

REPORT OF THE TENNESSEE READING PANEL

April 15, 2005

Tennessee Department of Education
710 James Robertson Parkway
Andrew Johnson Tower, Fifth Floor
Nashville, Tennessee 37243



Department of Education; May, 2005; Publication Authorization No. 331638; 5,000 copies.
This public document was promulgated at a cost of \$ 1.4210 per copy.

Tennessee Reading Panel

Elizabeth Bartholomew	Teacher	Memphis City Schools
Ron Butterfield	Professor	Freed-Hardeman University
Charlotte Fisher	Special Education Supervisor	Tipton County Schools
Acacia Ford	Teacher	Jackson-Madison County Schools
Lynda Gunter	Teacher	Williamson County Schools
Suzann Harris	Professor	Free Will Baptist Bible College
Melissa Hughes	Teacher	Metro-Nashville Public Schools
Randall Kincaid	Elementary Supervisor	Sevier County Schools
Reggie Mosley	Principal	Knox County Schools
Charlene Norfleet	Teacher	Hamilton County Schools
Alice Patterson	Professor	Trevecca Nazarene University
Karen Reed-Wright	Literacy Coordinator	Kingsport City Schools
Valerie Rutledge	Professor	University of Tennessee, Chattanooga
Sandy Smith	Professor	Tennessee Technological University
Bobbie Solley	Professor	Middle Tennessee State University
Roberta Tharpe	Teacher	Montgomery County Schools
Connie White	Center for Literacy Studies	University of Tennessee, Knoxville

The Tennessee Reading Panel represents a broad scope of both experience and expertise in teaching children to read. This representation consists of schools in systems with various geographical, racial, population size, and socio-economic make-up.

The charge of this panel was to create a comprehensive, cohesive reading policy for all educational institutions in the state of Tennessee. The panel has looked at the report of the National Reading Panel, as well as the most current research in reading. The overall goal is that instructional practices will be improved and students throughout Tennessee will become successful readers.

Participation of the following Tennessee Department of Education personnel has been a valuable asset to the Reading Panel. Their expertise as resources was greatly appreciated. Thanks to the following:

Lana Seivers	Commissioner of Education
John Scott	Assistant Commissioner
Deborah Boyd	Executive Director
Rosemary Mosier	Director, Elementary Education
Jim Herman	Director, Reading First in Tennessee
Etta Crittenden	Reading Coordinator
Sandy Williamson	Early Childhood Programs
Nancy Shumate	Language Arts Coordinator
Linda Creek	Middle Grades Coordinator
Teresa Bess	Elementary Consultant, 4-6
Karen Munn	Elementary Consultant, K-3

Etta M. Crittenden
Reading Coordinator
Tennessee Department of Education

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Tennessee Reading Panel (TRP) is to promote lifelong literacy for all Tennessee citizens. The TRP will provide literacy support through leadership, advocacy, teacher training, professional development, and the establishment of community and family partnerships.

Guided by the mission of the Tennessee Reading Panel, this document is a collaborative effort involving diverse representation from higher education, school administrators/supervisors, classroom teachers, and the Tennessee Department of Education. Recognizing that literacy is the basis for all learning, this document has been created to meet the needs of the children of Tennessee by providing instructional support for teachers and administrators.

The federal government has established, by law, a scientifically-based research focus on reading. The cornerstone of this focus is Reading First. No Child Left Behind establishes that the Reading First mandate is for **all** schools. This mandate includes Reading First, acquiring grade level reading skills by third grade, as well as Reading Next, acquiring the reading comprehension skills that can serve youth for a lifetime (“Reading Next,” 2004); therefore, this document supports No Child Left Behind guidelines for the teaching of reading throughout our nation.

This vision of reading serves as a companion guide to *A Blueprint for Learning: A Teacher’s Guide to the Tennessee Curriculum*. It includes position statements on literacy as it relates to advocacy, teacher training, professional development, and the maintenance of family/community partnerships.

The Scientific Research Base for Reading

To meet the requirements of being scientifically-based reading research (SBRR), findings or conclusions must be drawn from studies that used an experimental design to test the effectiveness of a reading strategy or set of materials in improving one or more of the essential skills involved in reading. Further, these studies had to use samples of students who represented the larger population so that the findings would be relevant to schools. The studies had to be repeated, or replicated, to build confidence that the findings were solid and not likely to be mere chance. Finally, the research had to be judged as sound and worthwhile by reading experts other than the studies’ authors (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

The teaching of scientifically-based reading includes systematic and explicit instruction. Systematic instruction reflects several important characteristics. Skills and concepts are taught in a planned, logically progressive sequence. Explicit instruction means that the teacher states clearly what is being taught and models effectively how it is used by a skilled reader.

Reading instruction incorporates proven strategies in each of the five essential components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension). These elements are based upon the definitions as outlined by the National Reading Panel and relate to a specific body of research. This research is replicable and generalizable to larger populations of students, effective in the measurement of student learning, and published in a credible peer-

reviewed publication. The National Reading Panel definitions are recognized as the official, appropriate terminologies (“NRP,” 2000).

The definitions of the five scientifically-based components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension) are as follows:

A. **Phonemic Awareness:** Phonemic awareness is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate the individual sounds in spoken words. Phonemic awareness is the understanding that the sounds of spoken language work together to make words. Phonemes are the smallest identifiable units of spoken language.

B. **Phonics:** Phonics is the understanding that there is a predictable relationship between phonemes (sounds of spoken language) and graphemes (the letters and spellings that represent those sounds in written language). Readers use these relationships to recognize familiar words accurately and automatically. Phonics is also a key to decoding unfamiliar words (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

C. **Fluency:** Fluency is the ability to read texts accurately and quickly. Fluency provides a bridge between word recognition and comprehension. Fluent readers recognize words and comprehend at the same time (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

D. **Vocabulary:** Vocabulary is the development of stored information about the meanings of words necessary for communication (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

E. **Comprehension:** Comprehension involves using strategies for understanding, remembering, and communicating with others about what has been read. Comprehension strategies are sets of steps that purposeful, active readers use to make sense of texts (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

There are two approaches to incorporating such principles into the teaching of adolescents. For language arts teachers, it means always practicing reading or writing techniques with their students using content-area materials and not simply literature. This approach ensures transfer of the reading skill into the content area and combines learning reading comprehension with learning from the content-area texts (“Reading Next,” 2004). The second approach is to be used by subject-area teachers who should emphasize reading and writing skills and practices as they teach content, with a particular focus on those specific to their subject area. Teachers should also utilize instructional tools and tactics (outlines, graphic organizers, etc.) to ensure the mastery of curriculum content. With at-risk students, additional aids and devices might be needed. Subject-area teachers will need to coordinate reading and writing instruction incorporated in their content and curriculum with language arts teachers, literacy coaches, and other subject-area teachers (“Reading Next,” 2004).

The Three-Tier Reading Model

To help ensure the prevention and correction of reading difficulties in the five essential areas of reading, districts and schools are encouraged to adopt the Three-Tier Reading Model for reading instruction. Improved reading instruction and student learning are the results of the implementation of the three-tier reading model.

The model consists of three tiers or levels of instruction: Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III. It is a prevention model that aims at catching students early – before they fall behind – and provides the support they need to be able to read at or above grade level.

Tier I is comprised of three elements: (a) a core reading program based on scientific reading research, (b) benchmark testing of students to determine instructional needs at least three times per year (fall, winter and spring), and (c) ongoing professional development to provide teachers with the necessary tools to ensure every student receives quality reading instruction. Tier I is designed to address the needs of the majority of students. Using flexible grouping and targeting specific skills, classroom teachers are often able to meet the needs of those students.

Tier II is designed to meet the needs of those students where focused instruction within the classroom is not enough. These students require additional instruction to the time allotted for core reading instruction. Tier II gives the students an additional thirty minutes of intensive small-group reading instruction daily. The aim is to support and reinforce skills being taught by the classroom teacher.

Tier III is designed for the small percentage of students who have received Tier II instruction and continue to show marked difficulty in acquiring necessary reading skills. These students require instruction that is more explicit, more intensive, and specifically meets their individual needs. In Tier III an additional thirty minutes can be provided for the students.

Movement through Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III is a dynamic process, with students entering and exiting as needed (“3 Tier Reading Model,” 2003).

Five Categories of Concentration

To accomplish our mission, the goals and objectives of the Tennessee Reading Panel are set forth in the following five categories:

- Professional Development
- Leadership, Advocacy and Public Support
- Family/Community Partnerships
- Teacher Preparation Through Higher Education
- Recommendations

I. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Goal 1: To provide on-going support and promote professional development for administrators, teachers, and para-professionals as they engage in all levels of literacy instruction.

Objective 1: Provide learning opportunities for educators in effectively implementing best practices in all components of reading.

Key Finding: In Tennessee, “The Education Improvement Act” provides the framework for innovation by emphasizing educational outcomes and providing flexibility in the use of resources at the local school level. That legislation and the proposed “Education Reform Act,” the annual “Master Plan of the State Board of Education,” and the “Tennessee Standards for Teaching: A Guide for Mentoring” envision an educational climate in which schools are responsible for ensuring that all students learn. This can be accomplished through a comprehensive and coordinated K-12 literacy program supported by access to a variety of adequate resources, which include licensed reading specialists, trained literacy coaches, trained paraprofessionals, appropriate materials, and ongoing professional development.

Evidence: This policy updates the “Professional Development Policy,” first adopted by the Board in 1992. The policy explicitly endorses the standards developed by the National Staff Development Council. The standards focus attention on the systemic nature of staff development and apply to the school, school system, and state as these entities provide professional development for all educators responsible for the learning of students in pre-kindergarten through grade twelve. The policy is also consistent with the requirements of federal legislation supporting high quality professional development.

Strategies: The following strategies are suggested based on information from “Reading First: Professional Development” (“North Central Regional Education Laboratory,” 2001).

1. Understand scientifically-based reading research.
2. Monitor and assess student learning.
3. Evaluate and use student assessment data to plan for instruction.
4. Understand the needs of a struggling reader and writer.
5. Understand the needs of the English Language Learner in learning to read and write.
6. Plan and implement effective classroom management strategies to maximize classroom learning time.
7. Provide quality experiences for all learners with adequate time for participation to practice and master new understandings.
8. Provide ongoing opportunities for all learners (administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals) in the following:
 - Access to professional literature for continuous learning
 - Monthly/weekly/daily networking
 - Support through continuous learning opportunities (e.g., state, local meetings; faculty meetings; in-class coaching; grade-level focus meetings; topic focus meetings)
 - Time for reflection.
9. Provide quality literacy instruction to those serving as mentors to new teachers.

10. Base reading instruction on appropriate SBRR assessment data at all levels as well as on a strong understanding of the way students learn by establishing a comprehensive and coordinated K-12 literacy program through the creation of teacher teams that meet regularly to align and plan instruction across the curriculum.

Professional Development Must Focus on the Five Essential Elements of Reading

A. PHONEMIC AWARENESS: Phonemic awareness is the ability to hear, identify, and manipulate the individual sounds in spoken words. Phonemic awareness is the understanding that the sounds of spoken language work together to make words. Phonemes are the smallest identifiable units of spoken language.

What Students Need to Learn:

- Spoken words consist of individual sounds (phonemes).
- Words can be segmented into sounds, and these sounds can be blended and manipulated.
- Phonemic awareness skills are used to blend sounds to read words and to segment sounds to spell words.

Key Research Findings:

- Phonemic awareness can be taught and learned.
- Phonemic awareness instruction helps children learn to read.
- Phonemic awareness instruction helps children learn to spell and write.
- Phonemic awareness instruction is most effective when children are taught to manipulate phonemes.
- Phonemic awareness instruction is most effective when it focuses on only one or two types of phoneme manipulation, rather than several types.
- Phonemic awareness predicts a child's success in learning to read ("Put Reading First," 2001; "Reading First," 2004).

An effective program of **phonemic awareness instruction** should provide the students the following:

- Opportunities for hearing and manipulating sounds in spoken language

Evidence: Non-readers in kindergarten and first grade who have developed little or no phonemic awareness will benefit from explicit and systematic instruction that begins with the easier levels of phonemic awareness such as identifying the initial sounds in spoken words (National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 2000).

- Opportunities to become successful in oral language, reading, and spelling

Evidence: Phonemic awareness is a key predictor in success in reading. Phonemic awareness influences outcomes in word recognition and comprehension, as well as spelling, for all students except those with established learning disabilities (Vaughn & Thompson, 2004). Explicit

instruction in phonemic awareness benefits most beginning readers, including those with reading difficulties and English Language Learners (2004).

The National Reading Panel Report indicates that phonemic awareness helps students with disabilities, students with reading difficulties, very young students (preschoolers), kindergarteners, first graders, students from a range of socioeconomic groups, and ESL students. Furthermore, since phonemic awareness can be taught in a relatively brief amount of time each day (fifteen minutes) and throughout the school day, time should not be a constraint in providing appropriate training to beginning readers (Vaughn & Thompson, 2004).

- Opportunities for small-group work

Evidence: Working with small groups of three to four children to teach phonemic awareness may be more effective than one-on-one tutoring. It appears that children learn from observing and listening to the responses of other children and what the teacher says to the other children about their responses (NICHD, 2000).

Strategies:

1. Model and teach phoneme isolation.
2. Model and teach phoneme identity.
3. Model and teach phoneme categorization.
4. Model and teach phoneme blending.
5. Model and teach phoneme segmentation.
6. Model and teach phoneme discrimination.
7. Model and teach counting of phonemes.
8. Model and teach rhyme.
9. Model and teach alliteration.
10. Model and teach phoneme manipulation (including deleting, adding, and substituting).
11. Analyze linguistic units larger than the phoneme (e.g., segmenting sentences into words, words into syllables, and manipulating onsets and rimes in words) (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

B. PHONICS: Phonics is the understanding that there is a predictable relationship between phonemes (sounds of spoken language) and graphemes (the letters and spellings that represent those sounds in written language). Readers use these relationships to recognize familiar words accurately and automatically. Phonics is also a key to decoding unfamiliar words (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

What Students Need to Learn:

- Accurate and rapid identification of the letters of the alphabet
- The alphabetic principle: the ability to associate sounds with letters and use these sounds to form words
- Phonics elements
- The application of phonics elements to reading and writing

Key Research Findings: There is a direct relationship between systematic and explicit phonics instruction and student learning.

- Phonics instruction is a set of letter-sound relationships in a clearly defined sequence.
- Phonics instruction for kindergarten and first grade children improves word recognition and spelling strategies.
- Phonics instruction significantly improves reading comprehension.
- Phonics instruction is beneficial for children from various social and economic levels.
- Phonics instruction provides particular benefits for children who are having difficulty learning to read and who are at risk for developing future reading problems.
- Phonics instruction is only one part of a reading program for beginning readers, not the entire program.
- Phonics instruction significantly increases early success when used in a variety of grouping patterns such as one-on-one tutoring, small groups, and whole-class instruction (NICHD, 2000).

An effective program of **phonics instruction** should provide students the following:

- Opportunities to connect the sounds of language to the letters that represent them

Evidence: Phonics instruction is important because it leads to an understanding of the alphabetic principle—the systematic and predictable relationships between written letters and spoken sounds (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004). The purpose of phonics is that students should be able to come up with a reasonable approximation of a pronunciation of a word or a reasonable approximation of the spelling of the word, using the letter-sound relations and spelling patterns. Phonics instruction needs to be systematic; i.e., the teacher must follow a clear, step-by-step set of daily lessons to ensure that students receive appropriate teaching.

- Opportunities to improve reading comprehension in young children

Evidence: Systematic phonics instruction results in better growth in children’s ability to comprehend what they read than non-systematic or no phonics instruction. This is not surprising because the ability to read the words in a text accurately and quickly is highly related to successful reading comprehension (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004). Decoding is the process of reading letters or letter patterns in a word to determine the meaning. For students, it is a strategy for reading unknown words. Once children develop this skill they can apply it to reading unknown words automatically and effortlessly. This allows them to focus on getting meaning from what they read (Vaughn &Thompson, 2004).

- Opportunities to experience phonics instruction within a comprehensive reading program

Evidence: Phonics instruction provides key knowledge and skills needed for beginning reading. However, phonics should not be the entire reading program, but should be integrated with other elements such as language activities, story time, and small group tutoring to create a comprehensive reading program (“National Reading Panel,” 2000). Along with phonics instruction, young children should be solidifying their knowledge of the alphabet, engaging in phonemic awareness activities, and listening to stories and informational texts through read-

alouds. They also should be reading texts both orally and silently, and writing letters, words, messages, and stories (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

Strategies:

1. Decoding
2. Word families
3. Onset and rime
4. Syllabication
5. Letter-sound relationship
6. Making Words
7. Making nonsense words

C. VOCABULARY: Vocabulary is the development of stored information about the meanings of words necessary for communication (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004). Vocabulary is developed both formally and informally through daily experiences as well as explicit instruction.

What Students Need to Learn:

- The meanings for most of the words in a text so that they can understand what they read
- To apply a variety of strategies to learn word meanings
- To make connections between words and concepts
- To use “new” words accurately in oral and written language

Key Research Findings: Children learn the meanings of most words indirectly, through everyday experiences with oral and written language. Some vocabulary must be taught directly (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

An effective program of **vocabulary instruction** should provide students the following:

- Opportunities that encourage wide reading at a variety of levels, including reading for enjoyment and pleasure

Evidence: Avid readers acquire large vocabularies beyond explicitly taught vocabulary (Graves & Watts-Taffe, 2002) and the cumulative effects of reading can impact vocabulary learning to a greater degree than the identification of unknown words from context (Herman, Anderson, Pearson, & Nagy, 1987).

Strategies:

1. Select books that introduce or use new vocabulary words when reading aloud.
2. Provide recommended lists of books for students to read in and out of class.
3. Set aside time for students to discuss and share information about books they have read or are currently reading.
4. Encourage independent reading time.
5. Model an interest in reading by talking about books (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities for students to have exposure to high-quality oral language

Evidence: Vocabulary acquisition necessary for successful involvement in school texts can be influenced by a language-rich environment that introduces vocabulary beyond what is involved in informal conversation for English-speaking students and English Language Learners (Brabham & Villaume, 2002).

Strategies:

1. Follow reading aloud with discussions.
2. Make audio books available in classroom or library media center.
3. Provide opportunities for rich language use through storytelling, pretend play, and other role-playing activities.
4. Engage in vocabulary development across the curriculum and throughout the day.
5. Use key or essential vocabulary words in instruction (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities that promote word consciousness

Evidence: Students who demonstrate word consciousness know and use many words. They are aware of the power of words and the differences in word meanings (Graves & Watts-Taffe, 2002).

Strategies:

1. Point out the distinctive characteristics of written language when reading aloud.
2. Encourage students to “read” like a “writer.”
3. Encourage students to *write* with an audience in mind.
4. Encourage students to collect vivid descriptions or effective uses of words or phrases (e.g., similes, puns, metaphors, etc.).
5. Read and discuss different versions of the same story, contrasting the use of language in the two versions.
6. Encourage students to become observant about the way individuals use language both formally and informally.
7. Engage students in a variety of activities and games (teacher-created or commercially produced) that encourage word play (e.g., Hink-Pinks, puzzles, riddles, puns, anagrams, etc.) (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities that provide explicit instruction of specific vocabulary

Evidence: Explicit instruction of specific words and meanings can contribute to vocabulary development and should actively involve students in discussions that provide meaningful information about words and use both definitional and contextual information about word meanings (Iwicki, 1992).

Strategies:

1. Relate background knowledge and experiences with new vocabulary.
2. Teach synonyms and antonyms.

3. Ask students to define new vocabulary in their own words.
 4. Provide example sentences using key vocabulary.
 5. Discuss the differences between new words and related words.
 6. Dramatize and/or illustrate words.
 7. Construct Concept Cards.
 8. Make possible sentences or create sentences that contain the new word.
 9. Connect vocabulary through literature selections.
 10. Discuss the meaning of the same word when it is used in different sentences.
 11. Create silly questions (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).
- Opportunities that provide modeling and instruction in independent word-learning strategies

Evidence: In order to understand the meaning of unknown words independently students should be exposed to dictionary definitions and have explicit instruction on the use of the dictionary. They should be able to effectively use information about word parts, or structural analysis, and have repeated encounters with texts to make connections between unknown words and the text in which the words appear (Scott & Nagy, 1997).

Strategies:

1. Classify words into groups or categories.
2. Engage students in comparing relationships between words through analogies.
3. Use semantic maps and word webs to help display relationships among vocabulary terms and concepts.
4. Help students understand the features of a word by completing a semantic feature analysis grid or chart.
5. Investigate word origins.
6. Explain and model various types of figurative language (e.g., simile, metaphor, personification, hyperbole, euphemism, and allusion).
7. Explicitly teach students how to recognize prefixes, suffixes, and root words and their meanings.
8. Use graphic organizers (e.g., Venn diagrams) to visually depict comparisons and contrasts between words and concepts (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

D. FLUENCY: Fluency is the ability to read texts accurately and quickly. Fluency provides a bridge between word recognition and comprehension. Fluent readers recognize words and comprehend at the same time (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

What Students Need to Learn:

- To automatically recognize words
- To increase reading rate while maintaining accuracy

Key Research Findings: Repeated and monitored oral reading improves reading fluency and overall reading achievement. Fluency training was found to improve reading comprehension—including silent reading comprehension (“National Reading Panel,” 2000).

An effective program of **fluency instruction** should provide students the following:

- Opportunities for repeated reading

Evidence: Students who have reread the passage or story several times have been able to respond to what they have read. Students read and reread a text a certain number of times or until a certain level of fluency is reached. Four re-readings are sufficient for most students (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities for repeated oral reading with feedback and guidance

Evidence: Research has shown that repeated and monitored oral reading improves reading fluency and overall reading achievement (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities for fluency check-up

Evidence: Teachers should regularly assess fluency both formally and informally to ensure that students are making appropriate progress. Continued tape-recorded re-readings have proven to produce gains in reading fluency with sustained higher reading levels (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

Strategies:

1. Tell students unfamiliar words at the point of encounter so that they can focus on constructing meaning and reading with fluency.
2. Help students group words in a sentence into meaningful phrases.
3. Have students read along orally as the teacher or another fluent adult reader reads the story aloud.
4. Use repeated reading with a tape-recorded version of the story. Provide modeling of fluent reading by the teacher.
5. Gather assessment data through formally administered scientifically-based assessments and informal classroom measures (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

There are several ways students can practice orally re-reading text, including student-adult reading, echo reading, choral (or unison) reading, partner reading, and readers’ theatre.

E. COMPREHENSION: Comprehension involves using strategies for understanding, remembering, and communicating with others about what has been read. Comprehension strategies are sets of steps that purposeful, active readers use to make sense of texts (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004). Listening comprehension is vital in the pre-reading stages of development. The development of reading comprehension in students is vital for beginning readers through grade twelve. Students must be able to use comprehension strategies such as summarization, questioning, question answering, story maps, graphic organizers, cooperative grouping, prior knowledge, monitoring, and visualization and the combination of these strategies.

What Students Need to Learn:

- To read both narrative and expository texts
- To understand and remember what they read
- To relate their own knowledge or experiences to texts
- To use comprehension strategies to improve their comprehension
- To communicate with others about what is read

Key Research Findings: Text comprehension can be improved by instruction that helps readers use specific comprehension strategies. Students at every grade level can be taught to use comprehension strategies. Direct, explicit instruction in reading comprehension is a key component of effective adolescent literacy programs (“Reading Next,” 2004).

An effective program of **comprehension instruction** should provide students the following:

- Opportunities to activate background knowledge

Evidence: Stronger comprehenders use their background knowledge to identify or make connections among ideas in what they are reading. Good readers draw on prior knowledge and experience to help them understand what they are reading. Good readers also form mental pictures or images as they read to help them better understand and remember what they read (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

Strategies:

1. Preview the text.
2. Discuss text structure.
3. Discuss the author.
4. Discuss vocabulary.
5. Preview graphics, diagrams, and charts.
6. Draw pictures.
7. Use effective questioning.
8. Use graphic and semantic organizers.
9. Modeling comprehension strategies while reading aloud (teacher or other fluent reader).
10. Supporting new reading skills through scaffolding (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities to identify purposes for reading.

Evidence: Reading with a purpose, both self-constructed and teacher directed, encourages comprehension. Purposes for reading may include enjoyment, gaining knowledge, making predictions, and answering specific questions (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

Strategies:

1. Preview text.
2. Identify relevant/irrelevant information.
3. Make predictions.

4. Use think-aloud.
5. Use self-selected reading.
6. Provide guiding/motivational questions or statements that encourage higher order thinking.
7. Use readers' theater.
8. Use author's study.
9. Activate background knowledge ("Put Reading First," 2001; "Reading First," 2004).

- Opportunities to identify special characteristics of text.

Evidence: Systematic instruction of text structure facilitates comprehension. Text comprehension should be purposeful and active. It can be taught through explicit instruction, cooperative learning, and helping readers use strategies flexibly and in combination. Explicit instruction includes direct explanation, teacher modeling, guided practice, and application ("Put Reading First," 2001; "Reading First," 2004).

Strategies:

1. Recognize story structure (character, plot, setting) through the use of story maps or other graphic organizers.
 2. Recognize types of text, identifying narrative and expository styles of writing.
 3. Use syntactical clues to facilitate understanding of word order.
 4. Use semantic clues ("Put Reading First," 2001; "Reading First," 2004).
- Opportunities to metacognitively apply strategies to be used before reading, during reading, and after reading.

Evidence: Good readers gain conceptual knowledge, use strategies, have internal motivations to read, and interact socially to learn from texts. Good readers monitor their comprehension and make attempts to self-correct ("Put Reading First," 2001; "Reading First," 2004).

Strategies:

1. Provide cooperative learning activities.
2. Model think-alouds.
3. Use reciprocal teaching.
4. Provide interactive strategies.
5. Use graphic and semantic organizers, such as story maps.
6. Use questions to guide and monitor learning.
7. Help students to identify or generate main ideas.
8. Help students connect the main or central ideas.
9. Help students eliminate redundant and unnecessary information.
10. Help students remember what they read.
11. Ask questions about the text.
12. Summarize parts of the text.
13. Clarify words and sentences not understood.
14. Use reader-based and text-based knowledge to make appropriate predictions.

15. Provide for book clubs and literature circles (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

- Opportunities to identify the relationship between reading and writing.

Evidence: A special relationship exists between reading and writing. The integration of reading and writing through direct instruction provides many opportunities for students to be actively engaged. Reading and writing each contribute to the growth and strength of the other (Pressley, Wharton-McDonald, & Mistretta, 2002). Even good primary or adolescent readers do not necessarily write well. Teaching writing is important because it improves reading skills comprehension. Intensive writing does not simply mean more writing instruction; rather, it should include high-quality assignments that are connected to writing tasks students will have to perform in high school, when applying to college, and beyond (“Reading Next,” 2004).

Strategies:

1. Provide for journal writing.
2. Model prewriting, drafting, editing, revising, and sharing.
3. Provide opportunities to interact with different styles of writing (descriptive, expository, narrative, and informative).
4. Provide opportunities for students to interact through different modes of writing (independent, partner, cooperative group).
5. Conduct reading and writing workshops/conferences.
6. Encourage pictorial writing.
7. Model explicit teaching of note taking, summarizing, and outlining.
8. Establish an environment that promotes writing.
9. Create Word Walls (“Put Reading First,” 2001; “Reading First,” 2004).

II. LEADERSHIP, ADVOCACY and PUBLIC SUPPORT

Goal 2: To activate the mission of the Tennessee Reading Panel

Objective 1: To identify the scope and depth of the Tennessee Reading Panel.

Key Finding: The Tennessee Reading Panel will be on-going, meeting twice per year. A report will be made to the State Board of Education, which will include a list of panel members, as well as a report on recommended best practices for teaching reading in Tennessee. The panel will help set guidelines and parameters regarding reading in the State of Tennessee. While the panel realizes that there can be no "mandates" or "legislation" connected to this report, it will continue to act as an advisory panel to the Department of Education as the consultants conduct in-service trainings state-wide.

To accomplish this goal, the Tennessee Reading Panel will identify groups which can and should play a significant role in supporting and promoting literacy throughout the state. These groups include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Government officials (elected and appointed) at the local and state levels.

2. Education-related departments and organizations: Tennessee School Board Association, Tennessee State Board of Education, State Department of Education, PreK-16 Councils, Tennessee Education Association, Tennessee Higher Education Commission, PTA
3. School communities: Teachers, administrators, parents, and paraprofessionals.
4. Community members, business leaders, childcare providers, family literacy groups, and other community resources.
5. Faculty of institutions of higher education (IHE).

The Tennessee Reading Panel will identify and mobilize people across the state to help provide a focus on the significance of literacy and the development of a network of support by:

1. Identifying activists in other organizations and enlisting their assistance,
2. Naming and including in this effort leaders in primary and secondary education, business, government, and higher education, and
3. Establishing a literacy network which will assist in the distribution and dissemination of ideas, which will promote literacy and reading through the state.

Objective 2: To ensure that literacy is a Tennessee priority, the Tennessee Reading Panel will:

1. Organize and present a Literacy Summit which will inform the public about steps which can aid in this effort and which will serve to help enlist assistance from multiple sources.
2. Identify resources and people able to convey the significance of literacy to a wide range of constituencies.
3. Develop a literacy network which will provide a method of distribution for materials, information, and data reflecting the performance of Tennessee's population and the impact of efforts to improve the literacy rate in the state.
4. Create a Media Involvement Plan which outlines how the Tennessee Reading Panel will inform the public, including such steps as: issuing press releases, submitting articles to news media, informing local education reporters ("NCLB Practical Guide," 2002).
5. Build urgency, ownership, commitment, and involvement throughout the state as a crucial step in attaining literacy achievement goals.

Objective 3: To disseminate information and focus attention on literacy in Tennessee.

Key Finding: "The need for reading and understanding is greater than ever for today's students to succeed as adults. A student who can't read can't succeed in today's information-rich, technology-literate age. Several national leaders have coined reading as 'the new civil right in America,' noting that if you can't read, it is hard to access the greatness of the American dream" ("Seven Keys to Excellence," 2003).

Evidence: Research has discovered that "reading programs work best when implementation of the reading program is linked to effective instruction, assessment, professional development, and instructional leadership" ("Reading Leadership Academy," 2004). Literacy becomes even more effective when strong advocates and leaders provide additional avenues and resources for implementation and expansion of efforts in this area.

The TRP will disseminate evidence to the educational community and the state at large through information and events that articulate the value of literacy for a wide range of audiences.

III. FAMILY/COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIPS

Goal 3: To strengthen partnerships with families and community.

Objective 1: Collaborate with communities' families and educators in the literacy education of P-16 (Pre-school through college graduation).

Key Findings: Parents and teachers should work together to coordinate activities and resources to enable children to become more successful in their education. Teachers can suggest curriculum-based activities. According to the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education, "Schools should inform families about standards and how they relate to the curriculum, learning objectives, methods of assessment, school programs, discipline codes, and student progress."

Many schools provide a family literacy night, often held more than once during the school year. During this time the school library is open and parents are invited to join their children for an evening of reading. Often guest readers are scheduled which may include celebrities, business partners, storytellers, and a variety of community participants.

Evidence: Research indicates that family involvement in school increases student achievement (Epstein, 1995). "School leaders must create successful home-school partnerships and mobilize parents, community members, and social service agencies to engage in true collaboration on behalf of children and their families" ("Critical Issue," 1995).

Families and communities can become more knowledgeable about and involved in children's education by viewing partnerships as an essential component of school and classroom organization. School, family, and community partnerships can no longer be considered as optional activities or a matter of public relations. Such collaboration takes organization, time, and much effort in order to develop a successful partnership program that increases student learning and success in school ("What Is a Partnership," 2004).

Objective 2: Promote literacy programs for families by utilizing community resources.

Key Findings: There are many resources within the community which promote literacy for children. Such programs as Head Start, Even Start, Family Resource Centers, state-supported and private preschools, daycares, and other non-profit community-based organizations are available to families. Accessing the public library system is another resource for literacy. Many libraries have story times and special incentives for children to read, especially during the summer when school is not in session.

One way the schools offer support is by providing after-school tutoring for students. Many times this tutoring is in conjunction with an after-school/day-care program. In some cases businesses

allow employees to tutor students during the school day on business time. This is done on a regularly scheduled basis.

Strategic tutoring for adolescents provides intense individualized instruction to help students acquire critical curriculum knowledge and at the same time “learn how to learn.” During sessions, which may occur outside the regular school day, tutors teach learning strategies to students struggling with decoding and fluency or requiring short-term help. At the same time, tutors help students complete their content assignments (“Reading Next,” 2004).

In the state of Tennessee, Governor Bredesen has established a “Books From Birth” program. This program is based on the Imagination Library founded by Dolly Parton. The governor’s program is in partnership with community businesses and corporations which support the program within their own counties.

Evidence: According to a poll conducted by the Knowledge Works Foundation:

- Ninety-one per cent of respondents favor comprehensive after-school programs.
- Sixty-two per cent favor locating community social services for children on school grounds.
- Seventy-two per cent believe local public schools will not continue to improve unless citizens get involved.
- Seventy-one per cent believe public school officials are interested in the community’s hopes and dreams for its schools (“Community Schools”).

Goal 4: To promote the involvement of local businesses, faith-based organizations, and other community organizations.

Objective: Recruit potential leaders within the community to provide assistance in local schools.

Key Finding: “The nation’s schools must improve education for all children, but schools cannot do this alone. More will be accomplished if schools, families, and communities work together to promote successful students” (Epstein, 1995). According to the U. S. Department of Education, the important thing is that schools get support. “Developing strong partnerships among schools, families, businesses, and community and religious groups is the best way to make our education system thrive” (GLEF Staff). These partnerships are an integral part of many successful schools.

Evidence: “Schools with business relationships [have] increased access to new technology, greater opportunities for professional development for teachers and other staff. These relationships [have] reduced student violence, truancy, suspension, and drop-out rates” (“For the Best Results,” 2000). According to Mavis Sanders, assistant director of the National Network of Partnership Schools, community institutions with which schools can partner include: businesses/corporations; cultural and recreational institutions; faith-based organizations; health care organizations; senior citizen organizations; universities and educational institutions; national service and volunteer organizations; and other community organizations and individuals. Essential to a nurturing climate and engaged learning in schools is the provision of community

leaders who can serve in various capacities such as tutors, program coordinators, volunteers, and community liaisons (“Critical Issue,” 1995).

The business community can provide schools with needed materials, financial support, consultants and professional trainers to assist in areas such as planning, and teamwork. Partnerships can enhance communication and understanding between the school system and the business community, which can result in greater support for the schools (“Partnerships Between Schools,” 1992).

IV. TEACHER PREPARATION THROUGH HIGHER EDUCATION

Goal 5: To assist institutions of higher education (IHE) in attracting highly qualified candidates into teacher educational programs.

Objective 1: Will support rigorous admission policies to all teacher educational programs.

The Tennessee State Department of Education utilizes the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards in the approval of initial teacher licensure for institutions of higher education (IHEs).

These standards comprise the following areas:

- Knowledge and Skills
- Assessment
- Field Experience and Clinical Practice
- Diversity
- Faculty
- Governance and Resources

Given the rigor of these standards, the Tennessee Reading Panel acknowledges these criteria as the benchmarks for initial teacher licensure and advanced licensure in reading.

Key Research Findings: International Reading Association (IRA) calls for a major national investment in teacher preparation.

Evidence: “We must ensure that every beginning teacher is competent to teach reading from the first day on the job” (“The IRA Excellence,” 2003).

Key Research Findings: Investing in quality reading teacher preparation at the undergraduate level helps teachers effectively teach students to read.

Evidence: Teachers prepared in quality reading teacher education programs are more successful and confident than other beginning teachers. Teachers educated in quality reading teacher

preparation programs are more effective in creating a rich literacy environment in class and engaging students in reading than teachers who are not. Students who are engaged in reading activities with teachers from such programs show higher reading achievement (District Administration, 2002).

According to Hoffman and Roller, some beginning teachers have as many as twenty-four semester hours of reading instruction while others have as few as three semester hours.

Key Research Findings: Teacher educators need to conduct research on their teacher preparation programs.

Evidence: Teacher educators must:

- Take advantage of existing resources to improve preparation for reading instruction,
- Aggressively advocate for more resources to improve preparation for reading instruction,
- Extend teacher education programs through the first years of teaching to provide adequate support for excellent reading instruction, and
- Conduct research on teacher preparation programs and their ultimate impact on student achievement (IRA, 2003).

Key Research Finding: Quality and features of a program rather than its type or label can make a difference in pre-service teacher learning. Teacher education programs in collaboration with local, state, and regional agencies provide optimal professional development opportunities for future teachers and practicing educators to enhance learning particularly in reading and literacy (“Reading Next,” 2004).

Evidence: With appropriate and ongoing professional development, instructional innovations are likely to be sustained or even initially implemented effectively. “Appropriate remediation of adolescent literacy difficulties does not involve reteaching elementary school-level material, but rather engages teachers and students in an approach to learning that is grounded in a problem-solving process” (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004, p. 39).

IRA advocates a strong professional development prong as part of the teacher preparation program that includes mentoring and professional development. The specific suggestions are as follows:

- get their practical experience under the best teachers our schools can provide as mentors,
- continue to receive mentoring support throughout their first five years of teaching,
- participate in, initiate, implement, and evaluate professional development programs.

Objective 2: Will promote relationships among university units and education agencies (e.g., Tennessee Board of Regents, State Department of Education, Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Tennessee Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges of Teacher Education, State Board of Education, Tennessee Higher Education Commission, etc.)

Collaboration presently exists between the Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (TACTE), a state affiliate of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher

Education (AACTE), and the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and the Tennessee Association of School Supervisors. TACTE provides responsible professional advice and direction to state and national educational and political leaders. Eligible members of TACTE are colleges and universities in Tennessee which have state-approved programs for teacher education. The goals of the Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education include the following:

1. To establish, promote and adhere to quality standards in teacher education.
2. To influence and recommend policies, programs, and activities which impact teacher education.
3. To develop and define positions of importance to teacher education.
4. To stimulate and facilitate research, experimentation, and evaluation of teacher education and related areas of learning and teaching.
5. To cooperate and collaborate with professional and state organizations and agencies in activities designed to improve teacher education.
6. To serve as a clearinghouse for information and reports and to publicize findings of studies which have significance for teacher education.
7. To represent teacher education positively to its various publics.
8. To maintain effective communication and collaboration with the national AACTE organization.

Key Research Finding: The Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education continues to provide fellowship, networking possibilities, relevant conferences, and leadership in Tennessee teacher education while responding to state and national issues and problems.

Evidence: TACTE institutional members improve programs and deal more satisfactorily with problems facing institutions in Tennessee. TACTE affairs are carried out through the actions of the Executive Committee and standing committees with ad hoc committees formed as needed. Current standing committees include communication and publicity, interagency liaison, membership and elections, research and issues, and standards. TACTE works toward assuring cross-sectional representation on all committees.

Another collaboration presently existing between the State Department of Education and institutions of higher education in Tennessee is the Reading First Cadre membership. According to the Reading First Grant (2003), Tennessee is committed to providing administrators and teachers the necessary assistance to put into practice needed changes and improvements in the areas of leadership and literacy instruction in order to bring about successful outcomes for Tennessee students; in light of this commitment, the Reading First legislation is supported by the State of Tennessee.

The goals of the “Reading First in Tennessee” professional development programs are:

- to improve the reading achievement of students in grades K-3,
- to ensure that the reading-related content of professional development is research-based and that the process is evidence-based, that professional development is of high quality and is delivered using accepted professional development standards based on current adult learning theory,

- to enable teachers to implement scientific research-based reading programs, reading instruction, and reading-related practices,
- to develop competent and knowledgeable reading leaders at the school level, and
- to expand and strengthen the capacity of approved professional development providers to deliver high quality scientifically-based reading research (SBRR) professional development and technical assistance to local schools and school districts.

“Reading First in Tennessee” professional development meets the following objectives:

1. Develop a model of high quality professional development in reading grounded in scientifically-based reading research that will sustain and provide for continued improvement of professionals responsible for and contributing to a child’s literacy development in grades K-3.
2. Increase the knowledge base of teachers of reading to enable them to implement curricula and instructional methods validated by scientifically-based reading research that meet the requirements of “Reading First in Tennessee” and that are aligned with Tennessee’s reading content and performance standards as well as assessments.
3. Increase the amount of time devoted to supporting and teaching literacy skills in grades K-3 focusing on the direct and explicit teaching of the five essential components of reading as documented by research: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and text comprehension.
4. Institute assessment procedures in grades K-3 that will provide continuous data on the progress of children in learning to read as well as early indications of children who are not making adequate progress and who need immediate and intensive intervention. Assessment procedures must include the selection and implementation of valid and reliable assessment instruments for screening, diagnosing, and monitoring reading achievement administered on a master statewide schedule. An annual outcome assessment for each grade will be implemented. The Cadre will assist teachers and administrators in learning how to administer and use formal as well as classroom-based assessments.
5. Assist administrators and teachers to gain the knowledge and skills needed to effectively make decisions based on assessment data that lead to strong intervention strategies for children who are beginning to fall behind in reading. The objective is to accelerate the reading growth of all children.
6. Assist teachers to gain the skills and knowledge needed to manage their classrooms so that the environment leads to optimal learning. Teachers must understand and manage flexible grouping, levels of intervention, and learner diversity.
7. Ensure that professional development is consistent, continuous, and ongoing so that research can be put into practice and so that school faculty can effectively engage in

reflective practice, continuous learning communities, peer coaching, and shared leadership/shared accountability.

Key Research Finding: In order to benefit Tennessee students in the area of literacy, it is essential that common professional development for “Reading First” teachers, principals, literacy leaders, professional development providers, and appropriate others, based in scientifically-based reading research, be provided across the state.

Evidence: Approved professional providers (Tennessee Reading First Cadre) provide professional development based on scientifically-based reading research, which are aligned with state content and performance standards. These providers are mostly comprised of teacher education instructors from various higher education institutions. The professional development is designed to help teachers acquire the knowledge and skills base they must have to meet the learning needs of all students.

Goal 6: To assist IHEs in developing and implementing scientifically-based methods and modeling of best practices in literacy.

Objective: During pre-service the IHE will provide methodology and the required training to implement the goals and objectives of professional development.

Systematic and explicit instruction is essential for the teaching of best practices. Systematic instruction speaks to the consistent and progressive sequence of skills to be taught. For instruction to be explicit, the teacher must be very distinct and clear in instructing students in all concepts and then demonstrate these concepts through effective classroom modeling. Reading instruction incorporates proven strategies in each of the five essential components of reading. These elements are based upon the definitions as outlined by the National Reading Panel and relate to a specific body of research. This research is replicable and generalizable to larger populations of students, effective in the measurement of student learning, and published in a credible peer-reviewed publication.

All five components (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) of reading must be integrated into effective scientifically-based reading instruction as defined in the National Reading Panel Report.

Goal 7: To assist IHEs in maintaining rigorous licensure standards for all teacher preparation candidates.

Objective: Will collaborate to develop and maintain consistent competency-based licensure standards for all candidates at the initial, post-baccalaureate, and advanced levels (e.g., a current Tennessee Reading Panel (TRP) representative on the existing advisory council).

According to the International Reading Association (2000), teaching reading necessitates that all children receive outstanding instruction. In order for this goal to be accomplished, rigorous

licensure standards must be implemented. Standards for Reading Specialist Licensure are presently in place in Tennessee.

Candidates completing licensure in early childhood education (PreK-4), elementary education (K-8), and middle grade education (5-8) usually completed a focused study of the teaching of reading within the context of their teacher preparation program. According to Tennessee Licensure Standards and Induction Guidelines, education in the teaching of reading is a life-long endeavor that begins in college coursework, is refined through field experiences, and is enhanced while in professional practice.

V. Recommendations of the Tennessee Reading Panel

All Tennessee educators should possess a shared schema of literacy. To accomplish this goal, the Tennessee Reading Panel recommends the following:

1. Offer the content of Reading First Cadre Training to IHE teacher educators in order to better prepare future teacher candidates in the areas of literacy.
2. Share the content of Reading First Professional Development that is presently offered to recipients of the Reading First Grant (2003) with all K-3 schools.
3. Implement a systemic plan to continuously monitor the progress of students to determine reading proficiency in the five essential components of reading at all levels using assessment data.
4. Base reading instruction on appropriate SBRR assessment data at all levels as well as on a strong understanding of the way students learn by establishing a comprehensive and coordinated K-12 literacy program through the creation of teacher teams that meet regularly to align and plan instruction across the curriculum.
5. Implement a comprehensive and coordinated K-12 literacy program supported by access to a variety of adequate resources including licensed reading specialists, trained literacy coaches, trained paraprofessionals, appropriate materials, and on-going professional development.
6. Have a daily minimum of 90 minutes or more of uninterrupted, direct, and explicit reading instruction using a comprehensive Scientifically-Based Reading Research (SBRR) program that systematically and effectively includes the five essential elements of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension), taught appropriately per grade level.
7. Adopt the 3-Tier Reading Model with an intense daily intervention program to meet the needs of all students.
8. Use SBRR methods, programs, and materials for instruction, remediation, and practice.
9. Use SBRR assessments to inform instruction and determine flexible grouping through ongoing progress monitoring.
10. Integrate reading standards in all 7-12 licensure areas.
11. Support and encourage collaboration among IHEs, LEAs, and other agencies or organizations (e.g., TACTE, TAILACTE, TRA) to continue to conduct research in the area of student achievement of their teacher candidates.

12. Establish a literacy network and on-line clearinghouse that distributes, disseminates, and promotes information concerning existing programs and support systems to school districts throughout Tennessee.
13. Focus on the fifteen elements of effective Adolescent Literacy Programs listed in the “Reading Next” report which include:
 - Direct, explicit comprehension instruction
 - Effective instructional principles embedded in content
 - Motivation and self-directed learning
 - Text-based collaborative learning
 - Strategic tutoring
 - Diverse texts
 - Intensive writing
 - A technology component
 - Ongoing formative assessment of students
 - Extended time for literacy
 - Professional development
 - Ongoing summative assessment
 - Teacher teams
 - Leadership
 - A comprehensive and coordinated literacy program
14. Develop and implement a state-wide literacy awareness campaign.
15. Create a coalition of multiple stakeholders including students, teachers, parents, faith-based leaders, political leaders, representatives of media, government officials, and civic leaders within each district or county to work collaboratively and cooperatively to meet the literacy needs of all age groups.
16. Cultivate relationships with social service, health, religious, and cultural organizations that provide support for children and prospective parents. These relationships will encourage a close working relationship to promote literacy.
17. Provide support and access to quality educationally-viable pre-school programs for all children.

References Cited

- Anderson, R.C. & Nagy, W.E. (1991). Word meaning. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.). *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 2, pp. 690-724). New York: Longman.
- Beck, I.L. & McKeown, M.G. (1983). Learning words well--A program to enhance vocabulary and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher*, 36, 622-625.
- Beck, I.L., Perfetrti, C.A., & McKeown, M.G. (1982). Effects of long-term vocabulary instruction on lexical access and reading comprehension. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74 (4), 506-521.
- Biancarosa, G. & Snow, C. E. (2004). Reading Next--A Vision for Action and Research in Middle and High School Literacy: A Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York. (p. 39.). Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Big Ideas in Beginning Reading. (2004). Institute for the Development of Educational Achievement. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from <http://reading.uoregon.edu/appendices/contents.php>.
- Blachowicz, C.L.Z. (1986). Making connections: Alternatives to the vocabulary notebook. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 643-649.
- Brabham, E.G. & Villaume, S.K. (2002). Vocabulary instruction: Concerns and visions. *The Reading Teacher*, 56, 264-268.
- Brice Heath, S. (1983). A lot of talk about nothing. *Language Arts*, 60, 39-48.
- Brice Heath, S. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- CIERA. (2004). Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from <http://www.ciera.org>.
- Comer, J.P. (1988, January). Is "parenting" essential to good teaching? *National Education Association, NEA Today*. 6, 34-40.
- Community Schools: Fact Sheet for Media. (2001). Coalition for Community Schools. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from <http://www.iel.org/press/ccsfactsheet.html>
- Critical Issue: Establishing Collaboratives and Partnerships. (1995). North Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved January 24, 2005 from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrshp/le300.html>.

- Critical Issue: Partnerships Between Schools and Businesses. (1995). North Regional Education Laboratory. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/leadrshp/le3partn.htm>
- Critical Issue: Restructuring Schools to Support School (1995). North Regional Education Laboratory. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/css/cs100.htm>.
- Cunningham, A.E., & Stanovich, K.E (1991). Tracking the unique effects of print exposure in children: Associations with vocabulary, general knowledge, and spelling. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83, 264-274.
- DIBELS. (2004). Official DIBELS Home Page. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from <http://dibels.uoregon.edu>.
- Dickinson, D.K. & Smith, M.W. (1994). Long-term effects of preschool teachers' book readings on low-income children's' vocabulary and story comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 104-122.
- District Administration. (2002, September). Quality Teacher Preparation. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from <http://www.districtadministration.com>.
- Duffelmeyer, F.A. (1985). Teaching word meaning from an experience base. *The Reading Teacher*, 39, 6-9.
- Epstein, J.L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share." *Phi Delta Kappan*. 76(9). p. 701.
- Fielding, L.G., Wilson, P.T., Anderson, R.C. (1986). A new focus on free reading: The role of trade books in reading instruction. In T. Rapheel & R.E. Reynolds (Eds.), *The contexts of school-based literacy*. New York: Random House.
- Florida Center for Reading Research. (2003). *The Science of Reading*. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from the Florida State University Center Web site: <http://www.fcrr.org>.
- For the Best Results, Schools Need Partners. (2000). The George Lucas Educational Foundational. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from http://www.edutopia.org/php/article.php?id=Art_590&key=189.
- Framing the Discussion and Tips for Community Outreach. (2003). *NCLB Practical Guide*. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from <http://www.learningfirst.org/lfa-web/rp?pa=doc&docId=4>.
- Graves, M.F., Juel, C., & Graves, B.B. (1997). *Teaching reading in the twenty-first century*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Graves, M.F. & Watts-Taffe, S.M. (2002) The place of word consciousness in a research-based vocabulary program. A. E Farstrup, & S.J. Samuels, (Eds.) *What research has to say about reading instruction*. (p. 142). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Herman, P.A., Anderson, R.C., Pearson, P.D. & Nagy, W.E. (1987). Incidental acquisition of word meanings from expositions with varied text features. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 23, 263-284.
- International Reading Association (IRA). (2003). *Investment in teacher preparation in the United States*. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1060_teacher_preparation.pdf.
- Investment in Teacher Preparation in the United States. (2003). *International Reading Association*. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http://www.reading.org/downloads/positions/ps1060_teacher_preparation.pdf
- Iwicki, A.L. (1992). Vocabulary connections. *The Reading Teacher*, 45, 736.
- McKeown, M.G., Beck, I.L., Omanson, R.C., & Pople, M.T. (1985). Some effects of the nature and frequency of vocabulary instruction on the knowledge and use of words. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 522-535.
- Nelson-Herber, J. (1986). Expanding and defining vocabulary in content areas. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 626-633.
- Nagy, W.E., Herman, P.A., & Anderson R.C. (1985). Learning words from context. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 233-253.
- Nagy, W. E., Winsor, P., Osborn, J., & O'Flahaven, J. (1994) Structural analysis: Some guidelines for instruction. In F. Lehr & J. Osborn (Eds.), *Reading, language, and literacy: Instruction for the twenty-first century* (pp. 45-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD). (2000). *Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction Reports of the subgroups* (NIH Publication No. 00-4754). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Reading Panel (NRP). (2000, December). U.S. Department of Education. Public Health Service. National Institutes of Health. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Washington DC: National Institution of Health.
- NCLB Practical Guide. (2002). No Child Left Behind. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from <http://www.nochildleftbehind.gov>.

- NIFL. (n.d.). National Institute for Literacy. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from <http://www.nifl.gov>.
- Partnerships Between Schools and Businesses. (1992). North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/envrnmnt/css/cs100.htm>.
- Pressley, M. (2002). Metacognition and self-regulated comprehension. A.E. Farstrup, and , S.J. Samuels, (Eds.) *What research has to say about reading instruction*, (pp. 291-309). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Put Reading First. (2001, September). U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from <http://www.nifl.gov>.
- Reading First: Federal Guidelines for Reading First Professional Development Plans. (2004). North Central Regional Education Laboratory. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from www.ncrel.org.
- Reading Next. (2004). A Report from Carnegie Corporation of New York. *Alliance for Excellent Education*. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from <http://www.all4ed.org>.
- Roller, C. M. (ed.). (2001). The IRA Excellence in Reading Teacher Preparation Commission's Report: Current Practices in Reading Teacher Education at the Undergraduate Level in the United States. *Learning to Teach Reading: Setting the Research Agenda*. Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Sanders, M. (n.d.). A study of the role of "community" in comprehensive school, family, and community partnership programs. Nation Network of Partnership Schools. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/default.htm>.
- Scott, J. A., & Nagy, W. E. (1997). Understanding the definitions of unfamiliar verbs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32, 184-200.
- Seven Keys to Excellence in Reading Achievement. (2003). Iowa Association of School Boards. Retrieved January 25, 2005 from http://www.ia-sb.org/studentachievement/reading_Key1.asp.
- Stahl, S.A. (1986). Three principles of effective vocabulary instruction. *Journal of Reading*, 29, 662-668.
- Stahl, S. A. (1999). *Vocabulary development*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Stahl, S. A. & Fairbanks, M.M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56, 72-110.
- Stahl, S.A. & Kapinus, B.A. (1991). Possible sentences: Predicting word meanings to teach content area vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher*, 45, 36-43.

- Stahl, S.A., Richek, M.G., & Vandevier, R. (1991). Learning word meanings through listening: A sixth-grade replication. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.) *Learning factors /teacher factors: Issues in literacy research. Fortieth yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 185-192). Chicago: National Reading Conference.
- Standards for Reading Professionals. (2004). International Reading Association. Retrieved January 29, 2005 from http://www.reading.org/resources/issues/reports/professional_standards.html.
- Sternburg, R.J. (1987). Most vocabulary is learned from context. In M.G. McEown & M. E. Curtis (Eds.), *The nature of vocabulary acquisition* (pp.89-105). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Supplemental and Intervention Programs Review. (2004). Oregon Reading First. Retrieved January 26, 2005, from <http://oregonreadingfirst.uoregon.edu/SIreport.php>.
- TACTE. (2005). Tennessee Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Retrieved March 5, 2005 from <http://plato.ess.tntech.edu/tacte>.
- Three-Tier Reading Model. University of Texas System/Texas Education Agency. (2003).
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). Help My Child Read: Reading Resource. Retrieved January 26, 2005 from <http://www.ed.gov/parents/read/resources/edpicks.jhtml?src=ln>.
- Vaughn, S. & Thompson, S. (2004). *Research-Based Methods of Reading Instruction: Grades K-3*. Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (VASCD).
- What Is a Partnership Program? (2004). National Network of Partnership Schools. Retrieved January 27, 2005 from <http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000/program2.htm>.