

ED 704 Contemporary Issues in Literacy

Instructor: Joanne F. Carlisle, PhD

Contact information: telephone 615-1267; email jfcarl@umich.edu

Office hours: Monday, 9-noon, Thursday 1-4 PM, or by appointment

Office: 3210C SEB

Class meeting: Tuesdays 9-noon; Room 2328 SEB

Teaching Reading and Writing: Understanding the Effects of Teachers' Practices
on Literacy Achievement

Overview:

Over the years, studies have identified a number of important variables that affect students' acquisition of literacy. These have included the curriculum and reading program, theories of instruction (e.g., code-based versus meaning-based), school reform efforts, and the role of the teacher. At present, teacher quality is in the forefront of efforts to improve the literacy of students in the US. Recent studies have shown that even among teachers teaching at the same grade level and using the same reading program, there is considerable variation in students' reading achievement at the level of the classroom, and probably therefore attributable to differences in the instruction they receive. In order to uncover the major characteristics of teaching that are related to students' literacy development, we need to examine methods of studying teachers' literacy instruction. That is the major focus of this course. The course will start by asking why this is an important problem and what has been done in the past. We will examine classroom studies from different perspectives (e.g., ethnographic), and we will study research reports that focus on characteristics of effective teaching of reading and writing. A major focus will be study of different observational systems. Our goal is for students to develop analytic frameworks that can be used in critically evaluating literacy observational methods and instruments. While I am the instructor of the course, Dr. Geoffrey Phelps, a research scientist with strong interests in effective teaching of reading, is collaborating with me on the course plans and will participate in our class meetings.

Materials

Two books can be purchased at Ulrich's. These are:

- 1) Vaughn, S., & Briggs, K.L. (Eds.), *Reading in the classroom: Systems for the observation of teaching and learning*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- 2) Waxman, H.S., Tharp, R.G., & Hilberg, R.S. (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The remaining readings are available on the C-Tools site set up for this course. All members of the class have access to this site. Please note that under "resources" there are separate folders that correspond to each of the course topics. Additional readings are found in a separate folder, so labeled.

Course Requirements:

- 1) Students should attend class and participate in discussions.
- 2) There are three projects that students are required to complete. The first involves observation of one teachers' literacy block, comparing results of two student observers. The second has the two students observing in the same teacher's classroom, but this time using different observation systems. Projects 1 and 2, therefore, are collaborative. The third project involves examining a current issue related to the course topic, reviewing scholarship and scholarly critiques of this problem. Details for each project assignment are given at the end of the course outline.

Evaluation:

Each student's grade will be calculated by weighting the grades on the three assignments in the following manner: Project 1 25%, Project 2 25%, Project 3 50%.

Course Outline:

Jan 10: Introduction to the course: What are the dimensions of the problem—that is, of the relation of teachers' practices and students' achievement? Have researchers been studying this relationship for as long as teachers have been teaching? How diverse are the efforts being made to understand effective instruction in literacy? And, of course, what aspects of this broad topic are you interested in? What perspectives do you bring to study of this topic?

Preparation for class: If you have a chance, look at the files of the papers in the folder labeled Introduction. These contain papers on teacher quality (*Americans Speak on Teacher Quality*; *Quality Teachers for AT-Risk Schools*; *How Teaching Matters*). They will heighten your awareness of the national concern for teacher quality that underlies the basic issue addressed by the course: how can we determine the characteristics of effective literacy instruction?

Jan. 17: Historical overview and current policy issue

Questions to consider: Why is teacher quality such a high priority national issue at present? What historical factors have set the stage for the focus on teacher quality? In the area of reading, what research has been accomplished to date? What have we learned, and what important questions have not been answered? What is the relation of teacher evaluation and school evaluation?

Readings:

Pearson, P.D. (2001) Learning to teach reading: The status of the knowledge base. In C.M. Roller (Ed.), *Learning to teach reading: Setting the research agenda* (pp. 4-19). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2004). Inequality and the right to learn: Access to qualified teachers in California's public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106, 1936-1966.

Hoffman, J.V. (1991). Teacher and school effects in learning to read. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, Vol 2. (pp. 911-950). NY: Longman.

Ellett, C.D., & Teddlie, C. (2003). Teacher evaluation, teacher effectiveness and school effectiveness: Perspectives from the USA. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 17, 101-128.

Jan 24: Studies of the effects of teachers and their teaching on student achievement:

Questions to consider: Is there evidence that teachers significantly impact students' learning? What is meant by "teacher effects"? How is "effective teaching" defined? Does it matter how student achievement is defined and measured? What teacher characteristics are associated with positive outcomes?

Readings:

Rowan, B., Correnti, R., & Miller, R.J. (2002). What large-scale, survey research tells us about teacher effects on student achievement: Insights from the Prospects study of elementary schools. *The Teachers College Record*, 104, 1525-1567.

Nye, B., Konstantopoulos, S., & Hedges, L.V. (2004). How large are teacher effects? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 26, 237-257.

Wayne, A.J., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. *Review of Educational Research*, 73, 89-122.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. L. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Wittrock (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, 3rd ed. (pp. 328-375). New York: Simon and Schuster MacMillan.

Jan 31: The measurement of teaching and teacher effects; overview of methods of study (e.g., logs, portfolios, performance measures, videotaping)

Questions to consider: To be able to measure "effective teaching", one needs a definition of this construct. How do researchers address this problem? What are the "tools" researchers use to study teacher effects? How are classroom observations designed so as to determine effective teaching (and teachers)? Are teachers' self-evaluations useful sources of information—and if so, for what purpose(s)? Please note: Shavelson et al is a

long paper—a valuable but very detailed research overview. I suggest you read it selectively.

Readings:

Shavelson, R.J., Webb, N.M., & Burstein, L. (1986). Measurement of teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching*, 3rd ed. (pp. 50-91). New York: Simon and Schuster MacMillan.

Good, T.L. & Mulryan, C. (1990). Teacher ratings: A call for teacher control and self-evaluation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 191-215). Newbury Park: Sage.

Camburn, E., & Barnes, C. A. (2004). Assessing the validity of language arts instruction log through triangulation, *Elementary School Journal*, 105, 49-73.

Feb. 7: Learning observational methods and procedures.

Class activities and discussion: The purpose of this class meeting is to gather expertise examining and evaluating observation systems and learning to use such systems. You will be given materials prior to the class to examine. A large part of the class meeting will involve training in one system (procedures, criteria for coding what is observed, and so on) and then watching videoclips to gather experience using this observation system. We will also discuss such issues raised by Stodolsky, such as interrater reliability and the difference between high and low inference systems. These activities and the discussion will prepare you for your first course project.

Stodolsky, S.S. (1990). Classroom observation. In J. Millman & L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* (pp. 175-190). Newbury Park: Sage.

Feb. 14: Theoretical orientations toward literacy and teachers' literacy knowledge as factors in evaluation of effective literacy instruction

Questions to consider: To what extent do literacy perspectives and philosophies affect our thinking about what constitutes “good” literacy instruction? Do different perspectives in literacy lead to different literacy outcomes for students? How do differences in content and curriculum affect the methods we might use to evaluate literacy instruction? Are there particular literacy practices (instructional behaviors and decisions) that could be considered a foundation for the evaluation of all literacy instruction?

Readings:

Duffy, G.G. (2002). Visioning and the development of outstanding teachers. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 41, 331-343.

Deford, D. E. (1985). Validating the construct of theoretical orientation in reading instruction. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20, 351-367.

Mather, N., Bos, C., & Babur, N. (2001). Perceptions and knowledge of preservice and inservice teachers about early literacy instruction. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 34, 472-482.

Roehler, L.A., & Duffy, G.G. (1991). Teachers' instructional actions. In R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Handbook of Reading Research Vol 11* (pp. 861-883). NY: Longman.

Feb. 21: Observations of literacy instruction: Methodological and measurement issues

Questions to consider: As Stodolsky pointed out, every measure of teacher effectiveness (whether a rating scale or an observation system) reflects assumptions about or a theory of effective teaching; in the area of literacy, beliefs about or a theory of effective literacy instruction inevitably shaped the criteria in rating scales and observation protocols. As you read the following papers, consider the assumptions about the nature or characteristics of good (effective) teaching or good literacy instruction. In addition, consider the similarities and differences in the instruments and procedures.

Readings:

Rowan, B., Camburn, E., & Correnti, R. (2004). Using teacher logs to measure the enacted curriculum: A study of literacy teaching in third-grade classrooms. *Elementary School Journal*, 105, 75-101.

Foorman, B.R., & Schnatschneider, C. (2003). Measurement of teaching practices during reading/language arts instruction and its relationship to student achievement. In S. Vaughn & K.L. Briggs (Eds.), *Reading in the classroom: systems for the observation of teaching and learning* (pp. 1-30). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Edmonds, M., & Briggs, K.L. (2003). The instructional content emphasis instrument: Observation of reading instruction. In S. Vaughn & K.L. Briggs (Eds.), *Reading in the classroom: systems for the observation of teaching and learning* (pp. 31-52). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Taylor, B.M., & Pearson, P.D. (2001). The CIERA School Change Project: Translating research on effective reading instruction and school reform into practice in high poverty elementary schools. In C.M. Roller (Ed.), *Learning to teach reading: Setting the research agenda* (pp. 180-189). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

[Feb. 28: break]

March 7: Student presentations and class discuss of Project 1; Observing literacy instruction in diverse classrooms

Class activities: In the first half of the class we will discuss the results of your Project 1 observations. (Your papers must be handed in at this time.) See the final section of the course outline for explanation of this assignment. In the second half, we will discuss readings focused on different purposes of evaluation of teaching. The three papers focus on observations for the purpose of a) helping teachers improve their teaching, b) examining compliance with standards; c) carrying out school reform. Consider the relation of purposes and methods of assessing effective instruction.

Readings

Waxman, H.C., & Padron, Y.N. (2004). The uses of the classroom observation schedule to improve classroom instruction. In H.S. Waxman, R.G. Tharp, & R.S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms* (pp. 72-96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hilberg, R.S., Doherty, R.W., Epaloose, G., & Tharp, R.G. (2004). The standards performance continuum. In H.S. Waxman, R.G. Tharp, & R.S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms* (pp.48-71). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Castellano, M., & Datnow, A. (2004). The influence of school reform on classroom instruction in diverse schools. In H.S. Waxman, R.G. Tharp, & R.S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms* (pp. 231-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

March 14: Observing literacy instruction in diverse classrooms

Questions to consider: Many researchers believe that context is a critical factor in studying teacher effects. With this in mind, this week we will focus on two issues: a) using an ethnographic perspective to examine the context of learning and b) observation methods designed for classrooms with diverse or ELL learners. How do these observation systems differ from those designed to measure effective teaching, in general, or those designed to measure effective literacy instruction?

Readings:

Klingner, J., Sturges, K.M., & Harry, B. (2003). Conducting ethnographic observations of reading in elementary schools. In S. Vaughn & K.L. Briggs (Eds.), *Reading in the classroom: systems for the observation of teaching and learning* (pp. 145-178). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Haager, D., Gersten, R., Baker, S., & Graves, A.W. (2003). The English-language learner classroom observation instrument for beginning readers. In S. Vaughn & K.L. Briggs (Eds.), *Reading in the classroom: systems for the observation of teaching and learning* (pp. 111-144). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Knight, S.L., & Smith, R.G. (2004). Development and use of a classroom observation instrument to investigate teaching for meaning in diverse classrooms. In H.S. Waxman, R.G. Tharp, & R.S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms* (pp. 97-119). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivera, H.H., & Tharp, R.G. (2004). Sociocultural activity settings in the classroom: A study of a classroom observation system. In H.S. Waxman, R.G. Tharp, & R.S. Hilberg (Eds.), *Observational research in U.S. classrooms* (pp. 205-230). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

March 21: Studying “effective teachers” to learn about effective practices in teaching reading and writing

Questions to consider: One approach to determining effective literacy instruction has been to select teachers who are thought or known to be effective and studying how they go about teaching reading and writing. Several of the papers for this week follow this research paradigm. Consider how effective teachers were selected (and the quality of the evidence presented to support their effectiveness). Does what we learn from these studies differ from what we learn about effective practices through other research methods?

Readings:

Allington, R.L., & Johnston, P.H. (2001). What do we know about effective fourth-grade teachers and their classrooms? In C.M. Roller (Ed.), *Learning to teach reading: Setting the research agenda* (pp. 152-165). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Pressley, M. (2001). Ch. 2: Surveying nominated-effective first-grade teachers about their instruction, and Ch. 3: The nature of first-grade instruction that promotes literacy achievement. In M. Pressley, R. Allington, R. Wharton-McDonald, C. Block, & L. Morrow. *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first-grade classrooms*. NY: Guilford Press.

Wharton-McDonald, R. (2001). Teaching writing in first grade. In M. Pressley, R. Allington, R. Wharton-McDonald, C. Block, & L. Morrow. *Learning to read: Lessons from exemplary first-grade classrooms* (pp.70-91). NY: Guilford Press.

Langer, J.A. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high school: How teachers' professional lives support student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 397-439.

March 28: Project 2 reports of student observations

Class activity: Your Project 2 paper is due. In addition, students will present and discuss their experiences observing in a classroom in which two students used different observation instruments. Details of the assignment are found at the end of this course outline. We will also discuss similarities and differences in the observation systems used by students for this assignment. Along with the underlying theoretical framework, we will want to look at any information about the reliability and validity of the method and results from any studies which used the instruments.

April 4: Studying teachers' implementation of specific methods of literacy instruction and the effects on students' response to the instruction i.e., improvements in reading or and writing)

Questions to consider: Research studies have been carried out to examine specific implementation of literacy practices, examining the effects of such practices on the learning of the students. The readings this week are three studies that fall into this category. To provide a framework to consider these, please read the Shulman paper. Consider whether these studies provide insights about effective instruction that are not likely to come through more general studies of teachers' practices. In our discussion of these studies, we can return to Hoffman's chapter for other studies of this type—for example, studies carried out by Durkin and Chall.

Readings:

Shulman, L.S. (2005). Knowledge and teaching. In S.M. Wilson (Ed.), *The wisdom of practice: Essays on teaching, learning, and learning to teach* (pp.219-248). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L., Meloth, M.S., Vavrus, L. Wasselman, R., Putnam, J., & Bassiri, D. (1986). The relationship between explicit verbal explanations during reading skill instruction and student awareness and achievement: A study of reading teacher effects. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 237-252.

Perry, N.E., VandeKamp, K.O., Mercer, L.K., & Nordby, C.J. (2002). Investigating teacher-student interactions that foster self-regulated learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 37, 5-15.

Palincsar, A.S. (1986). The role of dialogue in providing scaffolded instruction. *Educational Psychologist*, 21, 73-98.

April 11: Sociocultural studies of teachers' approaches to literacy instruction

Questions to consider: Sociocultural researchers, among others, raise questions about what should be considered appropriate and relevant measures of teacher effects on students' learning. Consideration this issue as you read the following papers. In addition, consider whether (or how) classroom practices in studies such as these might be analyzed systematically. For example, might the Rivera and Tharp approach (sociocultural activity settings) be useful here?

Readings:

Au, K.H., & Carroll, J.H. (1997). Improving literacy achievement through a constructivist approach: The KEEP demonstration classroom project. *Elementary School Journal*, 97, 203-221.

Maloch, B. (2002). Scaffolding student talk: One teacher's role in literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 37, 94-112.

Englert, C.S. (1996). A sociocultural perspective: Teaching ways-of-thinking and ways-of-talking in a literacy community. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 11, 157-167.

April 18: Final reports of student projects on teacher effects on their students' literacy acquisition. Details are given at the end of this course outline.

Course projects/assignments:

Project 1: Observations of literacy instruction using the same instrument

The purpose of this project is to help students acquire first-hand knowledge about the process of carrying out systematic observations of literacy instruction in elementary classrooms. Students will become familiar with issues of theory, research methods, and implications for use of observations for different purposes. The activity involves students' work in pairs. Each pair of students will observe the literacy block in one teacher's classroom. Before the observation, the students will meet with the teacher to discuss the project, show him/her the observation protocol, discuss procedures of the observation (e.g., as observers, the students cannot help students with questions), and determine a date for the observation. Training on the observation instrument will take place in class, with the possibility of additional practice sessions at a different time.

The students will collaborate on the preparation of a paper describing the experience of carrying out the observation and reflecting on issues. The paper should cover the following topics:

- 1) Describe the classroom you observed and the teacher you worked with. Describe the entire observation event, from the time you arrived at the school to the time you left.
- 2) Explain the method of your observation and the context (e.g., classroom activities), including any details that might help to interpret results.
- 3) Present the results of the observation completed by you and your partner. Include the observation protocol in your paper. Provide an analysis of interrater reliability.
- 4) Discuss the validity and reliability of the observation you completed.
- 5) Reflections: What did you learn about carrying out observations from this activity? What did you learn about reading instruction from this activity? Evaluate the potential of this instrument to help us learn about effective reading instruction.

Questions you might consider are the following: What is the implied definition of effective literacy instruction for this instrument? Does this observation system reflect aspects of effective teaching found in other research studies?

The paper must be handed in on March 7, so I recommend that you schedule your observation for the middle of February.

Project 2: Evaluation of literacy practices comparing two instruments

This second project builds on the first project. Two students will visit the classroom of the same teacher. This time, although they are observing the same literacy instruction, they are asked to use different observation systems. The two students need to discuss different observation methods that they would like to explore and then settle on the two that they will use. Options available in the books for this course are as follows:

From Vaughn and Briggs:

- 1) Classroom Climate Scale, Kim, Briggs and Vaughn (Chapter 4; see p. 101 for scale)
- 2) English Language Learner Classroom Observation Instrument, Haager, Gersten, Baker and Graves (Ch. 5, see p. 138 for scale)
- 3) Instructional Content Emphasis- Revised (Edmonds and Briggs, Chapter 2). The instrument is not published in this chapter, but students can get copies from me.)

From Waxman et al:

- 1) Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Echevarria & Short, see p. 44 ff)
- 2) Standards Performance Continuum (Hilberg et al, see p. 48 ff)
- 3) Classroom Observation Schedule (Waxman & Padron, see p. 95)
- 4) TFM Classroom Observation Form (Knight and Smith, see p. 120 ff)
- 5) Classroom Activity Settings (Rivera & Tharp, see p. 226 ff)

As with project 1, the purpose is to help students acquire first-hand knowledge about the process of carrying out systematic observations of literacy instruction in elementary classrooms. Students should gain competence to evaluate observation systems with respect to underlying theoretical frameworks, research methods, intended purposes, and the promise they hold for helping us learn about effective literacy instruction.

For this assignment, the students will collaborate on the preparation of the first part of the paper – that is, the description of the observation. The students should also collaborate on a section in which they discuss the similarities and differences of the results for the two observation systems. In a final section, each student should write a critique of the particular system he/she used for this assignment.

The “collaborative” part of the paper should cover the following topics:

- 1) Describe the classroom you observed and the teacher you worked with.

Describe the entire observation event, from the time you arrived at the school to the time you left.

- 2) Explain the method of your observation and the context (e.g., classroom activities), including any details that might help to interpret results.

- 3) Present the results of the observation completed by you and your partner.

Include the observation protocols (and any transcriptions or analyses) in the appendix of your paper.

- 4) Compare the “picture” of literacy instruction that emerges from the different observation systems. If the two systems you and your partner used reflect different literacy perspectives, how do these play out in the process of gathering data about literacy instruction?

The “individual” section of the paper should focus on what you learned through this observation. Some questions to consider: What did you learn about reading instruction from this activity? About the role of classroom contexts? About underlying theoretical frameworks and research perspectives? Evaluate the potential of this instrument to help us learn about effective reading instruction.

The body of the paper (not including appendices) should not exceed ten pages, double spaced. Your paper must be handed in on March 28th. I recommend that you schedule you carry out your observation in the first two weeks of March.

Project 3:

The purpose of this project is to provide each student with an opportunity to study one issue or topic in greater depth than we have been able to cover in the course. The student is encouraged to pick a topic that is aligned with his/her interests. The paper can conceptualized as a research critique or position paper.

Possible topics:

- 1) What are the student “outcomes” that should be considered in evaluating teacher effectiveness? What are options suggested by the research literature? And what are arguments for or against these options?
- 2) How should teacher/teaching evaluation methods be designed to be appropriate for different purposes?
- 3) The importance of understanding teacher planning and decision making: Can we learn about effective literacy instruction by asking the teachers to reflect on their own practices? What does the literature on teachers’ self-reflection suggest?
- 4) Consider context-specific and context-free evaluation systems. Can we come to generalizations about effective literacy instruction if such instruction is context-specific?
- 5) How can we address problems of validity and reliability in carrying out observations of classroom literacy instruction?

I will be asking you to select a topic by mid-February, and I will ask you for a brief overview of your work on your topic (including a list of references) in mid-March. The paper will be due on April 18th, and at that class meeting you are asked to give a brief presentation based on your study to the class. The paper should not exceed twenty pages, double-spaced.

Some References for Additional Readings

- Anderson, L.M., Evertson, C.M., & Brophy, J.E. (1979). An experimental study of effective teaching in first-grade reading groups. *Elementary School Journal*, 79, 193-223.
- Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (1999). Teacher learning. In *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school* (pp. 178-193). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Brophy, J. (1973). Stability of teacher effectiveness. *American Educational Research Journal*, 10, 245-252.
- Brophy, J. (1975). Classroom observation scales: Stability across time and context and relationships with student learning gains. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 873-881.
- Duffy, G.G., Roehler, L., Meloth, M.S., Vavrus, L. Wasselman, R., Putnam, J., & Bassiri, D. (1986). The relationship between explicit verbal explanations during reading skill instruction and student awareness and achievement: A study of reading teacher effects. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 237-252.
- Gee, J.P. (2002). Discourse and sociocultural studies in reading. In M.L.Kamil, P.B. Mosenthal, P.D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Methods of literacy research* (pp. 119-131). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Gersten, R., Baker, S.K., Haager, D., & Graves, A.W. (2005). Exploring the role of teacher quality in predicting reading outcomes for first-grade English learners. *Remedial and Special Education*, 26, 197-206.
- Good. T.L., & Brophy, J.E. (2000). *Looking in classrooms* (8th ed.). NY: Longman.
- Greenwald, R., Hedges, L.V., Laine, R.D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 361-396.
- Iwanicki, E.F., & Rindone, D.A. (1995). Integrating professional development, teacher evaluation, and student learning: The evolution of teacher evaluation policy in Connecticut. In D.L.Duke (Ed.), *Teacher evaluation policy: From accountability to professional development* (pp. 65-98). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mangano. N.G., Rupley, W.H. & Willson, V.L. (1983). External validity issues associated with classroom observational research. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 19, 10-14.

- Mangano, N.G., Willson, V.L., & Rupley, W.H. (1986). Practical suggestions for increasing the reliability of classroom observational research. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 25, 184-191.
- McConney, A.A., Schalocj, M.D., & Schlaock H.D. (1997). Indicators of student learning in teacher evaluation (pp. 162-192). In J.H. Stronge (Ed.), *Evaluating teaching: A guide to current thinking and best practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- McGaw, B., Wardrop, J.L., & Bunda, M.A. (1972). Classroom observation schemes: Where are the errors? *American Educational Research Journal*, 9, 13-27.
- Miller, J.W., Ellsworth, R. (1985). The evaluation of a two-year program to improve teacher effectiveness in reading instruction. *Elementary School Journal*, 85, 485-496.
- Milliman, J., & Darling-Hammond, L. (Eds.) (1990). *The new handbook of teacher evaluation: Assessing elementary and secondary school teachers*. Newbury park: Sage Publications.
- Moats, L.C. (2004). Science, language, and imagination in the professional development of reading teachers. In P. McCardle & V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research* (pp. 269-287). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.
- Morrow, L.M. (2004). A case study of exemplary practice in fourth grade. In B.M. Taylor & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Teaching reading: Effective schools, accomplished teachers* (pp. 289-307). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Pellegrini, A.D. (2004). *Observing children in their natural worlds: A methodological primer* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pool, J.E., Ellett, C.D., Schiavone, S., & Carey-Lewis, C. (2001). How valid are the National Board Professional Teaching standards assessments for predicting the quality of actual classroom teaching and learning? Results of six mini case studies. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 15, 31-48.
- Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Raphael, L.M., Bogner, K., & Roehrig, A. (2002). Exemplary first-grade teaching. In B.M. Taylor & P.D. Pearson (Eds.), *Teaching reading: Effective schools, accomplished teachers* (pp. 73-88). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Richardson, V. (2002). Teacher knowledge about language. In C.T. Adger, C.E. Snow, & D. Christian. *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 85-101). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.

- Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28, 559-586.
- Sacks, C.H., & Mergendoller, J.R. (1997). The relationship between teachers' theoretical orientation toward reading and student outcomes in kindergarten children with different initial reading abilities. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 721-739.
- Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations for the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1-22.
- Snow, C., Barnes, W., Chandler, I., Goodman, I.F., & Hemphill, L. (1991). *Unfulfilled expectations: Home and school influences on literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Susniak, L.A., & Stogolsky, S.S. (1993). Teachers and textbooks: Materials used in fourth grade classrooms. *Elementary School Journal*, 93, 249-275.
- Taylor, B.M., & Pearson, P.D. (Eds.) (2002). *Teaching reading: Effective schools, accomplished teachers*. Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum.
- Taylor, B.M., Pearson, P.D., Peterson, D.S., & Rodriguez, M.C. (2005). The CIERA school change framework: An evidence-based approach to professional development and school reading improvement. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 40, 40-69.
- Tharp, R.G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S.S., & Yamauchi, L.A. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Valli, L. & Hawley, W.D. (2002). Designing and implementing school-based professional development. In W.D. Hawlye (Ed.), *The keys to effective schools: Educational reform as continuous improvement* (pp. 86-96). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2002). *Meeting the highly qualified teacher challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education
- Wong Fillmore, L. & Snow, C. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C.T. Adger, C.E. Snow, & D. Christian. *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7-53). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.