

## Grades 6-12 Literacy Instruction Practice Profile

### Philosophy, Values & Guiding Principles:

According to Rule 6A-6.053 of the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan, the plan must demonstrate adequate provisions for:

- Ensuring that all instruction in reading is systematic, explicit, based on data and uses an evidence-based sequence of reading instruction and strategies to meet the needs of students at the school level and determine appropriate instructional adjustments;
- Ensuring that data from formative assessments are used to guide differentiation of reading instruction; and
- Incorporating reading and literacy instruction by content-area teachers into subject areas to extend and build discussions of text in order to deepen understanding.

According to the rule, reading instruction:

- Provides print-rich, explicit, systematic, scaffolded and differentiated instruction;
- Builds background and content knowledge; and
- Incorporates appropriate writing in response to reading.

Additionally, literacy instruction in grades 6-12 must be:

- Aligned to the B.E.S.T. Standards for English Language Arts (ELA); and
- Informed by four types of classroom assessment (screening, progress monitoring/formative assessment, diagnosis and summative assessment) to guide differentiation of instruction and the use of corrective feedback.

Literacy and reading instruction are to be inclusive of all learners, incorporating the principles of Universal Design for Learning and providing appropriate accommodations for students with a disability, students with an Individual Educational Plan (IEP) and students who are English language learners. Finally, high-quality literacy and reading instruction are guided by careful planning of appropriate instructional goals, content, methods/routines, use of materials and text selection, including quality texts, such as the sample texts by grade and standard included in the B.E.S.T. Standards for ELA.

**Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria:** Includes instruction provided to all students in grades 6-12.

### Desired Outcome:

1. Increase the percentage of students reading on grade level.
2. Close the achievement gap for Florida's most vulnerable students.
3. Increase Florida's high school graduation rates.

Core Component	Contribution to the Desired Outcomes	Accomplished Use	Ineffective Use
Description of the Component	An explanation of how the components contribute to the desired outcome	Activities and behaviors that exemplify adult practitioners who are able to generalize required skills and abilities to a wide range of settings and contexts; skills are used consistently and independently – skills are sustained over time while continuing to grow	Activities and behaviors that exemplify adult practitioners who are not yet able to implement the required skills or abilities in context
<b>EXPLICIT INSTRUCTION</b> is intentional teaching with a clear and direct presentation of new information to learners, which does not require student inferencing during the introduction of new or previously taught content, concepts or skills (e.g., the gradual release model).	Explicit instruction contributes to the learner's: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear understanding of newly introduced or previously taught content, concepts and skills;</li> <li>2. Positive engagement in relating to the new learning; and</li> <li>3. Continued literacy progress.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher will communicate goals and expectations for student learning.</li> <li>2. Teacher will provide clear explanations of goals and expectations for student learning.</li> <li>3. Teacher will model or demonstrate, providing examples and non-examples.</li> <li>4. Teacher will provide opportunities for student practice with guidance.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher indirectly communicates goals and expectations for student learning.</li> <li>2. Teacher provides explanations of goals and expectations that are unclear.</li> <li>3. Teacher models or demonstrates but does not provide clear examples and non-examples.</li> <li>4. Teacher provides opportunities for student practice without guidance.</li> </ol>
<b>SYSTEMATIC INSTRUCTION</b> is a planned sequence that includes a logical progression of content, concepts and skills, from simple to complex, with cumulative	Systematic instruction contributes to the learner's continuous acquisition of increasingly complex content, concepts and skills in order to become a confident reader. It decreases the prospect of a	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher will activate the student's prior knowledge.</li> <li>2. Teacher conducts a cumulative review, enabling learners to make connections to previously learned material.</li> <li>3. Teacher uses a logical progression</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher provides instruction without activating the student's prior knowledge.</li> <li>2. Teacher does not conduct a cumulative review, preventing learners from making connections to previously learned material.</li> <li>3. Teacher does not use a logical</li> </ol>

Core Component	Contribution to the Desired Outcomes	Accomplished Use	Ineffective Use
teaching/review and practice to enable learners to achieve learning goals.	learner developing a reading difficulty over time.	<p>of content, concept and skill, proceeding from simple to more complex.</p> <p>4. Teacher will provide multiple and varied opportunities for student practice.</p>	<p>progression of content, concept and skill, proceeding from simple to more complex.</p> <p>4. Teacher does not provide multiple and varied opportunities for student practice.</p>
<p><b>SCAFFOLDED INSTRUCTION</b> is the intentional support provided by a teacher for learners to carry out a task or solve a problem, to achieve a goal that they could not do without support. It is temporary support matched to the current understanding or skill level of learners. The intent is to provide a decreasing level of support until learners are empowered to perform independently.</p>	Scaffolding instruction contributes toward the quality of a learner's efforts in relating to new or unfamiliar content, concepts and skills that fortify the development of language and literacy skills orally and in written form.	<p>1. Teacher uses formative assessments to identify the student's need and adjusts support based on the student's response.</p> <p>2. Teacher uses temporary written or verbal prompts, tools or resources to provide appropriate support (think alouds, cue cards, checklists, examples).</p> <p>3. Teacher engages students in interactive, content-centered learning (dialogue, exchange of ideas, opportunities to question and clarify).</p> <p>4. Teacher intentionally and gradually decreases support and transfers responsibility to students as self-sufficiency is developed (I do—we do—you do).</p>	<p>1. Teacher uses formative assessments to identify the student's need but does not adjust support based on the student's response.</p> <p>2. Teacher does not use temporary written or verbal prompts, tools or resources to provide appropriate support (think alouds, cue cards, checklists, examples).</p> <p>3. Teacher does not engage students in interactive, content-centered learning (dialogue, exchange of ideas, opportunities to question and clarify).</p> <p>4. Teacher intentionally and gradually decreases support but does not transfer responsibility to students as self-sufficiency is developed (I do—we do—you do).</p>
<p><b>CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK</b> is clearly communicated, timely and developmentally appropriate information aligned to learning goals or objectives that specifically addresses the</p>	Corrective feedback contributes to a learner's awareness of errors and increases self-correction and self-regulation, the quality of a learner's literacy engagement, motivation and independence for improved performance,	<p>1. Teacher identifies the student's misunderstanding or error relative to the target instructional goal.</p> <p>2. Teacher communicates feedback clearly and in a timely manner using student-friendly language.</p>	<p>1. Teacher does not identify the student's misunderstanding or error relative to the target instructional goal.</p> <p>2. Teacher communicates immediate feedback but does not provide it in student-friendly language.</p>

Core Component	Contribution to the Desired Outcomes	Accomplished Use	Ineffective Use
learner's errors or misconceptions. It is one type of ongoing instructional feedback.	behavior and academic achievement.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Teacher provides students the opportunity for timely self-correction.</li> <li>4. The teacher repeats the process as needed or confirms accuracy based on the learner's response.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Teacher does not provide students with an opportunity for timely self-correction.</li> <li>4. The teacher repeats the process but does not confirm accuracy based on the learner's response.</li> </ol>
<b>DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION</b> is adapting instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners in order to increase their access and opportunities to meet specific learning goals.	Differentiated instruction contributes to the refined understanding of specific content, concepts and skills within each learner's distinct range of understanding and independent practice that improves individual abilities to successfully engage in comprehension, fluency/decoding, letter-word reading, vocabulary and writing.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher creates flexible structures and routines that allow for differentiation.</li> <li>2. Teacher delivers instruction that is adapted through content, process and/or product in order to meet individual student learning needs.</li> <li>3. Teacher monitors student understanding and progress toward meeting targeted learning goals on a continued basis.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teacher creates flexible structures and routines that do not allow for differentiation.</li> <li>2. Teacher delivers instruction that is adapted through content, process and/or product but does not meet individual student learning needs.</li> <li>3. Teacher does not monitor student understanding and progress toward meeting targeted learning goals on a continued basis.</li> </ol>

**Glossary of Terms:**

**Cumulative review:** Frequently reviewing concepts that have been taught previously over time. Lessons build on previous knowledge, moving from simple concepts to more difficult concepts

**Gradual Release Model:** Strategic transfer of responsibility in the learning process from the teacher to the student

**Inferencing:** Process of drawing conclusions based on information provided plus prior knowledge and experience

**Intense support:** Directs the student's thinking but does not provide the answer

**Moderate support:** Encourages a student to utilize their own thinking without stretching the student beyond their capacity

## Citation of Research Used:

### **Corrective Feedback**

- Andrade, H.L. (2019). A Critical Review of Research on Self-Assessment. *Frontiers in Education*, 27(4). <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00087>
- Beesley, A., & Apthorp, H. (Eds.). (2010). *Classroom Instruction That Works, Second Edition: Research Report*. MCREL International.
- Hattie, J., & Timperly, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses*. Routledge. [https://apprendre.auf.org/wp-content/opera/13-BF-References-et-biblio-RPT-2014/Visible%20Learning\\_A%20synthesis%20or%20over%20800%20Meta-analyses%20Relating%20to%20Achievement\\_Hattie%20J%202009%20...pdf](https://apprendre.auf.org/wp-content/opera/13-BF-References-et-biblio-RPT-2014/Visible%20Learning_A%20synthesis%20or%20over%20800%20Meta-analyses%20Relating%20to%20Achievement_Hattie%20J%202009%20...pdf)
- Li, S., & Vuono, A. (2019). Twenty-five Years of Research on Oral and Written Corrective Feedback in System. *System*, 84, 93–109.
- McLeskey, J., Barringer, M-D., Billingsley, B., Brownell, M., Jackson, D., Kennedy, M., Lewis, T., Maheady, L., Rodriguez, J., Scheeler, M.C., Winn, J., & Ziegler, D. (2017). *High-leverage Practices in Special Education*. Council for Exceptional Children & CEEDAR Center.
- McMillan, J.H., & Hearn, J. (2008). Student Self-Assessment: The Key to Stronger Student Motivation and Higher Achievement. *Educational Horizons*, 87(1), 40–49. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ815370.pdf>
- Panadero, E. (2017). A Review of Self-Regulated Learning: Six Models and Four Directions in Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 422. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00422>
- Shute, V.J. (2008). Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189.
- Wisniewski, B., Zierer, K. & Hattie, J. (2020). The Power of Feedback Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of Educational Feedback Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 3087. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087>

### **Differentiated Instruction**

- Bondie, R. S., Dahnke, C., & Zusho, A. (2019). How does changing “one-size-fits-all” to differentiated instruction affect teaching? *Review of Research in Education*, 43(1), 336–362. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3102/0091732X18821130>
- Deunk, M. I., Smale-Jacobse, A. E., de Boer, H., Doolaard, S., & Bosker, R. J. (2018). Effective differentiation practices: A systematic review and meta-analysis of studies on the cognitive effects of differentiation practices in primary education. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 31–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.02.002>

- Puzio, K., Colby, G.T., & Algeo-Nichols, D. (2020). Differentiated literacy instruction: boondoggle or best practice? *Review of Educational Research*, 90(4), 459–498. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654320933536>
- Smale, A.E., Meijer, A., Helms-Lorenz, M. & Maulana, R. (2019). Differentiated instruction in secondary education: a systematic review of research evidence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02366>
- Valiandes, S. (2015). Evaluating the impact of differentiated instruction on literacy and reading in mixed ability classrooms: Quality and equity dimensions of education effectiveness. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 45, 17–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.02.005>
- Watts-Taffe, S., Laster, B.P., Broach, L., Marinak, B., Connor, C.M., Walker-Dalhouse, D. (2012). Differentiated instruction: making informed teacher decisions. *The Reading Teacher*, 66(4), 303–314. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/TRTR.01126>

### ***Explicit and Systematic Instruction***

- Archer, A.L., & Hughes, C.A. (2011). *Explicit instruction: Effective and efficient teaching*. The Guilford Press.
- Boardman, A.G., Roberts, G., Vaughn, S., Wexler, J., Murray, C.S., & Kosanovich, M. (2008). *Effective Instruction for Adolescent Struggling Readers: A Practice Brief*. RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- Clark, R.E., Kirschner, P.A., & Sweller, J. (2012). Putting Students on the Path to Learning: The Case for Fully Guided Instruction. *American Educator*, 36(1), 6–11. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ971752.pdf>
- Finlayson, K., & McCrudden, M.T. (2020). Teacher-implemented Writing Instruction for Elementary Students: A Literature Review. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 36(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10573569.2019.1604278>
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing Next: Effective Strategies to Improve Writing of Adolescents in Middle and High Schools – A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York*. Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graham, S., McKeown, D., Kihara, S., & Harris, K.R. (2012). A Meta-analysis of Writing Instruction for Students in the Elementary Grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 879–896. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029185>
- Hougen, M. (2014). *Evidence-based Reading Instruction for Adolescents, Grades 6-12 (Document No. IC-13)*. University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator Development, Accountability and Reform (CEEDAR) Center.
- Kosanovich, M.L., Reed, D.K., & Miller, D.H. (2010). Bringing Literacy Strategies into Content Instruction: Professional Learning for Secondary-Level Teachers. RMC Research Corporation, Center on Instruction.
- National Institute for Literacy. (2007). *What Content-Area Teachers Should Know About Adolescent Literacy*. National Institute of Child Health & Human Services. [https://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/adolescent\\_literacy07.pdf](https://lincs.ed.gov/publications/pdf/adolescent_literacy07.pdf)

## ***Scaffolded Instruction***

- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C.E. (2006). *Reading next - A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy: A report to Carnegie Corporation of New York* (2nd ed.). Alliance for Excellent Education. [https://media.carnegie.org/filer\\_public/b7/5f/b75fba81-16cb-422d-ab59-373a6a07eb74/ccny\\_report\\_2004\\_reading.pdf](https://media.carnegie.org/filer_public/b7/5f/b75fba81-16cb-422d-ab59-373a6a07eb74/ccny_report_2004_reading.pdf)
- Pierce, K.M.G. (2020). Talking about books: Scaffolding deep discussions. *Reading Teacher*, 74(4), 385–393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1957>
- Reynolds, D. (2017). Interactional scaffolding for reading comprehension: A systematic review. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, (66), 135–156. DOI: 10.1177/2381336917718820.
- Rosenshine, B. (2011). Principles of Instruction: Research-based Strategies that All Teachers Should Know. *American Educator*, 36(1), 12–19. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ971753.pdf>
- Shute, V.J. (2008). Focus on Formative Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(1), 153–189 <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Van de Pol, J., Volman, M., & Beishuizen, J. (2010). Scaffolding in Teacher-Student Interaction: A Decade of Research. *Education Psychology Review*, 22, 271–296. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10648-010-9127-6>