

EDU 5651-030/040 or 6651-030/040
Tier I Instruction for Improved Fluency and Comprehension
School-Year Practicum (whole class)

Professor: Dr. Kelly C. Patrick, Director
 University of Utah Reading Clinic (UURC)
 Phone: 801-265-3951 (office)
 Email: kelly.patrick@utah.edu

Logistics:

- on location in schools
- register fall semester/tutor all year/grade posts summer semester
- implementation in classroom; minimum 90 minutes weekly
- 3 credit hours CR/NC = \$450 or Letter Grade = \$550
- obtain advisor permission for this course to count toward degree
- presentation of university transcript to USOE earns 54 professional learning credits

Course Description and Expectations

This credit/no credit continuing education course is designed to build theoretical and practical knowledge related to reading fluency and comprehension—especially as they relate to intermediate readers. Educators will learn to execute effective, research-based reading instruction with challenging Tier I text in a whole class setting. The course follows a “practicum model,” in which participants build a conceptual framework for reading development and effective instruction through a year-long, mentored experience.

The course is open to any educator, including but not limited to: classroom teachers, reading specialists, special educators, administrators, paraprofessionals, and Multi-Language Learner (MLL) personnel.

Through application, observations, and participation, educators will be expected to extend their knowledge of the following topics: fluency, gradual release of responsibility, text difficulty, textual scaffolding, word reading development, oral language development, building/activating background knowledge, planning, text types, comprehension strategies, text-based comprehension questions, and motivation.

Most importantly, participants will be expected to use their knowledge of these topics as they provide ongoing instruction for students in whole class and small group formats.

Please note that for this course to count toward the USBE’s Secondary Literacy Interventionist Endorsement, educators must implement Tier 1 instruction in a group of secondary students (i.e., grades 6-12).

Course Schedule

Clinical Sessions: Topics and Readings

Session 1

Overview & Expectations: empirical research base, theoretical framework, issues in Tier I text

instruction, overview of Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI) and Questioning the Author (QtA) models, overview of practicum expectations, overview of university credit options.

Clinical Rounds: instructor models FORI and QtA routines with participants

Session 2

Planning for Comprehension Instruction & Scaffolding Routines: major understanding vs. theme, building and activating background knowledge in a brief preview, frontloading orthographically challenging words, using plot as a guide for fiction major understandings, read-to, echo reading, choral reading, partner reading.

Clinical Rounds: instructor models FORI and QtA routines with a whole class

Optional Reading: Stahl S.A. & Heubach, K.M., (2005). Fluency-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 37, 25-60.

Session 3

Oral Language Development & Repeated Reading: scaffolding full sentence replies, targeting and embedding academic language, different types of repeated reading as scaffolding, using main idea and important details as a guide for non-fiction major understandings.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Optional Reading: Kuhn, M.R., Schwanenflugel, P.J., Morris, R.D., Morrow, L.M., & Woo, D., et al. (2006). Teaching children to become fluent and automatic readers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38, 357-387.

Session 4

Comprehension Queries: using major understandings and text type to develop general queries, specific queries, and follow-up queries.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Optional Reading: Schwanenflugel, P.J., Hamilton, A.M., Kuhn, M.R., Wisenbaker, J., & Stahl, S.A. (2004). Becoming a fluent reader: Reading skill and prosodic features in the oral reading of young readers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 119-129.

Session 5

Comprehension Queries: using major understandings and text type to develop general queries, specific queries, and follow-up queries.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Optional Reading: Schwanenflugel, P.J., Meisinger, E., Wisenbaker, J.M., Kuhn, M.R., Strauss, G.P., & Morris, R.D. (2006). Becoming a fluent and automatic reader in the early elementary school years. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*, 496-522.

Session 6

Implications for Small Group Instruction: text types, text difficulty, instructional routines, instructional leveling.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Optional Reading: McKeown, M.G., Beck, I.L., & Blake, R.G. (2009). Rethinking Reading Comprehension Instruction: A Comparison of Instruction for Strategies and Content Approaches, *Reading Research Quarterly, 44*, 218-253.

Session 7

Implications for Small Group Instruction: text types, text difficulty, instructional routines, instructional leveling.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Optional Reading: Beck, I.L, McKeown, M.G., Sandora, C., Kucan, L., & Worthy, J. (1996). Questioning the Author: A yearlong classroom implementation to engage students with text. *Elementary School Journal, 96*, 385-414.

Session 8

Comprehension Research: Schema Theory, Comprehension Strategies, Common Core.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Optional Reading: McKeown, M.G., & Beck, I.L. (2004). Transforming knowledge into professional

development resources: Six teachers implement a model of teaching for understanding text. *Elementary School Journal, 104, 391-408.*

Session 9

Assessing Comprehension: psychometric issues, implications for instructional leveling, implications for instruction.

Clinical Rounds: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of coach and peers. Clinical session is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, text difficulty issues, comprehension work, oral language development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, clarification.

Course Credit Criteria (EDU 5651/6651-030)

To earn university credit (i.e. no letter grade), participants must satisfactorily meet each of the following criteria:

- completion of at least 8 of 9 half-day clinical trainings, conducted by a licensed Tier I Text Trainer
- completion of 6 observations conducted by a licensed Tier I Text Trainer or a certified Tier I Text Educator working in a support capacity under a licensed Tier I Text Trainer
- earn satisfactory ratings for at least 2 of those observations, with 1 of those satisfactory ratings earned within the final 2 observations
- completion of 2 self-observations
- completion of 6 peer observations
- completion of at least 20 weeks of Tier I Text instruction, as demonstrated by weekly lesson plans

Letter Grade Course Criteria (EDU 5651/6651-040)

To earn letter-grade credit for the course, participants must satisfactorily meet each criterion outlined below:

- completion of at least 8 of 9 half-day clinical trainings, conducted by a licensed Tier I Text Trainer
- completion of 6 observations conducted by a licensed Tier I Text Trainer or a certified Tier I Text Educator working in a support capacity under a licensed Tier I Text Trainer
- earn satisfactory ratings for at least 2 of those observations, with 1 of those satisfactory ratings earned within the final 2 observations
- completion of 2 self-observations
- completion of 6 peer observations
- completion of at least 20 weeks of Tier I Text instruction, as demonstrated by weekly lesson plans

Tutoring Execution :

Tutoring during the practicum will earn Satisfactory-strong, Moderate-less as UURC staff conduct formal and informal observations as needed.

The criteria are as follows:

- Satisfactory-Strong, 100% = Satisfactory to strong tutoring execution for most of the practicum. Satisfactory to strong ability to analyze and respond to student performance. Satisfactory to strong preparation and management of tutoring materials. Satisfactory to

strong ability to integrate trainer feedback into tutoring performance. Satisfactory to strong contribution to training and debriefing sessions.

- Moderate-less 70% = Moderate-less than satisfactory tutoring execution for most of practicum. Moderate-less than satisfactory ability to analyze and respond to student performance. Moderate-less than satisfactory preparation and management of tutoring materials. Moderate-less than satisfactory ability to integrate trainer feedback into tutoring performance. Moderate-less than satisfactory contribution to training and debriefing sessions. It is important to note that failure to meet a majority of the criteria listed above under 100% constitutes grounds for a score of 70%.

Participants who register for EDU 5651/6651-040 must complete a written assignment, in addition to other practicum requirements. Choose one intermediate reader from your class as the subject for a written case study. The case study should include:

The case study should include:

1. **Summary and analysis of the student's foundation for reading success at baseline.** This is more than simply "reporting the data." In addition to describing the student's baseline instructional level in passage reading, you must discuss his/her reading level in relation to chronological grade level in terms of oral reading accuracy, oral reading rate, and comprehension. Specifically, at baseline, where is this child in relation to where s/he should be?
2. **Summary and analysis of the intervention.** Describe the intervention you provided for this child. Briefly describe each component (assisted reading, advanced word study and fluency work). Did any component seem to offer more difficulty or ease than others? Why? What, if any, adjustments did you make in the intervention?
3. **Summary and analysis of the student's reading abilities at posttest.** After administering the posttest and analyzing the data, describe your student's reading abilities at the close of the intervention. Discuss your student's instructional level in passage reading and word recognition in relation to chronological grade level. If indicated, make specific recommendations for future instruction/intervention.
4. **Summary and analysis of your own teaching practices.** As an educator, what have you learned about reading development and instruction/intervention from your practicum experience? How has this learning informed your practice? Provide specific examples.

Please keep a copy of your case study on file or hard drive until you receive your final grade.

Course grade = 25% case study grade and 75% tutoring grade.

The criteria for grading are as follows:

93-100% (28-30 points earned) = Exceptionally strong summary and analysis of baseline results, intervention, and posttest results. Exceptional analysis of practicum's impact on own teaching. Superior academic writing style. No mechanical errors.

73-92% (22-27 points earned) = Satisfactory summary and analysis of baseline results, intervention, and posttest results. Satisfactory analysis of practicum's impact on own teaching. Satisfactory academic writing style. Very few, if any, mechanical errors.

60-72% (18-21 points earned) = Less than satisfactory summary and analysis of baseline results, intervention, and posttest results. Less than satisfactory analysis of practicum's impact on own teaching. Flawed academic writing style. Numerous mechanical errors. It is important to note that

failure to meet any criterion constitutes grounds for an assignment to earn a lower score. For example, a case report that is satisfactory in meeting the first three criteria but evidences numerous mechanical errors may earn “Not Passing.”

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOU RUN YOUR CASE STUDY THROUGH A WRITING ASSISTANCE APP (E.G., GRAMMARLY) PRIOR TO SUBMISSION.

Case Study Grading Conversions:

93-100% (28-30 points earned)

73-92% (22-27 points earned)

60-72% (18-21 points earned)

Not Passing = below 60% (0-17 points)

Your case study is due by 5pm, two weeks after the final day of your practicum. Please submit your case study by email to kelly.patrick@utah.edu. Dr. Patrick will evaluate your paper using the rubric below and respond to you with a paper grade and a final grade that will be entered with the U of U Registrar.

If you miss the deadline for paper submission, you will receive an “I” signifying “incomplete.” After 1 year, the “I” will convert to an “E,” – a final grade of “no credit.”

Be aware that your grade may not post with the registrar until the semester following your paper submission. We cannot make “special arrangements” to post individual grades early—regardless of the reason.

Case Study Rubric

	<i>Below expectations</i>	<i>Meets expectations</i>	<i>Exceeds expectations</i>	<i>Far exceeds expectations</i>
1. Summary and analysis of the student's foundation for reading success at baseline.				
Description of student's baseline instructional level in passage reading.				
Discuss baseline oral reading accuracy, oral reading rate, and comprehension performance in relation to chronological grade level expectations.				
2. Summary and analysis of the intervention.				
Brief description of each component (assisted reading, advanced word study and fluency work)				
Did any component seem to offer more difficulty or ease than others? Why?				
What, if any, adjustments did you make in the intervention?				
3. Summary and analysis of students' reading abilities at posttest.				
Discusses student's instructional level in passage reading and word recognition in relation to chronological grade level.				
If indicated, specific recommendations for future instruction/intervention are made.				
4. Summary and analysis of your own teaching practices.				
New learnings about reading development and instruction/intervention from practicum experience including how this learning informed your practice. Specific examples provided.				
5. Mechanics				
APA standards (style, grammar, spelling, etc.)				
5 pgs or less				
Case Study				
Case Study subtotals				
Case Study total points				
Case Study percentage				
Case Study grade				

Evaluation Procedures:

75% Tutoring 90 points

25% Case Study 30 points

120 Total Points

Grading Scale:

A = 94-100%

A- = 90-93%

B = 84-86%
B+ = 87-89%
B- = 80-83%
C = 74-76%
C+ = 77-79%
C- = 70-73%
D+ = 67-69%
D = 64-66%
D- = 60-63%
F = 59% and below