

## **EDU 5651/6651-040: Tier I Instruction for Improved Fluency and Comprehension**

**Professor:** Dr. Kathleen J. Brown  
 Director: University of Utah Reading Clinic  
 office – 801-265-3951  
 email: [kathleen.brown@utah.edu](mailto:kathleen.brown@utah.edu)

**Logistics:**

- on location in schools
- register fall semester/tutor all year/grade posts spring semester
- implementation in classroom; minimum 4 hours weekly
- university transcript specifies letter grade
- obtain advisor permission for this course to count toward degree
- presentation of university transcript to USOE earns 54 re-licensure points

### **Course Description and Expectations**

This letter-grade continuing education course is designed to build theoretical and practical knowledge related to reading fluency and comprehension—especially as they relate to struggling 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 English-Learner (EL) 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.

### **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.

**Clinic:** 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.

Clinic: instructor models FORI and QtA routines with a whole class

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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.

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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.

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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.

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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.

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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.

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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.

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.

Clinic: each participant has the opportunity to model FORI and QtA with a small group from his/her class in front of mentor 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**

To earn university credit, participants must satisfactorily meet each of the following criteria:

- completion of 9 half-day clinical trainings, conducted by a Licensed Tier I Text Trainer,
- complete 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 6 peer observations,
- completion of at least 20 weeks of Tier I Text instruction, as demonstrated by weekly lesson plans, and,
- earn a grade of .7 or better on tutoring and written case study.

Instruction Execution Grading Rubric: Tutoring during the practicum will earn pass +, pass -, or fail as UURC staff conduct formal and informal observations as needed.

The criteria are as follows:

Pass + = Satisfactory to strong Tier I Text instruction for most of the practicum. Satisfactory to strong preparation and management of Tier I Text materials. Satisfactory to strong ability to integrate mentor feedback into Tier I Text instruction. Satisfactory to strong contribution to clinical sessions.

Pass - = Less than satisfactory Tier I Text instruction for most of practicum. Less than satisfactory preparation and management of Tier I Text materials. Less than satisfactory ability to integrate mentor feedback into Tier I Text instruction. Less than satisfactory contribution to clinical sessions.

It is important to note that failure to meet a majority of the criteria listed above under Pass + constitutes grounds for a score of Pass -.”

Instruction Grading Conversions: Pass + = 4.0/A                      Pass - = 2.0/C

Written Case Study Guidelines:

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

1. Summary and analysis of student’s foundation for reading success at baseline.

This is more than simply “reporting the data.” In addition to describing the student’s baseline reading ability on 2 measures (e.g., DIBELS, UURC-RLA, CRT), you must discuss his/her reading level in relation to chronological grade level in terms of oral reading accuracy and oral reading rate. Also, describe your impressions of the student’s reading comprehension ability in relation to grade level expectations. Specifically, at baseline, where are these students in relation to where they should be?

2. Summary and analysis of the Tier I Text Instruction.

Describe the Tier I Text instruction you provided for these students. Briefly describe each model (i.e., FORI, QtA) and its respective components. Did any component seem to offer students more difficulty or ease than others? Why? What, if any, adjustments did you make?

3. Summary and analysis of student’s reading abilities at posttest.

After administering the posttest and analyzing the data, describe the student’s reading abilities at the end of the school year. Discuss his/her reading ability on 2 measures (e.g., DIBELS, UURC-RLA, CRT), 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 from your practicum experience? How has this learning informed your practice? Provide specific examples.

-----

This case study must be typed, double-spaced, and **must** include the following information:

- your full name
- student identification or social security number
- semester and year you registered for the course (e.g., Fall, 2007)
- course name, course number, section number (e.g., Tier I Text 5651-040)
- your employing school and district (e.g., Sandy Elementary, Jordan District)

This information may be placed on page 1; a separate cover page is **not** necessary.

The case study should be no longer than 7-10 pages in length. It must meet American Psychological Association (APA) standards for writing style and mechanics. As such, students are encouraged to have their papers proofread for appropriate grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

Your case study is due by 5pm, June 15th. We encourage you to submit your case study electronically to [kathleen.brown@utah.edu](mailto:kathleen.brown@utah.edu). If electronic submission is not possible, you may bring a hard copy to the UURC (attention: Dr. Kathleen Brown), 5242 South College Drive, Suite 100, Murray, UT 84123. If you want your paper returned, please enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope when you submit the paper. Papers that do not include a self-addressed, stamped envelope will be discarded.

**Case Study Grading Rubric:** The case study will earn pass +, pass, pass -, or fail. The criteria for grading are as follows:

*Pass +* = Exceptionally strong summary and analysis of baseline abilities, Tier I Text instructional models, and posttest results. Exceptional analysis of practicum's impact on own teaching. Superior academic writing style. No mechanical errors.

*Pass* = Satisfactory summary and analysis of baseline abilities, Tier I Text instructional models, and posttest results. Satisfactory analysis of practicum's impact on own teaching. Satisfactory academic writing style. Very few, if any, mechanical errors.

*Pass -* = Less than satisfactory summary and analysis of baseline results, Tier I Text instruction, 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 satisfactorily meets the first three criteria but evidences numerous mechanical errors will earn "pass -."

Case Study Grading Conversions:

Pass + = 4.0-3.7(A to A-)      Pass = 3.3-2.0(B+ to C)      Pass - = 1.7-.7(C- to D-)

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.

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