldsmith-Conley: What I want to ask you is—aren't there many teachers, sitting right there—people who have left teaching [and] who are more expensive than the ones right out of college—who can't get positions? That's what I saw in New York City, even though New York was saying exactly what you are saying. But there were all those teachers, older teachers with their certificates.

Panelist Response

Dr. Timothy Shanahan: Systems are very different now. Union contracts are very different now. We pay teachers based on years of experience, and there is nothing we can do about it. If somebody comes in as an uncertified teacher through an alternative route, they get paid just as much as any other beginning teacher. There is no differentiation on that in Chicago or most systems that have union contracts. So, the reasons that people leave are sometimes financial. I think that some of the other factors that several folks on the panel talked about [are] in terms of working conditions and the way teachers cultivate the culture of the school. The culture of the society [is such] that in terms of those 366 Chicago schools in the newspaper this morning that Scott Paris is referring to, I assume they feel pretty bad today just in terms of embarrassment. When you go to a family or a friend's get-together, you don't want to tell people that you are a teacher or where you teach under those circumstances. I think there are a lot of reasons why teachers leave teaching. We are certainly not forcing people out to save money. We are forcing people out because we are sloppy and not getting the job done. It is a different kind of problem.

Moderator Danielle Carnahan: I would like to thank all the panelists and the audience for a wonderful morning.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Luncheon Address

Dr. Barbara Eason-Watkins, Chief Education Officer for the Chicago Public Schools, delivered the luncheon address.

"I wanted to frame my comments today. I know that this is a research group that is meeting today and really beginning to talk about ways in which we can begin linking effective research into classroom practice. I am going to use, as a basis for most of my comments, some of the work that was done at McCosh School and try to connect that with—Dr. Shanahan is here who is the Executive Director of the Chicago Reading Initiative—this link as I conclude my comments with how we are moving our reading initiative forward. Let me give you more information about McCosh because if you think about schools, we have varying schools and different demographics. Our poverty level range at that time was between 95 and 100 percent. I was there for approximately 12 years. It was never below 95 [percent], and it generally ranged about 97 to 98 [percent]. The community was characterized as having high gang involvement. We had many single parent homes. We had many grandparents raising children. We had a mobility rate that ranged annually anywhere from 30 to 50 percent. I think only one year of the 12 years that I was there, it was below 30 percent; it was 28 percent.

"We had teachers initially working in isolation. We had reading instruction, as you moved from classroom to classroom, varying in intensity. Some were focused strictly on phonics. We had some, when I first got them, who were really using direct instruction. I think it was called Distar. We had some who just came out of school who were focused on whole language. We had those who used this basal [reading text] and those that used that basal.

"Obviously, there was not a core set of knowledge that really spanned all of our grade levels for all of our students. It was noted earlier that McCosh was one of the 100 lowest performing schools. Our initial efforts at raising reading instruction and achievement, really focused on having some of our university faculty—we were working with some partners at that particular time—conducting workshops on effective instructional practice. At the conclusion of the workshops, the teachers would say they really enjoyed the work and the presentation. [Yet] we did not see an impact on classroom instruction. It did not connect with what was happening in the classroom. So we began to think about ways in which we could really begin to link the work that we knew should be going on in the classrooms—the work that faculty members were telling us that was really being recommended from the research and classroom practice. We started initially what we called the 'Breakfast Club.' We were trying to figure out a way again to bring teachers together in small groups and get them involved in discussions and conversations about teaching and learning. So initially, our faculty members who were working with us brought articles that were related to our reading program. The teachers would get together,

and initially they would simply read the research articles and summarize them. That, too, is not going to have any impact on classroom instruction.

"We then began to push them a little more. Let's go beyond the research. Let's figure out what the research is saying. But let's talk about and see if we could think about implications for practice. So they did. They summarized, and then they talked about implications for practice. Once again, it did not go any further.

"We continued, and we thought we had a good idea. Let's see if we can nurture this. We still had the group coming together, because it was the Breakfast Club meeting. I was personally paying for the breakfast. I couldn't pay the teachers for coming, because we hadn't budgeted it for that particular year. But I wanted to ensure that I had some incentive, and we provided a pretty nice breakfast for them. So we began to give them posing questions. Like if you read this article a little bit in advance, think about the implications for practice. And then think about what you are doing in your own classroom that might relate to that. So then we began to get a dialogue where the teachers really began to talk about what they were doing, what they could do in the classroom, and it began a conversation about teaching and learning. But it was a process; it didn't happen overnight. We continued to work with that particular process. What was happening was we began, as we listened to teachers, to say that we have got some really good things happening in isolation, but nobody really knows about it.

"We connected this Breakfast Club, where we would introduce a piece of research or literature about our reading program. The teachers would talk about implications. Then they would talk about how it connected with classroom practice. We connected it with the teacher leader program, where our teachers would conduct workshops on things that they were actually doing in their classrooms. They would model strategies, sometimes involving some of the teachers. And then, subsequent to the workshops, they would actually open up their classrooms as a sort of mini-laboratory and allow other teachers to come in and observe practice.

"It was only when we went through that complete loop that we began to see a difference. This is what we began with our primary teachers, and we found that it was a very, very effective way for us to promote our reading framework, which at that time was based on the Four Blocks [see Cunningham & Hall, 2001]. We were starting looking at some research that Pat Cunningham had done on the Four Blocks framework. We developed a hybrid of the Pat Cunningham model. We were committed to the fact that there were four things that needed to take place during the reading period: Guided Reading, Self-Selected Reading, Writing, and Working With Words.

"Everything we did focused on those particular areas. As I look back on some of our inservice reports from those particular years, we were just emerging as a school that was focused on literacy. Every single workshop focused on the reading framework. Every particular piece of research or literature that we read in the morning focused on what we were doing or connected with what we were doing in the classroom. The teachers began to lead the discussions and facilitate the discussions during the Breakfast Club. They led the workshops. As they led the workshops and talked with their peers, they really began to immerse themselves in the research. They wanted to appear as experts. And what it did for our school was to really help build capacity within our school, based on best practices.

"I just wanted to go a little bit further and talk about middle school literacy because that was something else that was really troubling for us at the time. Our sixth-, seventh- and eighth-grade students were low-performing and acting out. They were totally disinterested in the reading program. So the teachers themselves began looking at turning points because we already had begun looking at articles and research and different kinds of things. They said, 'We are not ready to teach these adolescents. We don't really understand them. We don't have the knowledge that we need to effectively respond to reluctant and struggling readers and really provide a viable instructional program for them.' So with that, because we had created a culture within the school where we were already reading and discussing and sharing, there was an environment that really reflected one of trust, where teachers could say, 'I need this. It's okay if we don't know everything. It's important, and we will try to move forward.' The teachers themselves agreed, as a cohort, to take courses on middle school philosophy, psychology of adolescence, and then middle school curriculum. And that led to them describing—based on the research—a model for instruction at our middle school level, that basically included an interdisciplinary focus, but again it also linked a strong content-area focus. Because once again we are still a school with a high mobility rate, students coming in and out of our school all year long, and we had to ensure that the students were getting that content-area knowledge that was required.

"There was an article that the teachers read in the National Middle School Association's research journal [*Middle School Journal*] that comes out periodically, that led some of the teachers to want to visit some schools that were actually modeling some aspect of this particular work. So based on the research and the site visits, they got together by grade level and by subject area, and they began the process of actually restructuring our school curriculum at the middle-grade level. In essence what has happened, they were collaboratively working to design a research-based model that, from their perspective and the perspective of some of the faculty members who were working with us from the various universities, really reflected the best thinking that was going on and the best knowledge at that particular time on middle-level education and what our students needed. It really helped for us to put together a standardized focus for our school. Because again, at one point, we had teachers in isolation; we had a fragmented approach. But because the teachers were looking at the literature and collaboratively working together, we then began to have a uniform focus. So, in essence, from just these two examples of what happened at the school, we provided access to the research to our teachers. I was really astounded. I began my career in Michigan, and when I moved to Illinois and found that there was no requirement for teachers to take classes or to do any type beyond the bachelor's degree, I was astounded. We had to take 15 hours every five years at that particular time, and this goes back to the 1970s. We provided access to the research and access to research that would directly have an impact and support the teachers' work. It was not something that was good information or something that someone had done and gotten an award for. It was something that was personalized and directly related to our school.

"We then made sure that the teachers clearly understood what the research study said. They understood clearly the implications, and they understood some instructional strategies that directly related to it. We then connected our school as a laboratory so that the teachers could observe good practice. But a key piece that then began to emerge was this whole notion of professional community—because the teachers were talking together, they were collaborating together, they were

reflecting together, they were supporting one another. So, as a team, they were able to work together to enhance instruction within our school. We then began to look at the adult piece. As the research and literature began to emerge about professional communities, we began to compare it to the work that was going on in our school. We made some other modifications to ensure that we were clearly identifying the problems that existed, and we were focusing our inquiries—identifying research—based on those particular problems, so we were not wasting time. We always wanted to work smart. We were focusing on the things that would lead to improvement for us.

"Let me shift gears for just a moment and begin to think about how researchers and practitioners can support the efforts of urban schools [in] moving these schools from the high-poverty, low-performing stance into high-performing schools. From my perspective, based on the work that took place at our school and the work that I have known that has taken place in other areas, I think that it is important that the studies and research that are done really focus in on typical urban classrooms and urban schools. I think that when teachers can see that these things can work in a setting that is just like the setting that I am working in, then—first of all—they will pay more attention to it. They will believe it, and it is more relevant.

"One of the teachers from McCosh School said to me, 'It is nice having the university people here, but they may not have been in the classroom for 25 years.' When I am looking at information or seeing a video or I am looking at research that describes the feelings of teachers and principals in settings like mine, it is more believable. I am more willing to try it. I think that it is important that they tell us what works and what the best practices are, but I think that it is really important that they are able to get into the classrooms and tell us what actually is going on in the classrooms. I had a large number of teachers—11 teachers—in my school who went through National Board certification [see National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 2001]. And these were good teachers. But as part of their work, they had to actually videotape themselves and then reflect and look at their videos in terms of what was happening. They were really able to say, 'I wish I would have done this differently. Look at the students who are over here. I thought I had a good view of everyone in the classroom. Now I see that I have to position myself or I might need to do this differently.' I think that it is so critical that we begin to get into the classrooms, so that we can report on those types of things.

"We were really intrigued by some of the work by the consortium at the University of Chicago [see Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2002]. In addition to our clear focus of literacy, we looked broadly at some of the research that was done and some of the research that they did. They actually went into classrooms. They talked about the fact that pacing and coherence were generally weak in the lower-performing schools. They talked about the fact that students in the lower-performing schools had less opportunities to be engaged in more challenging work. [They also talked about] the fact that time—the misuse of time—was often a factor. The types of examples they provided to us really helped to change the way in which we do things. There was a time when our regional office would call, and they would have an assembly program or some speaker who was coming in and they wanted to pick your school because you have a good school. They wanted to send these people out. I had to start saying no because it took away those instructional minutes that we could never get back. Because our students have a high mobility rate, we have issues that often prevent our children from coming to school. We had to make

those types of decisions. But it was the research from the consortium that we really wove into our work with literacy that really helped to frame that for us.

"Now in terms of the work that is going on in Chicago in general with our reading initiative, we were able to merge the work of the National Reading Panel and the work that we knew had come out of the consortium, and the knowledge that came out of McCosh. I really thank Dr. Shanahan for his influence and support and his agreement to come on board with us. I know sometimes he says, 'Why did I do this?' But we thank him. He first said to me, 'Well, I will consult with you.' And I said, 'No, that is not going to be enough.' And then he said, 'Well, maybe I will come on half-time.' And I said, 'No, that is not going to work.' And he was really able to make the leap and really make that commitment to come into our system to help us to determine the types of things that were important. So with regard to the Chicago Reading Initiative—and, again, think back to what I said about consortium reports and about reading—time is important. We have to make sure that the amount of time that children are actively engaged in meaningful reading activities is increased. To that end, our reading program has a mandated minimum of two hours that must be devoted to reading instruction. We have said that at the middle school and the high school, reading can be taught across the content areas. It *should* be taught across the content areas. As we look at the ISAT [Illinois Standards Achievement Test] in science and social studies, what do the kids have to do in order to get a good score? They have to be able to read. So in using reading strategies, we have to make sure that they are the appropriate ones for reading expository text.

"Then we—I still feel a part of McCosh School—saw a significant increase in the social studies and science scores because we taught them a combination of reading strategies for expository text along with the hands-on experiences that they needed in the science, for example. We also know now that coherence is important. With 26,000 classrooms across the city, we had to find a way of bringing coherence to the system. We did that by establishing a uniform framework for instruction. This uniform framework is based on the findings of the National Reading Panel [see National Reading Panel, 2000], which basically says that word knowledge, fluency, comprehension, and writing are the four things that need to be included in a reading program. We did not endorse any particular reading program. We have vendors coming out from everywhere and telling us that their reading program supports this or supports that. We are not doing that because schools have relationships. We know that in many cases, the findings are that most things do work if used properly. The key is making sure that equal attention is paid to the things that we felt are important. We are also recommending that the instructional strategies—and we have examples of them in resources that they can utilize to support the various components of the framework—that they support engaging intellectual work.

"We know that our work with elementary schools is going to be fairly easy, but our work with the high schools is going to be more difficult. We have to proceed—as Tim [Shanahan] says—with care and engage them in the process; because, with the high schools, we know that the research has indicated there that professional community is often weak. Teacher trust is often weak. Their total work orientation is not about collaboration, but everybody there is the expert and who are we to come in and tell the experts what to do? Most of them engage in more traditional ways of teaching that engage the students less and provide a more lecture-oriented format.

"So our plan is—we don't hear a lot about high schools today—in fact, I am glad to see Dr. Dawson [Diane Dyer-Dawson, principal of George W. Collins High School in Chicago] here today because we talked with her about perhaps working with her school in a more comprehensive manner—[so our plan is] really promoting professional community first.

"I think that the courses that are offered at the university level need to clearly link theory and practice. Teachers need to be able to connect the information that they are getting in the courses and directly take it into the classrooms. And if that is not the case, it is not going to be meaningful. With our preservice teachers who were coming into our schools and with some new teachers coming in, they were coming in from universities with high grade-point averages, with strong credentials, and could cite the research, but they couldn't figure out what they needed to do next. And if we don't connect theory and practice for them, then we are not going to be able to accelerate the progress.

"I also think, as I noted earlier, there has to be a real connection between research and field work. It really has to focus in on the specific areas of concern. We need to provide concrete recommendations and make sure that the schools have access. What I think was helpful to us and has been helpful to other schools is that the university faculty actually came into our school. We didn't have to go to them; they came to us. Not only were they sharing the research and helping us to better understand how to utilize the research, they went into our classrooms and cotaught with the teachers. They became part of the process, and that's what really made the difference.

"And even though this is a literacy group, we did something with mathematics that involved a math educator and a person from the math department. That was really difficult. But once he got into the school, and he could see what the teachers actually needed, he restructured the courses that he was taking for the next year. But had he not come on-site, that would not have happened.

"The final thing that I think that needs to be done is that I really feel that the university personnel—in terms of guiding us to begin to work together, to work together collaboratively to review the research—helped us to feel the institutional capacity within our school. They first started off by providing us with articles, and then we started providing articles. They first facilitated the workshops; we then facilitated the workshops. Then after a year, they did not have to come back. They would just come back at times to see how we were doing. I think that as we were able to move our system forward and build that capacity, that is the only way we were really going to be able to see the progress required. I just have to say to those of you who are part of the research community and those of you here representing universities, I truly look forward, in my capacity as a Chief Education Officer, to working with you and to getting guidance from you as we move forward. We know we have a tremendous journey ahead. It is going to be quite difficult. But I encourage you to take the leap, as Dr. Shanahan has taken the leap, and begin to work closely side-by-side. We even e-mail on the weekends. It is that type of commitment that is really going to ensure that our underperforming schools—be they urban, rural, or whatever—are able to make progress and become high-performing schools."

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Afternoon Session

Linking Research to Practice: Framework for Cross-States Study Teams

The topic of the afternoon session was linking research to practice. In developing this topic, participants were assigned to four cross-states study teams. The teams were asked to complete two forms: the Cross-States Collaboration Study Team Research-to-Practice Form [see Appendix B], and the Research-to-Practice Guiding Questions Form [see Appendix C].

When completing the Cross-States Collaboration Study Team Research-to-Practice Form, each team selected two research areas that were discussed in the morning panel presentation and one of the common areas of literacy needs selected previously by the Regional Literacy Network. The teams then discussed and recorded on the form the research problems or critical issues, practice solutions, and results of implementation. They suggested the following information:

Content-Area Reading in Middle and High School

Practice Solutions:

- Break the concepts into simpler terminology.
- Create a broader definition of reading.
- Understand that every teacher is a reading teacher.
- Understand how to contextualize literacy in the content areas.
- Understand strategies that content-area teachers can use.
- Develop professional development that models strategies for teaching literacy with content-area textbooks.
- Identify the top ten strategies for content-area textbook reading.
- Create standards that are consistent across the region.
- Learn how to collect and interpret data to make instructional change.
- Look at and bring about consistency of standards across the region.

Results:

- Middle and high school teachers who use literacy in the content areas for diverse learners (e.g., cultural, linguistic, special needs).
- Fewer dropouts and suspensions.
- Reexamination of how middle and high schools look.
- Positive, inclusive environment for all students.

Closing the Achievement Gap

Practice Solutions:

- Modify standards to be inclusive.
- Change support structures.
- Reexamine grouping structures.

Results:

- Changes in classroom practice.

Professional Development

Practice Solutions:

- Have professional development available during the school day.
- Align professional development with the school vision.
- Form a collaborative team that works with state departments and universities.
- Bring in consultants to which teachers can relate.
- Get teachers to "buy in."
- Develop master teachers.
- Include the administration.

Results:

- Publish university professional development ideas.
- Model teaching in the classroom and meet with individual teachers or by grade level.
- Better instruction.
- Higher test scores.
- Increased capacity of teachers.
- Community of learners, which translates into best practices.
- Teachers see themselves as professionals.

Preservice Preparation

Practice Solutions:

- Understand what is meant by *reading assessment* and *testing*.
- Define *balanced literacy*.
- Train teachers to be reading specialists.
- Create a schoolwide focus on reading, and train teachers to work together as a team.
- Have NCREL create a model for training reading teachers.

Results:

- Everyone is a reading teacher.
- Collaborative work.

Assessment and Accountability

Practice Solutions:

- Involve all content areas in reading and writing.
- Create a partnership with families.
- Work as a team.
- Use the school library and public library more.

Results:

- Opportunities for families to become partners.
- Collaboration with public libraries to get students reading.

The team then completed the Research-to-Practice Guiding Questions Form. This form asked the participants to think about what research-based instruction would look like in instructional practices, learning environment, grouping, materials, and assessment. It asked them how they would monitor the instructional implementation process of research-based practices in the classroom and schoolwide literacy program. The teams' responses are reflected below.

1. What does research-based instruction look like for the following areas?

Instructional Practices:

- Level of engagement: 90 percent of students on task 90 percent of the time.
- Less focus on the teacher and more on the students.
- Quality of tasks and discussion.
- Standards are reflected.
- Multiple teaching styles and methods are used to teach various learning styles within each class period.
- Collaboration between content areas.

Learning Environment:

- Maximizes instruction.
- Students "buy in."
- Student products are visible.
- High expectations for all students.
- View students as "half-full."

Grouping:

- Every child is holding a book that he or she can read independently.
- Fluid groups, teacher conferencing with groups.
- Random.
- Flexible.

Materials:

- Variety of resources.
- Student generated.
- Multicultural.

- Based on students needs and interests.

Assessment:

- Ongoing.
- Variety.
- Teacher observing himself or herself.
- Performance based.
- Correlated to learning objectives.
- Result oriented.
- Authentic.

2. How would you monitor the instructional implementation process of research-based practices in the classroom and schoolwide literacy program?

- Classroom visits.
- Peer coaching.
- Time to reflect and collaborate.
- Mentoring.
- Study groups.
- "Standardized" information.
- Parent and community involvement.
- Set questions:
  - What are you doing?
  - Why are you doing it?
  - Are you doing well?
  - How do you know you are doing well?
- Action research.
- Self-assessment.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

References

American Educational Research Association. (2000). *AERA position statement concerning high-stakes testing in preK-12 education.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.aera.net/about/policy/stakes.htm

American Psychological Association. (2001). *Testing and assessment.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.apa.org/science/testing.html

Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkenson, I. A. G. (1986). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading.* Champaign, IL: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

Armbruster, B. B., Lehr, F., & Osborn, J. (2001). *Put reading first: The research building blocks for teaching children to read.* Washington, DC: Partnership for Reading. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.nifl.gov/nifl/partnershipforreading/publications/PFRbooklet.pdf

Banchero, S., Olszewski, L., & Dougherty, G. (2001, November 15). 75% of city's grade schools on warning list. *Chicago Sun-Times,* pp. 1, 28.

Beginning School Study Team. (2001). *Hopkids home: The Web site designed specifically for the participants of the Beginning School Study at the Johns Hopkins University.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://bssonline.jhu.edu/hopkids/

Carter, S. C. (2000). *No excuses: Lessons from 21 high-performing, high-poverty schools.* Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.noexcuses.org/

Consortium on Chicago School Research. (2002). *The consortium's unique approach to research on urban schools.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.consortium-chicago.org/aboutus/u0001.html

Cunningham, P. M., & Hall, D. P. (2001). *The four blocks.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.wfu.edu/~cunningh/fourblocks/

Entwisle, D. R., Alexander, K. L., & Olson, L. S. (2001). Keep the faucet flowing: Summer learning and home environment. *American Educator, 47,* 10-15.

Haladyna, T., Nolen, S. B., & Haas, N. S. (1991). Raising standardized achievement test scores and the origins of test score pollution. *Educational Researcher, 20*(5), 2-7.

Haney, W. (2000). The myth of the Texas miracle in education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(41). Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n41/

Haycock, K. (2001, July 20). *Achievement in America and what we have to do to improve it.* Keynote address at the tenth annual institute of the Consortium for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Education (CREATE), Wilmington, NC.

Heath, S. B. (2000). Making learning work. *Afterschool Matters, 1*(1), 33-45.

Hoffman, J. V., Assaf, L. C., & Paris, S. G. (2001). High stakes testing in reading: Today in Texas, tomorrow? *The Reading Teacher, 54*(5), 482-492.

International Reading Association. (1998). *Standards for reading professionals* (Rev. ed.). Newark, DE: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.reading.org/advocacy/standards/free_index.html

International Reading Association. (1999). *High stakes testing* (Summary of a position statement of the International Reading Association: High-stakes assessments in reading). Newark, DE: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.reading.org/positions/high_stakes.html

Kirsch, I., & Jungeblut, A. (1986). *Literacy: Profiles of America's young adults* (ETS Report 16, PL-02). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (2001). *National Board certification*. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.nbpts.org/

National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *The 1992 national adult literacy survey: Overview*. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://nces.ed.gov/naal/design/about92.asp

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001). *Standards for professional development schools.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.ncate.org/2000/pdsstands_10-00.pdf

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2002). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of education.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.ncate.org/2000/unit_stnds_2002.pdf

National Council of Teachers of English. (1996). *Guidelines for the preparation of teachers of English language arts.* Urbana, IL: Author.

National Council of Teachers of English & International Reading Association. (1996). *Standards for the English language arts.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

National Evaluation Systems. (2001). *Reading instruction competence assessment.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.rica.nesinc.com/

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/publications/summary.htm

National Staff Development Council. (1995). *Standards for staff development.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.nsdc.org/standards.htm

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/

Nolen, S. B., Haladyna, T. M., & Haas, N. S. (1989). *A survey of Arizona teachers and school administrators on the uses and effects of standardized achievement testing* (Technical Report No. 89-2). Phoenix, AZ: Arizona State University West Campus.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (2000). *A study of the differences between higher- and lower-performing Indiana schools in reading and mathematics.* Oak Brook, IL: Author.

Paris, S. G. (2000). Trojan horse in the schoolyard: The hidden threats in high-stakes testing. *Issues in Education, 6*(1, 2), 1-16.

Paris, S. G., & Urdan, T. (2000). Policies and practices of high-stakes testing that influence teachers and schools. *Issues in Education, 6*(1, 2), 83-107.

Paul, T. D. (1996). *Patterns of reading practice.* Madison, WI: Institute for Academic Excellence.

Rossi, R., Beaupre, B., Grossman, K., Mendietta, A., Balacci, L., & McKinney, D. (2001, September). Failing teachers: A Sun-Times investigation. *Chicago Sun-Times.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.suntimes.com/special_sections/failing_teacher/

Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher, 29*(7), 4-14. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.aera.net/pubs/er/arts/29-07/shep01.htm

Stanovich, K. E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly, 21*, 360-406.

Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the net generation.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Taylor, B. M., & Pearson, P. D. (2001). *CIERA school change framework.* Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.schoolchange.ciera.org/

Texas Education Agency. (2002). *Student assessment division.* Retrieved July 16, 2002, from http://www.tea.state.tx.us/student.assessment/reporting/index.html

U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *Preparing tomorrow's teachers to use*

technology Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.ed.gov/offices/OPE/PPI/teachtech/

Viadero, D. (2001, October 17). DOD-run schools cited for closing achievement gap. *Education Week, 21*(7), 23-24. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.edweek.org/ew/ew_printstory.cfm?slug=07dod.h21

WestEd. (2000). *Teachers who learn: Kids who achieve: A look at schools with model professional development.* San Francisco: Author. Retrieved July 23, 2002, from http://www.wested.org/cs/wew/view/rs/179

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Appendix A. Biographies of Speakers and Panelists

Barbara Eason-Watkins, Ed.D.

Barbara Eason-Watkins was recently appointed chief education officer for the Chicago Public Schools after serving as a principal since 1985. She has received numerous awards, including the Whitman Award for Excellence in Educational Leadership (1989), Chicago Public Schools Principal of Excellence Award (1990 and 1995), Kizzy Award (1996), Chicago Public Schools Outstanding Principal Leadership Award (1997), *Phi Delta Kappan* Educator of the Year Award (1995), and the 1998 Chicagoan of the Year Award from *Chicago Magazine*.

Under her leadership, McCosh Elementary School was transformed from one of the 100 lowest performing schools to recognition as a Level A school by the Chicago Public Schools Office of Accountability for consistent improvement. Both the Consortium on Chicago School Research and Northwestern University conducted studies at the school to document and disseminate instructional and leadership practices that have led to increased student achievement. In addition, McCosh School is featured in videos produced by the Illinois State Board of Education (*Quality Review Training*), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (*Principal and Instructional Leadership Series*), National Education Services (*Professional Learning Communities at Work*), and Video Journal (*Leadership in the Age of Standards and High Stakes*). McCosh School also was the focus of a recent leadership series in Education Week in an article titled "Principals Try New Styles as Instructional Leaders."

Dr. Eason-Watkins attended the University of Michigan (B.A.), Chicago State University (M.A.), and the University of Chicago (Fellow in Educational Administration). She received her doctorate in education from Loyola University.

Peggy A. Grant, Ph.D.

Peggy Grant currently holds the position of program associate in the Center for Literacy at NCREL. Her responsibilities include conducting research on issues related to literacy and providing technical assistance in schools, particularly in the area of secondary content-area literacy.

She received her Ph.D. in literacy education from Washington State University with minors in English and political science. Her coursework centered on issues of culture and language as they relate to education, and her research examined the reflection processes of preservice teachers as they worked toward an understanding of constructivist learning theory.

Before pursuing her doctoral degree, Dr. Grant taught English and reading for 21 years at the junior and senior high school levels. She served as the district language arts coordinator for several years and was twice chosen by her peers as the district Teacher of the Year.

She taught literacy methods and general secondary methods for six years in the Department of Initial Teacher Preparation at Purdue University-Calumet in Hammond, Indiana. She served on the University Senate and worked to move the teacher preparation program to a standards-based curriculum in keeping with the requirements of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the state of Indiana.

In addition to her published work, she has presented at the national conventions of the American Educational Research Association, the International Reading Association, the Association of Teacher Educators, and the National Reading Conference.

She currently is working on a research study of high school teachers' understanding of content-area literacy strategies and the processes they undergo to integrate literacy into their instruction.

Terry A. Greene, Ph.D.

Terry A. Greene is the owner and president of Literacy Initiatives, a consulting company specializing in prekindergarten through 12th-grade professional development and district planning in literacy. As a consultant, her goals include establishing long-term relationships with school districts and regional education centers in the design, implementation, and professional development of quality reading and language arts programs that support high achievement for all students.

Prior to establishing Literacy Initiatives, Dr. Greene worked with Richardson Independent School District, in Texas, as the coordinating director of language and literacy. Her district responsibilities included the implementation, supervision, and professional development of programs in prekindergarten through 12th-grade reading, bilingual and English as a second language, prekindergarten through sixth-grade language arts, Reading Recovery, Title I and Compensatory Education in reading, and state and federal grants in literacy.

Dr. Greene also worked with the Pacific Regional Office of the Department of Defense Dependents Schools as the director of early childhood, school improvement, and North Central accreditation programs. She provided professional development for teachers and supervised early childhood, school improvement, and accreditation programs in Korea, Japan, and the Philippines. Prior to this position, Dr. Greene was the assistant principal of a large elementary school, Yokota East Elementary School, at Yokota Air Base outside of Tokyo. For the 11 years prior to moving into administration, she was a classroom teacher in the elementary and middle grades and a reading improvement specialist in Germany, Korea, Newfoundland, the Philippines, and Austin, Texas.

In addition, Dr. Greene was an assistant professor at the University of Arizona in the Department of Teaching and Teacher Education. She taught reading, language arts, and social studies methods courses to preservice teachers and supervised

student teachers. She defended her dissertation on October 31, 1995, at the University of Arizona, majoring in language, reading, and culture with a minor in teaching and teacher education.

Mary McNabb, Ed.D.

Mary McNabb is a research scientist at the University of Denver Research Institute. She serves on the core group of evaluators at the program level for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (PT3) federal grant program and codirects the PT3 Vision Quest for Teaching in
E-Learning Cultures project.

From 1996 to 2000, Dr. McNabb served the North Central Regional Educational Laboratory as program associate, senior program associate, and then director of applied research in educational technology. During that time, she coauthored a number of research and development products on planning and evaluating educational uses of technology. She worked closely with the Office of Educational Technology at the U.S. Department of Education on national and regional conferences pertaining to evaluation of educational technology. She served as NCREL's partner on the leadership committee developing the National Educational Technology Standards for teachers.

In 1996, she earned a doctorate in educational technology and a master of science in educational psychology from Northern Illinois University. She also holds two English degrees from Michigan State University and is a licensed professional counselor. While teaching at several institutions of higher education prior to 1996, she helped infuse technology into the reading, writing, and preservice education curricula.

Donna M. Ogle, Ed.D.

Donna M. Ogle is a professor of education at National-Louis University in Evanston, Illinois, and president of the International Reading Association during 2001-02. She teaches graduate courses in literacy, engages in research, and participates in ongoing staff development projects in the United States and internationally. Her primary areas of work are reading and learning strategies and the process of instructional change in schools. The K-W-L strategy that she developed is widely used around the world as a major component in reading to learn. Dr. Ogle has written widely and is featured on many videotape programs (ASCD and IRI Skylight). Her latest book, coauthored with Camille Blachowicz, is *Reading Comprehension: Strategies for Independent Learners*, published by Guilford. She also is a senior consultant for McDougal-Littell's new middle-grade history text, *Creating America*.

Dr. Ogle received a B.A. in social studies from Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota, a Master of Education in reading from the University of Virginia, and an Ed.D. from Oklahoma State University. She has been a classroom teacher and Title I resource teacher. During the 1998-99 academic year, she served as coordinator for the Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking project in Europe and Asia. She also served as consultant for USAID in Pakistan and for the Newspapers in Education project in Argentina.

Dr. Ogle is committed to the improvement of literacy opportunities for all students. She is currently a volunteer for the Reading and Writing for Critical Thinking project in Russia and Romania. She directs a Goals 2000 project in five Chicago high schools and is a senior consultant with the National Urban Alliance. Dr. Ogle is a consultant to the Illinois State Board of Education, cochaired the development of the Illinois Language Arts Standards, and is author of the Illinois resource book *Reading in the Middle Grades*. She has served as consultant to the U.S. Office of Education and is on the advisory boards for North Central Regional Educational Laboratory and the Texas Reading Task Force.

Dr. Ogle is an active leader in professional associations. She has been on the board of directors for the National Reading Conference and the International Reading Association, and she has chaired the research assembly of the National Council of Teachers of English. She is past-president of the Illinois Reading Council and is an associate for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. She has served on the review boards for *The Reading Teacher, The Journal of Literacy Research, Reading Research Quarterly, California Reader*, and *Educational Assessment*.

Scott Paris, Ph.D.

Scott Paris is a professor of psychology and education and a researcher at the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIERA) at the University of Michigan. Since receiving his Ph.D. from Indiana University, he has been on the faculty at Purdue University and a visiting professor at Stanford, UCLA, the University of Hawaii, the University of Auckland (New Zealand), and three universities in Australia.

Dr. Paris has published ten books and written more than 100 book chapters and research articles in the areas of children's reading, learning, metacognition, and cognitive development. In 1993 and 1997, he received the Dean's Award for Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching, and in 1995 he received the University of Michigan Amoco Foundation Faculty Award for Distinguished Teaching.

Timothy Shanahan, Ph.D.

Timothy Shanahan is a professor of urban education at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), where he is coordinator of graduate programs in reading, writing, and literacy and director of the UIC Center for Literacy. His research focuses on the relationship of reading and writing, school improvement, the assessment of reading ability, and family literacy. He has just been appointed director of reading for the Chicago Public Schools, the nation's third largest school system, which serves more than 432,000 children.

Dr. Shanahan received his Ph.D. at the University of Delaware in 1980. He just completed a term as member of the board of directors of the International Reading Association. He serves on the National Reading Panel, a group convened by the National Institute of Child Health and Development at the request of Congress to evaluate research on successful methods of teaching reading. He is chair of the Reading Advisory Committee for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and coeditor of the *Illinois Reading Council Journal*. He has authored more than 100 research articles, chapters, and other publications.

He received the Albert J. Harris Award for outstanding research on reading disability from the International Reading Association (IRA), the Milton D. Jacobson Readability Research Award also from IRA, the Amoco Award for Outstanding Teaching, and the University of Delaware Presidential Citation for Outstanding Achievement.

Dr. Shanahan is director of Project FLAME, a family literacy program for Latino immigrants now used throughout the United States. Project FLAME received an Academic Excellence Award from the U.S. Department of Education.

Edyth E. Young, Ph.D.

Edyth E. Young is the director of research in the Center for Literacy at North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). Prior to joining NCREL in 1999, Dr. Young served as interim director of the graduate program in reading and literacy at Lewis University School of Education and as district administrative reading specialist and Title I director at Oak Park and River Forest High School.

In her present position, Dr. Young directs research projects and the development of high-quality research and technology-based products to support literacy at the elementary, middle, and high school level. She provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers, administrators, and other state-level educators. She works with school and state-level evaluations and supports formal and informal collaborations with national literacy research centers and institutions and collaborative regional networks.

Dr. Young was chosen by the People To People International Citizen Ambassador program to be an ambassador for literacy in South Africa during the summer of 1996. The focus of this ambassadorship was international cross-collaboration on educational initiatives, ranging from preschool to adult literacy, with the Ministry of Education and in schools within and outside of townships, universities, and a variety of communities. The program was established in 1956 by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower through the U.S. State Department and is highly active today. As a result of this ambassadorship, she helps schools and organizations establish branches of Readers as Leaders International (i.e., student ambassadors with a mission to spread worldwide literacy). The major focus is on developing expert reading and strategic thinking skills, leadership, and citizenship awareness with at-risk learners.

She also is a member of the Focus Council for the American Association of College Teacher Educators, whose board of directors has charged this council with determining what preservice candidates need to know about reading. The council also is charged with preparing a position document on the subject.

Dr. Young earned her doctorate degree in reading and evaluation research with an administrative endorsement from the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana.

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Appendix B: Cross-States Collaboration Study Team Research-to-Practice Form

Research Problem or Critical Issue	Practice Solution	Result

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Appendix C: Research-to-Practice Guiding Questions Form

1. What does research-based instruction look like in the classroom for the following areas?

- Instructional Practices
- Learning Environment
- Grouping
- Materials
- Assessment

2. How would you monitor the instructional implementation process of research-based practices in the classroom and schoolwide literacy program?

Previous | Table of Contents | Next

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

Report of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations

Acknowledgments

Meeting Developers
Edyth E. Young, Peggy A. Grant, Danielle Carnahan

Meeting Coordinator
Dina Czocher

Report Written by
Jennie M. Righeimer and Cathy Voss

Editor
Jan Gahala

Video Production
Creative Café

Special thanks are extended to the members of the Regional and National Literacy Network of Research and Professional Organizations, the Regional Literacy Network, and special guests for their participation and input at the first annual meeting of the Research Network. The Center for Literacy would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Paul Kimmelman, special advisor to the executive director at NCREL, for delivering the morning keynote address on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the federal role in education related to reading. In addition, special recognition and thanks are extended to Dr. Barbara Eason-Watkins, chief education officer, Chicago Public Schools, for delivering the luncheon keynote address and sharing her knowledge and expertise on how to move high-poverty, low-performing schools into high-performing schools.

Gratitude is also extended to the seven panelists who addressed current trends in literacy research: Dr. Peggy Grant, program associate, Center for Literacy, NCREL; Dr. Terry Greene, consultant for the National Staff Development Council and president of Literacy Initiatives; Dr. Mary McNabb, research scientist, University of Denver Research Institute; Dr. Donna Ogle, National Louis University, and president of the International Reading Association; Dr. Scott Paris, University of Michigan; Dr. Timothy Shanahan, professor of urban education, University of Illinois at Chicago, and director of reading for the Chicago Public Schools; and Dr. Edyth Young, director of research, Center for Literacy, NCREL.

The input, comments, and discussion of all the participants at the meeting form the basis of this report, and their contributions were invaluable.

Previous | Table of Contents

literacy@contact.ncrel.org

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

	This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
X	This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").