EDU 5652/6652-040: Tier I Instruction for Writing about Challenging Text

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

Logistics: - on location in schools
                   - register fall semester/tutor all year/grade posts spring semester
                   - implementation in classroom; minimum 2 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 builds on theoretical and practical knowledge acquired from a pre-requisite course: EDU 5651/6651: Tier I Instruction for Improved Fluency and Comprehension and expands that knowledge to Tier I writing instruction for students from diverse backgrounds. Educators will learn to execute effective, research-based writing instruction for challenging Tier I text in a whole class setting. The course follows a "practicum model," in which participants build a conceptual framework for writing development and effective writing instruction through a year-long, mentored experience.

The course is open to any educator who has completed the pre-requisite course, 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: writing process, writing fluency, text structure, scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, oral language development, academic language, writing skills (i.e., grammar, punctuation, spelling) building/activating background knowledge, instructional planning, self-regulation, 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.

Recommended Readings

Graham, S. & Harris, K.R. (2005). *Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Ferretti, R.P., & Lewis, W.E. (2013). Best practices in teaching argumentative writing. In Graham, S., MacArthur, C.A. & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 113-140). NY: Guilford.

Bruning, R.H., & Kauffman, D.F. (2016). Self-efficacy beliefs and motivation in writing development. In C. MacArthur, Graham, S., & Fitzgerald. J (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 160-173). NY: Guilford.

Graham, S., Harris, K.R., & Chambers, A.B. (2016). Evidence-based practice and writing instruction: A review of reviews. In C. MacArthur, Graham, S., & Fitzgerald. J (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 211-226). NY: Guilford.

Hillocks, G. (1987). Synthesis of research on teaching writing. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 71-82. Retrieved from www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198705_hillocks.pdf.

MacArthur, C.A., & Graham, S. (2016). Writing research from a cognitive perspective. In C. MacArthur, Graham, S., & Fitzgerald. J (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 24-40). NY: Guilford.

Santangelo, T., & Harris, K.R., & Graham, S. (2016). Self-regulation and writing: Meta-analysis of the self-regulation processes in Zimmerman and Risemberg's model. In C. MacArthur, Graham, S., & Fitzgerald. J (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 174-193). NY: Guilford.

Saddler, B. (2013). Best practices in sentence construction. In Graham, S., MacArthur, C.A. & Fitzgerald, J. (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 238-256). NY: Guilford.

Course Schedule

Clinical Sessions: Topics and Readings

Session 1
Review of Tier I Text Routines, Introduction of Tier I Writing Routines: review of Fluency-Oriented Reading Instruction (FORI) and Questioning the Author (QtA) routines—especially Deep Queries, issues in Tier I writing instruction, empirical research base, overview of practicum expectations, and overview of university credit options.

Clinic: instructor reviews Tier I Text routines and introduces Tier I Writing About Challenging Text routines, including prompt development, prompt analysis and using organizers to prepare for composing.

Reading:
Graham, S. & Harris, K.R. (2005). *Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
- Section 1 – The Power of Writing, pp. 1-20.
- Section 2 – Strategies for Teaching Planning, Writing and Revising, pp. 21-38.

Session 2

Writing about Informational Text: brief review of research on writing instruction, prompt development and analysis, review of informational text structure with organizer, motivation for organizer use & fluent writing, sequencing for paragraphs, use of an informational summary frame with sentence starters, use of academic language, engagement techniques for whole class drafting and choral re-reading to edit/move forward.

Clinic: instructor models drafting a summary of challenging informational text with whole class. Clinic is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, engagement, scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, oral language diversity and development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, and clarification.

Readings: MacArthur& Graham (pp. 24-40), Hillocks (pp 71-82), Graham, Harris & Chambers 9pp. 211-226)

Session 3

Writing about Narrative Text: prompt development and analysis, review of narrative text structure with organizer, motivation for organizer use & fluent writing, sequencing for paragraphs, use of a narrative summary frame with sentence starters, use of academic language, engagement techniques for whole class drafting and choral re-reading to edit/move forward.

Clinic: instructor models drafting a summary of challenging narrative text with whole class. Clinic is followed by discussion of relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, engagement, scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, oral language diversity and development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, and clarification.

Reading:
    Graham, S. & Harris, K.R. (2005). *Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
        - Section 3 – Writing Strategies That Can Be Applied Broadly, pp. 39-80.
        - Section 4 – Writing Strategies That Are Genre Specific, pp. 81-132.

Session 4

Using 2 Texts for an Explanatory/Informative Essay: prompt development and analysis, adding info from multiple texts to organizer, gradual release through use of pair-share to finish sentence starters within an informational summary frame, engagement techniques for whole class drafting and choral re-reading to edit/move forward.

Clinic: instructor models adding info from 2 texts to organizer and use of pair-share to reduce scaffolding for writing about informational text with a whole class. Clinic is followed by discussion of possible timelines for writing instruction for the remainder of

the school year, relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, engagement, scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, oral language diversity and development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, and clarification.

Reading:
        Graham, S. & Harris, K.R. (2005). *Writing better: Effective strategies for teaching students with learning difficulties.* Baltimore, MD: Brookes.
           - Section 5 – Strategies for Self-Regulating and the Writing Process, pp. 133-154.

Session 5
Using 2 Texts for an Opinion/Argument Essay: prompt development and analysis, adding info from multiple texts to organizer, gradual release through use of pair-share to finish sentence starters within an opinion/argument frame, engagement techniques for whole class drafting and choral re-reading to edit/move forward.

Clinic: instructor models adding info from 2 texts to organizer and use of pair-share to reduce scaffolding for writing an opinion/argument with a whole class. Clinic is followed by discussion of possible timelines for writing instruction for the remainder of the school year, relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, engagement, scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, oral language diversity and development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, and clarification.

Reading: Ferretti & Lewis (2013), Saddler (2103). Santangelo, Harris & Graham (2016).

Session 6
Using 2 Texts for an Opinion/Argument Essay: prompt development and analysis, adding info from multiple texts to organizer, gradual release through use of pair-share to finish sentence starters within an opinion/argument frame, engagement techniques for whole class drafting and choral re-reading to edit/move forward.

Clinic: instructor models adding info from 2 texts to organizer and use of pair-share to reduce scaffolding for writing an opinion/argument with a whole class. Clinic is followed by discussion of possible timelines for writing instruction for the remainder of the school year, gradual release of responsibility, relevant instructional issues (e.g., pacing, engagement, scaffolding, gradual release of responsibility, oral language diversity and development) and opportunities for questions, remodeling, and clarification.

Reading: Bruning & Kauffman (2016)

Course Credit Criteria
To earn university credit, participants must satisfactorily meet each of the following criteria:
- use Tier I Text Routines with whole class daily for 40 minutes,
- complete and use weekly at least 25 prompts, LPs and organizers
- attend 6 half-day clinical trainings, conducted by a Licensed Tier I Writing About Text Trainer,
- complete at least 5 observations conducted by a Licensed Tier I Writing About Text Trainer or a certified Tier I Writing About Text Educator working in a support capacity under a Licensed Tier I Writing About Text Trainer,
- earn satisfactory ratings for at least 2 of those observations, with 1 of those satisfactory ratings earned on the final observation,
- conduct at least 2 self-observations of writing instruction (1 organizer video & 1 drafting video),
- read research articles on writing instruction, and,
- earn a grade of .7 or better on instruction and written case study.

Instruction Execution Grading Rubric: Instruction 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 Writing About Tier I Text instruction for most of the practicum. Satisfactory to strong preparation and management of Writing About Tier I Text materials. Satisfactory to strong ability to integrate mentor feedback into Writing About Tier I Text instruction. Satisfactory to strong contribution to clinical sessions.

  Pass - = Less than satisfactory Writing About Tier I Text instruction for most of the practicum. Less than satisfactory preparation and management of Writing About Tier I Text materials. Less than satisfactory ability to integrate mentor feedback into Writing About 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 5652/6652-040 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 one student's foundation for reading/writing 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 or UURC-RLA & SAGE Writing Score), you must discuss his/her reading and writing abilities in relation to chronological grade level expectations. Specifically, at baseline, where is this student in relation to where s/he should be?

2. Summary and analysis of the Writing About Tier I Text Instruction.
Describe the Writing About Tier I Text instruction you provided for your students.
Briefly describe each model (i.e., FORI, QtA) and its respective components. Did any
component seem to offer your case study student 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/writing abilities at the end of the school year. Discuss his/her reading ability on 2
measures (e.g., DIBELS or UURC-RLA & SAGE Writing Score), 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/writing 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
- semester and year you registered for the course (e.g., Fall, 2019)
- course name, course number, section number (e.g., Writing About Tier I Text
  5652-040)
- your employing school and district (e.g., Horizon Elementary, Murray
  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. 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, Writing About Tier I Text instructional components, 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, Writing About Tier I Text instructional components, 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, Writing About Tier I Text instructional components, 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 (pass) 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.